TO: File

FROM: Christopher R. Bean, PE

DATE: May 24, 2018

RE: Exit 4A, Derry-Londonderry 13065
Public Information Meeting
CLD | Fuss & O’Neill Reference No. 05-0244

LOCATION: Derry West Running Brook Elementary School

ATTENDEES: See Attached List of Citizen Attendees who signed in. Additional attendees included:

- Keith Cota, NHDOT
- Marc Laurin, NHDOT
- Jamie Sikora, FHWA
- Dave Caron, Derry
- Janusz Czyzowski, Londonderry
- Project Team
  - Larry Pesesky, LBG
  - Kerri Snyder, LBG
  - Vicki Chase, NAI
  - John Connors, State Representative
  - David Milz, State Representative
  - Paul Konieczka, CLD | Fuss & O’Neill
  - Nicole Fox, CLD | Fuss & O’Neill
  - Chris Bean, CLD | Fuss & O’Neill

1. Informal Review Session: Some attendees took advantage of the 30 minute informal inspection period before the meeting and a period following the presentation to inspect the plans, the evaluation matrix and get questions answered. Each project team member was wearing a “Project Team” nametag to assist the public with identifying the team members.

2. Presentation:
   a. It was noted that a copy of the PowerPoint presentation would be loaded onto the project website i93exit4a.com along with the Fact Sheet and meeting notes.
   b. The PowerPoint presentation was made by Keith Cota and Chris Bean. It consisted of an overview of the project’s origins through to the current timeline and presentation of the re-evaluation of the 2007 DEIS reasonable range of alternatives, which indicates no new information or circumstances that would warrant reconsideration of Alternative A being the preferred alternative. It was pointed out that the project will have no westerly access to the local street network. This was a condition of the original approval from the USDOT to allow a new interchange.
3. **Questions, Comments and Responses:** Find below a summary of the questions that were asked along with responses.

a. **Project Schedule:** Representative Milz expressed frustration that the project has not advanced forward. The information presented is a repeat of prior summaries in 2007. [Response: Due to the dated timeline lapse since the original study in 2007, a revisit of the reasonable range of alternatives was needed to update the corridors for environmental resources and traffic modeling for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and FHWA's NEPA regulations.]

b. **Review the SDEIS:** Representative O’Connor requested the opportunity to review the Supplemental Draft EIS when it is available. [Response: Yes, it will be made available for public review prior to the Public Hearing anticipated to be held in September 2018.]

c. **Truck Traffic Rte. 102 and Tsienneto Road:** Stephen Landau, Selectman from Chester expressed his concern for increased traffic (especially for heavy vehicles) through the town of Chester. He requested consideration of restricting the State highway and Tsienneto Road to “no through trucking.” [Response: Current state laws do not restrict truck traffic on State routes. Restricting through trucking along Tsienneto Road is an issue the Town can consider.]

d. **Re-evaluation of Alternatives:** One resident asked if the scope included re-evaluation of all of the original (47) build alternatives. [Response: No. The SDEIS will address the re-evaluation of the final five build alternatives.]

e. **No Build Alternative:** Several residents from Derry spoke in support of the no-build alternative due to their lack of support and objection for the prior town lawsuit that set up town funding for the development of Exit 4A. [Response: The EIS document is being completed at the request of the Towns. The five build alternatives and the no-build alternative were developed previously as part of the EIS process. They are being measured as to their effectiveness in meeting project's purpose and need.]

f. **Tsienneto Road Alignment, Water Quality (Wells) and Flooding:** One property owner along Tsienneto Road, between the Route 28 Bypass and Route 102 expressed concern with the increased traffic due to a hill limiting sight distance, the potential negative impacts to private drinking water wells and the flooding along the easterly section down near Route 102. [Response: The roadway alignment will be adjusted to address the vertical issues; the wells should not be affected by the project as this section of roadway will only be adding 4 or 5 foot shoulders and will not be adding any additional lanes so no appreciable increase in chloride will result and the project will include water quality measures to treat roadway runoff. The water quality basins will be located outside the protective radius of the drinking water wells. The project will also evaluate the floodway along this easterly stream system. More detailed information will be presented at the next meeting planned in July.]

g. **Rail Trail Underpass:** Rail trail advocates expressed their appreciation for the connector road installation of an underpass culvert to allow for future connectivity of the rail trail. They also noted there is a gap in the section of publically owned trail to the north and requested that the project include acquisition of public rights to the rail in this gap section as part of the project. [Response: At this time, the project scope only includes the connection of the rail on the north side of the connector road to the existing rail corridor.]
h. **Project Cost:** A question was asked about the estimated cost in the alternative evaluation matrix. Are the construction costs and transmission line relocation costs representative of the total cost? [Response: No. The total cost will also take into consideration Preliminary Engineering, Right of Way and Mitigation costs. The Preliminary Engineering costs would be similar for all alternatives except for the Alternative F, which does not meet the Project and Need, so it will not be differentiator in the alternative selection process. The ROW and Mitigation costs are still being developed. The project is currently estimated to cost a total of $56M, which includes $37M for construction and an estimated $12M for ROW.]

i. **Project Benefit to Derry:** One resident asked about the benefit of the project to the community of Derry. [Response: The EIS has progressed based on the approved purpose and need and the EIS is being processed in response to a joint request from the towns.]

j. **Traffic Signal Delays:** A resident was concerned that the additional proposed signals on Alternative A will result in more delay. [Response: New signals are included at intersections that meet signalization warrants based on the projected future traffic volumes in the design year of 2040. It was noted that in order to accommodate the needs of vehicles from all roads entering the intersection, typically additional lanes are needed to pass the traffic. All proposed signalized intersections are designed to pass the traffic from all intersecting roads with reasonable delays.]

k. **I-93 Soundwalls:** Two residents along I-93 (one from Trolley Car Lane (west) and one from Seasons Lane (east) expressed concern for the delay on the installation of the ‘promised’ soundwalls north of Ash Street bridge overpass. [Response: The Department has requested the contractor to not install the soundwalls along this section until a determination can be made as to whether their location will be impacted by the proposed Exit 4A alternative, as it would not be a good use of public funds to build a soundwall now that would need to be relocated to accommodate Exit 4A. New ROW may also be needed to accommodate soundwalls, which could not be purchased until after the NEPA process for Exit 4A is complete. The current contractor efforts only include the construction of the earth berms to support the future soundwalls. Construction of the berms represents a small percentage of the total cost of the soundwalls. Most of the cost is related to the structural elements. The soundwall construction may need to be delayed until the Exit 4A project goes to construction. When analyses show that a soundwall is reasonable and feasible, the NHDOT soundwall policy requires the soundwall be constructed to abate noise to exterior, ground level areas where frequent human use occurs, not the upper floors of residences.]

l. **Rte. 102 Rotary (East Derry):** A resident noted there is extreme congestion at the Derry rotary. Will improvements be included with the project to address this concern? [Response: No. The project limits were established based on the need to address roadways and intersections that would be adversely affected by the project. With the preferred alternative (Alternative A), the Derry rotary is not adversely impacted by traffic from the project. Subsequent to this meeting, it was verified that there are no plans in either the Town’s capital improvement plan or the State’s Ten Year Transportation Plan to reconstruct the rotary. The Town has not lobbied for this project to be included in the State’s Ten Year Transportation Plan. Also the
Town has not undertaken any studies to review capacity or safety concerns. Note: It was suggested at this meeting, that residents and the Town could request improvements through their local regional planning commission. This project could then compete against other proposed projects statewide to be included as part of the next State Ten Year Transportation Plan.

m. **Watchdog to Ensure Compliance:** One resident asked if there would be anyone following up to ensure that commitments made during the design phase are in fact implemented as part of the construction. [Response: Jamie Sikora, from FHWA noted that FHWA has the responsibility to ensure that the project is built in conformance with the all permit related conditions.]

n. **Seasons Lane Blasting Damage:** Cindy Gervais noted she is already seeing damage from blasting associated with the ongoing I-93 widening project. How will she be assured she won’t see more as part of the Exit 4A project? [Response: Ms. Gervais concerns have been forwarded to NHDOT Bureau of Construction.]

o. **Meeting Notifications:** One abutter asked why abutters were not notified of this meeting. [Response: This meeting included discussion of the five build alternatives, which are spaced over a large region. Due to the number of notifications that would have been required, notifications for this meeting were sent to the towns for posting and placed in the local paper. Also those who had asked to be added to the mailing list were sent a notification by email. All abutters along Alternative A will be notified in advance of the July public meeting. All abutter parties with interest in the properties (owners, mortgage holders etc.) will be notified by certified mail for the following meeting which will be the Public Hearing.]

4. **Handwritten Comments/Questions Received After the Meeting (new comments not noted above)**

   a. **Water and Sewer Tsienneto Road:** A Tsienneto Road resident asked if water and sewer will be installed along Tsienneto Road. [Response: There are no plans in the Town's master plan or the capital improvement plan to provide sewer or water to Tsienneto Road properties between NH 28 Bypass and NH 102.]

   b. **Opposed to Project:** A resident requested the project not be continued due to the destruction of many homes.

   c. **Recreation Trail:** Julie Carignan, Board Member of the Windham Rail Trail Alliance noted the importance of the Granite State Rail Trail to the community. Allowing trail access for pedestrians, bikers, hikers and other recreational users is important. Goal is to connect Salem to Concord and beyond. Please include bike lanes, sidewalks, safety barriers and other necessary improvements. [Response: A combination of shoulders and sidewalks, where they exist today are proposed as part of the project.]

   d. **Impacts to 33 Londonderry Road (Route 102 Towing) Anticipated?** [Response: The project does not extend south of the Ash Street Bridge so no work/impacts are anticipated.]

   e. **Signalization at NH 28 Bypass/English Range Road:** A resident requested that signalization be considered at this intersection due to increased traffic. [Response: The NH 28 Bypass/English Range Road/Scobie Pond Road intersection is outside the limits of the Alternative A project area. However this intersection is currently scheduled to be signalized by a separate NHDOT project in 2019.]
5. **July Public Information Meeting**: Another public information meeting will be held in July where we will provide more details on the preferred alternative (Alternative A).

CRB:
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