

**SPECIAL MEETING
BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN
(RE: NHDOT PRESENTATION)**

March 26, 2013

6:00 p.m.

Mayor Gatsas called the meeting to order.

Mayor Gatsas called for the Pledge of Allegiance, this function being led by Alderman Greazzo.

Mayor Gatsas called for a moment of silence.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Craig, Long, Roy, Osborne, Corriveau, O'Neil, Levasseur,
Shea, Shaw, Greazzo, Gamache, Arnold

Absent: Aldermen Ludwig, Roy, Katsiantonis

4. Presentation by the New Hampshire DOT regarding the I-293 exits 6&7 project.

Mayor Gatsas stated Alderman O'Neil, if you would pick up chairing this, I have to go to the School Board and preside over a meeting there for the superintendent search. Good luck, everybody. Make sure that they don't give us a little project; we want the whole thing done.

Chairman O'Neil stated thank you, Your Honor. With that, I will introduce Keith Cota for project management for New Hampshire DOT Exits 6 and 7 among many other projects. We have seen him on TV with the memorial bridge and there were probably a few more along the way. Keith, why don't you take over for tonight's presentation?

Mr. Keith Cota, Project Manager at New Hampshire DOT, stated thank you. We certainly want to acknowledge that we very much appreciate the opportunity to come down to give an update about one very important project for the city, but I also have an update on Exit 4 if we have some extra time. They are two very critical projects for the city. As Alderman O'Neil stated, I certainly have put my feet around the state with the bridge project in Newington/Dover. It will be great to work closer to Concord. What we have this evening is basically an overview of the Exit 6 and 7 project. I have with me Mike Dugas from our Bureau of Highway Design. Next to him is Bill Cass, Director

of Project Development, so if you have any tough questions I will let Bill Answer those. We also have our consultant from VHB, Marty Kennedy and I am going to be passing the mic over to Marty and hopefully we can answer any questions you have about Exits 6 and 7. It will give you a good understanding as to where we are going and the time schedule that we are looking at.

Mr. Marty Kennedy, VHB, stated Vanasse Hangen Brustlin are the lead on the study team, but we are also working with Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission who is preparing the traffic plan for the team as well as RKG Associates who are on our camp. Let me just review the overall study purpose. The purpose of this study is to consider transportation system modification aimed at addressing capacity and safety related deficiencies along the mainline and at the interchanges of Exits 6 and 7 for a three mile segment of I-293 including consideration of relocating and reconfiguring Exit 7 into a fully directional interchange. Let me quickly touch on the study corridor. I think you all know that the study corridor we are looking at starts just north of the Granite Street interchange and extends up through Exit 6. This is the existing Exit 7 on Front Street with the landfill. Up in this area, just north of the landfill, this is the area that we are looking at potentially relocating. We do have a technical advisory committee that has been put together. It is made up of members of the DOT, highway commission, Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission as well as the City of Manchester, Town of Goffstown, Town of Hooksett, the Chambers of Commerce, from Manchester and Hooksett, Manchester Community College and also State Senator David Boutin, who is also serving on that committee. Do we have a planning website, 293planningstudy.com, and you can go onto that website to get any of the materials, meeting minutes, upcoming schedules, that type of information. Before I go over the concepts, let me go over the over all schedule. We have broken out the overall project into four phases. We started in the spring of last year. In our first phase it was our data collection period and that was spring into summer of last year. That is when we went out and collected our traffic volume counts and prepared the traffic model, we developed our environmental resource mapping. We had all that. Into the fall of last year we stepped into the second phase, which we called the brain storming phase and it was there, based on the information we heard from public meetings and input from the website, where we developed what we thought were potential solutions. We had a public meeting here in December at the end of phase two where we presented those initial ideas. Then we moved into phase three and that is where we are right now, coming to the end of phase three and developing, evaluating and screening alternatives. We are better defining those alternatives. I am going to finish up the concept and come back to the schedule to figure out where we go from here. Ultimately this planning

study is going to be complete this summer. Once we get through phase three, which is the final stage of documentation getting all the plans and reports together, we are going to be done in the summer of this year. We have had a series of meetings like I said. We have had public meetings, advisory meetings, committee meetings, briefings with the Town of Hooksett and the Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission and with you here tonight. The idea is just to try to best keep the communities and the public up to speed where we are on the projects so we are continuing to do that. At one of the earlier public meetings, we had an informal public workshop and we asked people to come in to the meeting and talk to us informally about the problems were, some of the issues and constrains and also at that time the potential solutions. This is not a complete list, but some of the major problems or issues that were raised through that public meeting or from other input from the website included poor sight lines along the highway, queuing onto the highway from the ramps, high speed weaving, short on ramps and limited acceleration lengths, vehicular crashes, confusion or congestion at Amoskeag Circle, highway noise, truck access to Goffstown between Goffstown to the highway, congestion and safety issues at the MCC/Front Street intersection and limited access at existing Exit 7 location because it only has access from the south so you don't have full directional access. There were a few more, but those were the major issues being raised. With this, let me get into the various alternatives. Back in December we described a number of potential concepts and they are starting to look a little bit more like real design plans rather than the sketches that we had in December. However, I do want to make the point that this is still a planning study and even though some of these plans do look like more engineered plans, the reality is, because it is a planning study, we still don't have a good sense and it is still too early to know about property impacts. We have done a plan on an aerial, which means that there is going to be the obvious question of what is going to be in the impact on that property, but I just want to remind you that because it is a planning study we are well away from deciding if this is going to take one property or another. With that said, we are going to start with Exit 6. This is an aerial photo of Exit 6. North is to the right on 293 and the issues that were raised here were pretty much the idea of the weaving and the congestion problems up on the circle. This is where traffic today backs down the northbound ramp onto the highway. In the northbound on-ramp, although this ramp is relatively long, there is very little acceleration length here so once you are out you are right on the main line. In the southbound direction you have a heavy volume entering the ramp at that point and heavy volume exiting at that point so there is a very tight weave section that is in there that is problematic. Also, you have this small southbound slip ramp that is on a tight road so there is not much acceleration distance as you are entering the highway. We started looking at various alternatives and we are down now to four primary alternatives

for Exit 6. Let me go through them for you. The first one that we are looking at is a single point urban interchange. This is very similar to the layout you have at Granite Street. Single point meaning that it would be located at Amoskeag. Each of the ramps would come into a single intersection. The difference between what we are showing here and the single point is that the single point would actually be above the highway whereas on Granite Street the single point is below. I-293 would pass underneath and these ramps would come up to a single intersection here with a traffic signal. Because of the Front Street/Eddy Road... This is where the existing intersection is that is too close to be able to have a full intersection here. What this concept does is look at bringing Goffstown Road up and over the single point and Front Street passes underneath and comes down into an intersection somewhere in this area where there would be another structure that would pass over 293 and come into a signalized intersection at this point. What that would allow is all the ramps movement happening at a single point, but Front Street and Eddy Road could occur at the signalized intersection to either go into the city or go to Goffstown Road or go to the highway interchange. I said that today there is this existing short southbound ramp. Under this concept what we are proposing is that this be maintained, actually it would be restructured and provided sufficient acceleration and distance and so forth. The reason for this under this concept is that the volume of the traffic that comes up Eddy Road and gets on at this point would not, under the single point option, would need to come up and take a right hand turn at the signal, come to this signal, take a left hand turn, come to a third signal at the single point and then get on to the on-ramp. That is a little out of the way and the fear is that if we did that, the traffic that comes up today from Eddy Road would stay on the local streets and try to head back south to Granite Street. I think there would be a little bit too much impact on the local streets. I think under this condition, if this is the plan that goes forward, we could provide for that movement which would allow for the traffic to get on to the highway. The main line, 293, is proposed to be, in the future, three lanes in each direction. That is an additional through lane in each direction. At the Exit 6 interchange, coming southbound into the interchange, what we are proposing is that there would be three lanes coming down into the interchange, but with the relatively heavy volume that gets off at that ramp and the heavy volume that gets on at that ramp what we can do is actually drop a lane from three to two in this area for an immediate change and what that does is it allows this on-ramp to enter the highway without merging because it has its own lane. It would be able to accommodate that while entering the highway. This on-ramp from Eddy Road would be a ramp, a merge movement, so you could enter through that third lane but to be able to be able to drop that lane from three down to two and then allow this lane to come on, up into its own lane, will allow us to overall substantially improve the operations of the on-ramps

and the configuration in general. As I said, this is a planning study and way too early to talk about property impacts, but what we are trying to do here is minimize the impact to properties. If you give me just a minute to point out another few things. Along this that side here, this is the existing ramp, the gray area in here. This is the hotel that is located here. We are actually showing that we can provide greater distance between the road and the hotel under this concept than is out there today so we are not actually pushing into that area. Also, if you come over to this side, when we first started we were concerned about the properties on this side. That gray area is the existing circle and we are over here now so we are actually staying away from the properties here so we are trying to minimize impacts. Again, you can look at this gray area right underneath our ramp. This is the existing on-ramp and we are further to the west than that. We have a residential area in here and we are trying to minimize the impacts. At least at this point, with this concept, we are able to show substantial improvement, but at the same time trying to minimize impacts. There would be properties over here, but it looks as though all of the properties in this area would be able to keep impacts to a minimal. There are three other types of options for exit six and the other three are all very similar. The three of them are diamond configuration and I will walk through those. The diamond configuration looks something like this so as opposed to the single point which was located over here, now we have a diamond configuration where we have the southbound off ramp and on-ramp with two signalized intersections, the typical diamond type intersection. We would have Front Street entering Goffstown Road at the Amoskeag Bridge as a T-intersection. You would not be able to travel through, but you would be able to come in, enter and be able to come down to the signal at this point at Fletcher Street. The issue with this particular layout, with the diamond over here, as opposed to what the single point did is that the volume of traffic, the traffic that is either coming from Goffstown Road coming from the city, from the Amoskeag Bridge and off of Front Street all have to go through this area. This intersection is pulling a lot of traffic through that point and I will tell you that at this point, we are not finish all our analysis, but our analysis is saying that it is very challenging to make that work. Keep in mind that the difference between the single point was that we had the movements from the interchange that were happening here and we were able to split the traffic from Front Street away from those movement where when we had the diamond configuration all traffic is going through this point. We are looking at two other configurations here, very similar layout, diamond interchange configurations. This is a standard diamond interchange configuration. We are looking at a diverging diamond interchange. It is a little different. It is a little unconventional. There are not a lot of these around. Basically, the way it operates is that the signals are simple two-way operations with the segments between the two signals, traffic actually travels on the opposite side of the

bridge and if you are interested, at the end of the meeting, I actually have a video I can show you on how these operate if you want to see that, but it is a little bit of a different configuration. We are also looking at the same general layout, the diamond configuration, but with roundabout control. I will tell you again that we have not completed all of our evaluations, but I will tell you that so far the operational analysis for the two lane roundabouts is that they don't work very well. Again, I don't want to prejudge any of this, but I don't expect that we will be carrying that one forward. Those are the four major alternatives that we are looking at for Exit 6 so whether it is the diamond or all the single point, the properties over here, we are able to stay away from those and minimize those impacts. Let me step up to Exit 7.

Chairman O'Neil asked does the board want to ask questions of Exit 6 before we move on?

Mr. Kennedy stated this is the existing Exit 7 at Front Street. We are looking at potentially relocating this interchange further to the north, but also as part of this evaluation, what we need to look at as an alternative if we can also get the same benefit of relocating and doing it in this location. We are looking at one of the alternatives, which is to reconstruct that interchange at that location. We have a configuration that would show the three lanes in each direction on 293 to create a diamond interchange if we reconfigure the ramps, you can see on the northbound ramp that comes in at this point, you bring it in at 90 degrees and in addition, what you would have is northbound ramps, which are not there today. I will tell you that when we started looking at the options for relocating the interchange further to the north one of the aspects of that configuration is that it provides connection to the west of Dunbarton Road. When I did a follow up to be fair and to be comparing apples to apples, maybe we need to provide an alternative here with a connection to Dunbarton Road. We have been looking at that. I will tell you from a geometric standpoint or if you could build it, the grades are such that you could do it that, it is constructible, however, as we continue to look at how it would operate, and it would provide a connection to Dunbarton Road, there is still a significant amount of traffic that travels along Front Street and now that we are taking a closer look at that, what we would be doing is pulling traffic from Front Street up until Dunbarton Road, taking a left to come down and back onto Front Street, I don't know that that makes a lot of sense. Again, no final decisions have been made, but I want to show you that we are looking at that potential alternative. One key element of updating the existing Exit 7 location and one of the potential problems with maintaining the existing location is the spacing between Exit 7 and the reconstructed Exit 6. This is the single point if we reconstructed Exit 6 and this would be Exit 7 in its current location.

The point between getting off the on-ramp here and that point is only about 1,600 feet. It is fairly close. You generally don't want to build interchanges that close. However, it can operate. If it was just the three lane main line and you had diverging movement, vehicles exiting, what we have shown in our 20 year condition plan, which would actually fail. There would be more volume than could be handled at that point. However, if you were to put in a short distance, essentially a fourth lane, through this section to create a weaving lane between the two ramps, you can actually get it to operate acceptably. Again, it is a question of it being close, creating weaving. It doesn't mean that it is perfect, but there is a way to make it operate acceptably if this is one of the options that you want to take seriously and move forward.

Alderman Shaw asked would that be comparable in length to the one on South Willow Street when you are coming from South Willow Street and you are getting on westbound where you can get off at Exit 2, which is Brown Avenue, where there is a narrow strip where you can stay over to the right? Would that be comparable in length?

Mr. Kennedy replied that is the extra lane that I am talking about with the weaving, yes. With that little additional widening in here to provide that, obviously, it has a little bit more impact to properties on both sides of the road, so that is a potential downside to this. Let me move up further to the north. This is the landfill; this is Front Street; this is the existing interchange in here. We are looking to construct an interchange up in this area somewhere. What we have done is laid out a potential interchange up in this area. What we would have is an on-ramp, an off-ramp and because of the landfill here there is really not room to have an on-ramp, but you would have a loop ramp but you would have all the movements at this location. We would create a connection down to Front Street at a signalized intersection. You need to provide connections to the college as well as to Country Club Drive so we have looked at how we could do that and how we could provide those connections. There is a residential complex down here and we also have to provide connections to this new roadway. We would also provide connection to the west, to Dunbarton Road. I should also say that we have two options within this alternative of where to connect to Front Street. This is one of them and then the other one that would bring it this way and it looks like back so instead of the intersection here, it is over on this side. If it is here we still need to be able to provide connections to the college and to the residential areas on this area. At this point it looks like this is feasible. The grades are actually very challenging in this area. This is looking like it is going to be feasible. Note that this area right in here is part of the landfill and the grades are substantial in that area. Back a number of years ago there was a previous alignment that looked at a new interchange in this location and it hugged the area, intersecting

Dunbarton Road and one of the reasons for that was to continue the connector road up to this area. The Town of Goffstown would very much like to have a connector here so there is a connection to their industrial area to the interchange. That would involve the crossing of Black Brook in this area and there are some relatively substantial environmental issues of the crossing of the brook in this area. The reason I point that out is because if you notice in our concept, we pushed the road to this side. The reason for that is if you hug the landfill the grades are much more substantial and it would increase the costs and the cuts that would be needed to put in that road would be substantial. Over here, the general alignment and now we are looking at, depending on where we come into Dunbarton Road, whether this happens sooner or later, we still have to make sure that it all fits together. I suspect that as the project moves forward we are going to be looking at, once we get beyond the planning study, and into the environmental assessment process, we will be looking at in more detail the alignment process. The grade alignment process works best here it may make sense to move this a little bit more to this area. Those decisions still need to be made. For that matter, if this connection is there, whether this is the main line, the heavy traffic does that as opposed to being T-ed into this or if this roadway should T into Dunbarton Road, those decisions still need to be made.

Chairman O'Neil asked before you come off of this slide, could you reference where Goffstown Road and Dunbarton Road are?

Mr. Kennedy replied Goffstown Road comes in here and heads down here to Exit 6. This is Straw Road and Dunbarton Road runs down to here. That is it for the concepts. Before I wrap up, I wanted to let you know what is coming up next because we are at the point... As I said, we are in phase three. We are right at the end of developing and screening these alternatives. On April 10th we are going to be meeting with the advisory committee again and that meeting is going to be about going over the results of the evaluation. We have an impact matrix that goes over the impacts of properties and other things. When we come out of that meeting we are hoping to be able to package this and come to a public meeting, perhaps sometime in May where we would present the results of the evaluation, all the concepts and then get final signoff from yourselves and the public and if that goes well, then we will do the documentation and get the reports done by the summer and we would have the planning study done.

Mr. Cota stated thank you, Marty. As Marty indicated, we are well along in trying to develop what we classify, reasonable alternatives. The purpose of this planning study is not to come out with one alternative. It is basically to identify what are the reasonable approaches to addresses the capacity and safety issues that we are seeing along the Exit 6 and Exit 7 corridor. We still have a long way to go, even after we come out of this planning phase study. As Marty indicated, it is our intent to continue with the public dialogue and public input on the alternatives. We do know from our partners in Goffstown that they certainly have an interest in Exit 7 for transportation aspects to their community. There is a lot up in the air right now. Public feedback is what we are still looking for. What we are basically seeing right now, eventually this corridor analysis is going to identify reasonable approaches. We are going to identify the purpose and need for the project. These are very critical elements in the next phase of the project. The next phase basically takes us through the NEPA process, our national environmental protection act process where we take the reasonable alternatives and the purpose and need and start very detailed conversations with our resource agencies, the federal and cultural agencies like EPA, Fish and Wildlife and also the cultural aspects with the state historical preservation office and start dialoguing very carefully and narrowing down the reasonable range of alternatives to get down to the least damaging practical alternative. That piece will come in after this documentation is completed. The department has, through the turnpike capital program, has the funding for this corridor analysis. That is all the funding that we currently have available to carry this project. What is coming out of this with the documentation are the documents that we need for support to go back to our legislative leaders, as well as the governor and executive council, to seek additional appropriations through our capital program. Our turnpike program has a lot of needs. We anticipate probably in the order of another \$460 million of capital needs for the turnpike. Part of that \$460 million is this improvement here. The department, through the turnpike commission, fully supports moving this project forward. Once we complete this documentation, the next phase will be to go to the governor and council and the leadership at the legislature and seek additional capital improvement funds to move this project forward. We certainly hope that you will support us on that avenue when we get to that point, but we are nearing that point very quickly. If you have any questions, we will try to address any questions you have.

Chairman O'Neil stated Bill Cass, the director of project development, is also here and an old friend to many of us here.

Alderman Greazzo stated I was curious on the update on Exit 4 before we got too deep into questions. If they can give that presentation real quick.

Mr. Cota stated as I noted earlier, there are two very important projects along the I-293 corridor in the boundaries of the city. The purpose of the Exit 4 project basically was to look at the five red list bridges that we have along that .8 mile corridor. We have the northbound off-ramp over 293, the mainline over the northbound on-ramp, the northbound on-ramp over the southern channel of the Piscatquog River, as well as the mainline bridges over the river channel. Those bridges basically are reaching a point where they are functionally obsolete and structurally we have to address them. That is the primary reason why they are on the red list. This is the location of the bridges themselves; the ramp bridge up and over the turnpike, the I-293 bridge over the northbound on-ramp, the ramp bridge across the river, the bridge up towards Exit 5 and the two river bridges which span both the north and southbound barrel. The held a public hearing in September 2011 with the special committee and the layout was approved in November 2012. Right now we are looking to advertise this project on July 23, 2013. We expect that the completion of this will be in the fall of 2016. This is funded through our turnpike capital improvement program and it is about \$33 million in total construction costs. Some of the aspects coming out of this are on the southbound direction we are looking at carrying three lanes past the weave of the on-ramp as well as the off-ramp. That third lane is actually going to give relief to that short weave section in there. We are also widening the shoulders throughout this area. We are also building a sound wall to protect this neighborhood here, plus another sound wall to protect the Wentworth Street neighborhood. We are adding several water quality basins to the project and that is basically going to lower the polluting to the water system itself. Of course, as I noted, it is also improving the weaving as well as providing additional shoulder widths in this corridor. The construction of this is in a very tight area. It is one of those projects where you design it around traffic control. That is basically what we had to do here. We have a three phase construction set up for this project. The first phase is the westerly widening, basically taking the new bridge widenings to the westerly side and creating enough width on the westerly side to allow traffic to be carried over, taking the southbound traffic that we have today and moving it over to the newly built structures on the westerly side. All the ramp construction along the Exit 4 side has to be completed during that phase. We are looking at a short closure of the southbound on-ramp for about three weeks as we reconstruct that portion of the ramp. We think it is going to take less than three weeks, but it will be about a three week period where we are looking to redirect traffic through the turnpike system to alternative means, whether it is down to 101 or up to Granite Street interchange. Phase two, after we move traffic over to the westerly side, we start to take the southbound side where the traffic is today and rebuild that section. That will certainly be the tightest section. It

will take about a full construction season to be able to complete that. Once that middle section is completed, we will be moving the northbound traffic over onto that middle section and then start rebuilding the easterly side of the corridor. That is where we run into some difficulties from a traffic management stance. Again, it is going to be a whole construction season to be able to build that easterly side, but we will have about a nine month closure of the on-ramp that comes into the weave on Granite Street and I can explain why. The closure itself with this situation, we have to rebuild the two river bridges. This river bridge is connected with a ramp. We also have to rebuild the on-ramp bridge over the Piscatquog River. While we are building this, the ramp bridges in here we really can't put traffic on it so we really have no other means, other than looking to close that ramp during this period while it is being constructed. We are going to put precautions in the contract that look to accelerate the construction as fast as it can be done. We are also looking at other avenues for traffic mitigation. We are looking at smart work zones. We are going to have traffic cameras out there monitoring the traffic flow on Second Street as well as the turnpike. We are going to have dynamic message boards out there where we basically broadcast if there are delays getting through the corridor. We will be looking at signage further down the Bedford side as well as further up on the turnpike side to alert traffic and redirect them to the changes in the traffic patterns. We have very strong signed construction packages for the corridor. We will also be modifying and monitoring signal timing at Second Street intersection with Granite Street as we look at the traffic pattern change that will be occurring. We will also be coordinating with emergency responders and City Public Works workers. We will be working very closely on those angles. There will be a period during that 2016 construction season where that ramp is going to change. The impacts to the City, besides the traffic flow through this area, considering the size of this project, we were surprised at the minimal impacts to the City. The sewer pump construction, we have some temporary easements on the highway side of that. We will have to work with Public Works in relation to the building site itself. The actual construction of that site has very impressive construction features. We were able to actually minimize or stay away from critical components of that plant so it will continue to be in operation. There is a water line that runs under this bridge that crosses. We do have a short segment in there that needs to be relocated, but that is being relocated under a force account with the City and will be repaid by the project. We also have three sewer service connections right down to these three property. We are splitting the cost of that with the City; one third is being reimbursed to the City for that cost. It is a very small cost, but it is a minor impact. That is a quick overview for Exit 4, but it is coming. Like I said, we are advertising the project this July and we are hoping in September/October we would be looking for governor and executive council approval of the contract. I would not expect

much to happen this winter because of the season itself, but you may see some work on the westerly side section. Again, the biggest impact is going to be the last third phase of our construction in that area.

Chairman O'Neil asked any questions on Exit 4? Then we can go back and concentrate on Exits 6 and 7. Thank you, Keith, for that update.

Alderman Arnold stated I just have a couple of comments that I want to make. Keith, thank you for the presentation and thank you for the work that your entire team has been doing for what seems like forever, even though I know it has only been a few months. Some of the issues you cited in your presentation, specifically dealing with traffic congestion and the public safety hazards at the Amoskeag rotary are things that a lot of us have been talking about for a long time. I said this before and I'll say it again, but anyone's commute that takes them through the Amoskeag rotary certainly thinks that some major traffic mitigation measures need to be enacted there or that a redesign is appropriate so I'm glad to see this finally moving forward. I know that we are still in the study phase, but I want to thank my colleagues who have participated at various junctures. Chairman O'Neil and the Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission have been very active in that conversation as well as Alderman Long and other members of the Manchester state rep delegation for their efforts in trying to make this a priority in the capital budget. Hopefully we continue with those efforts and we see some changes that are badly needed in that part of the city. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Alderman Shaw stated as a legislator, my other role, you mentioned that you are going to have to go to the legislature at some point for funding. Will you have any federal funding for Exits 6 and 7?

Mr. Cota replied the future funding is still up for discussion. One of the directions that the department has taken with this project, with the corridor analysis, we asked the federal highway administration to be the lead federal agency. The impetus behind that is that it allows the federal highway administration to overview and be our partner in reviewing the NEPA document, the national environmental protection documentation, so that should we have the opportunity to apply for federal funds or federal grants coming forward then the NEPA process would have been completed according to their requirements and therefore it would make it easier to obtain federal funds. At this point, I cannot tell you what the distribution of funds would be. I know from the aspect of our turnpike association it certainly has its limitations. We certainly will be looking at all reasonable approaches to pay for the advancement of this project.

Alderman Shaw stated I like the fact that you are looking at a connection to Goffstown. I know that we represent Manchester but I know that that area has long wished for some sort of access to 293 rather than coming down through Manchester. Like you said, it probably should get done while you are doing it and get it over with.

Mr. Cota stated and I appreciate that. There is no question that Goffstown representatives also appreciate it. It is still a challenge. In this corridor analysis we are identifying that there is a reasonable approach for that connectivity. A lot is going to bear on the traffic modeling because we really need to show that there is a traffic gain, a benefit to it, so it is not out of the woods yet, but it is not being cut out of the reasonable approaches for this corridor. We do envision it carrying on to the next phase of this development.

Alderman Long stated project 10448—that is the bridge between Exits 6 and 7. That is on hold until this gets figured out because there is no chance of doing that until we finish this or there could be no need to do that. Is that correct?

Mr. Cota replied that's correct.

Alderman Long stated on all of these proposals, Exit 6 actually, we are not encroaching to the east on where the residential units are on Stark Lane. If I remember, it is pushed more to the west.

Mr. Cota stated yes. Surprisingly, what we are seeing is that the easterly side of the corridor is encroaching further to the west so there will be fewer impacts on the easterly side. What we are envisioning right now is that the bulk of the movement would be more toward the westerly side. Right now that is what we are seeing.

Alderman Long stated my goal is to be sure that Manchester is the most accessible. I do have concerns about Goffstown and Hooksett, but my goal is to make sure that Manchester is accessible, whether through Front Street or Dunbarton Road coming to the east side on Elm Street. It looked like, of all the proposals, the first one, the single point, most fit that. I don't know about all these lights. It is heavily travelled. I don't really see it getting any less travelled. I see it picking up. Again, my main goal is making sure that Manchester is easily accessible. That will be my focus. On the funding, if the funding is there, I'm thinking that the gas tax addition is what this funding source is. We don't have another funding source today.

Mr. Cota stated at this point, we have not identified any further funding sources for the construction of a project here. Like I indicated earlier, we still have the ability to apply for federal funds on the project.

Mr. Bill Cass, Director of Project Development for NH DOT, stated you had said another funding source. The funding source that we would most likely be looking at, primarily because this is a turnpike, would be turnpike funds. Turnpike funds are supported by the tolls and it is an enterprise, self-supported system. I think, right now, that would be... Representative Shaw, you had asked about federal funds, but federal funds are flat, they are stagnant, they are being stretched extremely thin. Most of the major work that we have going on in the system today is either supported by the turnpike capital projects or supported by bonding, which we are doing in I-93. Major, major project like this, I think we would definitely be looking at supporting with turnpike funds.

Alderman Long stated what I am not understanding is... I remember looking at the ten year plan and this was at the top of the ten year plan. Is that still here?

Mr. Cass replied as he said, this is just a planning study so if you drop this down, future updates of the turnpike capital program we are going to be looking at additional funding for this.

Alderman Long stated what are we looking at for additional funding, Bill? Is it \$5,000?

Mr. Cota replied that scenario we have not put numbers on yet. As we come up with this corridor analysis, we will begin to get an understanding of the dollar values. Certainly, the levels of improvement that we are looking at are going to be very expensive, probably in excess of \$75 million.

Alderman Long asked when would we know that the funding was there?

Mr. Cass replied I believe, right now, you know in the legislature there has been a lot of discussion on the highway fund and the gas tax my assumption is that we have a capital program on the turnpike program that we need to address and I presume we will take that up at the next session as well. We want to separate the two so they didn't overlap them and confuse them. We are focusing on the highway fund this session and I think

we are going to have to address the turnpike fund next session.

Chairman O'Neil stated on the update, if I recall, not too long ago Public Works Director Sheppard submitted a list of recommendations from the City and this project was number one on the list from us as DOT is going through the new ten year plan. That was submitted to DOT through the regional planning commission, Kevin. It was submitted through the regional planning commission on our behalf.

Alderman Roy stated your comment to Alderman Long about the impact to the neighbors, when you showed us the stretch of road between the northbound on-ramp for Exit 6 and the northbound off-ramp to Exit 7; you said you may be widening it to four lanes.

Mr. Cota stated yes. If the interchange at Exit 7 is left where it is and a full interchange is created... That is the comparative that we have to look at. Even though we understand that the interchange is so close together, it is going to require a wider system in order to handle that traffic. That is the environmental balance. That is the alternative that we have to look at, the wider section compared with moving it and creating a new interchange further north how much decrease of impact that has. That is the environmental comparison that will be done in the next phase.

Alderman Roy stated if we go with that plan, and nothing says that we are going to go with that plan, I would have to guess that the impact for people on Stark Lane is going to be significant because when you drive past Stark Lane now, you are looking in their front windows.

Mr. Cota stated I would agree that any widening, even six lanes, three lanes each way, even that widening is going to add an additional lane on each side, whether it is the westerly side or the easterly, but that is the analysis that we have to look at, but yes, those properties along Stark Lane and the backside of Front Street will have...

Alderman Roy stated I just wanted to bring that up because when you were speaking before you said that the impact would be to the west, but in that scenario there would be a significant impact to those people on Stark Lane who have an issue now with the impact.

Mr. Cota stated yes, Alderman Roy, you are quite correct. My reference was more in the area of Exit 6. To tell you the truth, looking at some of the concepts that we have come up with I have been pleasantly please to see how much of the real estate we can fit the improvements in, what we already own there. You are right; north of Exit 6 there are certainly going to be additional impacts.

Alderman Levasseur asked this is just in the study phase?

Mr. Cota replied yes.

Alderman Levasseur stated I thought that ten years ago we were supposed to be in line for Exit 7. Did that get dropped somewhere? Does anybody have any institutional knowledge on that?

Mr. Cass replied yes, it was in the ten year plan originally and it wasn't funded through the turnpike program so there weren't any funds to approve that at that time.

Alderman Levasseur stated when there is a ten year plan, the actual funding is for the conceptual design first. Is that what we are going into now? This is a ten year plan. I am just confused. It wasn't funded for the first ten year plan. Are we funded for the next ten year plan?

Mr. Cass replied yes, as I said to Representative Long, the only funding that is in place right now is to complete this conceptual study. When we go through our biennial update of the ten year plan, these are the needs that we are going to have to address and prioritize.

Alderman Levasseur stated so this concept that you have now, this is not something that was conceptualized ten years ago or 15 years ago, this is something that has been in the design process for the last year or so. Could you give me the history on that?

Mr. Cass replied Marty had a picture up there. There was a previous concept that was developed when it was in the ten year plan. This layout was developed at a very high level. There was no true engineering to it. We had some USGS maps and some overlays and just drew out where it may fit. That was the basis of programming something into the ten year plan. If you remember, about four to six years ago, we had a very over-committed, a very unrealistic ten year plan so when we went through to get that plan under financial constrains some of these ideas and projects were the ones that

were deferred from the ten year plan and we were only able to just now bring them back on through these corridor studies. I am trying to identify funding to bring them forward.

Alderman Levasseur stated when you do these plans, like the one you are working on now, do you look at the amount of taking a property and what the effect on the tax rate in Manchester would be? In other words, if you were to come across the Amoskeag Bridge and some of the properties on the left or the right were part of that taking, is there an impact on the study of what the tax effect would be if that were taken and then if you take \$1 million worth of property and whatever that would be to the tax base, do you put that into your plan?

Mr. Cota replied that analysis is actually part of the environmental documentation for the project. It looks at the impact on properties as well as the impact on the tax base as a result of it.

Alderman Levasseur asked is there a positive impact that is also on the other end of it? If there is a taking and a widening, are there other tentacles that come off of that where you could have an increase in taxes or properties or developments that you normally wouldn't get?

Mr. Cota replied typically, through our environmental protection we look at the physical impact on the facility. There is an additional land use benefit that that community could derive out of the impacts. You have the ability to look at your land use development and overtime, it could be a positive gain for a community. I think we see this quite often. If you look at 101 between Manchester and the seacoast look at some of those interchanges over there and look at the changes that have occurred since that interchange has come into place. There is a land use benefit associated with the improvements. Just making the improvements and putting in the interchange so you have less delays and you feel safer. That weighs in and reigns in the potential for other development in the area.

Alderman Levasseur asked have you look at to see how this would tie into Hackett Hill which is our major business development area? On the map, could you show us where that is and how that would be affected?

Mr. Cota replied at this stage, we have not directly looked at how the connectivity would be made there, but there is no question that the new interchange at Exit 7 has a benefit to the proposed development at Hackett Hill. We are running a very delicate

balance here. We are looking at the capacity for the turnpike. We are really trying to focus on it, but we do recognize that this interchange will have other benefits than just addressing the safety and capacity that we are looking at. If I may, the concept earlier that showed the blue line, as Bill indicated, is a rough concept. It was developed many years ago. I can tell you that it was done in the 1980s because I did it. I was the engineer working under Mike Dugas, who wasn't the architect, but his predecessor at the time. This is the graphic sheet and developing a profile on alignment and coming up with a rough concept for project development for the ten year plan. I have a little history here.

Alderman Levasseur stated this one seems to have a little bit less of an impact on the direct land of Hackett Hill. Your design, at that time, makes me happier than the one now because it seems to cross over into that property. I only worry about that because I know that they are trying to develop it. At the time that they find some nice property to go on there and you guys are trying to develop and go through the whole legislative process, which I'm sure can be... You have to try to balance those two things at the same time and we have to think about that if we are going to allow... I don't know what kind of power or authority we have to allow something to go up on that site, but members of this board who are on this board in a couple of years or longer, will have to keep this in mind if we are going to allow... I know they want to put a prison up there and there are other things going up there. I liked the other design because it seemed to have less impact on that particular site, but this is probably an improved design for safety issues. It is not an easy thing to do when you are trying to develop all of these things with not having the money in place to do these things. Let me ask you; if we did develop that then you would change your plan? Is that how it would work?

Mr. Cota replied we certainly would be through the next phase of the project as we look at identifying the corridor that is the least damaging practical alternative we will work with the City to ensure that with long term planning...

Alderman Levasseur stated I'm just saying precedent-wise that if you got approval on this, and I don't know what ordinances have to be passed or not, is it a race for the developer to get his property done before you get your ordinances passed at the state level? Would it change upon that time frame?

Mr. Cota replied there is no question that if there is a change in the land use in this corridor it can have a change on the ordinance and the proposal that comes forward. The improvements through here will require acquisition of private property as well as

public property. As a result it will be a control of access so there will be a special committee public hearing process. We will follow the public hearing process for the layout and seek executive approval through the special committee. Yes, certainly development that occurs between now and the time we go to the public hearing will have an impact on the final layout of the roadway.

Mr. Cass stated I would just add that it is going to be a long process, but our goals, first and foremost, would be to make sure that things are done in concert with the City's plans for whatever development comes up. It has to be supported. You phrased it a little adversarial, but our goals would be to take anything that was proposed and make it work so that it was engineeringly feasible, permissible and it works in harmony of the land use plans and the development plans that are planned up there. What came first, we would certainly work with to make sure that it works with whatever development plans came along.

Alderman Roy stated I have a question on that same subject, now that it has been brought up. One of the issues that we had ten years ago was access to our property on Hackett Hill. We didn't have any access so that had an adverse affect on our ability to develop it. When I look at the new plan, as opposed to that blue line, it seems this would be more advantageous to us to develop that property because it gives us direct access to it, rather than having it all east of the power lines and then we would have to go through getting access underneath those power lines. Am I wrong looking at this that way? There are three phases up in there so it certainly isn't this going to be more advantageous to us to have access to that land and develop it rather than the original blue line that was hugging the landfill?

Mr. Kennedy replied I could answer it this way. We have copies of the master plan. At VHB we planned the master plan. This layout doesn't include the development of that. For all I know you may be right, but we laid out this development to make sure that we do not preclude this development or access to it.

Chairman O'Neil stated speaking for myself, I'm not sure, in my time here, there has been a project that could be more import to the City of Manchester and its impact on many wards. Alderman Shaw talked about the improvements along 293 at Exits 2 and 3. When you look at this there are direct impacts on Wards 12 and part of 11. As Mr. Kennedy said, they didn't do that, I'll call it the Dunkin' Donuts ramp where there was going to be a lot of traffic impact in Ward 10 on Granite Street and then when you come across the bridge, although it isn't part of their project, there are impacts on Ward 3, 2

and 1. This is a very important project to the City of Manchester directly and indirectly. This is either for Keith or Marty. I do agree with Aldermen Long or Roy who said that the single point urban interchange looked like it was maybe the best option. Having gone to a few of the previous meetings with a lot of work by you folks. You had a lot of options out there at one time and you have narrowed it down. Access to Front Street from Goffstown Road or the Amoskeag Bridge, could you point out how you would get to Front Street from either of those locations?

Mr. Kennedy replied if you are coming down Goffstown Road, today, you could take a left at a signal. In the future, you would not be able to do that. What you would do is come up in that direction or traffic that wants to head southbound on 293, would have to come down to this and get on the ramp at this point. What we are also thinking about is if this we end up moving forward with this concept, do a little bit more here and allow that left hand turn from Front Street onto the ramp here, which would make it a little easier.

Chairman O'Neil stated Marty, if you were on the Amoskeag Bridge and you were heading east and you wanted to get to Front Street?

Mr. Kennedy replied you would come down to the signal here, take a left hand turn, go right and come underneath to Front Street.

Chairman O'Neil stated one of the changes, and I call it the Dunkin Donuts ramp, that early on you were thinking that you might have to get rid of, but I appreciate looking at it and the impact that it would have on other parts of the City. In one of your previous presentations, I know the mayor got on you a little bit about midterm improvements. I don't know if that is the right word. Where are you with that? Are there still possibilities? Where are you with that?

Mr. Kennedy replied we are going to identify that there is the potential for these mid term alternatives. Ultimately, what this comes down to is when you do a project, it is going to come down to how many dollars are available. If it takes longer to get a long term fix in place it is conceivable that you may want to spend some money to face a safety issue in the long term. The mayor's point was to be careful because if you do that, you will never see any the money again.

Chairman O'Neil stated midterm may become long term, I think is what he said.

Mr. Kennedy stated and we will talk about those issues.

Chairman O'Neil asked Marty, could you talk about what some of those issues could be? I don't know if you have a slide on it or not.

Mr. Kennedy replied actually, I do. Basically what we were looking at was to address this weave. Today you have this heavy traffic coming on and exiting here. Instead of full reconstruction of the interchange, what if you were to construct a ramp that came in here so you take that off-ramp move it over here and take the on-ramp and bring it down to this point. Then you would close that and you would basically eliminate that weave. That would be a safety condition. By the way, that costs money. You are not talking about a low cost item. It is a fairly significant improvement. We also talked about if you do that, there is a relatively heavy volume of traffic entering at this point so we would come down to a traffic signal and maybe there is a better way to do that. You don't want the heavy volumes stopping at the signal at this intersection, you would bring the ramp intersection off at a signal to take a left or right onto Eddy Road, but allow the on-ramp traffic to come on to the ramp and actually go up and over in that fashion. We also looked at one other potential. If we are doing that and we are taking that traffic on and that traffic on, maybe what we could consider is taking a ramp into an intersection, but allow the traffic that is now going down that ramp to come onto Eddy Road, go down this intersection and simply getting on a loop. There are different types of ways to look at it and those are millions of dollars worth of construction, but they could be a short term fix to a safety problem.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think you are going to hear from Aldermen Long and Shaw who will become champions and out leading the funding efforts on this. I have a few questions on Exit 7. You talked about two potential opportunities for the relocated Exit 7 northbound exit, coming back down to Front Street and I was just curious, what was the advantage or disadvantage of each?

Mr. Kennedy replied where we are right now, the primary impact would be to the properties at the college. At this point, now that we have these developed, we are going to sit down with the college. They are actually developing a master plan for that area and so it will likely come down to what has the least impact on properties here.

Chairman O'Neil stated there is a real traffic impact from the standpoint of the intersection of Front Street.

Mr. Kennedy stated they both were.

Chairman O'Neil stated and cost wise they are about the same.

Mr. Kennedy stated they would be similar.

Chairman O'Neil stated you brought up the connection to Goffstown Road and I know Goffstown is represented this evening by their public works director. We had have to put some traffic restrictions on Goffstown Road to prevent some trucking so we try to be good neighbors to them and hopefully there are some opportunities here to get some of that traffic moving through Exit 7 and maybe it will relive some of the traffic at Exit 6. I know Alderman Levasseur was asking questions about Hackett Hill which I had written down as well. I know that is not really part of your scope, but I appreciate that you are looking at it. How far off the turnpike, Keith, and that is a very appropriate slide, doe you expect will be the responsibility of the New Hampshire DOT? Do you think that part of the project might be taking it beyond Dunbarton Road?

Mr. Cota replied that is a very good question. I can tell you right now that I don't have an answer for it. As part of the focus of the project itself, we are looking for safety and capacity improvements for the turnpike. We certainly recognize that there is a connectivity back to Front Street. We recognize that there is a connectivity to someplace to the west. As I indicated, the corridor analysis that we are doing now is a top level traffic modeling to get an understanding so if this connectivity is not made here what would be the traffic load on this interchange as well as onto Exit 6 so we know what no-relief would occur as a result. With the connectivity in here, is there a benefit being derived here that could benefit this connector as well as support he environmental impact that that would have. The difficulty that we are going to and when I say we I mean that as an overall team and community to find the supportive reasons to comply with those environmental protection requirements. We have some stringent rules that we have to answer and we are still working toward that. We do not see how that would be excluded as a corridor analysis of that be included so we will carry that forward to the next environmental phase of the project. That is a very good question and hopefully we can bring that up about a year from now.

Alderman Levasseur stated I didn't think that I could ever find something more exciting than watching a Manchester School Board meeting, but this is a lot more exiting than I thought it was going to be because now I am seeing all this. I have to give you credit, alderman. I wasn't looking forward to coming to this meeting, but I'm glad I

showed up. You are talking about some pretty dry stuff. I don't claim to be an engineer, but I did have a paper route for six years and if anything, you learn how to take every shortcut you can because the faster you get your papers delivered the faster you can get home to watch Gilligan's Island so I find this stuff exciting. If I was in charge of this project, to me, this would be more important than dealing with the Amoskeag Bridge issue and my perspective would be that... Our major issue with that traffic circle is that everyone has to get on to go to Goffstown. If you could give them an alternative route, those people coming home from Concord could go that way. People coming up 93 could also take that route which would relieve a lot of pressure. Also, what you would be doing for us in Manchester is developing one of our last important pieces of economically developable land. We traded UNH for that property back in 1998 with the expectation that that would bring us a lot of taxpayer money that would go into the development. I look at that from two perspectives. It looks like if you could get that in it would really relieve a lot of pressure right on the Amoskeag Circle if you could get that over to Goffstown. You would have an alternative route which would help them and help us. You could also go a heck of a job for the companies that may want to take those properties, but because they have to go to Front Street to get there... I can't tell you how many times I have been on that road, but living here and growing up here, and trying to drive on that road, I'm amazed that anyone would want to live on that road to be honest with you. The whole idea that we took this property and this was already going to be done. There was one point when we had a lot of bondable money, I suggested that we bonded it out because I think it is that important. That never occurred. What is the possibility of getting through the legislative process and actually get this started? What timeframe are we looking at? It is something that we thought would already be done before now.

Chairman O'Neil stated before I let Keith respond, just recall that when he opened it up, NH DOT started this process because of safety and volume. I don't know if volume is the specific word that Keith used. Economic development is part of this, but they were focusing on safety and capacity on the interchange.

Alderman Levasseur stated to make sure I am clear, the design was made to decrease the volume on the Amoskeag Circle.

Mr. Cota responded this corridor analysis for Exit 7, any improvement that we look to make at Exit 6, with the close proximity to the interchange at Exit 7, you cannot look at it as two separate sections. We had to look at them together to see how they are functioning within each other. As Marty indicated, having the interchange at the

existing location of Exit 7, what gains goes that location have for benefits at Exit 6. That is the traffic modeling that I talked about. Is there a better gain if there was a new interchange with connectivity to the west at some point, whether it is Dunbarton Road or Goffstown Road, there is a traffic benefit associated with either of those connections. From a traffic modeling, that is where we are right now, showing that and trying to establish what we see as a reasonable gain for a reduction in traffic in this location, Exit 6, as a result of this change over here.

Alderman Levasseur stated I understand the mayor said that he wants to go for the whole kitten caboodle, but I want to get something. I'm one of these guys who believes that we are automatically going to everything to get a tax passed in the state. You see that people want to get rid of toll booths, you see that people don't want to go up on the gas tax. We have federal issues, we have sequestration. I'm not very optimistic that the money is just going to show up somewhere. If you have, in your professional opinion as engineers, to do one of the two projects... I know which one I would choose in my seat as a Manchester resident with the thought process that I want to gain some economic value as quickly as I can to bring more money in so we can help our schools, lower our tax rate, etcetera, which project would you say is more important if you could only get one of them? Eventually you are going to get two, but that could be 50 years down the road. If you could only get one, which would it be? I guess you are going to be looking at two different perspectives. My perspective is that you would understand yes, Alderman Levasseur, that is the one that I would want. I guess I have to defer to your expert opinion because you guys are more... I don't know if you have ever owned a paper route.

Chairman O'Neil asked is that a fair question for Mr. Cota to have to answer though?

Alderman Levasseur stated they are going to have to ask for the money. Why do you have to...

Mr. Cota responded Alderman Levasseur, it is really difficult, at this point, to say that there is a special benefit of one verses the other. What we have seen so far is that both interchange improvements are necessary in order to meet the purpose of the project, the capacity and safety. Certainly Exit 7 has its issues, but the Amoskeag Circle has even greater capacity and safety issues. If you look at it from purely a factor of accident history then one would certainly say that I really need to put my eggs in a basket for Exit 6. But assuming that I put my eggs in the basket for Exit 6, assuming that a single point

diamond is the alternative, I am going to have a lot of impacts between Exit 7 and Exit 6 to deal with. I still have that weave connectivity to make. I have those problems there. That is why I am looking at doing it in conjunction, both improvements.

Alderman Levasseur asked are you going to be able to do them at the same time because if you think about the amount of traffic that we already have and you are doing construction on Amoskeag Bridge and you are doing the other one at the same time... That would be more of a nightmare to deal with. Wouldn't you do one before the other?

Mr. Cota replied in this size of a project, we would certainly look at where the reasonable construction projects can occur to result in the least amount of damage to the traffic flow. That would be the next phase after the NEPA process. We would basically go through the environmental process, get approvals that this is the location that we can get permits for and that we have funding for. Under the found design phase of the project we would actually start laying the roadway out, looking at the minimum right of way that we need to purchase to build the project, going through that process, getting our permits and then looking at constructively, aspects of how we build this. I can guarantee you that there are going to be some traffic disruptions at the Amoskeag Circle.

Alderman Levasseur asked how much does it cost for both at the same time?

Mr. Cota replied we don't have the actual price yet. As I quoted earlier, I certainly envision that the cost of the overall improvements will probably exceed \$75 million. It certainly means that there may be a series of, if we are able to bring this to fruition, there may be a series of three projects, three contracts, possibly four contracts, but I can't tell you right now. I can tell you that I am up for the engineering challenge.

Chairman O'Neil stated I just want to recognize our departments that are here, David Beauchesne from Planning and Community Development is represented, Kevin Sheppard and our new City engineer, Todd Connors are here from Public Works, Guy Chabot and David Paris from the Manchester Water Works, Dave LaFleurier from Transit Authority, Jim Flanagan was here from the Police Department, Julie Chen from the Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission and the representatives from the Town of Goffstown out in the back, taking all kinds of notes. Keith, is there anything that we as a City need to get you or are you getting all the information that you need from any and all departments? I know David has been active on your committee and Bruce Thomas from Pubic Works as well.

Mr. Cota replied at this point, no. We certainly deeply appreciate the efforts of the City and the staff have provided to us. You have been a great community to work with. We all know that we look at this from a team approach and we will continue to look at it that way.

Chairman O'Neil stated on behalf of Mayor Gatsas, the board of aldermen and our citizens, I want to thank you, Keith, Mike and Bill from New Hampshire DOT for being here this evening and Marty from VHB for being here as well. This was very informative and I think as Alderman Levasseur said, many may have come here thinking that this was going to be a pretty dry presentation, but it is a very exciting project and I know we look forward to it going forward. Thank you for taking the time to be here.

*There being no further business, on motion of **Alderman Roy**, duly seconded by **Alderman Craig**, it was voted to adjourn.*

A True Record. Attest.



Clerk of Committee