

**SPECIAL MEETING
BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN
(Called by the Mayor)**

June 17, 1999

7:00 PM

Mayor Wieczorek called the meeting to order.

Mayor Wieczorek called for the Pledge of Allegiance, this function being led by Alderman Clancy.

A moment of silent prayer was observed.

The Clerk called the roll. There were twelve Aldermen present.

Present: Aldermen Wihby, Reiniger, Sysyn, Clancy, Pinard, Girard, Shea,
Rivard, Pariseau, Cashin, Thibault and Hirschmann

Absent: Aldermen Klock and O'Neil

- 4** Presentation by representatives of the State of New Hampshire, Department of Transportation relative to the proposed Granite Street Ramp.

Mayor Wieczorek stated we are very pleased to have the Commissioner of Transportation Leon Kenison and the Assistant Commissioner of the Department of Transportation Carol Murray with us today and some of their staff members. They are going to make a presentation to us regarding the northbound ramp on Granite Street and I will let the Commissioner or the Assistant Commissioner introduce the folks that are going to be with them because I'm assuming they're probably going to be assisting in the presentation. So, Leon, if you would just come up to the microphone. We're very important that you're here, Leon, this is a very important project for us here in the City and we're pleased to have you and your staff here.

Commissioner Kenison stated with me tonight, as you mentioned are Carol Murray, Assistant Commissioner; Chief Engineer Gil Rogers, Assistant Project Development Director, and Jeff Burlhart is with us here also the Chief Project Manager for this project and many others in the Manchester area that we are doing and planning on doing. As you may know the State and Federal governments are investing a great deal in the Manchester area on the existing interstate system, trying to improve upon the infrastructure that was built some time ago. We're working on 93 to the east, we will be working some more on a more southerly section in the years to come and looking forward to expanding 93 to Salem in further years to come. Working on 293 to provide some additional capacity and safety there including the Interchange with Brown Avenue. We certainly still have an Airport Access Road on the books and we have some projects to the west in Bedford: Kilton Road area, the Everett and 101 Interchanges that we'll all be doing over the next several years. Tonight, we bring to you for your comment and suggestion the proposal to make a full interchange here at Granite Street. We have monitored the things going on in Manchester for the last several years and you certainly are revitalizing the

Downtown area, the mid-region of Manchester in excellent shape and rapid shape. We think we need to bring the transportation infrastructure up to speed with the speed that you're developing. We recognize that to the north and south of Manchester you have excellent entry points but they are becoming somewhat limited and congested and we really feel as though looking from afar that you need a central point in the central part of the City to better serve all that you have planned. So, that is why we come here tonight. We propose advancing really plans for improving and fully integrating this intersection of Granite Street. We know that you're doing lots of things in the Millyard, UNH is going to consolidate its campus here, we have been a part of a player in that, we know that you have a sports facility and maybe another sports facility in the vicinity along with a Riverwalk and a Civic Center in the planning. So, all of those things attract folks who tend to come by automobile and we recognize the easiest way and the most direct way is to use Granite Street in its full format. I will ask Gil Rogers to make this presentation tonight and he will also in the end give us a timetable. Again, a very aggressive one. But, if in fact, Manchester decides that this is not something for the City at this time we can turn our attention elsewhere. We are not bound and this is not written in Granite, although it is Granite Street, but it is something that we propose to you and would be pleased to listen to the things that you have to say about it. So, maybe Carol will join me here along with Gil and Jeff do you want to make the presentations.

Mr. Rogers stated good evening, Mr. Mayor, Board of Aldermen, Ladies and Gentlemen. Probably one of the first questions that will come up is obviously where did the project come from. I think it's important to know a little of the background. Back in September of 1990, Governor and Council approved a study of I-293 or the F. E. Everett Turnpike through the Millyard from Route 101 through the Amoskeag Interchange...a substantial project between four and five miles long. So, we hired a consultant. In fact, a consultant that lives here in the City (CLD) to do that study and they've been working at it on-and-off over the last several years as we have found time to work with them to develop conceptual plans for improvements of the various interchanges. And, as the Commissioner alluded there are several reasons why working on Granite Street and completing the Interchange seems to make a lot of sense...with the activity going on in the City, but in addition to that the bridge over Granite Street on 293 is on our "red" list which means that we have to inspect that a couple of times a year to keep an eye on it because the deck while it's not down posted for any reason, but it's showing signs of age and, in fact, I remember when we put the median barrier on 293 in the last construction season we had some difficulties in attaching the barrier to the concrete on the bridge to show some of its age and the bridge is approaching 50 years old. So, that led some of our thinking to say we should probably look at considering the status of the bridge as well as looking at the completing of the interchange. So, that was part of what moved us in this direction. Obviously, a project to improve I-293 through the Millyard and we consider the addition of two more lanes one in each direction for a total of six thru lanes as probably what should happen in the future and that's off somewhere. In a project of that magnitude will be \$100 million or more based on the conceptual estimates that we have been provided with so far from our consultants. So, there's a lot of work that needs to be done at Exits 3, 4, this is Exit 5, the Amoskeag Interchange as you know it has its own problems and in looking at it from a map on an airplane you'll see that really what it is is

an elevated rotary. You spin around-and-around to find your way in through some of the ramps and onto the City streets; that has done a good job over the years, but it's basically outgrown its usefulness relative to the volumes of traffic and it needs attention and, of course, Exit 7 in itself is also another half interchange similar to what we have at Granite Street and the department over the past several years has been trying to eliminate half diamonds throughout the State. We did one on I-89 in Concord, we've got one on the books up in Northfield (Exit (19), we've got this one here and of course Exit 7 needs some treatment in some fashion and perhaps something will happen someday in conjunction with the City land, the old UNH piece up there and maybe we can work something that works well. We have discussed, from a conceptual viewpoint the opportunities that could exist in that area. But, that's just to give you a flavor of what the Millyard and adding more lanes would mean for the City. Granite Street...should we add the other two lanes, we found by looking at the traffic will help balance traffic flow on that side of the City by giving another opportunity for the citizens to get on and off the highway instead of having to divert to the adjacent interchanges and obviously overburden some of the City streets. So, there are certain benefits that I'm sure most of you have already figured that out and have decided that some of the things that Granite Street could make happen are indeed good. Now, to make something this good happen they'll be some impacts that we'll have to deal with and they are of the severe nature, but as the Commissioner said we are here to gather your input and to tell us what you like and don't like about the concept. Now, as we picked up the study for completing the interchange the first thing we said...what can we do just to add two missing ramps, that seems like the simplest thing to do and if I can approach the Board, Mr. Mayor, I think it'll be a little bit easier, I hope I don't get in anyone's way and if I'm obstructing I'll try and switch around a little bit to try and make it easier. The plan that I'm pointing to here is drawn at a scale of 1 inch (1") to 50 feet (50'). What that means is that 1" anywhere on this piece of paper would be 50' if you were to measure that spot on the ground. This of course, is the Granite Street Bridge crossing the Merrimack which outlined in blue. The turnpike with its reconstruction configuration is shown with yellow in the lanes, green as the median, yellow in the northbound lanes...this is the existing northbound off-ramp that you drive everyday, this in gray is the ramp that you use to go southbound on the turnpike everyday...not shown too well in here, but it's covered up is Turner Street and you have Second Street right here...this is the upper end of Granite Street, South Main, another landmark The Raphael, Henry's Auto Body and along in here either Lumber Lane or Allard Lane, I'm not sure I guess we have both names. All of these businesses in here that currently gain access on that road until you come to Foundry Street which, of course, heads up to the hospital. We are in a tough spot obviously because we are right up against the Merrimack, our turnpike is narrow to begin with and very close by, for example, is Ray the Mover's building in here on both sides, Vermont Salvage, Bogie's is in here and a set of businesses on this side. On Turner Street there are several tenement type dwellings in here that would be affected by this particular concept. Basically, the first row of buildings in here would have to be relocated, the buildings taken down and the families relocated in order for this particular concept to work. Now, back to what I stated originally about what's the simplest way to approach the project. Well, let's just say that we're going to put the two ramps in. If you drive the off-ramp today, come to the intersection...if you went and looked at the other side you'd say that makes sense you just put one opposite that and just hook it up to the turnpike.

When you look over the edge it kind of goes straight down to the water and there's no dry land down there to start building a ramp so, obviously, you're talking about some type of a bridge, a retaining wall or something to hold that up. Okay, so that's pretty simple that's the northbound on-ramp...we've got half the job done. The other half would just go ahead and attach a southbound off-ramp and we would bring that down through and it would come opposite the existing southbound on-ramp here which makes sense. It would form what we call a diamond interchange...I'm sure you're familiar with those...you've got one at Brown Avenue, you've got one at South Willow Street although it's really oversized, but it's a diamond shaped interchange and the ramp terminals come to each other where the sets of signals are. So, that would allow for those two ramps. Well, you've already figured out that we've got some serious problems to build this ramp in and adjacent to the river, but you try to build a ramp on the other side the first thing you do is the ramp runs right into the buildings that are here...Ray the Mover, Lumber Lane and all these in order to be able to line up opposite the ramp and it goes right between Henry's Auto Body and the Raphael Club. Well, that's unfortunate but that's what happens when you try to simply put in a ramp that would service that direction. What else happens, obviously, by building a ramp on top of what is your two-way city street that acts as a frontage road and serves all these properties. In order to replace that we'd have to construct it again further to the west...where I'm pointing now on this line in yellow, but again actually going through the buildings that we had to take originally just to put the ramp in. There's no additional damages, but it provides continuity down here it allows the connection opposite Second Street in the area where you currently have recently paved to provide some parking for the West High School students, that goes hard against the West High School Athletic Fields. In fact, between that piece of high ground and the low ground in the river we wind up having to build a series of retaining walls in order to be able to build those facilities in that rather narrow corridor. This piece of paper that's fallen down a few times already tonight is a picture that we engineers drew and take a slice out of the roadway as you look straight at it, if you were to stand straight out on the road and say what can I see and I know a lot of you have difficulty from a distance in figuring out exactly what it is I'll be pointing to, but if you can see this blue color that is where the river is and you go up on a steep slope to where if you can see there are four cars here and that's the existing turnpike where we currently drive. We're saying that in order to be able to do that we would have to start building the new highway and adjacent and higher than the existing turnpike and the reason for that is in order to be able to make the interchange ramps work in the long-term, we have to provide a long-span structure to allow the ramps to work underneath the bridge using one signal. So, what am I talking about. What we're doing now in Concord at Exit 13 for those of you who have driven through that area it looks like a bomb hit it, but actually we're trying to reconstruct the ramps, we're putting in new long-span bridges to accommodate an interchange similar to what we're talking about here at Granite Street. If you've driven under the bridges lately and you compare the old to the new you'll see that the new span is about 230' long, about two-and-a-half times longer than the existing span that you travel over now. We are going to rework that area and let the ramps come underneath the bridge into a set of signals. We can talk a little bit more about that if I've confused anybody because I'm trying to go fast to try to get to the point where you folks can start asking your questions. And, I got away from talking about the simple concept of adding the ramps. The difficulty there in this tight spot is that we

would have had to build a retaining wall to hold up the interstate just so that we could go in the build the ramp so that we could put in another retaining wall in along the river. That in itself will cause environmental issues that have yet to be addressed. Obviously, when the City built this ramp several years ago remember how difficult it was to get that permitted. You went in with retaining walls and cantilever retaining walls that hang out over the river because it's very difficult to get permission to fill in the river. I'm sure we can all understand why that is such the case. But, the simple adding of the two ramps meant that one, it didn't address the condition of the bridge which we know we have to soon, it did not address the issue of what happens to this retaining wall that we build when it comes time to rebuild the interstate and add the two lanes we talked about earlier up and down the Millyard; that would have been a throw away item and we hate to do that. We hate to build something and then have to tear it out just because there's not enough room. We eventually came to the conclusion that it made more sense that we address the condition of the bridge at the same time that we would build these ramps, if that's the City's wish and we would provide the long-span bridge; move the traffic over; get it away from where we would like to build a new ramp; build a new southbound bridge in this area; move the traffic over; and then move the other lane over to the existing barrel; move them all away; create a work zone for the contractor to come in and build in here and at the same time build this road if the City's to keep it; replacement of Allard Lane, Lumber Lane...that's a possibility to build on that and making that connection still work and provide an area for the contractor to perform his functions while we still keep four lanes open on the interstate. We know that closing any of the lanes to build this would be unacceptable, we had to do a lot of work in the City when we had a project here before (at nighttime) in order to minimize some of the impacts. While we were studying the traffic volumes that were attracted to this interchange and again we tried to predict over 20 years what the growth might be, we found that the widening of the Granite Street Bridge over the Merrimack, a City bridge would be important in order to be able to handle the traffic volumes. For those of you that are close enough to see there is a little black dash mark that shows our estimate of the bridge widening that would be necessary to handle the volumes in and out of the City and off and on the turnpike and that widening would project through the interchange area right up through the Raphael and go on up to the South Main Street interchange and it shows that the properties on this side of the road would be impacted by such a widening. It's possible, obviously, not to build as much, widening. It's possible to taper it off sooner and maybe leave buildings there to stay a little bit longer. But, all it means is that you're not addressing all of the traffic and the congestion issues that will have to be handled in this particular area. So, should this go forward with your ideas and endorsements we would recommend that the City address the issue of widening the Granite Street Bridge in order to perhaps catch up to this project for economy of scale where a contractor might do well to bid on a major project and build a couple of bridges, it could be to everyone's benefit. But, it also doesn't have to. The key is if you postpone the widening of Granite Street you will have additional congestion problems because of the fact that you'd be having more traffic to deal with through the signals. We can live with the ramps without the Granite Street widening for a while, but I think it would quickly be evident and necessary for some work to be done on that corridor to handle the volumes that would be attracted there. Someone will also say why do you have to do so much work on the turnpike. Well, we found that in order to be able to put in an

interchange to handle this traffic volume with that super span bridge as I mentioned earlier, we find that we have to have an extra deep steel structural section or beam to carry that load across that wide opening and that means that the grade on the turnpike would have to be raised...we show conceptually five or six feet right at Granite Street in order to be able to put in that structure at this particular location and some of you probably can't see but this is a picture we call a "profile". Now, what it tries to do is show what the grade of the road is that you drive today and the existing grade of the turnpike I'm tracing in brown and you go up over Granite Street Bridge here and then you come down the other side as you head to the south...this yellow line, black line at the top shows the grade that would be necessary to get the bridge clearance we talked about before and still maintain a good curve for a good stopping distance on hills for the vehicles that are through traffic up on the turnpike. So, that accounts for some of the distance in order to be able to tie in both north and south...just off the picture here is the Bridge Street Bridge and so it doesn't go quite that far before we tie into the existing roadway and again to the south, just to the south of the work here on Turner Street is the utility bridge or the old railroad line where the work would tie in on this side. I'd like to just go back just for a couple of seconds and then I'll turn it over to you folks or the Commissioner for additional questions or comments. When I mentioned we had the tight spot between the river and here is the ballfield at West High and here the river and the tennis court area. We took a slice out of the roadway in the tennis court area just to show how tight and tough it is to work in this area. In order to be able to build the improvement in phases as I talked about earlier and some of you may not be able to pick it out very well, but again...here's the river, here's the slope going up to where the existing lanes are and as I mentioned we had to raise the grade, it would be up at this level compared to what it is now. We show a retaining wall to save space instead of having slopes, we'd build a new southbound off-ramp to come...actually, through the Raphael Club and join opposite the existing southbound on-ramp and here's Allard Drive relocated in this location and here's a retaining wall that holds up the tennis court area right here. So, we've used up every available piece of land to provide this opportunity in here on Phase I as we start to build a new bridge. When half the new bridge is built we would take two lanes and put it up on that...if you can see it up in here...the two northbound lanes where they are now and then work in the middle and continue to build the rest of the new bridge up on this high platform...of course, this was already done under Phase I, everybody's got that in use and available and then eventually when this phase is done all four lanes would be up in here now on a temporary basis while we went ahead and rework this side, build another retaining wall, come in and build a northbound on-ramp and build another retaining wall right in the river's edge. So, the final product would be at the river's edge a retaining wall up to the northbound on-ramp, a retaining wall up to the northbound lanes, a median area...the green area that would allow for two lanes to be added in the future about in here, the two southbound lanes, the southbound off-ramp and Allard Drive relocated. So, that's how tight and congested it is to try to make that particular concept work. For those of you who still don't understand it, I would like to have a picture to look at real close right next to Assistant Commissioner Murray we made some small pictures for the Mayor and the Board, in fact, there's 50 of them we made so there should be some to go around for everybody. I think with that in hand you might find it a little bit easier to ask your questions and hopefully to get a better feel for what it is. What you have in front of you has all of the ultimate ramps colored in under

the bridge. We didn't color them in on this plan because it's already confusing enough between the gray pavement you drive on today and the yellow pavement of the future, but to make these ramps works similar to what I alluded to earlier in Concord. These ramps come together under the bridge and are controlled by a set of stop lights and those are colored on your concept and if you can follow the areas hopefully you'll be able to get a better appreciation of what's going on in that area. Perhaps, with that bit of information I can move along to what this might cost. We're estimating that an ultimate concept as we see here would be somewhere between \$20-25 million; that does not count what the City would be responsible for the actual widening on Granite Street for both the bridge and perhaps to go on up to South Main. There's several million dollars right there in my opinion, a sort of educated guess but I believe that something of that magnitude would be substantial. In my numbers that I gave you based again on concept we don't know how much it will cost to purchase and relocate the homes and the businesses of the folks that are in here, it's sort of an educated guess number. We have numbers in there for engineering and, of course, we don't know what the foundation conditions are for the retaining walls and things like that so I'm giving you a wide range, but it's a very significant number. Somewhere I had scheduled a Commissioner as emphasized that with all the reasons for proposing an improvement at this interchange we needed to get on with it as far as he was concerned and he has asked our project manager to be as aggressive as possible in coming up with a schedule and Jeff you're going to have to live up to this stuff, but Jeff is hoping that we could have additional public meetings to get people aware of what's going on this coming summer and hopefully have a formal public hearing late fall of this year, say November. Should that be a successful public hearing and we go forward with this project then we would be able to go into final design and hopefully start buying some of the property within a year or so and hopefully go to construction in the year 2001; that is a very aggressive schedule. My guess is that we would need two construction seasons at a minimum to accomplish this as I went very quickly through those phases you probably can understand that we have to build a portion, move traffic over, build another portion, move traffic over. So, we would probably be able to work some of the construction on a year-round basis, but winter is tough in New Hampshire and it makes our construction season a little short at times. In the best of all worlds I'd say a minimum of two seasons and it could go into a third to finish it up. We certainly we be aggressive in trying to follow that, we do have interests of course of making sure that the bridge stays in good shape and remains unposted for loading and such as that. Commissioner, I went through as fast as I possibly could. If I left anything out I'd appreciate your reminding me, others, questions might be in order.

Commissioner Kenison noted that the configuration that Gil's talked about is new to New Hampshire, although we're introducing it not only in Concord, but also in Exeter with the 101/108 Interchange is being constructed and the primary rationale behind such a configuration is to minimize the footprint and the impact thereby on the property while being able to move the traffic volumes that are there and that is a very efficient geometric configuration and that is proposed here and for the obvious reasons that we have constraints of a natural kind on the east of mankind, if you will, on the west. There are a number of properties impacted. Carol has

among us had more opportunity to deal with property acquisition and relocation phase and I'm going to ask her to very briefly describe the process that we go through, Carol.

Assistant Commissioner Murray stated there are a number of affected property owners that I know are with us this evening. Right-of-way acquisition is a very complex process with a number of different steps associated with it. I am going to do a very short, condensed version and certainly when we get to the question phase I'd be happy to expand on any of those. State law provides for any property owner to receive "fair market value" if their property is affected by a transportation improvement project. That is determined by an appraisal, in some cases two appraisals depending on the property values that are estimated either by staff appraisers within the department or fee appraisers and in this case I would see having involvement by appraisers from the industry outside the department. Those appraisal reports are then submitted to us. They are reviewed to be sure that they're accurate and have taken into account all approaches to value. There are a number of ways to look at valuation of property. Some are appropriate in some commercial enterprises, for example, you may look at all three approaches to value. Once those reports are reviewed and a determination has been made that there are no errors or omissions they are then given to some folks to start negotiations with the property owners and that's our starting point. We don't offer less than that reviewed appraisal. The offer is tendered, the negotiations ensue. Operating parallel with that for businesses, homeowners, tenants and personal property is a relocation benefit that is provided and that is there to assure that folks can move from their present location to a new location with minimal disruption and, hopefully, no added expense to them. Once the offer is made, if negotiations are successful deeds are prepared and the property is exchanged. If we are unsuccessful in reaching a negotiation at that phase we then move to an eminent domain portion; that does not mean that negotiations cease. It means the lead is then taken by the Attorney General's Office and they again attempt to reach a resolution on property values. Failing a resolution at that point the Board of Tax and Land Appeals will hold a hearing, listen to both parties...the State has to provide their expertise, property owners are considered experts when it comes to testimony about the property value of their property. This can be done with or without an attorney for property owners for exactly that reason. We only have to move into the eminent domain phase with about 10 percent of the property we required, 90 percent is successfully negotiated. So, our success rate at sitting down with folks and talking about property value is very high, but it is not a hundred percent. That is kind of a very short, condensed process that takes a long time to conclude and again I'd be more than happy to answer any questions you may have.

Commissioner Kenison stated, your Honor, two more points that I wish to make. Gil mentioned that I've asked the department staff with your concurrence...that and the Board of Aldermen for the project to move on a very fast-track basis because if it's needed, it's needed quickly and we're prepared to make that effort, be unusually intense. The other one point I think we need to make tonight is that this is essentially proposed at State expense, this would be a turnpike expansion project financed by the Turnpike Revenue that we create when we go through a toll booth. We're not proposing any toll booths in Manchester and the only City expense is your option at improvements on the Granite Street Bridge and approaches thereto. We would certainly be

responsible for all of the improvements essentially between the river and where the ramps enter and Allard Drive relocation. So, the City can choose to participate in that fashion if they wish or just to delay that investment until a later time. But, we know you're investing in an aggressive manner throughout the City and we think this is just a fine complimentary project to aid in the access of all of that investment that you're making. We'd be pleased to answer any questions.

Mayor Wiczorek stated thank you very much, Commissioner.

Alderman Wihby in reference to this plan asked how many lights are going to be regular, is it like four or five in that short span.

Commissioner Kenison replied no. As Gil has mentioned there is only one master signal hanging under the bridge that controls all four of those ramps right under the bridge and in about a year, a year-and-a-half you'll be able to see that coming into reality in the Concord Exit 13 project. Gil, did you have something else you wanted to add.

Mr. Rogers stated these are the ramps coming together.

Alderman Wihby stated these people are just going to come into traffic.

Mr. Rogers stated they'll come out and take a right turn here. The main set of signals that would handle all of the ramps on and off would be at one location under this superspan bridge. It's possible to control, at times, the off-ramp when this traffic is coming through, but we'd like to let everybody stay on a "Right Turn on Red" as much as possible, but if necessary for safety purposes you might have to do that and stop when folks are coming through. A lot of times people will take a "Right Turn on Red". We need signals at Second Street and I'd say yes, we'd want to retain those and would be coordinated to handle both those sets of signals.

Alderman Wihby stated so Granite Street is the way you have it planned and I assume you've done some studies. Your recommendation is that it goes to six lanes. You probably don't want to recommend it, but.

Mr. Rogers stated if you were to look closely and count the number of arrows going in both directions, then I think you would note that we had eight lanes under that structure...two lanes in either direction with double lefts to serve both sets of ramps for a total of eight. These show that the Granite Street Bridge widening...we would recommend that you have four lanes out there today and probably for the future should have another three, so it would handle the lanes coming into the interchange area.

Alderman Wihby stated I know that you're well-aware that we're having a civic center put in right up the road from there that might happen. Are those numbers anticipated at all in what you've done or is that just going to...

Mr. Rogers stated we have background growth in the numbers that were looked at for the whole City through Moni Sharma. They have a model that shows what's happening around the City...it's very proactive in trying to predict what happens when you add traffic at different locations. One of the benefits of the Civic Center, of course, is that a lot of the activities would probably occur in off-peak hours, but wouldn't necessarily play with the commuter traffic so numbers for that may not be full, but there is some consideration.

Alderman Thibault stated on Second Street there is already a light there now, are you going to eliminate that light, is that what we're saying.

Mr. Rogers replied no, we would keep that light.

Alderman Thibault stated that's close now to the interchange, especially the off-ramp that we're looking at. How are you going to control that because I find that it's a problem as it is.

Mr. Rogers stated it is a problem if there is not enough lanes to handle the traffic that you currently have out there and, of course, there is going to be more coming in the future as the City continues to grow, that is why we need more lanes under there to handle it. The signals would be tied together, coordinated through one control box, a computer...the big black box that sits on the corner would have sensors under the pavement that tells the box when traffic is there and it reacts during peak times and non-peak times.

Alderman Thibault stated you said something about widening the bridge. Has anybody estimated what the cost of that might be to the City.

Mr. Rogers replied I suspect maybe your City professional staff has been working on that. Frank, I don't know have you arrived at a number on that or not.

Mr. Thomas replied we have a very preliminary number right now somewhere between \$12 to \$14 million to widen the bridge and the Granite Street corridor from Elm Street up to Main Street.

Alderman Thibault stated if you're going all the way up to Main Street what other properties are we talking about here...Cumberland Farms and the gas station, is that all going to be involved in this.

Mr. Rogers replied based on a widening on that side, Alderman, that is correct. This black line and I'm not sure if it shows on your map, but I think you can see how the yellow goes up to South Main Street and I believe it shows that the buildings on the north side of the road are the ones that would be taken under this particular concept in order to get that width. So, the answer to your question is yes.

Alderman Thibault asked has anybody also estimated what the cost is going to be to the City of all of the buildings that are being taken.

Mr. Rogers replied we have that number in the \$20 to \$25 million that I gave you for this whole concept. But, the buildings that would have to be taken by the project are outlined in black dash marks...this first building in here off of Turner Street...those are the ones that would be necessary. We haven't had appraisals yet as Commissioner Murray had mentioned, so we put a factor on those.

Alderman Thibault stated I think you misunderstood my question, I'm looking at what is the tax loss to the City because of all of these properties being taken. Has anybody looked at that.

Mr. Rogers replied not yet. What we will have to do. We do a bottom level assessment of a project such as this because as you might suspect there is a significant impact and we have to include the assessment as part of the process. In that document we would address those types of tax issues. Obviously, we would work with the folks to relocate them to different places of businesses and homes, but I couldn't tell you right now what the impact would be.

Alderman Thibault stated it looks to me like the northbound on-ramp would be cantilevered into the water such as the southbound off-ramp right now, am I right.

Mr. Rogers replied you're right on. This is the retaining wall, it doesn't show a cantilever, but obviously can be designed that way. We have received, as I mentioned earlier, strong encouragement by the Corps of Engineers and others to stay out of the river.

Alderman Thibault stated the one on the other side seems to work quite well.

Mr. Rogers stated I think we can make a good case for it and do the same thing on the other side. The agencies seem to think that the impacts in this area are relatively small when you look at the map of the City, but significant enough that they might want to consider an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and that means it's a different ballgame, a lot more detailed. We don't think that it warrants that much. We need to look at all of the impacts and address them, but we don't believe EIS such as at the Airport is necessary for this particular project. There is, in my mind, a slight improvement. You look at the map of the City and when you look at the project in here, it's really a spot improvement to an existing set of problems.

Alderman Thibault stated on Turner Street I was made to believe that you were not going to touch any buildings there, but from what I see here you are going to touch some buildings. As a matter of fact, I have had a few calls in that area and I told them as I understood it that it was not going to touch buildings in the Turner Street...I'm looking at south of Granite Street/Turner Street, that it was not going to impact any of the buildings there. But, from what I see here it will.

Mr. Rogers stated unfortunately that's true. This is where the lanes are today under the old railroad bridge here and if you go to the north here is where we start picking up the existing off-ramp and the retaining wall. So, we didn't want to go into the river again, but we wanted to make all the work go this way in saving that ramp and all that expense that is currently in place and because we also had to raise the turnpike to create the new bridge we had to move things over to make room for that raise and unfortunately what that meant was we had to reconstruct a little bit of the southbound on-ramp and it's important to provide Turner Street the links/the streets in this network...we've shown that as something that could be done. If the City said we'd be satisfied with a series of short deadend streets without something to connect that's possible and perhaps a few of the buildings could remain. There are issues such as fire and police that have a lot of deadend streets, so that's something for the City to consider.

Alderman Thibault noted they're all very short streets anyway as they are today.

Mr. Rogers stated this kind of shows the worse case scenario in here.

Alderman Thibault stated I'm just concerned because I told those people that I didn't think it was going to be touched.

Commissioner Kenison stated if I might also respond to that. As we said earlier tonight we are here in concept only, we're fast tracking this and have not had the time to develop this in the fine scale that we normally bring to a review such as this, so we're sort of looking at it in a very conceptual nature. Gil has said that it is the worse case scenario and we have to work with the City and I would hope that if you feel this is a worthwhile pursuit that we could form a committee made up of the Mayor's choosing and I suspect some of you folks that represents the community and particularly this area of the community and we could work together and identify the sensitive areas and do what we can and go through that alternative choice scenario so that, in fact, everybody in the community knows where we've been and can help us decide just what the best project would be.

Alderman Thibault stated I'm not against the project, I'm for the project. I'm just trying to minimize the impact to the area as much as we can possibly do because I think it's a worthwhile project knowing where the City is going with the Civic Center, the Riverwalk and all of these other things, I think it's going to bring a major impact to the City to have this done.

Commissioner Kenison stated I appreciate that, I think we need the local input on a constant basis in order to make a real sensitive design.

Alderman Girard asked has any consideration been given to the traffic impact along North Main and McGregor Streets if this project were to go through. It seems as though you are anticipating a lot of additional traffic perhaps heading toward the west since your suggestion we widen Granite Street, has any traffic impact been done there.

Mr. Rogers replied on a general basis we looked at these improvements and said we provide access, improved access what would the traffic do for adjusting conditions and in the future and the traffic models showed us it would tend to balance around the City as people would avoid congested areas and in some cases they would receive more traffic and other would receive less. But, it would tend to be a balanced system through the City. One thing the traffic model does is it allows the City to look at other hot spots where you might want to address issues because of the traffic and say we should program a project for improvement at intersection "X" over the next several years...that type of thing. So, that's the benefit.

Alderman Girard stated my concern specifically is if you are anticipating a lot of traffic heading toward North Main Street that is a one lane road from Granite Street all the way up to the Bridge Street Bridge, the Notre Dame Bridge and then, of course, it's two lanes there and back down to one lane once you get toward the Coca Cola plant, so that could be a bottleneck problem and there's not a whole lot of room up there for the City really to widen the road unless we're going to start going into the high school or going into the park.

Mr. Rogers stated there is no question that there are a lot of narrow streets in the area and people can take advantage of the opportunities to go where they find the least resistance. As we said the key is the City can react to changes to a plan such as this by plugging in theoretical improvements at various locations and see how they work.

Alderman Girard stated a question for Mr. MacKenzie actually. Well, actually before I get to that. Is it possible that the City could get a list of the addresses that would be affected under this plan so we could send them to the Board of Assessors and get the taxable value that Alderman Thibault was asking about.

Mr. Rogers replied sure.

Alderman Girard stated a couple of questions for your, Mr. MacKenzie. With what's being proposed down along Turner Street having the highway cut further into that residential neighborhood. Does it make sense make sense down there...first of all, can we anticipate a further decline in the value of the properties that remain as a result of the encroachment of the highway.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I couldn't say that for sure. It is going to get somewhat closer, the traffic noise may get somewhat higher. The Environmental Impact or the Environmental Assessment would tell us better what the impact would be in terms of noise and that would give us a better idea of impact on property value.

Alderman Girard stated my second question along that line is should we consider now from the area that would be affected say to Second Street...should we consider taking a look at that neighborhood and consider rezoning it so that a more compatible use with the roadway could be

put there because I could tell you if I lived down there I wouldn't exactly want a highway going through my backyard.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I would think that the City should at least review that matter. Certainly, it does happen...the City of Concord, for example, has changed the zoning for one of its neighborhoods right near the highway and I think the City should evaluate that although you have to be careful because we don't know what will happen in this area. I wouldn't want to say one way or the other until we've really seen what the designs are going to be and whether we could realistically accommodate businesses within that area, it's a relatively narrow strip from Second Street out to the highway. So, if there's not a realistic long-term possibility for reasonable businesses in there, I would not want to encourage business in that situation.

Alderman Shea stated I'm more interested in the coordination of the State and the City in terms of how one impacts the other. You're willing, we'll say, to put in the ramps and so forth...I'm wondering if the City because of whatever reason should choose not to widen Granite Street...is that an option.

Commissioner Kenison replied absolutely. I think as this is developed and again I've got to emphasize that we are here on a fast track way tonight and we're not able to specifically answer a lot of questions that we normally would be able to with projects of this nature, it taking a longer period of time, but yes is the answer to your question. I think later on we'll be better able to advise you what the consequences might be.

Alderman Shea stated I guess that answers my question...my second question would be implementation by the City in terms of having to widen the street. In other words, it would give the City if it so chose a few years to develop revenues in order to do that work which would be in the \$12 to \$14 million range, I would assume.

Commissioner Kenison stated that is correct. You certainly have that option to lag, if you will, on that improvement and as we all consider this in much more seriousness over the coming months, maybe we'll all be developing strategies and certainly be compatible on whether they will be coincident I think remains to be seen.

Alderman Thibault stated although I appreciate what Alderman Girard just brought up if you look at the buildings on Turner Street that possibly could be affected and like you say this is not all in concrete presently. As it is now the turnpike goes by these buildings, so I don't see such a major impact as far as that is concerned. What I'm more concerned about, I think, is that once if we do get into these buildings to whatever extent you have on that map one or two deadends at that point I don't think is going to make a big, big difference. It is just something that the City and the Planning Department would have to get into that and find out what the impact of that would be. I look at it as possibly a quite minimal impact in that area because these are all tiny

streets off of Second Street that if one or two of those were closed at the other end, as long as there was a way to get in and out, I don't see that as a major impact.

Alderman Pinard stated you keep referring to fast track, could you clarify time on your fast track.

Commissioner Kenison replied as Gil said we hope to get into construction in 2001 and that seems like a long ways out and you might say that isn't very fast track, but originally I think this was scheduled for 2006 or 07 and so for us to put this all together and the impacts both natural and manmade to be resolved in this area are going to take a very intense effort in 2001 when we also hope to start construction on the Airport Access Road will be a pretty good goal achieved.

Alderman Clancy asked what impact will this have on the West Memorial Field, we're starting to spend a lot of money over there on the ballfield and I heard you say you're going to take some land from the tennis courts.

Commissioner Kenison replied no, absolutely not, that's sort of untouchable. Gil mentioned that it comes up very close to the playing fields and when he was going through the cross sections he's showing you the out-of-boundary essentially and it comes up to the property line, to the fence line and that remains untouched. We appreciate the investment you've made there and how dear it is and we simply don't want to disrupt that. Frankly, we'd like not to disrupt a lot of other things here, but that is one we're able to honor.

Alderman Hirschmann stated the City's commitment on the bridge, how key do you see that as us committing to that bridge expansion in conjunction with your project.

Commissioner Kenison replied it's pretty much the same question that I responded to before. We don't have the alternatives and the consequences developed yet and I think we can lay those before you in number terms at a future date so we can all perhaps judge that more intelligently than we can tonight.

Alderman Girard asked as this project proceeds, will there be more detailed traffic impact analysis done of where you expect traffic to come from and go to as a result of this interchange.

Commissioner Kenison replies yes, indeed. Again, we are here in a concept phase and the question you asked before, I think, needs to be explored through the traffic modeling and we need to know and the City needs to know just what sort of impacts. Just as Gil said there will be a balancing that occurs here, I think overall will be a plus but there may be some pockets and you may have identified some of them...we'll see more traffic attracted because it's better than going up-and-down Second Street to other locations where we have to go now and certainly to the Elm Street area and all of the new attractions that are being developed to the east, you'll see a lot more traffic.

Alderman Pariseau stated I wonder if a motion would be in order that we give the State Department of Transportation encouragement by expressing our support for the project as a Board.

Alderman Cashin stated there are people out here that might be affected by this, couldn't we hear from them, your Honor.

Mayor Wiczorek stated I know there are some with questions. Are there any more questions from the Aldermen. If not, the public, I know, Ray.

Mr. Ray Allard stated as you probably know we own quite a bit of property down there and we're going to be involved and I'm very disturbed about finding out that my big warehouse which has been my livelihood, it's like a monument there is going to be destroyed. Is there a way that we can move that highway, I don't mind giving over the office part of it, but the other side of the street is what I'm talking about...where the big warehouse is, they're going to cut that part out they tell me.

Mr. Rogers replied, Mr. Allard, the relocation of Allard Lane is a major reason why that building is gone. We had made the assumption that providing access to the remaining properties in here along the turnpike through Granite Street was important to the City. If the City should decide that that is no longer necessary...the public still has to be served in some fashion and that would have to somehow be figured out. But, that's part of the reason why that building there has to be taken to provide that continuity of this road system and again if we didn't have this everything down in this area as you know would be served off the steep boundary and coming down opposite the hospital. If that was a deadend it could be a potential issue for the fire and police to go in in poor weather. So, we took the approach that it made sense to provide a two-lane street to replace the one because of the new ramp.

Mr. Allard asked do you have to have that ramp bubble up that way instead of going straighter down near the river.

Mr. Rogers replied we're in the river as much as we dare and will probably be asked to get out of the river as much as I showed on that concept which forces us to move even further than that direction, but every one of the distances between the traveled portions on this concept are at a minimum. We've shown a minimum amount of distance between the southbound lanes and the ramp, the snow plow so you don't pass snow down to the folks who might be travelling on the ramp and the same is the minimum amount of distance, I believe you have 10 to 12 feet between the ramp and the relocated Lumber Lane and that's pretty bare minimum also. We'd like to see more but we really can't due to the fact that we have the control of the baseball fields and the tennis courts. We need their advise tonight as to what is important to retain or what's okay to take as part of this project again on this side of Amoskeag and again on this side. We're here to learn.

Mr. Allard stated it seems to me that you could have the road go almost straight out there instead of making that balloon and moving everything to the west, bring it to the east over the river.

Mr. Rogers stated I understand that is what you'd like to do, but in my opinion we would never get a permit to build a road out into the river to that extent, not in today's society.

Mr. Allard stated you can always move the river if you flow it over.

Mr. Rogers stated it's a tough issue, but I'm afraid that is something that we probably could not get a permit for.

Mr. Allard stated I would like to have an opportunity to discuss this further.

Mayor Wiczorek asked, Ray, for the record would you please state your name and address.

Mr. Ray Allard, Owner of Ray the Mover, who owns that property we're talking about now.

Commissioner Kenison stated again one of the things coming before the Mayor and Aldermen tonight is that normally we would go to the major property owners and have these sorts of discussions before we do this, but because we are in this sort of a fast track mode, we have not had that opportunity. We will be doing that, we will explore all of those things that you're talking about and really the City staff hasn't had too much input on all of the questions about those roads on the westerly side and if in some fashion they can be found to serve the properties there including yours without those roads then the acquisition of your larger building there may not be necessary and we'll go through all of those considerations.

Mayor Wiczorek asked are there any other questions from the public out there. There were none. Any further questions from the Aldermanic Board.

Alderman Hirschmann commented with respect to that gentleman's building...if Lumber Lane was to go say through Vermont Salvage and then straight across connecting to Foundry Street in this fashion...see how it curves down through the building...if it were to go straight across like this connecting here that's a highly valued building (tax wise), Vermont Salvage is probably a lot less on the tax base, I don't know what that would do for that access road. These are parcels that will be developed...if this road went through here this would get developed, this would get developed.

Alderman Girard asked isn't that parking for CMC.

Mr. Rogers stated that is an idea to be considered that I am sure your City staff would also give you advice on. If you put the road back there that would certainly spare this building for that purpose although if any of the access onto the current Lumber Lane in this way wouldn't work well. If you could come up the back side onto a road that could work, but there really is

negligible room in there for that to affect...if you come up the other side it might work. So, maybe it's something the City would like us to look at after you've had a chance to think this through.

Alderman Girard stated I was wondering if the route that Alderman Hirschmann showed cut through CMC's parking which I think it might.

Mr. Rogers stated I think this is the current CMC parking, this gray, but that's not to say that it couldn't have gone further toward the river. We won't guarantee that this map is totally up-to-date we were out in the field reviewing just a couple of days ago trying to see and make sure the buildings were still there.

Alderman Clancy asked, Mr. Allard, how close is your building right now to the highway.

Mr. Allard replied probably six feet.

Mayor Wieczorek asked are there any other questions from the Board.

Alderman Pariseau moved to support the NH State Department of Transportation's proposed Granite Street Ramp. Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Girard asked is it the intent of Alderman Pariseau to ask the Department of Transportation to further develop this proposal for later consideration.

Mayor Wieczorek replied I think what he's saying is don't stop, but keep working at it.

Mayor Wieczorek called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Commissioner Kenison stated you've provided us good direction and we'll try to keep the faith. Thank you very much.

Mayor Wieczorek recessed the meeting.

Mayor Wieczorek called the meeting back to order.

Mayor Wieczorek stated we still have three items of business on the agenda this evening, but there is one item of new business that we would like to deal with tonight as a result of a meeting which was held earlier and asked for a motion to suspend Rule 2 that requires unanimous consent to allow an item of new business to be addressed.

On motion of Alderman Cashin, duly seconded by Alderman Rivard, it was unanimously voted to suspend Rule 2 relative to presentation of new business at special meetings.

A Report of the Special Committee on the Civic Center was presented recommending that:

An amendment to the Corporation Agreement dated June 15, 1959, between the City of Manchester and the Manchester Housing Authority for the Spruce Street Redevelopment Project, as Amended by Agreement dated March 3, 1965, and

An amendment to Urban Renewal Plan and the Redevelopment Plan of Spruce Street Project No. N.H. R-3 Including Amendments No. 1 and 2.

be approved; and further that the Mayor be authorized to execute such agreements subject to the review and approval of the City Solicitor.

Alderman Wihby moved to accept, receive and adopt the report as presented. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Shea asked what are we voting for, Tom, I really don't know. What does it mean simply.

Solicitor Clark replied simply the Board authorized up to \$2.5 million on Phase II of the Civic Center Project and this is to allow the Housing Authority to start spending some of that money to do the appraisals, to bring on a construction manager, they can't do anything further than that pre-development stage that we had already authorized.

Alderman Shea stated the Housing Authority will do that at their expense.

Solicitor Clark replied using the \$2.5 million that was appropriated for that purpose.

Alderman Clancy asked what's the Spruce Street Project.

Alderman Sysyn stated that was the name of the project area back then.

Mayor Wieczorek called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

5. Ordinance amendment submitted by Human Resource Director:

“Amending Section 33.079 (Vacation) of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester.”

Alderman Wihby asked what is this all about.

Mr. Tawney replied in the original ordinance there was an error, it was listed as eight-tenths and it should have been eight one-hundredths and that's the only difference. It leaves the vacation exactly as it was in the past, it was an oversight.

Alderman Wihby moved to suspend the rules and place this Ordinance on its third and final reading by title only without referrals to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading and the Committee on Accounts, Enrollment and Revenue Administration.

Alderman Cashin asked is this alright.

Solicitor Clark replied this is the way it always has been. The Decker Study...when they came in with their changes made a mistake on that one paragraph.

Alderman Girard duly seconded the motion.

Mayor Wieczorek called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

On motion of Alderman Cashin, duly seconded by Alderman Pariseau, it was voted that the Ordinance be read by title only, and it was so done.

This Ordinance having had its final reading by title only, Alderman Rivard moved on passing same to be Ordained. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

6. Communication from Deputy City Clerk requesting passage of Ordinance:

“To grant the Office of the City Clerk the authority to exclude the names of certain owners from its annual list of owners of unlicensed dogs required by New Hampshire R.S.A. 466:14.”

Alderman Pinard moved to suspend the rules and place this Ordinance on its third and final reading by title only without referrals to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading and the Committee on Accounts, Enrollment and Revenue Administration. Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Thibault stated I've had several calls on this. People seem to get a little upset about the fact that because they forgot to license their dog that the letter was sent to them was quite offensive meaning that they could end up at the Police station or in jail. I don't know how this letter is written, but I've had four or five calls on it telling me that the people were somewhat intimidated by it. I wonder if maybe the wording might be changed a little bit.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated we did not send letter. What happened was when we reviewed the law we determined that there was going to be a \$25 fee assessed to anybody that didn't license it as of today. We made phone calls trying to let people know that so that they could come down and register and not end up with a \$25 fee and the reason why we stated right out of the law was because we wanted them to understand that there was no choice in the matter, it was either they

were going to get hit with it. We made over 2,000 calls inside of a week from our office in order to try and warn people. Anybody that had a phone number in our system, we called.

Alderman Thibault stated I was just telling you about the feedback I got.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated there were some people who were very grateful and some people that were not happy at all.

Alderman Cashin stated I would like to commend the City Clerk's Office for taking the initiative to do that. I think that was very nice and I appreciate it.

Mayor Wieczorek called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

On motion of Alderman Sysyn, duly seconded by Alderman Clancy, it was voted that the Ordinance be read by title only, and it was so done.

This Ordinance having had its final reading by title only, Alderman Shea moved on passing same to be Ordained. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

7. Communication from Deputy City Clerk submitting a listing of owners of dogs that have not renewed their dog licenses and a warrant to be issued to the Chief of Police pursuant to R.S.A. 466:14.

Alderman Pariseau moved to commit the warrant and authorize deletion from the warrant the listing of those owners submitted by the City Clerk who have registered their dogs prior to closing of the forfeiture fee notice. Alderman Rivard duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Mayor Wieczorek stated a question I had. What if a dog died during the year.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated the reason we requested that the ordinance be passed was so that we could remove people from the list that didn't have a dog anymore or gave the dog away or the dog had been deceased because otherwise we would be required to send out a certified letter to them and assess the fee. I would also just like to note to the Board that we provided a handout which shows the revenues that we've taken in over the last few days and it basically represents having licensed over a thousand dogs out of those phone calls that we made and obviously our revenues will be up as well as the State's revenues for their share. The Police Chief is obviously not happy because people that don't respond to a certified mailing that we're going to have to do is going to come under his jurisdiction. We are going to attempt to tie that in with car registrations or something in the future, so that they are not having to do that.

Chief Driscoll stated this is the first time that we have encountered this new statute, it's the first time that I think the Clerk has dealt with it or the Police Department has dealt with it to go out and summons 700 individual residences or people at 700 different residences by July 31st is a huge task, it's probably resources that we don't have and I'm particularly troubled by the fact that once we give these summonses out and spend all the City's manpower to do it the revenue won't be returned to the City, the revenue will go to the State. I really think that the Statute needs to be addressed by the City, I also have discussed with Carol the possibility of somehow involving Joan Gardner so someone doesn't register their car until they've registered their dog or have taken care of all of their City business such as parking tickets and so forth. So, this needs considerable work and we'll do the best we can, but we certainly don't guarantee to the Board that we'll accomplish this by July 31st as required by the Statutes.

Deputy Clerk Johnson noted that because of the certified mail requirement which our office is going to conduct on behalf of the Police Department because they don't have those resources and they don't have the tools of the Dog Licensing program there will be a cost of about \$10,000 to our department's budget for this fiscal cycle and I did speak with the Finance Department about that and they believe they're going to accommodate it by making some sort of transfers to cover it. The revenues on the other hand that are coming in are all beyond what was anticipated in the budget, so your revenues are going to be way up. We've taken in approximately \$10,000 more than what was budgeted for as of now and by the time this is done I would estimate about another \$31,000 coming back to the City.

Mayor Wiczorek stated where were you when you needed you last week.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied if I had known this during the budget process, if I had realized this...we didn't discover part of this situation until less than a week ago, so we've really moved quickly to try and accommodate the situation.

There being no further business to come before the special meeting, on motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

City Clerk