

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

August 27, 2009

HEARING OF BERLIN, 12958B  
NEPA CONTINUATION

DISCLAIMER

No representative of/for CIS Secretarial Services was present for the taping of this hearing and no equipment of CIS Secretarial Services was used in connection with the recording of this matter. The bracketed words or conversation are either phonetic interpretations or if blank indicate that it could not be transcribed due to sound quality, noises such as coughing, sneezing, papers being shuffled. All spelling relating to individuals, places or organizations contained on these tapes have been accomplished with phonetic interpretations as well.



Lee A. Currier  
CIS Secretarial Services, llc  
1260 Briar Hill Road  
Hopkinton, NH 03229  
(603) 746-3938  
E-mail: [cisnh@tds.net](mailto:cisnh@tds.net)

1 Chairperson Ashley: Good evening, everyone. This hearing is called to order. My name  
2 is Barbara Ashley, Chair of the Commission. Dick Hamilton from  
3 Littleton is on my left and on his left is Dave Woodward from  
4 Milan. We all form the commission appointed by the Governor and  
5 Executive Council. This hearing is a continuation of the public  
6 hearing held on August 13<sup>th</sup> and is being held in accordance with  
7 RSA 230.14 and the Surface Transportation and Uniform  
8 Relocation Systems Act of 1987. This hearing this evening will  
9 cover the environmental aspects of the project. This hearing is  
10 being held in accordance with the requirements of the Council on  
11 Environment Quality and the National Environmental Policy Act of  
12 1969. At this time, I'd like to ask Chris Waszczuk, with the  
13 Department of Transportation to present the project and the  
14 environmental aspects. Once the Department finishes with their  
15 presentation, I will then open the floor for public comment. I will  
16 ask each person, once recognized by me, to come to the  
17 microphone, clearly state and spell their name and offer their  
18 address, then state their comments. Now I will ask Chris to present  
19 the Department's proposal.

20 Christopher Waszczuk: Thank you, Madam Chair. Good evening ladies and gentlemen.  
21 It's a pleasure to be here again this evening to present the NEPA or  
22 environmental portion of the project. The project concerns  
23 proposed alterations to NH 110 in the City of Berlin. My name is  
24 Chris Waszczuk and I'm the chief project manager of the  
25 Department. I'm also the project manager for this project. Two  
26 weeks ago the Department held a first formal public hearing for the  
27 project which focused on the project's design, layout, and right-of-  
28 way. Tonight's public hearing is intended to focus on the  
29 environmental assessment document which was completed for the  
30 project and to also get your public comment and testimony. Before  
31 I begin I'd like to introduce several of my colleagues this evening.  
32 Marc Laurin, he's a senior environmental engineer with the Bureau  
33 of Environment and he will provide an overview of the  
34 environmental assessment completed for the project. Next to him is  
35 Jamie Sikora. He is an environment program manager with the  
36 Federal Highway Administration and he will discuss Federal  
37 Highway's role in the project. And then Trent Zanes – he's a senior  
38 preliminary design engineer with the Department's Bureau of  
39 Highway Design and he will present the displayed plans this

1 evening. All the information this evening will be just the  
2 PowerPoint presentation. We do not have any displayed plans.  
3 And in the audience I'd like to acknowledge both Don Lyford, who  
4 is going to serve as the final design project manager and Chip  
5 Johnson who is going to be the right-of-way agent and then Lisa  
6 Denoncourt who is doing the recording this evening. Here's the  
7 agenda for this evening. We will try to be as succinct as possible to  
8 present all the information and anticipate our presentation to be  
9 about thirty to forty minutes. And then once we complete our  
10 presentation, as Chairman Ashley stated, we'll open the floor to  
11 comments. Some of the information here this evening will be a  
12 repetition of the information that was presented at the last public  
13 hearing. I just want to note that for any of those that... I think  
14 most people probably sat through the last public hearing. But here is  
15 the project area: Route 16 is down in the lower left which travels  
16 north to south. Then we have Route 110 as it comes in from the  
17 west and connects into 16. We have the Green Street Bridge  
18 Replacement Project which was completed in 2008 shown right in  
19 the middle of the slide there, and then 110 and then the project area  
20 which encompasses the 110 corridor. That's pretty much the  
21 project area and that's where the limits of the work are proposed to  
22 extend within. Just a little about the project background and history  
23 – the project was established to address NH 110 connection with  
24 Route 16. It was recognized as a problem back in the seventies and  
25 eighties. The City commissioned several studies: the Campbell  
26 Study and Haynes Report being two of the studies. Route 110  
27 Committee was formed in the nineties to study in more detail the  
28 connection and the issues associated with 110 coming in through  
29 the downtown area of Berlin and also that committee also sought to  
30 seek whether there was support for the project at that time. As part  
31 of the State's 10-year plan process back in 2003-2012, \$2 million  
32 was added into the program for phase two construction. Phase one  
33 construction addressed the Green Street railroad bridge and that  
34 construction was completed in 2008. Early on, back in 2001-2002,  
35 conceptual alternatives were developed. Several scoping meetings  
36 were held at that time also, to gather input on those alternatives.  
37 Primary studies were undertaken at that time which involved  
38 historic investigations and the completion of a socioeconomic  
39 report. In 2004 Federal Highway issued a preliminary  
40 determination on the project's potential impact and between 2004

1 and 2007 the Section 4(f) historic issues were deliberated. In the  
2 interim between there was federal earmarked funding that was  
3 dedicated to the project in the amount of \$5.6 million Federal which  
4 totals \$7 million with a 20% City match. The phase two project is  
5 included in the current ten year plan which covers the period of  
6 2009 – 2018. The basic project need is to safely and efficiently  
7 convey the 110 traffic through downtown Berlin. Presently the  
8 Route 110 traffic, including large trucks, travels through the middle  
9 of a dense residential neighborhood, around tight corners, narrow  
10 city streets and up steep grades. This is further complicated during  
11 the winter-time when snow and icy roads are prominent through the  
12 downtown area. Several detour routes have been in effect until  
13 most recently to address the deficient under clearance that pre-  
14 existed on Green Street. The City has always desired one  
15 consolidated and designated route to improve safety and alleviate  
16 congestion and also to avoid confusion. Pertinent issues that we  
17 investigated and considered during the development of the project  
18 were safety, efficient operation, neighborhood and community  
19 impacts, property acquisitions and relocations, impacts to historic  
20 resources, consistency with long-term planning and then  
21 community support. The preferred alternative that was presented at  
22 the August 13<sup>th</sup> hearing and also being presented here this evening  
23 is based on input from the City, input from several public meetings  
24 that were held and also there was an extensive survey that was  
25 developed. And based on that survey and also correspondence that  
26 was submitted, alternative 4E has been identified as the preferred  
27 alternative in the environmental assessment and is presented this  
28 evening at the public hearing. And now I'm going to transfer to  
29 Trent Zanes to just quickly go over the preferred alternative.

30 Trent Zanes:

31 Thank you. On the plan here we have alternative 4E as we've  
32 shown previously. And starting from the previous bridge job we're  
33 traveling west on Green Street, making a right-hand turn or a  
34 northerly sweep down First Avenue. Green Street will be  
35 connected in front of the police station and Gilbert Street will also  
36 be connected, as it is today. A connection will be provided for  
37 Roderick Street and as we proceed north on First Avenue the  
38 properties on the eastern side will be impacted by the widening of  
39 the roadway through this portion here. I should specify the typical  
section of the roadway as of now within this area is two-twelve foot

1 lanes, four foot shoulders, and an eight foot landscaped panel before  
2 a six foot concrete sidewalk on either side of the roadway. So as it  
3 continues northerly where First Avenue is today, it then proceeds  
4 through these properties and begins to parallel the railroad. As we  
5 come to Hillside Avenue we will be closing Second Avenue off so  
6 that it will only be connected to Mannering Street and Hillside  
7 Avenue will then become... that's called a T intersection with  
8 Route 110. Proceeding north from Hillside Avenue we'll have a  
9 connection for Third Avenue and additional green space will be  
10 provided when some of the existing pavement is removed. And to  
11 continue on here, from Third Avenue, this portion of the roadway is  
12 referred to as Wight Street and we won't be doing full box  
13 reconstruction; we'll be rehabbing the pavement through here,  
14 providing six foot sidewalks, curbed sidewalks, again concrete and  
15 we'll be trying to improve some of the intersections for Fourth  
16 Avenue through Sixth Avenue and then Duguay Street and Boulay  
17 Street, trying to improve some of the approaches to make them a  
18 little safer. But in essence, this portion of the roadway is just to  
19 kind of neatening things up and improve the sidewalks through the  
20 area. That's my presentation. Chris?

21 Christopher Waszczuk:

22 From a scheduling and funding standpoint, to date a total of six  
23 public meetings have been held in Berlin to discuss the project and  
24 gather input. Additionally, four meetings involving the City staff,  
25 Federal Highway, the Division of Historic Resources have been  
26 held to review and resolve historic issues. Tonight's NEPA public  
27 hearing is a continuation of the hearing held on August 13<sup>th</sup> and  
28 marks a significant milestone in the project where the project  
29 transitioned from the preliminary design phase to the more detailed  
30 final design and right-of-way procurement phase. Following both  
31 hearings a verbatim transcript will be prepared and will include all  
32 the testimony raised here this evening and at the evening of the 13<sup>th</sup>  
33 and all the letters of comments and statements which are received  
34 during the comment period which will be in effect until September  
35 11<sup>th</sup>. The Department will study all the issues that are raised and  
36 make recommendations on how they should be addressed. These  
37 recommendations will be presented to the Hearing Commission at a  
38 future public meeting. The Hearing Commission will then decide  
39 on the need, layout, or any other specific issue concerning the  
project as they feel is appropriate. If there is a positive decision by

1 the Commission, then the final design and right-of-way process for  
2 the project will begin. I want to make particular note – there is a  
3 comment sheet at the table in the back with the address if anyone  
4 wants to submit any comments and also on this sheet here, the  
5 hearing map, there’s also an address attention of... “Any written  
6 comments should be submitted to the Chairman of the Commission,  
7 in care of William Cass, Director of Project Development.” So that  
8 address is listed on the hearing map. I would encourage anyone  
9 that’s interested to do so. With all the necessary approvals, permits  
10 and right-of-way procured for the project, the project is targeted to  
11 advertise for bids in early 2012 and construction is envisioned to  
12 begin shortly thereafter. Most likely the project will require two  
13 construction seasons to complete with construction completion  
14 envisioned in the fall of 2013. Relative to the funding, as the  
15 project is located within the urban compact, the project falls within  
16 the jurisdiction of the City. A mutual agreement has been executed.  
17 Earmarked funding dedicated to the project in the amount of \$5.6  
18 million Federal and 20% City match for a total of \$7 million. The  
19 remaining amount will be made up with federal programmatic  
20 funds of 80% with 20% City matching funds. Right now the  
21 preferred alternative has been identified to total \$10.1 million with  
22 construction being \$4 million, right-of-way \$5.6 million, and  
23 engineering \$500,000. It is anticipated that the City match will be  
24 \$2.02 million. And now I’d like to turn it over to Jamie Sikora to  
25 discuss Federal Highway’s role.

26 Jamie Sikora:

27 Thanks, Chris. Good evening. As Chris mentioned, my name is  
28 Jamie Sikora. I work for the Federal Highway Administration’s  
29 New Hampshire Division and I am the Environmental Program’s  
30 Manager. I was born and raised in Vermont, lived there my whole  
31 life until about fifteen years ago when I joined Federal Highways.  
32 I’ve been in New Hampshire for the last eight years now so it’s  
33 good to be here and close to friends and family. Because Federal  
34 Highway Funds are being used, as Chris noted, that tasks that  
35 Federal Highways being the lead Federal agency responsible for  
36 working with the DOT and other State and Federal resource  
37 agencies to ensure the project is developed in compliance with the  
38 National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA as it is commonly  
39 referred to. Now NEPA requires all federal projects to be evaluated  
for impacts to both the natural and human environment. It’s

1 basically to determine if there's impacts, the significance of those  
2 impacts, if they can be avoided and if they can't be avoided, they  
3 have to be minimized or mitigated. I like to think of NEPA as a big  
4 umbrella because under it there are numerous other federal laws and  
5 requirements which factor into our decisions that we make such as  
6 flood plain impacts and wetland impacts, historic impacts. Now  
7 two of the more substantial laws that were involved in this project  
8 and how we continued through our evaluation is Section 106 of the  
9 Historic Preservation Act and Section 4(f) of the Department of  
10 Transportation Act of 1966. Now Section 4(f) was a substantial  
11 law. It's got a lot more teeth in it and it basically requires you to  
12 avoid 4(f) resources such as significant public parks and recreation  
13 areas, wildlife refuges and historic sites. And basically you must  
14 avoid it unless all the avoidance alternatives are shown not to be  
15 prudent or feasible. And Section 4(f) also requires that if you have  
16 multiple build alternatives that all impact 4(f) resources, and in the  
17 case of the Berlin project, both alternatives impact historic  
18 resources or 4(f) resources, you're required to do what we call a  
19 "least harm analysis" which basically means you look at the  
20 alternatives and you must pick the alternative that results in the  
21 least harm to the 4(f) resources and non 4(f) resources. This is a  
22 fairly new change in the regulation – a year ago or two years ago.  
23 This is really the first time we've put together a document,  
24 environmental document, that has this least harm analysis in it and I  
25 think it's a pretty good document. So I guess that brings us to why  
26 we're here tonight. I know that there's been frustration that there's  
27 been so many meetings and this project has been in the planning  
28 and development phase for a long time but what's important about  
29 tonight's meeting is it's for Federal Highways, it's to obtain input  
30 and then Marc Laurin from the DOT and I are tasked with  
31 collecting all those comments and seeing if we can address them in  
32 our environmental document. And then Federal Highways has to  
33 make a decision at the end of that process, if we can issue what we  
34 call a "FONSI," a finding of no significant impact or based upon  
35 the comments, if further environmental analysis is necessary. So  
36 that's why I strongly encourage anybody to provide any comments  
37 here tonight. And if you're not comfortable, as Chris said, there's  
38 comment sheets – and I think we're accepting comments until  
39 September 11<sup>th</sup>. So again, I appreciate your being here and I'll be

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

happy to answer any questions now or after the other presentations.  
Thank you.

Christopher Waszczuk: Thank you, Jamie. I'd like to ask Marc Laurin from our Environmental Bureau to just go over the environmental aspects of the project. Marc?

Marc Laurin: Thank you, Chris. Good evening, Commissioners, ladies and gentlemen. Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act we have put together and evaluated potential impacts the project will have on social, economic, and environmental issues. And we have established coordination with federal and state agencies including the Army Corps of Engineers, Fish and Wildlife Service, Wetlands Bureau, the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services and the New Hampshire Natural Heritage Inventory and the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources. In addition, we've received additional input from the City and regional officials and the general public. The evaluation that was gathered on these impacts are discussed and documented in the Draft Environment Assessment Section 4(f) of the Evaluation. These are the resources we have evaluated. I'll briefly go through what the results were for these major resources. On the air quality, it showed that the project is not expected to significantly impact the air quality and will not cause a violation of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards. The noise levels from the construction of the preferred alternative will not result in levels that approach or exceed the noise abatement criteria. As such, noise abatement measures are not required for the project. The evaluation of right-of-way issues has been conducted, such as the acquisition of the properties, the displacements that will occur, land use, impacts to businesses, neighborhoods, impacts to community services and recreation opportunities. And these show that the preferred alternative will provide an increase in the cohesiveness of the neighborhood and a reduction of through and truck traffic impacts to the neighborhood and as such will increase the safety to pedestrians and bicyclists. The transportation patterns of passenger and truck traffic through the city will improve by providing a well-defined route through the city and will enhance the regional transportation conductivity of traffic to and from NH 16. There was no disproportional impacts to minorities, elderly or disadvantaged groups that would result in non-compliance with the

1 1994 Presidential Executive Order 12898 on environmental justice.  
2 The presence of petroleum related contaminations or hazardous  
3 materials were evaluated and will be further quantified prior to  
4 construction. Initial site assessments will be conducted on  
5 identified parcels of concern to determine the actual risks that could  
6 be associated with the purchase of the properties or that may be  
7 encountered during construction. We will coordinate these  
8 investigations with the New Hampshire Department of  
9 Environmental Services and it is anticipated that any contamination  
10 will be minor in nature and within our standard treatment protocols  
11 and measures. Wetland and surface water impacts are only  
12 associated with the potential for management of a storm water  
13 system. If this storm water treatment is deemed necessary, impacts  
14 to the Dead River would most likely be very minor and probably  
15 even temporary in nature. We have searched the New Hampshire  
16 Natural Heritage Inventory Bureau's database to see if there were  
17 any rare plants or animals, species, or exemplary natural  
18 communities within the project limits. The database has  
19 demonstrated that there are some bald eagles and common  
20 nighthawks in the greater City of Berlin area, but has not identified  
21 any known occurrences within the project area. During  
22 construction appropriate precautions will be taken to protect the  
23 Dead River and any other surface waters. The contractor who will  
24 perform the work will implement a professionally prepared erosion  
25 and sediment control plan and it will be approved by the  
26 Department and will be followed to make sure that sediments do  
27 not reach the river. A temporary increase in the noise and dust will  
28 occur during construction. One major aspect of the project is the  
29 cultural resources and as Jamie mentioned, there is a Section 106 of  
30 the National Historic Preservation Act where we coordinated with  
31 the Federal Highway Administration to take into account any  
32 impacts to cultural resources which are historic districts, historic  
33 buildings and structures which are generally 50 years or more as  
34 well as archaeological sites. The eligibility and effect on the  
35 historic properties were made in consultation with the New  
36 Hampshire Division of Historical Resources and Federal Highway  
37 and DOT and also as mentioned by Jaime, we did a Section 4(f)  
38 evaluation to determine what the least environmental harm would  
39 be and this least environmental harm is decided by balancing the  
40 ability to mitigate the adverse impacts that may occur to these

1 resources; the relative severity of the harm after mitigation to the  
2 resources; the relative significance of the resource; views of the  
3 officials with jurisdiction over the resources – in this case it would  
4 be the Division of Historical Resources; degrees to which  
5 alternatives meet the purpose and need of the project; and after  
6 reasonable mitigation, the magnitude of any adverse impacts to  
7 resources not protected by Section 4(f); and of course, if there's any  
8 substantial differences in the costs among the alternatives. A  
9 determination was made that the project is located within the Berlin  
10 Heights Addition Historic District which is outlined in red on the  
11 plan. And it's also known as "The Avenues." This district is  
12 eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under  
13 a couple criteria – Criterion A for Community Planning and  
14 Development; Ethnic Heritage and Industry, and under Criterion C  
15 for the architecture of the buildings within the district. Its period of  
16 significance is from 1892 through 1958 and that's from its planning  
17 stage through the completion of its grid pattern and peak  
18 population. This table just shows the impacts that would occur to  
19 the historic district with the preferred alternative. We have primary  
20 contributing structures – there's about twenty-five of those we're  
21 going to be impacting; thirteen secondary structures – would be like  
22 garages, outbuildings would also be impacted. There will also be  
23 some visual impacts to contributing structures that have buildings  
24 that remain – about sixteen of those. There are some, like six, in  
25 that area that will not have any adverse effects to them resulting  
26 from the project. There are seven properties that are good examples  
27 of type. In other words they're buildings that show the historic  
28 nature of the type of building that it is. And when we're all done,  
29 we'll probably impact about 4.9 acres of the district. Some of the  
30 visual impacts that occur would be like where we're dead ending  
31 Second Ave and Hillside and basically you're losing direct access  
32 to it from Hillside to Second Ave. And we'll lose basically three  
33 street areas – Green Street from Gilbert Street to First Ave, First  
34 Ave itself from Roderick then back to Green Street. And we'll  
35 change the direction of the Third Ave intersection with Wight  
36 Street. The project has been determined to have an adverse effect  
37 on the district and the following potential mitigation have been  
38 proposed for the preferred alternative and it's been discussed in the  
39 Effects Memo which was signed off by the New Hampshire State  
40 Historic Preservation Officer, the Federal Highway and has been

1 concurred by DOT. We will be forming some sort of  
2 documentation of the impacted resources and they will probably  
3 vary by property and depending on the integrity of the resources.  
4 The existing grid landscape of the district itself will be documented  
5 probably by doing aerial photography. There will be a public  
6 forum. A charrette will be organized, mainly to discuss the  
7 planning of the open space development developed by the project  
8 construction. This effort will dovetail with some of the other  
9 planning efforts that are underway with the City. There will be  
10 some workshops. A practical workshop on preservation would be  
11 presented to the residents of the historic district. We will also  
12 provide some historical compatible landscaping. Basically a  
13 vegetative screening would be placed to visually separate the  
14 western edge of the highway corridor from the district. We will  
15 investigate the relocation of historic properties. Building  
16 relocations within or adjacent to the historic district would be  
17 evaluated. And we will have public outreach by putting maybe a  
18 state marker somewhere within the district and have user friendly  
19 versions of the historical studies that were undertaken, uploaded to  
20 the City and Division of Historical Resources websites. We've also  
21 fulfilled our requirements to investigate any archaeological  
22 resources that may occur within potentially sensitive archaeological  
23 areas that were assessed during the preliminary documentation  
24 phase and this will be done before construction, of course.  
25 Basically in the document it does discuss the alternatives that were  
26 considered. And initially, in addition to the No-Build, which we  
27 always have to discuss, there were six alternatives that were  
28 conceptually developed. Based on further study as we were  
29 developing the project and evaluation of these alternatives, along  
30 with community feedback and City officials' input, we came down  
31 to two alternatives – Alternative 2 and Alternative 4E which were  
32 progressed in more detailed evaluations and analysis and are better  
33 detailed in the document. As a result of these further evaluations,  
34 Alternative 4E was identified as the preferred alternative as it  
35 minimizes the overall harm to the Historic District and the  
36 neighborhood. The preferred alternative has an adverse effect on  
37 the Historic District, and although a determination of individually  
38 eligible properties has not been done, as I mentioned, there were  
39 seven good examples of types that were going to be impacted. So  
40 the relationship of the remaining contributing buildings to each

1 other as parts of the District that define the District as a whole, is  
2 the more important feature that was evaluated from which the  
3 determination of the retention of the significance of the District  
4 occurred. And the preferred alternative does maintain this overall  
5 character and feeling of the Historic District by placing the impacts  
6 along the edge of the District. Mitigation is required as was  
7 previously discussed. And after the hearing and prior to the  
8 issuance of the final environmental document, a Memorandum of  
9 Agreement will be signed that will establish the mitigation  
10 requirements as agreed to by the Division of Historical Resources  
11 and Federal Highways with concurrence by DOT and the City of  
12 Berlin. Alternative 4E impacts a larger number of properties than  
13 Alternative 2 but it removes the heavy truck traffic from the center  
14 of the residential neighborhood by placing, as I mentioned before,  
15 the NH 110 alignment along the railroad. And it establishes a  
16 transportation corridor along the edge of the neighborhood that is  
17 outside the core of the neighborhood. The majority of the existing  
18 street grid layout would remain also with the preferred alternative  
19 which contributes to retaining, again, the neighborhood aspect of  
20 the area. As mentioned before, the visual impacts of the alternative  
21 would be mitigated by landscaping along the edge of the alignment  
22 and that will provide a visual separation of the corridor from the  
23 residential area. We feel that the alternative better meets the  
24 purposes and needs of the project by improving safety and it  
25 reduces the number of driveway conflict points and removes heavy  
26 truck traffic from the district and from a residential neighborhood.  
27 The community cohesion of the neighborhood is expected to  
28 improve with the shifting of the traffic away from the core of the  
29 neighborhood reducing the long-term deterioration of the area and  
30 providing for the revitalization of the neighborhood. Consideration  
31 of the long-term impacts identified by shifting the route does less to  
32 compromise the feeling, association and linkages that are the  
33 defining characteristics of the district and eliminated the existing  
34 division to the neighborhood. I do have copies of the  
35 Environmental Assessment available for review and also I have, if  
36 you would like one after the hearing, you can come up and see me  
37 and I could give you one. The document can also be accessed at the  
38 DOT link listed on the hearing handout and there's also a link on  
39 the City website. We have provided a copy of the document to the  
40 Berlin Public Library. This concludes my presentation. Thank you.

1 Christopher Waszczuk: Thank you, Marc. And this concludes the Department's  
2 presentation. I'd like to thank all of you that have followed this  
3 process and attended both public hearings particularly. I know we  
4 had a lot of public meetings and I see a lot of familiar faces so I  
5 thank you for your support on this project. As requested at the  
6 previous public hearing and again, formally this evening, I'd like to  
7 ask Madam Chair and the Hearing Commission to find occasion for  
8 the necessity of this project as presented this evening. Thank you.

9 Chairperson Ashley: Thank you, Chris. Before I open the meeting for comments,  
10 concerns and questions, I'd like to ask if we have any elected  
11 officials with us this evening and would they like to be heard.

12 Mayor Bertrand: Good evening. Thank you all for coming this evening. My name is  
13 David Bertrand. I'm the mayor of the City of Berlin. I think this is  
14 a great report. I know the federal government sets up a lot of  
15 criteria and there's a lot of work involved and it's been a long  
16 process to get to this point in the process. As I said at the last  
17 public hearing, this has been going on, at least in its conception  
18 since the seventies and we're getting excited here to see that we're  
19 coming to the mountain here. I think just like with anything of this  
20 scope there's pros and cons. But I think if you read through this as  
21 I have and I refreshed my memory again tonight, the pros greatly  
22 outweigh the cons here as far as alternative 4E. There's a couple of  
23 graphic representations in here of what the noise effect is going to  
24 be to the neighborhood. There's a lot of talk about preserving the  
25 integrity of the neighborhood and preserving that neighborhood and  
26 I think this alternative can only make that neighborhood more  
27 appealing to people that live there now and people that could  
28 potentially want to live there in the future. We've talked in the past  
29 about what this is going to do for safety. It seems like it's the only  
30 way to go and I want to just re-affirm my support and the City's  
31 support for alternative 4E. And once again, thanks to all of you. I  
32 look forward to working with you and thanks to the Board for  
33 undertaking this task. Thanks again.

34 Chairperson Ashley: Thank you, Mayor. I think you've covered both of my questions  
35 which are there any elected officials or City officials and you cover  
36 both of those. Thank you. Are there any other City officials here  
37 that would like to be heard? Yes, sir.

1 Patrick Macqueen: Members of the Commission, DOT, thank you both. It's been a  
2 long journey as the Mayor pointed out. I'm the City Manager in  
3 Berlin. I'm not going to say what I said at the last public hearing  
4 but certainly it has been a long time getting to this point. There's  
5 no question in my mind and I don't think there's any question in the  
6 City Council's mind that the preferred alternative is the correct  
7 alternative for the community and we all support that. Thank you.

8 Chairperson Ashley: Thank you. I will now open the meeting to anyone desiring to be  
9 heard. Again, I would ask that you raise your hand and upon  
10 recognition, please come to the microphone. State your name and  
11 spell it if necessary. Give your address and make your statement.  
12 Yes, sir.

13 Dave Morin: My name is Dave Morin, M-o-r-i-n, 54 Whittemore Avenue here in  
14 Berlin. I'm also a longstanding member of the Berlin Planning  
15 Board that originally did the reviews in 1990 when we reignited this  
16 process to take a look at Route 110. I think it's important to realize  
17 this evening that the preferred route, Route 4E, serves a number of  
18 different purposes for this community. It not only lays out a very  
19 useful and straightforward means of getting in and out of the  
20 community while skirting the neighborhoods and preserving the  
21 integrity of the neighborhoods but in my opinion it does a road right  
22 – a road that goes back to the turn of last century, not this century.  
23 We have seen trucks grow in size and magnitude and weight and it  
24 is our anticipation that by using 4E and the preferred alternate  
25 layout it will not only serve us today but it will definitely serve us  
26 far into the future as being as very efficient and effective means of  
27 access and egress from this community. So we not only look to  
28 today and what it will do for us now but we're looking to the future.  
29 And as roads are not always the first priority in the North Country  
30 when money is spent, we would very much like to do this road and  
31 do it right and I believe that 4E is the way to go. I would like to  
32 thank you very much for coming up again and I know Chris has  
33 been here a number of times and is looking at a number of familiar  
34 faces and hopefully we can move forward on this with 4E as the  
35 preferred route and see something happen. Thank you very much.

36 Chairperson Ashley: Thank you. Are there any other people who would like to make a  
37 comment? I would remind you again that there are forms at the  
38 back if you want to take any with you for comments to be mailed in

1  
2  
3  
4

to DOT before September 11<sup>th</sup>. There being no indication of anyone remaining who desires to be heard, this hearing is adjourned at 7:45. Thank you all very much for coming this evening.

1 STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

2 MERRIMACK, SS.  
3

4 I, Lee A. Currier, do hereby certify that I transcribed from a digital recording the  
5 foregoing pages and that the same is a true, full and correct transcript of all of the testimony at  
6 the hearing, to the best of my knowledge and belief.  
7

8 I further certify that I am neither attorney nor counsel for, nor related to or employed by  
9 any of the parties to the action in which this hearing was taken and further that I am not a  
10 relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed in this case, nor am I financially  
11 interested in this action.  
12



13  
14 Lee A. Currier/ Notary Public  
15