

2.0: Public Outreach Process

The Maine-New Hampshire Connections Study's (Study) public outreach process was designed to clearly communicate the purpose of the Study, provide details on the analysis and ultimate screening of each proposed alternative and receive input from stakeholders and the general public.

The public outreach process was responsive and gave the general public and stakeholders an extensive opportunity to provide opinions and input. A study web site – www.mainenhconnections.org provided the public with updates on study progress, meeting dates, meeting minutes and materials, the purpose and need statement, information on how to get involved, committee members, study schedule and dates and an interactive question and answer (Q&A) section. The Study's goal was to provide the public with all relevant data and alternatives developed as part of this study in a clear and easy-to-understand manner.

2.1. STUDY COMMITTEES

Two committees, the Steering Committee and the Stakeholder Committee, provided feedback at regular intervals, significantly improving study process and direction. The Steering Committee, primarily responsible for directing the study, included representatives from Maine and New Hampshire DOTs, Maine and New Hampshire Historic Preservation Offices, the Town of Kittery, the City of Portsmouth, Pan Am Railways, and, as resources, the Rockingham County Planning Commission, the Southern Maine Regional Planning Commission and Maine and New Hampshire Divisions of the Federal Highway Administration. The Stakeholder Committee, responsible for helping the Steering Committee to interpret public feedback, included the Steering Committee and those representing business, navigation, community groups, multi-modal organizations, emergency services, individuals, conservation/sustainability groups and utilities, and included Section 106 Consulting Parties³.

Steering Committee members are:

MaineDOT, Gerry Audibert and Russ Charette; NH DOT, Bob Landry and John Butler; Town of Kittery, Jon Carter, Town Manager; City of Portsmouth, Steve Parkinson, Department of Public Works; Pan Am Railway, Mike McDonough; Maine Historic Preservation, Kirk Mohney; NH Historic Preservation, Linda Wilson; Southern Maine Regional Planning, Tom Reinauer; Rockingham Planning Commission, Dave Walker; Federal Highway Administration - Maine, Mark Hasselmann; Federal Highway Administration - New Hampshire, Leigh Levine and Jamie Sikora.

In addition, to provide a broad-based spectrum of viewpoints and help to provide insight and guidance around public concerns, a diverse Stakeholder Committee was formed based on an

³ Section 106 Consulting Parties are included under the National Historic Preservation Act. This act requires Federal agencies to take into account the effects of their actions on historic properties, whether publicly or privately owned

assessment of the needs of local and regional stakeholders. The Stakeholder Committee also includes Section 106 Consulting Parties.

Stakeholder Committee members are:

Section 106 Historic Consulting Parties:

Maine Preservation, Greg Paxton; NH Preservation Alliance, Jennifer Goodman; National Trust for Historic Preservation, Roberta Lane; Warner House Association., Ronan Donahoe; Albacore Park, Ken Herrick; Portsmouth Historical Society, Richard Candee; National Trust for Historic Preservation, Rebecca Williams.

Business:

Greater Portsmouth Chamber of Commerce, Doug Bates; Greater York Chamber of Commerce, Cathy Goodwin; Portsmouth Economic Development Committee, Nancy Carner.

Navigation:

Portsmouth Pilots, Chris Holt; Kittery Port Authority, Milton Hall; Pease Development, Tracy Shattuck.

Community Groups:

Save Our Bridges, Ben Porter; Prescott Park Trustees, Phyllis Eldridge; City Neighborhood Steering Committee, Cristy Cardoso; City of Portsmouth Traffic and Safety Committee, Councilor Ken Smith; Portsmouth Democrats, Peter Somssich.

Multi-Modal:

Seacoast Area Bicycle Routes, Josh Pierce; East Coast Greenway, Cameron Wake; New Hampshire Seacoast Greenway, Steve Workman; York County Community Action, Connie Garber.

Emergency Services:

Kittery Police/Fire, Chief Ed Strong.

Municipalities:

York, Kinley Gregg; Eliot, Dan Blanchette.

Miscellaneous

Strawbery Banke Museum, Beth Wheland.

Individuals:

Rose Eppard, Portsmouth; Gail Drobnik, Badgers Island.

Conservation/Sustainability:

Portsmouth Conservation Commission, Jim Horrigan.

Utilities:

Unitil, Peter Fister.

The following is a summary of all Public, Steering and Stakeholder Committee meetings, and Section106/Consulting Parties meetings and other meetings held for the Maine-New Hampshire Connections Study. This summary includes meeting date, agenda, and key input items. Detailed meeting minutes were prepared for all Public, Steering and Stakeholder Committee meetings, Section 106/Consulting Parties meetings, other process meetings, including action items, were documented in bullet format. These minutes are found in Appendix 49 (Public Meeting

Minutes), Appendix 50 (Steering and Stakeholder Committee Meeting Minutes), Appendix 51 (Other Meeting Minutes), and Appendix 52 (Section 106/Consulting Parties Meeting Minutes).

2.2. SUMMARY OF STEERING AND STAKEHOLDER COMMITTEE MEETINGS

05/22/09 | Meeting: Steering Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Welcome and Introductions
- Update on Study Data and Progress
- Committee Roles & Responsibilities
- Decision on Stakeholder Committee makeup
- Draft Purpose and Need Statement
- Brainstorming Session for Purpose and Need Statement
- Next Steps

Summary of Committee Input

- The Steering Committee made minor suggestions regarding adding members to the consultant's proposed list for the Stakeholder Committee and stated a wide range of needs as input for the draft Purpose and Need Statement.

06/25/09 | Meeting: Stakeholder Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Welcome
- Process/Next Steps
- Committee Membership
- Purpose and Need Statement Workshop

Summary of Committee Input

- Stakeholders reviewed a draft of the Purpose and Need Statement and added/reiterated need for items on long term environmental and fiscal sustainability, bicycle/pedestrian access, navigational improvements, economic viability, aesthetic and historic measures.

08/06/09 | Meeting: Steering Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Stimulus Grant Application Update
- Inspection and Study Update
- Purpose and Need Statement 2nd Draft
- Public Meeting Overview

Summary of Committee Input

- The committee reviewed and revised a new iteration of the Purpose and Need Statement, which had been changed based on FHWA comments, heard an update on the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Grant application and the still uncompleted inspection reports.

09/11/09 | Meeting: Stakeholder Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Welcome and Introductions
- Study Data Overview
- Fatal Flaw Analysis Discussion
- Brainstorm Alternatives (Solutions)
- Purpose and Need Statement Review
- Upcoming Meetings

Summary of Committee Input

- The committee discussed the contents of the TIGER Grant application package.
- The committee brainstormed alternatives, adding:
 - Tunnel
 - No bridges at all
 - Ferry (s)
 - Single high level bridge
- The committee accepted the revision of the draft Fatal Flaw Matrix.
- The committee accepted the final Purpose and Need Statement.

11/06/09 | Meeting: Steering Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Welcome
- Fatal Flaw Process
- Fatal Flaw Analysis to-date
- Evaluating the Alternatives
- Next Steps

Summary of Committee Input

- The committee viewed and agreed to accept the proposed list of alternatives for further consideration.
- High Level Sarah Mildred Long Bridge and all “new alternatives” were eliminated.
- Committee wanted to eliminate the new mid-level Sarah Mildred Long Bridge immediately and recommended eliminating both upstream and downstream Memorial Bridges due to historic impacts.

11/06/09 | Meeting: Stakeholder Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Welcome
- Fatal Flaw Process
- Fatal Flaw Analysis to-date
- Scoring the Alternatives
- Next Steps

Summary of Committee Input

- First Fatal Flaw Review: Committee viewed and agreed to accept proposed list of alternatives for further consideration.
- High Level Sarah Mildred Long Bridge and all “new alternatives” were eliminated.
- Committee wanted to eliminate new mid-level Sarah Mildred Long Bridge.

01/19/10 | Meeting: Steering Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Welcome
- Process/Next Steps
- TIGER Grant Application Update
- Results of Round 3 Fatal Flaw Analysis
- Alternatives Recommended to be carried forward
- Detailed Evaluation of Feasible Alternatives

Summary of Committee Input

- Reiteration of need for Business Impact Study and discussion of timing to implement – after Fatal Flaw Analysis completed.
- Fatal Flaw Analysis: New mid-level Sarah Mildred Long Bridge On-Alignment and mid-level Upstream Sarah Mildred Long Bridge eliminated.

01/19/10 | Meeting: Stakeholder Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Welcome
- Process/Next Steps
- TIGER Grant Application Update
- Results of Round 3 Fatal Flaw Analysis
- Alternatives Recommended to be carried forward
- Detailed Evaluation of Feasible Alternatives

Summary of Committee Input

- Continued Fatal Flaw Review: Committee discussed and agreed with adding a multi-use path to the Memorial Bridge Rehabilitation option.
- Reiteration of need for Business Impact Study and discussion of timing to implement – after Fatal Flaw Analysis completed.
- Fatal Flaw Analysis: New mid-level Sarah Mildred Long Bridge On-Alignment and mid-level Upstream Sarah Mildred Long Bridge eliminated.

03/26/10 | Meeting: Steering Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Final Fatal Flaw Report
- Review of Detailed Evaluation Progress to Date
- TIGER Grant Application –Round II
- Next Steps/Schedule

Summary of Committee Input

- Committee reviewed details of cross-sections for all remaining alternatives – no major changes.
- Report on Business Impact Survey – no concerns with process.

03/26/10 | Meeting: Stakeholder Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Final Fatal Flaw Report
- Review of Detailed Evaluation Progress to Date
- TIGER Grant Application –Round II
- Next Steps/Schedule

Summary of Committee Input

- Committee reviewed details of cross-sections for all remaining alternatives – no major changes.
- Report on Business Impact Survey – no concerns with process.

04/27/10 Meeting: Steering/Stakeholder Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Bridge Inspection Presentation
- Meeting Objectives
- Detailed Evaluation: Progress to Date
- Draft Evaluation Criteria
- Next Steps/Schedule
- Update: TIGER II Criteria

Summary of Committee Input

- Committees were very concerned about Memorial Bridge data but accepted conclusions of Inspection Report.
- Committees viewed Fatal Flaw Matrix and asked questions about weighting of criteria, how matrix was going to be used, discussion of meaning of regional economic impact versus local impact, accuracy of archeological data.
- Committee wanted to see criteria assessed separately for each bridge whenever possible.
- Committee strongly recommended that matrix with colors not be presented at this time at the public meeting because it appears to mean a decision has been made.

06/16/10 Meeting: Steering/Stakeholder Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Opening Discussion and Study Objectives
- Detailed Analysis of Alternatives
- Revisit Key Assumptions
- Recent Progress for Analysis of Alternatives
- Memorial Bridge Rehabilitation Alternative Update
- Mid-Level Sarah Mildred Long Hybrid Bridge Update
- Study Schedule

- Next Steps

Summary of Committee Input

- Committee members were concerned about the confusion following the May 6 public meeting and what the intent of Maine and New Hampshire was in terms of moving forward.
- Committee reiterated concern with Business Impact Analysis and asked questions regarding new assumptions on capacity, etc.
- Committee accepted that new Sarah Mildred Long Hybrid Bridge option proposed by MaineDOT has benefits.
- Committee did not believe that transit alternative proposed by MaineDOT would serve bicycle and pedestrian needs and wanted it removed from consideration.
- Committee expressed frustration that Maine seemed not to share their sense of urgency on Memorial Bridge and would not commit to the TIGER II application.
- Committee reiterated their lack of interest in pursuing the Memorial Bridge Bicycle/Pedestrian option.

11/16/10 | Meeting: Steering and Stakeholder Committee Meeting

Meeting Agenda

- Welcome
- Overview of Recent Events
- Review of Draft Final Report
- Next Steps for Memorial Bridge
- Next Steps for Sarah Mildred Long Bridge
- Next Steps for Connections Study

Summary of Committee Input

- Committees expressed concern that the TIGER II process was not included in the report.
- Committees expressed concern that the evaluation criteria for the two bridges were not separated for every criterion.
- Committees expressed continued interest for bicycle-pedestrian connectivity on the Sarah Mildred Long, especially during the Memorial Replacement period.
- Committees expressed continued interest in considering multi-modal options for all new Sarah Mildred Long Bridge options. It was noted that there are numerous design options that make this reality very feasible.
- Committees expressed concern over the scheduling of bridge construction as phasing is necessary for the efficient movement between communities during the construction period.
- Committees expressed the desire for continued contact as the process moves forward.

2.3. SUMMARY OF PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL MEETINGS

04/27/09 | Kickoff Public Meetings/Portsmouth High School/Kittery Trading Post

Meeting Agenda

- Study Purpose and Need Statement

- Federal Stimulus Grant Funding
- Study Schedule/Public Process
- Q&A on Process, Schedule and Stimulus
- What We Know Now
- Feedback – What More Should We Know?

Summary of Public Input

- Anger that the Memorial Bridge had not been repaired yet.
- Anger that the study was unneeded.
- Need for bicycle/pedestrian access on both bridges.
- East Coast Greenway over Memorial Bridge as important as US Route 1 traffic.
- Concern about need to apply for TIGER funding and Maine's lack of commitment.
- Concern about potential negative effects on PNSY.
- Concern about potential negative effects on the local economy if Memorial Bridge fails or is closed.
- Memorial Bridge connects commercial and historic districts of the two communities.

Total estimated attendees for both meetings: 150+/-

08/20/09 | Meeting: Public Informational Meeting/Portsmouth Public Library

Meeting Agenda

- Welcome
- Federal Stimulus Grant Update
- Bridge Inspections Update
- Study Update/Schedule Review
- Baseline Conditions and Analysis Overview
- Purpose and Need: Review and Discussion
- General Questions/Discussion

Summary of Public Input

- The public suggested revising the draft of the Purpose and Need Statement to include reference to rail, buses, evacuation and Section 106.
- A discussion of the history of public transit between the two communities included the comment that interstate transit was challenging due to federal interstate regulations.
- The public accepted the proposed process for the Fatal Flaw analysis.

Total estimated attendance: 70+/-

09/24/09 | Meeting: Public Informational Meeting/Kittery Trading Post

Meeting Agenda

- Welcome
- Update on Stimulus Applications/BICA
- Study Schedule Update
- Traffic Forecasts
- Fatal Flaw Analysis Discussion

- Brainstorm New Alternatives
- Next Steps

Summary of Public Input

- The public accepted the list of proposed alternatives.
- The public accepted the Purpose and Need Statement.

Total estimated attendance: 45+/-

12/16/09 | Meeting: Public Informational Meeting/Portsmouth High School

Meeting Agenda

- Welcome
- Memorial Bridge Update
- Stimulus Application Update
- Fatal Flaw Analysis
- Alternatives Considered but Eliminated
- Alternatives Carried Forward for further Study
- Next Steps

Summary of Public Input

- Public heard that Inspection Report on Memorial Bridge was worse than anticipated.
- Bicycle/Pedestrian Origin and Destination Survey released and accepted.
- Public accepted potential plans and timing for a Business Impact Analysis regarding effects of Memorial Bridge closure.
- Fatal Flaw Review/Second Round:
 - Mid-level Sarah Mildred Long Bridge on alignment eliminated.
 - Memorial Bridge total removal eliminated due to need for bicycle/pedestrian connection between communities.
 - Memorial Bridge Upstream and Downstream alternatives eliminated.
 - Public agrees with all proposals.
- Bicycle/Pedestrian option gets mixed review but audience does not suggest taking it from consideration.

Total estimated attendance: 110+/-

02/25/10 | Meeting: Public Informational Meeting/ Portsmouth High School

Meeting Agenda

- Welcome
- TIGER Grant Application Results (application was not selected)
- Round 3 Fatal Flaw Analysis Results
- Alternatives to be carried forward
- Next Steps: Detailed Evaluation
- Business Impact Assessment
- Next Steps/Upcoming Meetings

Summary of Public Input

- Fatal Flaw Review: Report accepted.
- Strong support for expanded bicycle/pedestrian access on Memorial Bridge Rehabilitation; informational Paper submitted by Steve Workman, New Hampshire Seacoast Greenway.
- Concern with effects on Sarah Mildred Long Bridge neighborhoods due to additional traffic if Memorial Bridge bicycle/pedestrian is the recommended option.
- Strong interest in plans/schedule for Business Impact Analysis.

Total estimated attendance: 110+/-

05/06/10 Meeting: Public Informational Meeting/Portsmouth City Hall

Meeting Agenda

- Welcome
- Presentation of Local and Regional Businesses Impact Analysis
- Presentation of Bridge Inspections
- Presentation of Evaluation Matrix

Summary of Public Input

- Public did not agree with or accept Charlie Colgan's and Evan Richert's conclusions that only local economic impacts would occur based on Business Impact Survey Report.
- Public did agree that some local businesses would lose significant business if Memorial Bridge is closed to vehicle traffic.
- Public was concerned about Memorial Bridge data in terms of replacement plans and current safety, but accepted conclusions of Inspection Report that bridge could not be rehabilitated.
- Public was very enthusiastic about NH DOT Commissioner Campbell's announcement that new NH Legislation authorized funding for the Memorial Bridge replacement option in order to apply for TIGER II funds.
- NH Seacoast Greenway and Eastern Trail representatives stated non-support of bicycle/pedestrian only Memorial Bridge option.

Total estimated attendance: 120+/-

06/23/10 Meeting: Public Informational Meeting/Portsmouth High School

Meeting Agenda:

- Study Update and Schedule
- Detailed Analysis of Recent Progress
- Update on Revisiting of Key Assumptions
- Alternatives Update: Memorial Bridge Rehabilitation and Sarah Mildred Long Mid-Level Hybrid Bridge
- List of Remaining Alternatives – Pros/Cons
- Next Steps

Summary of Public Input

- The public asked many questions regarding the underlying assumptions behind the study.

- The public indicated that they believed that any change in bridge configuration (including a Memorial Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge or the Transit option) would not be business-friendly and is not supported, and that these two options should be eliminated.
- The public indicated that they believe that the Memorial Bridge – or lack thereof - would affect a much larger area than just Kittery, perhaps even all of York County.
- The public indicated that they believe the Sarah Mildred Long Hybrid Bridge option had benefits but they are concerned about the bicycle and pedestrian access and limiting potential passenger rail or more frequent rail usage.
- The public wondered why rail was really necessary at this location and why the Navy was not paying some of the added costs to provide it.
- Comments were made that a two-lane bridge plus another two-lane bridge provides future flexibility.
- Public show of hands showed no vote for bicycle/pedestrian; one vote for transit option, and virtually all support full two-lane Memorial Bridge replacement, “to see this area stay the way it is now”.
- Another vote seemed to indicate support for Alternative 9: Full Memorial Bridge replacement coupled with Hybrid replacement at Sarah Mildred Long Bridge.
- Some concern heard regarding need for three bridges for evacuation and emergency response and potential closures.
- The public expressed concern that Maine is not committing to the TIGER II application.
- Overall, the public strongly supported keeping a vehicular crossing at Memorial Bridge and keeping the region as it is now.

Total estimated attendance: 120+/-

11/16/10 | Meeting: Public Informational Meeting/Frank Jones Center

Meeting Agenda

- Welcome
- Overview of Recent Events
- Review of Draft Final Report
- Next Steps for Memorial Bridge
- Next Steps for Sarah Mildred Long Bridge
- Next Steps for Connections Study

Summary of Public Input

- The public expressed concern that there would be a need for a six-lane Sarah Mildred Long if the I-95 Bridge ever closed.
- The public expressed interest in providing bicycle-pedestrian connectivity on the Sarah Mildred Long Bridge.
- The public expressed interest in ensuring that all Memorial Bridge replacement options provide bicycle-pedestrian connectivity.
- The public expressed concern that the new administration in Maine could change the level of interest in supporting the replacement of both bridges.

2.4. SUMMARY OF PUBLIC MEETING COMMENTS

The study public involvement process was well attended, with a broad spectrum of individuals attending committee and public meetings. From the very first meetings, there has been a consistent sentiment that the two communities – Portsmouth and Kittery – are closely joined both economically and socially and any barrier, however small, to easy access between the two would not be welcomed by either community. This was clear from the input gathered for the Purpose and Need Statement as well as the documented comments made throughout the Study.

At the start of the Study there was perceived support for rehabilitating the existing Memorial Bridge, but when the inspection report indicated that rehabilitation was not feasible, this was accepted by the public with only minor evidence of concern.

The public in general was not supportive of a replacement bridge that would combine the two bridges, nor was it supportive of a higher level bridge. In general, this was because it was seen that these alternatives would create more difficulty in traveling between the two communities as well as create aesthetic and historic impacts.

The other overriding concern from the start was the need for full bicycle/pedestrian facilities across both bridges, but especially the Memorial Bridge. This led to the idea of replacing the Memorial Bridge with a bicycle/pedestrian-only bridge. While some initially welcomed this as a positive concept, in terms of public acceptance the idea rapidly fell victim to the growing concerns about the potential negative effect of reduced vehicle traffic to local businesses adjacent to the Memorial Bridge.

2.5. SUMMARY OF OTHER MEETINGS

04/20/09 Save Our Bridges Meeting

This informal meeting provided the Save Our Bridges committee (headed by Ben Porter and Richard Candee) with the opportunity to ask questions about the study objectives and timeframe, and also provided the Study Team with the opportunity to understand the concerns and objectives of the organization. An important outcome of the meeting was to ensure participation in the Study by key members of the organization.

Attendees: Carol Morris, Morris Communications; and Ben Porter, Richard Candee, Josh Pierce, Doug Bates, Tom Holbrook, Steve Fowle, all of Save Our Bridges.

04/02/09 Municipal Meeting: Portsmouth

This informal meeting was to provide city officials with an overview of the study objective and timeframe and allow them an early opportunity to ask questions and offer concerns and advice.

Attendees: Portsmouth City Manager John Bohenko; Portsmouth Public Works Director Steve Parkinson; and Carol Morris, Morris Communications.

04/02/09 Municipal Meeting: Kittery

This informal meeting was to provide the Kittery town manager with an overview of the study objective and timeframe and allow him an early opportunity to ask questions and offer concerns and advice.

Attendees: Kittery Town Manager Jonathan Carter and Carol Morris, Morris Communications.

05/04/09 Portsmouth Naval Shipyard Meeting

The purpose of this meeting was to provide an overview of the Study objectives and timeframe to PNSY officials, ask them to participate on the Steering Committee and define a process for obtaining PNSY-related information critical to the Study. The discussions include the Study purpose and goals, the upcoming Stimulus grant funding, the schedule and public process, the study team's assessments of PNSY needs, and an assessment by PNSY of future growth. Other information gathered from PNSY included:

1. The 2035 Infrastructure Plan was currently being developed.
2. An additional 1,000 jobs are possible in long term.
3. Three-shifts daily - 60% in first (7:00-3:30), 30% in next, 10% in night shift.
4. Approximately 200 commercial vehicle deliveries daily.
5. Both registered and private shuttle services transport personnel to the PNSY.
6. Concerns with Pan Am ownership of rail line and their long-term ability to service PNSY needs.
7. Note: PNSY had previously indicated that they would not accept the invitation to sit on the Steering Committee due to Navy policy.

Attendees: Deborah White, Danna Eddy and Rod Moore, all of PNSY; Gerry Audibert, MaineDOT; Bob Landry, NH DOT; Paul Godfrey, HNTB; and Carol Morris, Morris Communications.

06/16/09 Navigation Meeting

The purpose of this meeting was to review and discuss navigational needs and opportunities for the Piscataqua River as they relate to the Study. Items discussed were the upcoming United States Coast Guard (USCG) Waterways, Analysis and Management survey, the existing clearances of the two bridges and specific improvements requested (an extra 15' in vertical clearance for the Sarah Mildred Long Bridge, an extra 60' in horizontal clearance to match the Memorial Bridge, and reduce the skew on the Sarah Mildred Long Bridge), the size of the ships currently using the river (largest being the Panamax at 750' long, 108' wide, 135' air draft), and the process for procuring permits (USCG issues permit for bridge construction, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE) evaluates environmental impacts). NH Port Authority provided an update on the Study's river user list.

Attendees: Paul Godfrey, HNTB; Bion Pike, Kittery Harbormaster; Milton Hall, Kittery Port Authority; Dick Holt, Jr., Portsmouth Pilots; Tracy Shattuck, NH Port Authority; Gerry Audibert, MaineDOT; Bob Landry, NH DOT; Terence Leahy, USCG; John Mauro, USCG; Gene Popien, NH DOT; John McDonald, USCG; and John Butler, NH DOT.

02/05/10 US Coast Guard Meeting

The purpose of this meeting was to bring the Coast Guard up to date with the progress of the Study and to determine their needs should a permit be required as a result of Study recommendations. Items discussed were the timeframe for receiving a Coast Guard permit, the size increase in the width of the lift section of the Sarah Mildred Long Bridge, the need for fenders, the height of a new bridge, the size of ships using the river, dredging needs and the Army Corps of Engineer’s involvement, the feasibility of restricting river traffic during a bridge construction period, and a request for the Coast Guard to be a Cooperating Agency on the process.

Attendees: John McDonald, USCG; Dan Satterfield, USCG; Geno Marconi, NH Port Authority; Tracy Shattuck, NH Port Authority; Chris Holt, Portsmouth Pilots; Gerry Audibert, MaineDOT; Eric Shepherd, MaineDOT; Bob Landry, NH DOT; John Butler, NH DOT; Paul Godfrey, HNTB; and Carol Morris, Morris Communications.

06/03/10 New Hampshire State Historic Preservation Office Environmental Effects Meeting

The purpose of this meeting was to allow the New Hampshire State Historical Preservation Office (NH SHPO) the opportunity to advise NH DOT of the historical impacts of proposed alternatives for the Sarah Mildred Long Bridge and the Memorial Bridge. Items discussed were the results of the Determination of Eligibility (DOE) report, local property impacts, consultants’ review of the Memorial Bridge, archaeological impact considerations, alternatives under consideration and whether each alternative had adverse impacts on the Memorial Bridge, Memorial Park, Scott Avenue Bridge or the Portsmouth Historical District.

Attendees: Bob Aubrey, John Butler, Mike Dugas, Jill Edelman, Cathy Goodmen, Bob Landry, Don Lyford, Joyce McKay, Julius Nemeth, Kevin Nyhan, Christine Perron, Jason Tremblay, and Matt Urban, all from NH DOT; Jamie Sikora, NH FHWA; Laura Black, Edna Feighner, Peter Michaud, Beth Muzzey, and Linda Wilson, all from NH Division of Historical Resources; Joe Grilli, HNTB; James McMahon, Horizon Engineering; Vicki Chase and Brian Colburn, McFarland-Johnson; Russell Charette, MaineDOT; Rebecca Williams, National Trust for Historic Preservation; Jennifer Goodman, NH Preservation Alliance; Richard Candee, Portsmouth Historical Society; Carol Hooper and Lynne Monroe, Preservation Company; and Scott Lees, White Mountain Survey.

Note – The Maine SHPO was unable to attend due to scheduling conflicts.

06/24/10 New Hampshire State Historic Preservation Office Environmental Effects Meeting

The purpose of this meeting was to allow the NHHPO the opportunity to advise NH DOT of the historical impacts of the proposed alternatives for the Sarah Mildred Long Bridge and the Memorial Bridge. Items discussed were a detailed explanation of alternatives remaining for consideration and whether the alternatives would have adverse effects to the bridge structure,

Albacore Park, Christian Shore Neighborhood District, Eastern Railroad or Portsmouth Historic District Landmarks.

Attendees: John Butler, Jill Edelmann, and Joyce McKay, all from NH DOT; Laura Black, Peter Michaud, Beth Muzzey, and Linda Wilson, all from NH Division of Historical Resources (NH DHR); Jamie Sikora, NH FHWA; Carol Hooper and Lynne Monroe, Preservation Company; Roberta Lane and Rebecca Williams, National Trust for Historic Preservation; Ken Herrick, Albacore Park; and Jennifer Goodman, NH Preservation Alliance.

Note – The Maine SHPO was unable to attend due to scheduling conflicts.

07/01/10 United States Coast Guard Meeting

The purpose of the meeting was to provide the USCG with an update on Study progress. Items discussed were the Study recommendations and the USCG preference, the concurrence that Memorial Bridge Rehabilitation is no longer a viable alternative, traffic growth assumptions, the revisitation of bridge openings to one lift per hour, the new Sarah Mildred Long Hybrid Bridge alternative, river dredging depths, the possibility of adjusting regulations to allow peak hour traffic to use Sarah Mildred Long Bridge without lifts in the event of Memorial Bridge closing for construction. John McDonald, from the USCG, said he would need a copy of the bridge summary logs for openings in order to evaluate feasibility of adjusting regulations. Also discussed were the pros and cons of the alternatives that remain on the table, study schedule, and the need for a USCG permit for any alternative on the Memorial Bridge or the Sarah Mildred Long Bridge.

Attendees: Steve Johnson, NH DOT; Gerry Audibert, MaineDOT; Gene Popien, NH DOT, Bob Landry, NH DOT; Chris Holt, Portsmouth Pilots; Tracy Shattuck, NH Port Authority; John McDonald, USCG; Paul Godfrey, HNTB; and Benjamin Ettelman, Morris Communications.

08/17/10 US Army Corp of Engineers Meeting

The purpose of the meeting was to provide a Connections Study update to the USACOE, review remaining alternatives that are still under consideration, as well as allow the opportunity for USACOE to provide comments and input regarding the remaining alternatives and the permitting process. Items discussed were the pending dismissal of the rehabilitation of the Memorial Bridge as a viable alternative, the review process for the draft report, NEPA considerations, the refined assumption for bridge lifts on the Sarah Mildred Long and Memorial Bridges during PM peak hour, the newly introduced Hybrid Sarah Mildred Long Bridge Alternative and possible permitting scenarios.

Attendees: Paul Godfrey, HNTB; Gerry Audibert, MaineDOT; Russ Charette, MaineDOT; Jay Clement, USACOE, Mark Hasselmann, Maine FHWA, Bob Landry, NH DOT; John Butler, NH DOT; Richard Roach, USACOE; Chris Williams, NH Department of Environmental Services; Ted Deers, NH DES; and Ben Ettelman, Morris Communications.

08/19/10 Meeting with Pan Am Railways

The purpose of this meeting was to provide a Connections Study update to Pan Am Railways, review remaining alternatives still under consideration, and allow opportunity for Pan Am Railways to provide comments and input regarding the remaining alternatives. With the exception of the Hybrid alternative, all of the remaining alternatives would maintain similar rail operations and procedures to current practices. The Hybrid Alternative was discussed in greater detail because it could potentially change operation and maintenance responsibilities and procedures. Pan Am Railways expressed potential concerns regarding the Hybrid Alternative regarding their responsibility for a fixed vs. moveable track, and the need for them to perform a visual inspection by walking all portions of the rail prior to rail movement, which could impact the length of time the vehicle portion of the bridge would be closed during rail movements. Other meeting discussions included the potential for future rail shipments other than to PNSY (none known or anticipated at this time) and the need for an additional rail track (none foreseen). Regarding bridge rehabilitation, Pan Am Railways indicated there might be coordination and service issues for deliveries to PNSY, given the bridge could be closed for up to two years during construction. A follow up letter was sent to Pan Am Railways requesting additional information regarding these concerns and opinion on alternatives after the meeting.

Attendees: Mike McDonough, Pan Am Railways; Gerry Audibert, MaineDOT; Russ Charette, MaineDOT; Bob Landry, NH DOT; John Butler, NH DOT; Paul Godfrey, HNTB; and Carol Morris, Morris Communications.

12/09/10 United States Coast Guard Meeting

The Purpose of this meeting was to provide a study, make sure everyone is aware of the process in place, what tasks need to get done in what order and to clarify environmental requirements. The Portsmouth Pilots outlined their concerns that a Sarah Mildred Long replacement bridge would not improve the significant safety issues encountered due to the narrowness of the horizontal bridge opening. They noted that ships are continually built to be larger due to environmental and economic concerns, and maintaining the existing bridge horizontal clearance would over time reduce the number of ships physically able to deliver goods to this region. The USCG noted that they have been involved in other bridge projects in order to make sure future ship size is factored in before the application for a permit is made. If USCG believes there is a navigational hazard, they can deny a permit. It was noted that the Governors' Task Force is still looking at funding for all Sarah Mildred Long Bridge options and the process is not completed. Three options (rehabilitation of the existing bridge, replacement with a low-level two-lane bridge immediately upstream, and replacement with a mid-level two-lane hybrid bridge immediately upstream) – except No-Build – are still on the table. It was noted that the next steps include completion of the NEPA process and Section 106 for each bridge. It was also noted that the historic aspect of the Sarah Mildred Long Bridge may become more important since the Memorial Bridge will be replaced. A discussion took place regarding the channel widening at the Sarah Mildred Long Bridge, and it was noted that it is still under consideration. A discussion took place regarding the permit application for the Memorial Bridge, and the USCG asked when they would get that application. It was agreed to get the design to the USCG soon so the

permitting processes (wetlands, etc.) could move forward concurrently. NH DOT said that the Memorial Bridge design build contract was scheduled for award in the fall.

Attendees: John Butler, NH DOT; Bob Juliano, NH DOT; Bob Landry, NH DOT; Chris Holt, Portsmouth Pilots; Dick Holt, Jr., Portsmouth Pilots; P.J. Johnson, Portsmouth Pilots; Vicki Chasse, McFarland Johnson; Jed Merrow, McFarland Johnson; Peter Reilly, HDR; Gary Kassoff, USCG; Chris Bisigwano, USCG; John McDonald, USCG; Paul Godfrey, HNTB; and Carol Morris, Morris Communications.

On January 6, 2011, the USCG submitted comments on the “Draft Final Report, Maine-New Hampshire Connections Study, dated November 9, 2010” regarding the needs of navigation.

The USCG commented that the navigation needs, particularly at the Sarah Mildred Long Bridge, dictate that replacement/rehabilitation designs incorporate navigational clearance improvements. The navigational clearance designs should favor greater horizontal clearance as well as an increase in the vertical clearance in the closed position as compared to those clearances which maintain the existing navigational opening.

Regarding the Memorial Bridge, the USCG recommended that commencement of construction of the Memorial Bridge precede that of the Sarah Mildred Long Bridge due to the structural issues at the Memorial Bridge.

2.6. SUMMARY OF SECTION 106 CONSULTATION MEETINGS

As part of the investigations conducted in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, parties with a demonstrated interest in historic resources that may be affected by the alternatives considered in the Study were identified and invited to participate in the evaluation process. The purpose of the consultation was to consider historic resources early in the feasibility evaluations of alternatives. It is recognized that further Section 106 Consultation would be required subsequent to the conclusion of the Study, when NEPA documentation and design studies are advanced.

Consulting/interested parties were invited to participate on the Study Stakeholder Committee. In addition, both State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO) were invited to participate on the Study Steering Committee. Committee meeting agenda, meeting notes, and meeting materials were sent to the consulting/interested parties, as invited participants on these committees, whether or not they attended meetings.

The following organizations were identified and invited to participate as consulting/interested parties:

- Albacore Museum and Park*
- Aroostook Band of Micmacs
- City of Portsmouth**
- COWASS North America, Inc., The Abenaki Nation of Vermont, Inc.
- Friends of the South End
- Historic New England

- Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians
- Kittery Historical and Naval Museum
- Kittery Historical Society
- Maine Historic Preservation Commission (Maine SHPO)**
- Maine Preservation*
- National Trust for Historic Preservation*
- New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources (New Hampshire SHPO)**
- New Hampshire Preservation Alliance*
- Passamaquoddy Tribe of Indians
- Portsmouth Advocates
- Portsmouth Athenaeum
- Portsmouth Historic District Commission
- Portsmouth Historical Society*
- Portsmouth Naval Shipyard (PNSY)
- Prescott Park Trustees**
- Strawberry Banke Museum**
- Town of Kittery**
- Warner House Association*

* *Organizations that accepted invitation to become Consulting Parties*

** *Organizations that sat on Steering or Stakeholder Committee*

In addition to participation in the Steering Committee and Stakeholder Committee meetings, additional consultation meetings were conducted for this stakeholder group. Minutes of these meetings are included in Appendix 52 (Section 106/Consulting Parties Meeting Minutes). The dates of these meetings and the topics discussed are noted below:

- **04/21/10 Consultation Meeting on Albacore Park Issues and Concerns.** Topics discussed: 1) Bridge inspection results; 2) eligibility and need for further investigations; 3) potential effects of alternatives on historic resources; and, 4) schedule and process.

Attendees: Bob Landry, NH DOT; John Butler, NH DOT; and Ken Herrick, Albacore Park.

- **06/03/10 NH DOT, Bureau of Environment Effects Meeting.** The primary purpose of this meeting was to conduct a preliminary historic impact evaluation for the No-Build and Build Alternatives which remained after completion of the Connection Study's Fatal Flaw screening analysis. The potential direct and indirect impacts to historic resources resulting from the alternatives were identified and/or considered. In some cases, the potential direct or indirect effects of alternatives on historic resources could not be determined and/or confirmed without further design details being developed. Topics discussed: 1) Effects of the alternatives on the Memorial Bridge, the Sarah Mildred Long Bridge, and other historic resources in New Hampshire; and, 2) process.

Attendees: Bob Aubrey, John Butler, Mike Dugas, Jill Edelmann, Cathy Goodmen, Bob Landry, Don Lyford, Joyce McKay, Julius Nemeth, Kevin Nyhan, Christine Perron, Jason Tremblay, and Matt Urban, all from NH DOT; Jamie Sikora: NH FHWA; Laura Black, Edna Feighner, Peter Michaud, Beth Muzzey, and Linda Wilson, all from NH DHR; Joe Grilli, HNTB; James McMahon, Horizon Engineering; Vicki Chase and Brian Colburn, McFarland-Johnson; Russell Charette, MaineDOT; Rebecca Williams, National Trust for Historic Preservation; Jennifer Goodman, NH Preservation Alliance; Richard Candee, Portsmouth Historical Society; Carol Hooper and Lynne Monroe, Preservation Company; and Scott Lees, White Mountain Survey.

- **06/24/10 NH DOT, Bureau of Environment Effects Meeting.** The primary purpose of this meeting was to continue conducting a preliminary historic impact evaluation for the No-Build and Build Alternatives which remained after completion of the Connection Study's Fatal Flaw screening analysis. The potential direct and indirect impacts to historic resources resulting from the alternatives were identified and/or considered. In some cases, the potential direct or indirect effects of alternatives on historic resources could not be determined and/or confirmed without further design details being developed. Topics discussed: 1) Continued discussion from the June 3rd meeting on the effects of alternatives on the Memorial Bridge, the Sarah Mildred Long Bridge, and other historic resources in New Hampshire; 2) process; and, 3) need for further effects meetings when design is advanced.

Attendees: John Butler, Jill Edelmann, and Joyce McKay, all from NH DOT; Laura Black, Peter Michaud, Beth Muzzey, and Linda Wilson, all from NH DHR; Jamie Sikora, NH FHWA; Carol Hooper and Lynne Monroe, Preservation Company; Roberta Lane and Rebecca Williams, National Trust for Historic Preservation; Ken Herrick, Albacore Park; and Jennifer Goodman, NH Preservation Alliance.

2.7. MAINE PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT WITH STATE AND FEDERAL AGENCIES

In 2004, the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Maine State Historic Preservation Officer and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) developed and signed a programmatic agreement outlining the process by which the responsibility for ensuring cultural resource and 36 CFR Part 800 activities would be undertaken by MaineDOT, with annual assessment by FHWA, the FTA, SHPO and ACHP.

A copy of Maine's Programmatic Agreement with State and Federal Agencies can be found in Appendix 56.

2.8. MAINE AND NEW HAMPSHIRE GUBERNATORIAL TASK FORCE

On October 5th, 2010, Maine Governor John Baldacci and New Hampshire Governor John Lynch co-signed an executive order authorizing the creation of a task force charged with aggressively formulating plans that would allow the states of Maine and New Hampshire to develop funding for the bridge projects, identifying joint financing options and proposing any necessary

legislation to accommodate bridge construction. Among the two Governors' assurances is a commitment maintaining all three bridge crossings including a full vehicular replacement of the Memorial Bridge.

A copy of the Governor's executive order can be found in Appendix 57.

A copy of the "*Bi-State Bridge Funding Task Force – Final Report, dated December 15, 2010*" can be found in Appendix 60.