



MEMO

TO: Eamon Kernan, MassDOT Project Manager
FROM: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, WSP Senior Consultant
RE: PFC Ralph. T Basiliere Bridge Replacement Project Workshop 2
DATE: June 12, 2023

CONTENTS

OVERVIEW..... 1
 PRESENTATION..... 1
 BREAKOUT GROUPS..... 8
 DISCUSSION 9
 NEXT STEPS 10

OVERVIEW

On Thursday, May 18th, 2023, members of MassDOT and staff associated with the PFC Ralph T. Basiliere Bridge Replacement held the second public workshop associated with the project. The event was held at the UMass Innovation Hub located at 2 Merrimack Street in Haverhill. Built in 1925, the Basiliere Bridge is named for Private First Class Ralph T. Basiliere, Haverhill's first Vietnam War casualty. While MassDOT routinely inspects the bridge and it remains safe for all users, it is approaching the end of its useful lifespan and must be replaced. The purpose of the meeting was to display and discuss what was heard from the first public workshop on April 3, and the new developments and ideas that the project team derived from the first meeting.

The presentation provided an overview of the topics covered from the initial public information meeting and the first workshop, reviewed essential concepts, and displayed a series of bridge concepts to gather initial public feedback. The project team explored possibilities related to open space, pier locations, potential connections between the bridge and the surrounding area, and discussed potential design ideas to accommodate bicycle and pedestrian access. Participants had the opportunity to engage with the project team through two breakout groups highlighting bridge aesthetics, circulation and open space, and traffic and cross-sections.

The meeting was advertised through local news outlets and email announcements. Attendees displayed a high level of active participation and enthusiasm when sharing their input with the project team in each breakout group. It was widely shared that a four-lane bridge would be optimal for the community's needs, and attendees emphasized the importance of preserving the history of the old bridge while incorporating a more modern aesthetic to align with the evolving characteristics of downtown Haverhill. Attendees expressed preference for deep arches and overlooks. Participants noted the need to enhance safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists through the new bridge design and raised concerns regarding traffic congestion and accessibility for emergency services during construction.

PRESENTATION¹

C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis (NCC): Good evening, everybody. Since the people here at the UMass facility are really nice to us, there is not only a selection of food from the event they had last night but there is also a selection of additional food which we brought over this evening. Please do help yourself. We are going to have a short



presentation this evening, then we are going to have some breakout groups. The aesthetic breakout group will be back in that corner and if you go out around the hall, go down on your left, in the Bradford room, we will conder this the Haverhill room. Just sit with us for a few minutes, listen to the presentation, I am going to hand it off to our MassDOT project manager Eamon Kernan and we will have a couple of our other folks on the team talk tonight before we head to the breakout groups. We are going to spend about a half of an hour in each then we will come back, do the report out and hopefully get some great guidance from all of you on what it is that you would like to see. Thank you so much for joining us on this really nice night and here is Eamon.

C: Eamon Kernan (EK): Good evening, my name is Eamon Kernan, I am the project manager with MassDOT. I am based at headquarters in Boston. Today is the second event like this, we had the charette last month. We listened to you last month and here are some of our ideas based on what we heard from you. We are going to show you some examples and then hopefully when you go to the breakout sessions you will be able to work on that. We hope that when we are finished here tonight, that we will have a much better idea of what this structure is going to look like moving forward. We will come back after the breakout groups and say this is what we heard, confirm it, and then we are good to go, because we really need to get to that point to start designing this bridge. Last time we were here it was dark out and you could not see the bridge. Looking at it right now, we need to get going on that bridge. Again, I am Eamon Kernan, our architect is Etty, and Nate is our communications specialist, Richard is with WSP, he is the project engineer.

This is some important writing so I will read it: All MassDOT/MBTA activities including public meetings are free from discrimination. The MassDOT/ MBTA complies with all federal and state civil rights requirements, preventing discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, limited English proficiency, and additional protected characteristics. We welcome the diversity from across our entire service area. If you have any questions or concerns, please visit this web address (www.mass.gov/nondiscrimination-in-transportation-program / www.mbt.com/titlevi) and any questions or comments are welcomed and appreciated.

This is going to be a brief presentation. When Etty sent me over her drawings, I suppose we can call them that, but when I saw them I was like “wow, okay, I like them!” I hope you like them too. When you see one idea, you might like it, when you see another idea, you might not. You might like a piece of one and another piece of another. Those are the comments that we want to hear you speak about today. We will get feedback on the different images, and we will start to get closer to what this bridge is going to look like. We will break out and go to the different tables. We will come back here, and we will discuss what we saw.

This is ongoing. This is our third meeting. We had two prior to that, one with the city hall and one with the legislative liaisons, state delegation and city offices. We have been in your newspapers. I had somebody from MassDOT tell me that they heard my voice on their car radio. I am not sure how that sounded, but they heard it so, it has been spread around. If you have given us your e-mail address, you are getting emails to let you know what is going on and when we have our next meetings. If you have not given us your e-mail address, please do so, so that you will get the emails for everything that is upcoming. You will also get links to the MassDOT website. We will try to keep that updated with everything after this meeting, so that you can see some progress as the project moves forward.

Richard is going to talk about this a little bit. This is not our project, but we want you to know that we are aware of this project.

C: Richard Lenox (RL): Thank you Eamon. My name is Richard Lenox. I am the project manager with WSP. We are the design consultant working for MassDOT. One of the things that has been discussed at both the previous public meetings was that there are some other activities that are happening within the city, not just this bridge project that is on the horizon. One of the projects is in the downtown, called the Renaissance Project, to redevelop the parking deck



area. We met with that developer's engineer shortly after our last public meeting to start that coordination, get an understanding of what is proposed, the timeline, and to make sure that we do the best that we can to work with each other and make sure there is not any conflict. We had some initial information exchanged and got a sense of what their timing is. Their project is actually starting later this year and it is our understanding, that per the grant that has been received, that the phase one project which will deal with a lot of the roadway improvements and the initial demolition, that the phase one construction will be completed by the time that the bridge project really gets underway. We expect the start of the bridge project to really get underway in 2026 and the phase one of the parking deck project to be done before that. I think their timeline is really 18 months based on what the engineer told us so before the end of 2025 that phase one would be done and then the roadway improvements that are associated with it will be primarily done. It should help mitigate any kind of conflict, but we are going to continue to have ongoing discussions and coordination as things going forward. If any further questions come up, please ask us as the night goes along.

C: EK: We also wanted to point out that MassDOT is a large organization and recently we were told by our District 4 which maintains the bridge that there some work that is needed on it in the very near term. Our project does not begin until 2026, but you will see some work out on this bridge in, I think, by the end of the month. On the Bradford side of the bridge, they discovered that there is a beam that needs to be supported. They are going to put some concrete barriers around this beam, and you are going to see that, I think, by the end of the month. There were sidewalk repairs done recently based on a photograph we got from a community member. In the photograph you can see the sidewalk and the water flowing underneath. The district has been out, and they have repaired that. I think they were out for two nights working on the sidewalk. District 4 understands the conditions of the bridge are poor, so inspection happens a little more frequently. I know when they get calls, they come out and take care of it when they can.

There was a comment the last time regarding canoes going underneath the bridge and worries that pieces of concrete may fall off with boaters underneath the structure. The district is looking at ideas on what they could do there. There were comments about whether they could close off some sections and force everybody through one section of the bridge and then put netting underneath. Whoever gave us the comment, it is with the district, and they are looking at what can be done underneath the bridge to protect any boater that may want to go under. Like I said, inspections and needed repairs will continue. If you are out on the bridge and you see something, get in touch with your city engineer because he will directly get in touch with us or get in touch with the district.

We talked about where we are and where we are going. We started with these targeted briefings; we had the charette last month where we really started listening to the ideas that you have. We are having one today, where we are showing you: "this is what we believe that you told us that you want to see. This is what we are giving you back." We will have the second public meeting and awareness campaign. We are hoping that we will be able to start focusing down and determine what type of bridge we are going to have. In the summer of 2023, we will start what is called the pre-25, or over-shoulder, which is where the design firm will start putting the structure together and going to MassDOT with their designs. We are trying to either say yes, "we agree with the path that you are taking," and then these guys are off and running. Then we will progress into 25% design in the fall of 2023.

I am going to show this slide. Sometimes in conversation people are not completely aware of some of the terminologies. You will hear us say deck. Deck is the roadway of a bridge. You will hear people say piers. They are basically the foundations of the bridge. The arches, everybody has seen the Colosseum and understands the Roman arch, the whole idea is that it takes the force from the sides and puts it into the piers. I have to note scour. It is one of the issues with this bridge. Scour is when the water is flowing through and it moves fast enough to undermine the foundations. There is an issue with scour on this bridge. One of the things that we are doing with our new bridge is that we will have fewer piers in the water which improves the cross section of the river through, slowing it down and eliminating the scour issue. I am going to hand it over to Etty to discuss everything that she has done to date.



C: Etty Padmodipoetro (EP): Thank you so much. We have talked about this before and as I said we are not just bridge architects, but we are urban designers, so when we look at and approach a bridge, we look at it first from the urban design perspective. How the whole bridge fits within the context, how it creates connections, encourages connections or how we make sure it does not preclude connections in the future. The last one, but not the least, is of course, the components of the bridge itself. Like Eamon said, the piers, the overlook, and the signage. Today, we are going to really focus more on the components. We will still listen to you about all the pieces that might make connections and how the structure fits into the context. We have heard from all of you so when we are looking at new ideas for the bridge we have already thought about the connections and how it fits in the context, but the focus today is more on the components themselves.

This is the same thing as what we had last time. What do we believe are the principles for making bridges? One is of course, that it should be beautiful, create a strong relationship with the surrounding area, and incorporate aesthetics, not as an add on. We do not want to do gargoyles on the bridge, meaning that you are just making it pretty by finding things to add on to the bridge. We want the ornament to be more meaningful, we want the things on the bridge to have a reason for being there. Another thing is that we do not want to make this bridge just a vehicular bridge but truly a bridge that people can enjoy. We are trying to create a bridge that is an inviting space. We talked last time, and people were talking about the activities on the river itself. Wouldn't it be nice to have a real area on the bridge where you can really connect to the river? Again, in terms of context, we want to make sure that there are some visual connections from the bridge to the surrounding area, which would have beautiful vista. Also, from the surrounding areas looking at the bridge itself. We want the bridge to be iconic, something that the neighborhood and the city can really own and be proud of.

This is what we think about the bridge. One of the big things that we were talking about last time was how to create connections and how in the future we can create a circle, a loop. The Dempsey Board Walk and the Wall Street path right now are not connected or do not connect easily. Whether we are going to make the connections fully for this bridge or not, we want to ensure that our bridge will allow for connections in the future. The other one, of course, is the Bradford Trail which we want to expand to make sure that it will be good, not just for pedestrians, but potentially for cyclists. The other thing that people talked about last time was that they dislike the feeling of being in a tunnel where the trail passes under the bridge. Our goal is to take that away and make something that is much more transparent. People were also talking about how there is no real connection to the river. Those are real comments that we would not know from an outsider's perspective. We definitely hear you, and we will be working on that even though today will be more about the bridge.

C: RL: Thank you. So, what we are going to go through here is summarize some of the things that came up at the last meeting and discuss what we are going to be doing with those tonight and in the future.

Construction staging, we do not really have a follow-up graphic, or discussion really planned for that. That is going to really have to evolve as Etty's concepts evolve and we really get a sense of what the bridge is going to be like. Then we can start to see how we can construct the type of bridge that we've picked. Just quickly, hitting on the things that we heard to make sure we are aware of relative to the staging for this bridge design, construction, and public safety, of course: making sure we can accommodate emergency vehicles and that emergency response times are not negatively affected. We talked about ensuring safety for the users under the bridge or on the waterway. For the non-motorized travelers, we discussed potentially restricting a sidewalk on one side, or not, and how we can make sure that crossing the bridge while construction is happening is as safe as possible for the non-motorized users.

Traffic conditions, of course that is a very important one, we know that the project is going to have an impact as we need to restrict lane capacity, so how can we mitigate that as best we can, and some ideas were put out there relative



to changing operation or adjusting signal time. Those are all of the kinds of things that we are going to be looking at as we move forward. Then, of course, for the users of the waterway, and making sure we are protecting nature and not causing erosion issues and trying to make passage through the waterway safe for the users while the construction takes place.

C: EP: I am going to go through a lot of the things that we heard. It was good because it was sort of a free for all so, we just listened to everything that people had to say. When we did that, there are many things that were not necessarily in keeping with each other. Sometimes they were the opposite of each other. We are happy that we have all of that. We listened to all of that, and we are coming up with concepts. What we are hoping for tonight, is that by the end of the evening, it will start to go down to just one direction on where we are going. Back to what Eamon was saying, what we have here can be built in parts, where you can take pieces from one or another because right now, we are just trying to organize it from the comments on how each one of them might fall into a certain type of bridge.

Here we go. I am not going to read all of them, but I am going to just give the highlights. We want the entry to the bridge to be welcoming. That is going to be in all three, so we are not really focusing on that. That will be incorporated in the final version. One idea was to have a more modern look like the downtown and another was to have an older look like in Bradford, so that is a little bit confusing for us designers, so we are giving you two, one evokes history and the other is modern. Many people really love the deep arches that we have here, so we went all out and made one that looks modern, but it has deep arches. The other one, which was a bit more difficult, was to find ways to reflect the towers. The towers will have to go because they have to be over a pier and we plan to reduce the number of piers. We talked to a preservationist and the towers are not something that can be moved because they are not made of individual stones but cast stone. When we really think about the towers, the towers were an iconic expression for what the bridge was. It was supposed to be the place where a person could move the bridge up and down. It had meaning behind it. We can still have a vertical element, but the vertical element should do or express something, that's a challenge we need to meet now.

In terms of an overlook, that is pretty easy since almost everybody wants to have an overlook. The question is where the overlook should be, how big the overlook should be, and what should be on the overlook, from nothing, to a lot of things. Another thing people were talking about is bridge lighting. That is easy and that will be definitely incorporated into the final design, so we are not dealing with that right now because it is a definite yes. We will absolutely provide opportunities for artwork. So far, we have talked about the towers and that is something we can discuss today as well.

In terms of connection and circulation, we agree with everything basically. There needs to be better connections to the river so that people can do activities like fishing, kayaking, and canoeing. I will go even further and say, let's not reduce it, could we fully eliminate the tunnel? In terms of the turn onto the trail, we agree the corner should be eased, but there may be some right-of-way impacts. In terms of the Dempsey Boardwalk and Wall Street Path, we don't want to preclude a connection there.

This is the first bridge concept. We started with just two overlooks because it evokes what is there now. Instead of two we wanted it to be more symmetrical because there is the opportunity to do that. This is a plan view. We have four but then when we start to look at four, why four, it seems like the bridge is so long. One of the ideas that we have is making this new bridge have regular intervals where people can rest, pull over, and enjoy the river.

This is the one that has a deep arch, but remember we want to make sure that we work with the structure to avoid scouring. This is what we came up with. Again, this is an idea, it is the spirit of it, and it will change with your comments. We are really proud because what we are trying to do is make it traditional but if you look at it really closely it looks modern. One of the reasons that there is nothing on the overlook itself is because some of you really



wanted it to just be pure space where people can come. On this particular one, we do not have a vertical element, but we want to spend most of the time, or most of our focus, on the detailing of the bridge. We can make a bridge that is thoughtfully detailed and is special to the city. That is what we are trying to do here. This is what we are trying to talk about when we talk about removing the tunnel. Even with a lot of these arches, we can respond to that by creating openings so the whole thing is transparent. This is going to be on both the north and the south side. We want to ensure that connectivity on both sides will remain. In here, there will be a walkway that goes across, theoretically, in the future, you can connect the Dempsey Boardwalk and the Wall Street path.

This is the second concept. Many of you talked about how unpleasant it is to walk during the winter because of the cold and the wind and that it stops people from using the bridge. We cannot do wind protection for the whole bridge, but maybe we can do it in the middle and maybe we can cover more than just the center. What we like about this is the overlooks are located in between the piers. That way, when there are activities happening on the river you can really enjoy it and you can see it from where the activity is happening instead of from the sideline. It would create a big enough area to accomplish that. Again, we are not putting a gargoyle here because there is a real reason why we want to have this thing. It can be a place where people can change their pace in the summer when there are activities and can be used in the winter as a protection. It can be used year-round. This is what we will see on the bottom. We want to make sure when we are designing a bridge that it is not just good from the top, but we are conscious about what will be seen from the bottom because people will be walking on the bottom and there are boats.

This is the third concept and the last one. If we have a wind protection, why not some sort of a protection from the rain and from the sun. This is the same type of overlook, but it is a little bit of a different vertical element. This is giving people a chance to slow down and enjoy the river. The structures of the bridges themselves are different. This one is the Haunched Girder which has the least amount of arch feeling. This is what we will see under the bridge.

That is it for now. I am really looking forward to the discussion later. Hopefully we can mix and match and come up with just one answer.

C: RL: Thank you Etty. I am just going to quickly go over the feedback we received from discussion relative to the cross section and how many lanes. That is going to be a breakout session. Erik will have some full plots of some concepts for the full corridor so make sure you visit Erik in one of the breakout groups. There seemed to be a general preference for a four-lane cross section over three. Concerns were brought up about future volumes relative to the developments that are planned within the city and making sure that we can accommodate the non-motorized traveler. That is something that is kind of the tradeoff. If you take away space on the road, that helps the non-motorized users, whereas if you put more room for the cars, there is less room for those amenities. That is the balancing act that needs to happen here. Also making sure, as Etty was talking about, the connections, how the cross section of the corridor will connect to the rail trail and the boardwalk on the north side.

Here is a little bit of a different cross section from the ones we showed last time. This is the three-lane version. Again, we are showing you a couple and Erik will have the same plots available in the breakout session. It is kind of concentrating things on the west side relative to the loop between the rail trail and the boardwalk versus a balanced approach, which will have a view of in a second. This really provides probably the best overall accommodation for the non-vehicular users.

Here is the four-lane version. You can see we sort of have the same configuration, but you have less width on the pedestrian sidewalks and cyclist track.

Here is one that is similar to the last one. A four-lane section that would be sort of symmetrical where you provide the same sidewalk accommodations on each side and then a separate directional cycle track on each side that would



provide equivalent accommodations on both the west and east sides of the bridge. Erik again, is going to have these so you can discuss this. It is just a balancing act for how these transitions are going to work at each intersection. It is something that is going to have to be well thought out and planned to make sure we are protecting all of the users as they transition from separate cycle tracks and at those intersections.

These concepts will be illustrated with what Erik has to show. They will illustrate the north side at Water Street and Merrimack, how the three versus the four-lane transition from north to south will occur. In this case, the northern flow is the same but to the south, whether you have one receiving lane or two receiving lanes coming onto the bridge and how the traffic operations and the cycle track transitions may be different. Then at the south end we had a lot of discussion about the Middlesex Street intersection and how that really functions. There is a right turn pocket, but people are effectively using it as two lanes and merging immediately when you get south of Middlesex Street. We are going to have these robust bicycle accommodations at the intersection. We want to make sure that we are transitioning everything safely and planning everything out appropriately.

As Etty mentioned earlier, at the transition onto the Bradford Rail Trail, you have that hairpin turn, that is a challenging location, and we have some right of way limitations. These are all the things that we want to discuss and hear further feedback on as we have a little bit more of a design concept. It is really just concepts at this level, and we really want to get your feedback. As Erik can touch on when you go visit him, the operations from a traffic modeling standpoint can be done either way, it can operate effectively with either a three-lane or a four-lane configuration with some slight differences in the queuing. I encourage you to discuss that in more detail within the breakout session and give your feedback on these issues.

We are looking for your feedback. Tell us what you like and what you do not like. Did we capture your feedback from the previous meeting effectively or are there things that we missed and did not hit the topics? For the bridge options, it's not a one size fits all, meaning I like the structure type you are showing on this one, but I like the overlook scheme on this other one, and could they be merged together. We are looking for those kinds of things.

The last thing I want to bring up as we move forward to the different types of structures is that eventually we are going to do a full structural evaluation and process to evaluate the structure type with MassDOT relative to constructability, costs, and accommodating utilities, so it is an ongoing process, but we are really looking forward to getting some feedback.

C: EK: We do not want to influence your ideas. When I came out here today, if you look out on the bridge right now, in effect there is just one lane each way, but heading north right now there are two lanes. Heading south, although there is enough space for two lanes, it is acting as one lane and the drivers are using it as one lane. When they get to the end it is kind of going back to two lanes when they queue at the light to make their movements. When you are out there and you see the backed-up traffic, and say we need four lanes, it is because you see two lanes on this side, so you are saying well we need two lanes on both sides. When Erik does the analysis, it is not necessarily true. Erik is the traffic engineer; he is going to come up with the best solution. One of the advantages of going with three-lanes, if the numbers work, is that it gives that extra space on the side where we showed a bi-directional bike lane, and the sidewalk is going to be wider.

When they put in the rail trail, some people think of it as a trail, but if you actually think of it as a linear park, it used to be that people did not want their house to back up to a rail trail. They would say "people will be able to get to the back of my house and it is going to devalue my property" and that actually changed. The value of those houses went up. Those people that did not like it moved, but their homes were easily sold because people wanted to go out to their backyard and have access to this linear park that was 4 miles long. If we put a bidirectional path on the bridge and there is a sidewalk and potentially features for the overlook, it is around 800 feet long. It is almost a space for the city



over the water. If the city wants to have events where the bicycle lane is closed down, they have this extra cross section. These are just my ideas. They have not been necessarily shared with the team because the architect is working on her ideas. These are the sort of ideas that we want you to follow through. What could this space be used for, for the city later on? We are going to build a bridge, we are going to leave it, and we are going to walk away, and you will have this bridge for the next 100 years. Is it only a bridge used for getting cars across or can it be used for the city for something more?

We were told at the beginning of our process that a group called the Solomon Foundation came into the city to give them some ideas about what could be done with the bridge and the bidirectional bicycle path was one of the ideas. We had a meeting with the city, and they said that they prefer the idea of directional bicycle lanes. We really need to hear from you because we want to know what you want. If we leave here and we still do not know whether we want to put a bicycle lane on either side or whether you want bidirectional bicycle lanes, we are in trouble because now it is going to be our ideas. We need that feedback so do not be quiet; please give us everything that you can.

C: NCC: There are two stations. You have got about half an hour in each. Then we are going to come back here. The people who take notes can report back. We will do a quick double-check to ensure we have everything and then let you go. Do not run to one station all at once, there will be an opportunity to get to both. I will come around in about 25 minutes or half an hour and switch it up. The presentation will stay on the screen. You can move around between the slides that you want. I saw a lot of cell phones out. This presentation has already been uploaded to the project website. If you want to go download it, you can do that.

BREAKOUT GROUPS

After the presentation, attendees dispersed to one of the two breakout groups. Participants were given 30 minutes at each station and then asked to move to the other one. The project team recorded all questions, suggestions, and concerns at each breakout group to help advise the final bridge design.

The bridge aesthetics, open space, and connections breakout group observed the proposed concepts and provided feedback on them. For the first alternative, there was positive feedback for the deep arches as successfully evocative of the existing bridge. Some participants felt they would help alleviate flooding. There was concern expressed that the first alternative lacks a wind barrier or shade canopy. There was also positive feedback for the second alternative concept. Participants liked the idea of a gradual curve along the bridge that would serve as a lookout and public space. Attendees highlighted that the second alternative also provides a wind barrier and space for a shaded canopy. Several participants expressed a desire to see two of the concepts combined so that features from both carried into the final design. Some unfavorable comments were received regarding the wind barrier in that it could truncate the views off the bridge while attracting skateboarders and graffiti. Keeping bicycles and pedestrians separated from car traffic received a general positive consensus as did the second concept's central overlook.

The traffic and cross-sections breakout group received ample feedback from participants. Several attendees expressed concern over placing both directions of bicycle traffic on one side of the bridge suggesting that cyclists going north might simply ride of the bridge's eastern (downstream) sidewalk. It was also suggested that forcing cyclists going north to cross opposing traffic at the intersection on either end of the bridge would be unsafe for riders and confusing to drivers. To help address these issues, it was suggested that bicycle facilities be included on both sides of the road with riders traveling in the same direction as vehicle traffic. It was also noted that the bridge should be built in such a way as to allow bicycle and pedestrian facilities to be readily cleared of snow and ice during winter storms. Incorporating a greenspace or median in the center of the road was suggested as a way to keep cyclists from cutting across the road where they should not.

With regard to the three-lane cross-section, there was a suggestion that the two-lane direction of the bridge could be varied to match peak traffic conditions, however concern was expressed that this could possibly lead to confusion as



drivers exit the bridge. Supporters of a four-lane cross-section suggested that it could provide pull-off space for vehicles experiencing mechanical issues, additional room to allow emergency vehicles to pass during congested conditions, and generally take anticipated new traffic from anticipated developments in the area. A four-lane facility with directional bicycle facilities was generally agreed to be the most appropriate for the new bridge.

During the breakout groups, attendees raised several common questions and concerns regarding the new bridge. Safety emerged as a prominent topic, with participants expressing apprehensions about the possibility of cars breaking down on the bridge if lanes were too narrow. Additionally, there were concerns about the operations of emergency services throughout the construction period. Attendees also drew attention to the issue of cyclists potentially using the traffic lanes instead of the designated bicycle lanes and inquired about the sturdiness of the bicycle lane barriers. Attendees asked questions about the drainage system on the new bridge and emphasized the need to address snow disposal during and after severe weather events.

DISCUSSION

C: NCC: Hello, thank you for coming back. I really appreciate all of you folks for staying here. I want to say thank you to everybody for sitting through this. We are going to continue to do the outreach that we have been talking about. To answer a question some of my breakout participants asked, we're not sure just when our next meeting will be. I said we are going to take all the stuff we've received, put it together, figure out what people said, and then hopefully if we have enough, we will be able to come back to you over the course of sometime and in the summer to say "here, what do you think?" As Eamon said, then we can start narrowing down the direction that we can go.

I am going to give a couple of highlights from the aesthetics group. I will then see if Etty has anything that she would like to add. I think we got a pretty solid thumbs up for option one. We got a pretty solid thumbs up for more overlooks rather than less. There was a thought that if we had more overlooks rather than less, we did not necessarily need to have seating on all of them. We could have seating on the ones in the middle and not at the ends. Since people like to be contrary, I also heard "well why don't you put them just at the ends and not in the middle because you will want to rest when you come off." There was some discussion about how we could use lighting or structures, which are in some ways not filled in to reference the towers. I think at this point we are pretty clear that the towers themselves are passed it, but there was some interest in saving some pieces of them. For example, the copper urn that is on top, that could go somewhere. There is some interest in whether the obelisks, which are much smaller, could go somewhere or be incorporated in some way. That was an interesting thought. People are very partial to the structure of option one. They like the character. People also liked the fact that it is open underneath. I had people say that the windows on the water of the evocative option are good, but I also like the fact that it is really open, so the openness but not creating a space where nefarious business can happen under the bridge. People liked the arch of option two. There is a lot of concern over how glazing would be treated, whether it would pick up a lot of dirt and never get cleaned. Even if it did get cleaned, there was concern over graffiti stickers, etcetera. However, the shape of the arch got some love and there was some thought that perhaps the arch could carry some lighting, which I did think was an interesting concept.

A: EP: Thank you so much for this because it truly is helpful for us. We have a lot of comments, so we still need to sort them out. I agree with almost everything that Nate said. The only thing is, in one of our groups they were saying that right now not all of the vertical elements are there yet. The next time around we will have the vertical elements, so the number one will not look so bare. There will be lights and other stuff. The other thing that people liked about the number two is that the overlook is not just an overlook, but it could be a part of the linear park. A few people asked if we could do that spirit on the number one so we will explore that. I am looking forward to seeing everyone's comments and I think we should get them in a couple of days.



C: NCC: While I am passing off the microphone, I am going to leave this up. This website has the presentation from tonight if you want to download it for reference. If you would like to write us more comments use the email address right there, that goes to members of the project team. Please look at those, give us your thoughts and show your friends, because this is an important stage that we are at, and we want to make sure we get it right. I am going to pass it off to Eamon and Erik.

C: EK: If you are trying to remember this, if you type MassDOT Basiliere Bridge in your internet search, it will probably pop-up.

C: Erik Maki (EM): The traffic breakout group had a little bit of a mixed bag. We did hear a lot of feedback and concerns about if bicycles are crossing the street and if all the cyclists are concentrated in a two-way path you would have to cross two times at the intersections and people do not feel safe at those intersections. We talked about the pros and cons of both options, whether it is three-lanes over the bridge or the four. I heard a lot of talk about future development in the city and that a four-lane option could be preferred. We illustrated how even in a three-lane option, the lanes would switch in the middle so you would still have two lanes exiting each end of the bridge at the traffic signal so some of those operational traffic issues are similar between the two. Then the discussion centered a little bit on how people want to use the bridge. Is it just to get across or do you want to spend a little more time on the bridge? Are there other things that can happen on the bridge if it is wider on one side, like on the western side with a two-way path? Does that give you more of a linear park feeling and more ability to do different functions and things from the city's perspective as compared to two narrower sides? We will write those things up in the memos. The traffic analysis is going to continue.

With some of the options, let's say two lanes coming off on the Bradford side, if we got rid of the right turn only pocket and converted it to a through lane, then we are going to have a merge that is going to happen a little further down, so we can assess how long we have from the merge, and how well we think that will operate. Likewise, on the north end of the bridge, if there is only a single lane coming on to the bridge, we would do a lane drop on Main Street and convert one of the through lanes to a right turn pocket to Merrimack. There are some slight operational changes with lane drops and merges, but by and large they are pretty similar. We are going to continue to write that up. Please continue to give us your feedback and thank you again for participating. I think we had a pretty robust conversation on the traffic group side. Anything else Rich?

C: RL: I think you covered it really well. It is great to hear all the feedback and as Erik said, we have to take all of this information, knowing about all of the preferences and the development that is happening within the city, and make that all a part of our comprehensive analysis. Certainly, waying the public feedback as part of our analysis that we ultimately provide to MassDOT.

C: EK: It is 8:00 p.m. and we will call this meeting closed.

NEXT STEPS

Targeted briefings as described herein are scheduled to be conducted over the summer of 2023. The briefings will provide an update on the concept design to date and work to connect defined audiences such as the Crescent Yacht Club and Greater Haverhill Chamber of Commerce.



APPENDIX 1: MEETING ATTENDEES

First	Last	Affiliation
Kerri	Alves	Resident
Andrew	Benkert	WSP
Amy	Bourdon	Resident
Karl	Branelk	Resident
Ed	Buckley	Resident
Nathaniel	Cabral-Curtis	WSP
Seth	Cordes	Resident
Patrick	Devaney	Resident
Lisa	DoMeo	Uncommon Catalyst
Will	Domoson	Resident
Dan	Donovan	Resident
Thomas	Dowden	Resident
Robert	Duppy	Resident
Daniel	Fleury	MassDOT
Ku	Gregor	Resident
Paul	Gwiazda	WSP
Kristina	Hanes	Resident
Danie	Itasaka	Resident
Mike	Katsulis	Resident
Eamon	Kernan	MassDOT
David	King	Resident
Dot	LaPlante	Resident
Richard	Lenox	WSP
Lorna	Lupi	Resident
Kevin	Lynch	Haverhill Police Department
Kathleen	Lynch	Urban Idea Lab
Erik	Maki	WSP
Dave	Michienzi	Resident
Micheal	Morales	Resident
Katia	Morris	Resident
Etty	Padmodipoetro	Urban Idea Lab
Albert	Pettingill	Resident
Sara	Pettingill	Resident
Janice	Phillips	City of Boston
Domenic	Privitera	WSP
Catherine	Rogers	City of Haverhill
Emily	Weiss	Resident
Billie	Stove	Resident
Eric M	Tarpy	Haverhill Fire Department



First	Last	Affiliation
Emily	Weiss	Resident
Phil	Wgsocki	Resident
Tom	Wylie	Resident
Ann	Spines	Resident