

## **DEIS E-mail Comments**

**Thom Cunningham**

---

**From:** CE&C Administration [Admin@Commonwealth-Eng.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 20, 2001 12:19 PM  
**To:** Joe Levesque  
**Cc:** Vartan Sahakian; Thomas M. Cunningham  
**Subject:** FW: Website Comments

-----Original Message-----

**From:** vnt16.nj2.webhosting.com [mailto:vnt16.nj2.webhosting.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 20, 2001 1:07 AM  
**To:** general@commonwealth-eng.com  
**Subject:** Website Comments

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*

**Name:** Joe Grimard  
**Address:** 42 lawton Ave  
**City:** tiverton  
**State:** ri  
**Zip:** 02878  
**Phone:**  
**Email:** Jgrimard3@aol.com  
**Bl:** Submit  
**Remote Name:** 152.163.204.48  
**Remote User:**  
**HTTP User Agent:** Mozilla/4.0 (compatible; MSIE 5.5; AOL 5.0; Windows 98; Win 9x 4.90)

**Comments:**

I heard a rumor today and was wondering if you could confirm it:  
A co-worker said that there will be a toll on the Sakonnet River Bridge on Rt. 24 to help pay for the repair. Is that true? When will this go into effect and how much will it cost?

**Parker, Edmund**

---

**From:** Matt Mello [mattmello@uri.edu]  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 15, 2001 4:21 AM  
**To:** Fielding, Robert  
**Cc:** cedmonds@dot.state.ri.us; Kenneth M. Bianchi (E-mail); etparker@dot.state.ri.us  
**Subject:** Re: Sakonnet River Bridge Toll Collection

Dear RIBTA and DOT

I was just reading the study on the RIDOT web sit about the possibility of a toll booth for the new Sakonnet River Bridge. If that is the case, I think this is a better reason to implement EZ-Pass ([www.ezpass.com](http://www.ezpass.com)) for both bridges. With this, local residents of Newport County can pay a very low/no toll with the EZ-Pass and anyone else with an EZ-Pass (or FastLane in Mass.) can pay a higher price. I think with the DOT considering a brand new toll collection system for the new Sakonnet River bridge, it would be a good idea to have them both using the EZ-Pass system.

----- Original Message -----

**From:** "Fielding, Robert" <Fielding@pbworld.com>  
**To:** <mattmello@uri.edu>  
**Cc:** "Kenneth M. Bianchi (E-mail)" <ken@ritba.coxatwork.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 06, 2001 10:33  
**Subject:** Claiborne Pell Bridge Toll Collection

> Dear Mr. Mello,  
 >  
 > Thank you for your thoughtful suggestions of June 26 and July 4  
 > concerning  
 > additional conveniences for the users of the Newport/Claiborne Pell  
 > Bridge.  
 > Your thoughts come at a convenient time since the Rhode Island Turnpike  
 > and  
 > Bridge Authority is planning to upgrade the old and unreliable toll  
 > collection system at the Bridge, and at the present time, we are  
 > establishing the requirements for the new system.  
 >  
 > I am a consultant to the Authority assisting them on the upgrade, and have  
 > been asked to respond to you.  
 >  
 > We are intimately familiar with electronic toll collection (ETC) systems  
 > such as E-ZpassSM and FastLane and have considered the benefits such  
 > systems  
 > would provide to users of the Bridge. We have also considered the costs  
 > of  
 > such systems. In summary, we have found that the conveniences you ascribe  
 > to ETC are in general correct; however, at the Claiborne Pell Bridge we  
 > very  
 > rarely experience congestion of the intensity and duration that ETC is  
 > fundamentally designed to mitigate. Also, based on our experience, we  
 > believe that the disadvantages to the use of tokens you mention are minor  
 > to  
 > most of our users. Notwithstanding that, we are attempting to make the  
 > bulk  
 > token sales at the tollbooths and in the business office quicker and more  
 > convenient than at present, to reduce whatever delays arise from those  
 > transactions.  
 >  
 > In addition, installing ETC requires a non-trivial capital outlay for the  
 > various sensors in each lane that are not obvious to the casual observer,  
 > not to mention the costs of the ETC transponders which may be over \$25  
 > each.  
 > Since the Authority's only revenue source is the tolls collected on the  
 > Bridge, we are understandably reluctant to add features that are not  
 > justified by their advantages, or that might add an expense for our users  
 > or  
 > cause a toll increase in the future.

**From:** Fielding, Robert [Fielding@pbworld.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 18, 2001 9:15 AM  
**To:** 'mattmello@uri.edu'  
**Cc:** cedmonds@dot.state.ri.us; etparker@dot.state.ri.us; Kenneth M. Bianchi (E-mail)  
**Subject:** [REDACTED]

> Dear Mr. Mello,

>  
> First, let me say how gratified I am that you are pleased with  
> FastLane/E-ZPass. I personally managed the deployment of E-ZPass in New  
> York City a few years ago, and also (as part of my company's  
> responsibility) advised MTA in the design of FastLane.

>  
> As professionals in the field of toll collection, my company and I have  
> extensive experience with all kinds of toll collection technologies and  
> procedures, and are familiar with the advantages and disadvantages they  
> entail. In addition, toll collection has been and is continuing to be a  
> field that is closely studied by several universities, federal agencies  
> and by toll authorities all over the United States. They share their  
> experiences with each other and the professionals in the field through an  
> international organization (the International Bridge, Tunnel and Turnpike  
> Association) of which RITBA and my company are active members. There is  
> also a plethora of literature, both learned and practical, that we all  
> read, cogitate over and discuss.

>  
> One of the things we all have learned, and it is not restricted to the  
> field of toll collection or to the business of operating public  
> authorities, is that as the assumptions, realities and points of view of a  
> situation change, different courses of action become less or more  
> desirable. That is one reason why political and media polls can so often  
> be interpreted in conflicting ways.

>  
> Finally, please know that we considered all of the ideas you have  
> expressed in your emails in our earliest thinking about the new toll  
> collection system for RITBA. As a result, we have already included  
> provisions to add electronic toll collection, as economically as possible,  
> at the Claiborne Pell Bridge if necessary in the future. In a similar  
> manner, we have also included provisions for adding toll collection to the  
> Sakonnet Bridge.

>  
> We hope you will be pleased with the operation of the new toll collection  
> system when it is activated in the next year or so. And thank you for  
> your interest in the operation of the Claiborne Pell Bridge, and for your  
> patronage.

> Sincerely,

>  
> Bob Fielding  
> Mgr., ETC System Integration  
> PB Farradyne Inc.

>  
> When our new toll collection system is installed and operating next year  
> or  
> soon thereafter, we hope you will be pleased with its operation and the  
> conveniences it will offer. Please feel free to contact us in the future  
> with your observations.  
>  
> Sincerely,  
>  
> Bob Fielding  
> Mgr., ETC System Integration  
> PB Farradyne Inc.  
> 212/465-5775  
> 212/631-3779 (Fax)  
> If you want to learn more about PB Farradyne, go to <http://www.pbfi.com>

**Parker, Edmund**

---

**From:** Xenophontos, Christos  
**Sent:** Monday, July 16, 2001 8:58 AM  
**To:** Parker, Edmund; Farhoumand, Kazem  
**Cc:** Capaldi, James  
**Subject:** FW: Sakonnet River Bridge DEIS



Xenophontos,  
Christos.vcf

Good morning guys,

I received this e-mail over the weekend from a Tiverton resident on the Sakonnet River Bridge.

Christos S. Xenophontos

-----Original Message-----

**From:** M. McKee [mailto:mckee@att.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, July 13, 2001 1:00 PM  
**To:** CSXenos@dot.state.ri.us  
**Subject:** Sakonnet River Bridge DEIS

I would like to think that the engineering analysis and professional presentation that is reflected in the subject report as well as the web site hosting is indicative of a more efficient and responsive RIDOT organization. The rationale presented appears sound and although I am not particularly pleased about the prospect of a toll plaza and the attendant traffic backups this would invite, the technologies are in place for 'Fast Toll' solutions that could mitigate rush hour problems. Would the bridge be managed by RI Bridge and Turnpike Authority?

Now let's see, not taking into account the up front financing, ....\$172M over 30 years @ 40,000 transits/day (one way?) .....that would make the toll somewhere around 30 to 50 cents.

Martin McKee  
Tiverton, R.I.

Parker, Edmund

Response

(Em-3)

---

To: mckeem@att.net  
Subject: Sakonnet River Bridge DEIS

Thank you for your comments on the Sakonnet River Bridge DEIS. In reference to your comment on the Toll Study, I have attached a link to the DEIS. Appendix H includes the Toll Study / Financial Analysis.

[http://www.commonwealth-eng.com/sakonnet/250\\_DEIS/volume1.html](http://www.commonwealth-eng.com/sakonnet/250_DEIS/volume1.html)

**Levesque, Joe**

**From:** Parker, Edmund  
**Sent:** Monday, July 23, 2001 1:10 PM  
**To:** Thomas Cunningham (E-mail)  
**Cc:** Farhoumand, Kazem; Levesque, Joe  
**Subject:** FW: Sakonnet Bridge Study

Mr. Hussey requested a copy of the DEIS. Please check out his comment on the error. Thanks

-----Original Message-----

**From:** **Hussey Frederick B NPRI [mailto:HusseyFB@Npt.NUWC.Navy.Mil]**  
**Sent:** Monday, July 23, 2001 12:40 PM  
**To:** 'etparker@dot.state.ri.us'  
**Subject:** Sakonnet Bridge Study

Mr. Parker,

I called just a few minutes ago, and left a message to ask that a copy of the draft environmental impact study be sent to me and my wife. I forgot to ask who should be contacted if we saw a possible error in the draft report.

The apparent error concerns property owned by my wife and me at 108 Evans Avenue in Tiverton. Table 4-2, which lists affected and potentially affected property for the northern option, lists our property as potentially affected vacant land. In fact, we currently live in a house on that property which would appear to be about 40-50 feet from the footprint of the bridge following the northern route. Our house's location is shown on the corresponding map of the area. I felt I should bring this apparent error to your attention, even though the southern route is the preferred option, and the matter may be moot.

I also want to thank RIDOT for the professional way they have handled this sensitive matter. Dr. Anker suffered mightily at many of the public hearings, but always maintained his composure and professional bearing. In my experience, your department has always been courteous, and has shared information when it could. I am particularly thankful for the unsung effort you have made in the last two weeks to install the delinquent expansion joints. When the bridge reopened with the temporary plates welded over the gaps, I thought we were going to be left to suffer (not in silence) for the summer, in addition to probably losing our homes when the new bridge was built. Now that we know what the outcome is likely to be, and most of the temporary plates are gone on the east side of the bridge, I am in a much more peaceful state of mind.

Thank you for your attention.

Fred Hussey & Jo Ann Faris  
108 Evans Avenue  
Tiverton, RI 02878

**Stone, Sharon**

**From:** pdansereau [pdansereau@rwu.edu]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 26, 2001 7:37 PM  
**To:** rigov@gov.state.ri.us

RECEIVED  
AUG 17 2001  
RI/01  
STATE ENGINEER'S OFFICE

Dear Governor Almond, I am a resident of Tiverton, RI and was hoping you could take a moment to read an editorial from the Sakonnet Times newspaper along with my comments regarding a new Sakonnet River Bridge which links Tiverton & Little Compton to Aquidneck Island.

A new bridge on the south side is a good idea, but tolls are a terrible idea. The DOT suggests that the expense should be borne by the people who live and commute in Bristol and Newport counties. This is unfair and would place an onerous burden on the community, especially since its the fault of the DOT for ignoring the maintenance on the bridge for many years. Tolls will cause more traffic jams like we've been experiencing and I feel this is a slap in the face to Newport and Bristol County residents who have already paid dearly for DOT disregard. This toll solution needs to be shot down, and if there's anything you could do to help would be much appreciated.

Paula M. Dansereau  
Financial Aid Assistant  
Roger Williams University  
One Old Ferry Road  
Bristol, RI 02809  
pdansereau@rwu.edu

**Parker, Edmund**

---

**From:** Foberg, Ronald GS (NSNPT 43A1) [FobergR@nsnpt.navy.mil]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 22, 2001 9:32 AM  
**To:** 'ETPARKER@DOT.STATE.RI.US'  
**Subject:** FW: The \$4 Sakonnet Bridge Toll, & Word 6/95 Comment Form



DEISCFrm.doc

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Moore, Jon GS (NSNPT 43B3)  
 > Sent: Friday, August 10, 2001 1:00 PM  
 > To: Lord, Roger GS (NSNPT 41)  
 > Cc: Yentz Jr, George GS (NSNPT 43C); Foberg, Ronald GS (NSNPT 43A1)  
 > Subject: FW: The \$4 Sakonnet Bridge Toll, & Word 6/95 Comment Form

>  
 >  
 >

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Albert Scott G NPRI [mailto:AlbertSG@Npt.NUWC.Navy.Mil]  
 > <mailto:[mailto:AlbertSG@Npt.NUWC.Navy.Mil]>  
 > Sent: Friday, August 10, 2001 12:39 PM  
 > To: Brian F Clougher (E-mail); Craig F Derewiany (E-mail); Greg Calara  
 > (E-mail); Jon Moore (E-mail); yvetee Farnworth (E-mail)  
 > Subject: FW: The \$4 Sakonnet Bridge Toll, & Word 6/95 Comment Form

>  
 > <<DEISCFrm.doc>>

>  
 >

> Letter RAB01480  
 > August 04, 2001  
 > The \$4 Sakonnet Bridge Toll, & Word 6/95 Comment Form  
 > PLEASE READ AND PASS THIS INFORMATION TO OTHERS TO PROTEST THE PROPOSED \$4  
 > AQUIDNECK ISLAND TOLL.

>  
 > The Sakonnet Bridge Draft Environmental Impact Statement, released on July  
 > 13th, proposed a \$4 one-way toll for the new Sakonnet Bridge to pay for  
 > the  
 > bridge. Apparently, the news media did not read the Toll section (23  
 > pages)  
 > of the report, and never reported that the proposed \$4 one-way toll was  
 > also  
 > suggested for the other 2 bridges leaving Aquidneck Island (so as not to  
 > totally disrupt the flow of traffic leaving the island, and double the  
 > traffic through Bristol, Warren, and Barrington). The proposal includes  
 > an  
 > \$18 million toll plaza at Boyd Lane for the new Sakonnet Bridge, and a new  
 > \$2 million toll plaza for the Mount Hope Bridge. The two toll plazas add  
 > \$20 million to the price tag for the \$108 million bridge; and would cost  
 > (with half price tokens) \$520 / year per commuter or roughly \$1,500 / year  
 > per family. If our taxes pay for the Jamestown Bridge, the new George  
 > Washington Bridge, and other RI bridges, why should Aquidneck Island  
 > commuters / taxpayers be unfairly targeted to pay both taxes

>  
 > This is the web site for the information.  
 > [HTTP://WWW.COMMONWEALTH-ENG.COM/SAKONNET/SAKONNET\\_DEIS.HTML](http://WWW.COMMONWEALTH-ENG.COM/SAKONNET/SAKONNET_DEIS.HTML)  
 > <<[HTTP://WWW.COMMONWEALTH-ENG.COM/SAKONNET/SAKONNET\\_DEIS.HTML](http://WWW.COMMONWEALTH-ENG.COM/SAKONNET/SAKONNET_DEIS.HTML)>>  
 > toll section

> [http://www.commonwealth-eng.com/SAKONNET/250\\_DEIS/pdf/toll.pdf](http://www.commonwealth-eng.com/SAKONNET/250_DEIS/pdf/toll.pdf)  
> Please pass the information around. The more informed publicity and  
> outrage at the tolls that we can gather, the better our chances are at  
> defeating it. The RI DOT is obligated to respond publicly to ALL written  
> comments.

>  
> PLEASE SUBMIT YOUR COMMENTS ON THE ATTACHED FORM, TO THE ADDRESS BELOW.

>  
> I have already talked to the DOT people and informed them that "The  
> Sakonnet Bridge toll would be a reasonable idea, ONLY IF every other  
> similar bridge in RI had an equivalent toll based upon the value of the  
> bridge. The alternative to tolls on all the RI bridges is bridges paid  
> for by taxes." I will also make my thoughts known via the attached  
> Comment Form. However, one voice is routinely ignored. YOUR VOICES /  
> COMMENTS ARE NEEDED, IF WE ARE TO BE HEARD.

>  
> I asked the DOT to make the attached Word 6/95 version of the Comment Form  
> - DEISCFrm.doc (that can be typed on and E-Mailed), the E-Mail address to  
> send the form to Mr. Edmund T. Parker Jr. P.E, ETPARKER@DOT.STATE.RI.US  
> and his corrected Telephone Number, (401) 222-2023 Ext. 4020, all  
> available on the above DOT web site.

>  
> Roger A. Bennis  
> CAESAR69N@ATT.NET

>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>

**Parker, Edmund**

---

**From:** Segerson, Fran  
**Sent:** Monday, September 10, 2001 9:36 AM  
**To:** Parker, Edmund  
**Subject:** FW: Sakonett Bridge

-----  
**From:** Volpdog@webtv.net  
**Sent:** Friday, September 7, 2001 1:04 PM  
**To:** Webmaster@dot.state.ri.us  
**Subject:** Sakonett Bridge

We strongly object to the proposed toll of \$4.00 for the new bridge. We are Portsmouth residents, and live on a fixed income. We travel to the Fall River area daily. It would cost us in excess of \$100.00 per month just to go shopping out to dinner etc. We will be virtual prisoners of this island. It costs \$2.00 each way to leave over the Newport Bridge, and it will cost \$4.00 to leave by the Sakonett Bridge. To go over the Mt. Hope bridge will take forever due to the tremendous increase in traffic caused by others who can't afford the tolls, not to mention problems related to the new traffic light located at Roger Williams University. For many of us there is a life off this island, but we will not be able to enjoy it.

Please reconsider this toll, as you did for Jamestown residents in the same predicament. It is not fair to have to pay a toll at both ends of the island, one is enough.

Thank you,  
Bob & Cathy Volpe  
Portsmouth, RI

**Parker, Edmund**

---

**From:** Segerson, Fran  
**Sent:** Monday, September 10, 2001 9:36 AM  
**To:** Parker, Edmund  
**Subject:** FW: Sakonnet River Bridge

-----  
**From:** Henry Curran  
**Sent:** Friday, September 7, 2001 8:11 PM  
**To:** Webmaster@dot.state.ri.us  
**Subject:** Sakonnet River Bridge

If, when the final decision on the Sakonnet River Bridge is made, and they just happen to decide to rehab the bridge will the Federal Government supply funds for the rehabilitation, or will the state be responsible for the entire cost. This is just a what if question. When people ask me who will foot the bill, I don't have the answer. Hope you can help.

Thank You  
Pat Curran

EM-9

**Parker, Edmund**

---

**From:** CFPIA@aol.com  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 08, 2001 6:24 PM  
**To:** cedmonds@dot.state.ri.us  
**Cc:** etparker@dot.state.ri.us; sakonnet@eastbaynewspapers.com; Editor@newportri.com  
**Subject:** Public Comment on Sakonnet Draft EIS

Mr. Anker,

I would like to register my displeasure with the draft EIS for the Sakonnet River Bridge in Tiverton/Portsmouth RI.

There appears to be a total lack of vision and leadership in this process. To single out the Auto Bridge as an entity to be studied singularly and to minimize the inclusion of other transportation factors mocks the process as reasoned and studied. There is scant mention of the existing rail bridge, and when it is mentioned it typically is only as a justification to build south, as inclusion of the rail bridge dilemma only increases costs; best to ignore it now and revisit it another time in the distant future.

We need leadership. Until the end of civilization the traffic count will continue to go up not down. We need at this juncture to plan for that inevitable growth. It is apparent that DOT has no desire to increase the auto traffic capacity substantially. None of the alternatives provides a discernible increase in capacity over what exists today. Inclusion of the rail line in this infrastructure rehabilitation would plan now for that increased volume.

What does Newport want? More tourists spending more money. What doesn't Newport want? More automobiles. What other means has even a remote possibility of transporting thousands of additional tourists to grow Newport as a tourist Mecca without taxing our existing road infrastructure? Rail. The MBTA has vision and leadership. They understand that Boston can no longer dig its way out of the motor vehicle dilemma. That is why they press southward with more and more substations. Fall River is a done deal. Could we not tap into this to the State of RI's advantage? How many tourists can we draw from Boston and points North via rail?

When you amass the human and machine resources to build such a large scale project as a Bridge, are there no economies of scale to also resolve the rail bridge at the same time? Does anyone think for a minute that bringing all the men and equipment back 10-15 years later to build a rail bridge is going to cost less than if we did it now in conjunction with the auto bridge? Penny wise, pound-foolish. The Federal Government certainly has a labyrinth of rules on what they will fund, but I find it hard to believe there is not more federal dollars to be leveraged for a project that supports rail, auto, mass transit, pedestrian & bicycle access, as well as mitigating a navigation hazard on the water (the old swing bridge). The effort to design and study a new rail bridge alone no doubt will cost millions of dollars as this EIS and the rest of the present planning is now.

So many obstacles, so few willing to sacrifice. "We can't go north, the power lines are in the way and that would cost money." If we're proposing to build a new bridge that is both hurricane and earthquake tolerant, can you think of a better place to attach the vital electrical power distribution infrastructure for this island than to that bridge? Certainly not underwater where it can be snared or crushed, and while overhead has served us well,

will it sustain a category 5 hurricane? And finally, no one wants a power line in his or her yard, why not cross with the bridge and put it where no one will even think to complain about it. Maybe water, natural gas, and other utilities as well?

The EIS seems overly concerned with land acquisition. Families will need to be relocated. The mission appears to be to move as few as possible. The vision should be to move what is necessary. Many of these same folks complained loudly five and ten years' back when the State would do a little maintenance at night. Rightly so. The dilemma here is that the State allowed families to live in close proximity to a bridge of this size in the first place. Everyone in the hot zone should be made a very generous offer to move to a more tranquil location. Start at \$500,000 per and be done with this problem forever. The area in and around the bridge should be a State Park, and then the pesky fisherman won't be bothering anyone, and future maintenance needs will never cause anyone to lose any sleep. In 75 years when this new bridge is used up, we will revisit this for the third time, and it won't be any easier then either. When we reactivate the rail line and commuter/tourist rail buzzes by at 60 mph, do we really want to go through this all over again with the NIMBY's?

The crossing onto Aquidneck Island is fixed. Rocks outcropping on both sides dictate the area within which a bridge can be placed economically. That the old Stone Bridge would even be mentioned is an indication of how misguided this EIS has been. To propose going further South, adding more curvature to the roadway, can only be someone's attempt at reducing bridge-crossing speeds. An alignment to the North of the existing bridge allows for a much straighter and safer shot onto and off of the island.

And lastly, the tolls. How many places in the State of RI are motorists required to pay a toll? One, the Newport Bridge. The state would propose to toll a populace in a ten-mile radius twice but no other in the State? OK, fine bring on the ludicrous toll, but be sure to put one in Providence on I-195 as part of the revamp now underway there. One of RI's largest employers, the Federal/Contractor military R&D workforce is here on Aquidneck Island. This cluster of employer's generates an incredible amount of tax revenue through its predominantly white-collar workers, and we propose to tax them again to get to work? These jobs are not geocentric anymore. While they may have grown out of a wartime need to be on the water edge, most all of what needs to be done can be done anywhere with today's technology. The Fleet is gone, but the jobs are not, let's not drive them away too.

Scott Boyd  
20 Kensington Ave.  
Portsmouth, RI 02871

EM-10

**Parker, Edmund**

---

**From:** Chuck Dore [chuckdore@mac.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 08, 2001 8:12 AM  
**To:** etparker@dot.state.ri.us  
**Subject:** You can forget about your toll plan!

Take it off the boards. We won't stand for it for one second! Enough said!

Charles K Dore

**Farhoumand, Kazem**

EM-11

**From:** Roger A. Bennis [CAESAR68N@ATT.NET]  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 09, 2001 12:08 PM  
**To:** DeAngelis, Anthony; Flanders, Wendall  
**Cc:** Stone, Sharon; Farhoumand, Kazem; (DOT Chief Bridge Eng.); DiBiasio, Dan  
**Subject:** Sakonnet Bridge Traffic Delay Status, SakB0907.DOC



SAKB0907.DOC

68 Narragansett Avenue  
Tiverton, RI 02878  
Telephone (401) 624-3449 (Home)  
(401) 847-2260 (Work)  
E-Mail: CAESAR68N@ATT.NET  
CAESAR68N@EXCITE.COM  
Letter RAB01C05  
September 09, 2001  
To:  
Anthony DeAngelis  
Wendell Flanders  
cc:  
Dr. William Ankner  
Kazem Farhoumand, PE  
Dan DiBiasio

Gentlemen,

Pursuant to our conversations of September 06 & 07, 2001, I am sending a copy of my "SAKONNET BRIDGE TRAFFIC DELAY LOG", RB01C04.DOC / SAKB0907. I hope that this log will improve the DOT's visibility of the problem at the Sakonnet Bridge Repair Project, and hopefully instigate meaningful corrective actions that can be applied to other construction delays.

Unfortunately, since I live a few thousand feet south of the bridge, I enter Route 24 South at Main Road (or at the Central Avenue Suicide Entrance during construction only), and I cannot normally report meaningful Southbound Delays.

Very Truly Yours,

Roger A. Bennis

**Farhoumand, Kazem**

(Em-11)

**From:** caesar68n@att.net  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 09, 2001 6:54 PM  
**To:** Farhoumand, Kazem; (DOT Chief Bridge Eng.)  
**Cc:** CAESAR68N@ATT.NET  
**Subject:** Undeliverable: Sakonnet Bridge Traffic Delay Status, SakB0907.DOC (fwd)



Sakonnet Bridge  
Traffic Delay ...

Kazem,

Since the original message was returned as undeliverable, I am reducing the name part of your E-Mail address to a standard 8 digit name. I hope that the 8 digit name is successful.

Roger Bennis

Forwarded Message: \_\_\_\_\_

**From:** System Administrator <postmaster@DOT.STATE.RI.US>  
**To:** CAESAR68N@ATT.NET  
**Subject:** Undeliverable: Sakonnet Bridge Traffic Delay Status, SakB0907.DOC  
**Date:** Sun, 9 Sep 2001 12:00:03 -0400

Your message

**To:** DeAngelis, Anthony (SakBr Eng.); Flanders, Wendell(Chief of Eng.Operations Div)  
**Cc:** Ankner, Dr. William (DOT Director); Farhoumand, Kazem; (DOT Chief Bridge Eng.); DiBiasio, Mr. Dan, DOT PR  
**Subject:** Sakonnet Bridge Traffic Delay Status, SakB0907.DOC  
**Sent:** Sun, 9 Sep 2001 12:07:54 -0400

did not reach the following recipient(s):

Farhoumand, Kazem; (DOT Chief Bridge Eng.) on Sun, 9 Sep 2001 11:59:58 -0400  
The recipient name is not recognized  
The MTS-ID of the original message is: c=us;a= ;p=department of  
tr;l=RIDOTPDC0109091559R8VLLJ9X  
MSEXCH:IMS:Department of Transportation:DOT.STATE.RI.US:RIDOTPDC 0  
(000C05A6) Unknown Recipient



Thom Cunningham

---

**From:** Parker, Edmund [etparker@DOT.STATE.RI.US]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 03, 2001 7:43 AM  
**To:** Farhoumand, Kazem  
**Cc:** Levesgue, Joe; Thomas Cunningham (E-mail)  
**Subject:** FW: Sakonnet River Bridge

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Struancamp@aol.com [mailto:Struancamp@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 02, 2001 5:12 PM  
**To:** etparker@dot.state.ri.us  
**Subject:** Sakonnet River Bridge

I do not have a comment as to which of the five proposals being put forward should ultimately be chosen, but as I commute from Boston to Portsmouth and back daily, I feel that on the northbound side the merge from two lanes into one should be a mile away from the bridge. This would prevent cars from travelling up the inside lane and being forced to merge right at the bridge, which results in a backlog as far back as the Mount Hope Bridge exit. Merging earlier would allow cars to travel faster through the single lane area thus clearing congestion. At the moment it takes, on average, twenty minutes to cross the bridge in the afternoon and I feel that this would be greatly cut down in the merge were further away from the bridge itself. Thank you for listening.  
Struan Campbell

**Thom Cunningham**

---

**From:** Parker, Edmund [etparker@DOT.STATE.RI.US]  
**Sent:** Friday, October 05, 2001 10:15 AM  
**To:** Farhoumand, Kazem  
**Cc:** Levesque, Joe; Thomas Cunningham (E-mail)  
**Subject:** FW: DEIS submission



DEIS-kmo.doc

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Orton, Steve [mailto:SORton@Logicon.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, October 05, 2001 8:59 AM  
**To:** 'etparker@dot.state.ri.us '  
**Cc:** 'steven.orton@netzero.net '  
**Subject:** DEIS submission

Mr. Parker,

Please find my DEIS comment attached as a Word document.

Thank you,  
Steven Orton



**SAKONNET RIVER BRIDGE  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT  
STATEMENT (DEIS)  
AND  
DRAFT SECTION 4(f) EVALUATION  
PUBLIC COMMENT FORM**

NAME: Kathleen Orton

ADDRESS: 27 Champlin St., Newport, Rhode Island 02840

POSITION / AFFILIATION: Aquidneck Island Resident

COMMENTS:

I am adamantly opposed to the State's institution of a toll to help pay for the construction of a new bridge over the Sakonnet River. I believe this toll will so negatively affect the quality of life in this area, the state runs the great risk of losing a large part of the state's vitality. Besides the obvious and immediate affects on commuters and travelers, it will also have far reaching affects.

The city of Tiverton and the township of Little Compton will be completely isolated from the rest of the state. Not only will residents of these towns feel isolated from family and friends who live on Aquidneck island, but it seems to me that it should be illegal. There will be no "free" access to the rest of the state for these residents without leaving the state first. Businesses will also suffer, especially those that need to travel over the bridge multiple times per day. If it comes to a choice between having to avoid trips over the bridge to save money, it will be done in an instant, further isolating Tiverton and Little Compton.

Instituting a toll with the idea that it is making visitors pay the most by creating a perceived relief to the residents by offering a reduced toll price is a fallacy. Visitors to Aquidneck Island are under very low time pressures and will not hesitate to bypass the proposed toll plaza by going through Bristol. Commuters and business workers often will not have that option. Also, residents of the island will bypass the toll on their way to the major shopping areas to the north. This bypass will again be through Bristol and neighboring towns to the north. This increased traffic will put undue strain on the secondary roads, thereby reducing the quality of life in this section of the state.

In my opinion, the proposed addition of a toll to pay for the new bridge will essentially drive families and business owners out of the area and maybe out of the state. They will harbor resentment of the fact that they are being called upon to further pay for a necessary link to the state over and above the current toll over the Clayborn-Pell Bridge and state taxes. It will drastically affect the quality of life of all residents by adding to the feeling of isolation and will make Aquidneck Island residents feel more "island bound". It seems to me that this whole plan is being enacted because of the fact that this is a popular tourist area and the toll will mostly affect them and not the residents. It is a wrong assumption. There must be

other sources of revenue to pay for the bridge. The residents, businesses and the State's vitality are counting on it.

Please print and mail this form, by September 7, 2001, to:

Edmund T. Parker, Jr., P.E.  
Chief Design Engineer  
Rhode Island Department of Transportation  
Two Capitol Hill - Room 231D  
Providence, Rhode Island 02903

Thom Cunningham

From: Parker, Edmund [etparker@DOT.STATE.RI.US]  
Sent: Friday, October 05, 2001 2:59 PM  
To: Farhoumand, Kazem  
Cc: Levesque, Joe; Thomas Cunningham (E-mail)  
Subject: FW: Miscellaneous Environmental Impact



MiscEnvironmentImpac  
t.doc



ATT15375.bt

-----Original Message-----

From: Dave Pritchard [mailto:dpritch@MIT.EDU]  
Sent: Friday, October 05, 2001 2:45 PM  
To: etparker@dot.state.ri.us  
Subject: Miscellaneous Environmental Impact

Dear Mr. Parker,

Your secretary gave me your e-mail for this comment and a more important accompanying one on NOISE. She suggested that you would call me after reading these. I would very much appreciate this, as I might be able to help with this process.

Sincerely,

Dave

Other Sources of Environmental Pollution:

Here are two less discussed sources of environmental impact of the bridge.

- 1) Seismic Noise: Visitors to our house usually wake up on weekday mornings complaining that their bed was shaking. Actually the whole house shakes when the traffic is heavy or when a heavy truck crosses onto the bridge from the landfill area. This used to be much worse before the bridge was repaired at our end - then each unloaded truck actually lifted off and came down with a loud noise and a slightly delayed shake of the house.
- 2) Light Pollution. Don't forget the lights. They are so bright that they ruin the dark adaption that drivers get on the unlit sections of Rt 24 on either side of the bridge. Why does it have to be so bright?? And why does so much light have to escape unused to the side?

Dave Pritchard

### **Other Sources of Environmental Pollution:**

Here are two less discussed sources of environmental impact of the bridge.

- 1) **Seismic Noise:** Visitors to our house usually wake up on weekday mornings complaining that their bed was shaking. Actually the whole house shakes when the traffic is heavy or when a heavy truck crosses onto the bridge from the landfill area. This used to be much worse before the bridge was repaired at our end – then each unloaded truck actually lifted off and came down with a loud noise and a slightly delayed shake of the house.
  
- 2) **Light Pollution.** Don't forget the lights. They are so bright that they ruin the dark adaption that drivers get on the unlit sections of Rt 24 on either side of the bridge. Why does it have to be so bright?? And why does so much light have to escape unused to the side? Dave Pritchard, Room 26-241, MIT, Cambridge, MA 02139 or phoning 617 253 6812.

Thom Cunningham

From: Parker, Edmund [etparker@DOT.STATE.RI.US]  
 Sent: Friday, October 05, 2001 2:58 PM  
 To: Farhoumand, Kazem  
 Cc: Levesque, Joe; Thomas Cunningham (E-mail)  
 Subject: FW: Sakonnet Bridge Noise



Noise.doc



ATT15381.txt

-----Original Message-----

From: Dave Pritchard [mailto:dpritch@MIT.EDU]  
 Sent: Friday, October 05, 2001 2:45 PM  
 To: etparker@dot.state.ri.us  
 Subject: Sakonnet Bridge Noise

NOISE

The most significant environmental impact of the Sakonnet River Bridge is noise. Noise cannot be eliminated by looking the other way, and it penetrates inside one's house. Furthermore, noise carries great distances over water, and makes the outdoor environment near the bridge unpleasant and tiring. (My wife and I have to shout at each other to talk in our front yard.) In all the above respects, noise impact is worse than visual impact. Indeed, while some will opine that the new bridge looks good, no one says that it sounds good! With bridge noise, less is best!

The predominant form of bridge noise comes from tire noise. Excepting motorcycles and trucks, engine noise is nearly imperceptible relative to tire noise. There are two types of tire noise: the relatively steady hiss or whine of the tires on the road material and the impact noise of tires hitting the expansion joints in the bridge.

Both of these major types of bridge noise depend critically on the selection of materials for the roadway and expansion joints and on the overall design. Here are some measurements I made on the present bridge that illustrate this point: Measurements were made approximately 9 feet from the center of the lane about 4 feet above the pavement unless noted otherwise. The "A" spectral weighting was used (it attenuates low frequencies to approximate human response).

decibels	Source of Noise	Type of noise
<b>Expansion Joints</b>		
100	Tire over new expansion joint (0.2s avg)	Loud Thunk
<b>Various Pavements (one car only)</b>		
85	Tire noise on grooved* concrete	whine
76	Noise shielded by Jersey barrier	duller whine



I would be happy to talk with designers about my study, to provide a recording of the noise, or to serve on a citizen's review committee. Our house is at 44 Riverside Ave, Portsmouth - about 100 feet from the proposed southern side new bridge. You can contact me at [dpritch@mit.edu](mailto:dpritch@mit.edu) or by writing Prof. Dave Pritchard, Room 26-241, MIT, Cambridge, MA 02139 or phoning 617 253 6812.

Hoping to hear from you.

EM-15

**Parker, Edmund**

---

**From:** Neil Lynch [nlynchff21@home.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 06, 2001 10:53 AM  
**To:** etparker@dot.state.ri.us  
**Subject:** September 6th meeting Sakonnet River Bridge Alignment

Dear Mr. Parker, at the meeting held on 9/06/01, Dr. Ankner was handed a petition by Chris Cotta. I believe 132 people signed this petition in favor of a different alignment other than that of the D.O.T.. I was wondering if I could obtain a copy of this document and if so how to go about obtaining it. Thank you for your time in this matter, Neil Lynch

Neil Lynch  
200 Riverside Drive  
Tiverton, R.I.  
02878

10/09/2001

Thom Cunningham

RESPONSE

(EM-15)

**From:** Parker, Edmund [etparker@DOT.STATE.RI.US]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 09, 2001 9:34 AM  
**To:** 'Neil Lynch'  
**Subject:** RE: September 6th meeting Sakonnet River Bridge Alignment

We will send you a copy of the petition.

-----Original Message-----

From: Neil Lynch [mailto:nlynchff21@home.com]  
Sent: Saturday, October 06, 2001 10:53 AM  
To: etparker@dot.state.ri.us  
Subject: September 6th meeting Sakonnet River Bridge Alignment

Dear Mrs. Parker, at the meeting held on 9/06/01, Dr. Ankner was handed a petition by Chris Cotta. I believe 132 people signed this petition in favor of a different alignment other than that of the D.O.T.. I was wondering if I could obtain a copy of this document and if so how to go about obtaining it. Thank you for your time in this matter, Neil Lynch

Neil Lynch  
200 Riverside Drive  
Tiverton, R.I.  
02878