

# BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT CONFERENCE REPORT

**SUBJECT:** Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting

**DATE OF CONFERENCES:** April 12, 2018

**LOCATION OF CONFERENCE:** John O. Morton Building

**ATTENDED BY:**

**NHDOT**

Sheila Charles  
Keith Cota  
Ron Crickard  
D.J. Doherty  
Meli Dube  
Jill Edelmann  
Jon Evans  
Sally Gunn  
Wendy Johnson  
Marc Laurin  
Carol Niewola  
Leah Savage  
Trent Zanes

**ACOE**

Michael Hicks

**NHDHR**

Laura Black  
David Trubey

**FHWA (via phone)**

Jamie Sikora

**CHA**

Bill Ashford

**LM Preservation**

Lisa Mausolf

**MJ**

Jed Merrow

**Preservation Co.**

Lynn Monroe  
Reagan Ruedig

**Smart Associates**

Jenn Riordan

**Stantec**

Janice Bland  
Amy Gray  
(via phone)

**VHB**

Nicole Benjamin-  
Ma

Greg Goodrich  
Pete Walker

**Warrenstreet  
Architects**

Zachary Brock

**Town of  
Claremont**

Bryan Burr  
Ryan McNutt

**Consulting/Other  
Parties**

Kitty Henderson  
Nathan Holth  
Senator D.Watters

**PROJECTS/PRESENTATIONS REVIEWED THIS MONTH:**

*(minutes on subsequent pages)*

Claremont Municipal Airport (CFDA No: 20-106; R & C 5479).....	1
Ossipee 29315, X-A003(995).....	3
Swanzy 40485, X-A004(415).....	4
Haverhill-Benton 41297, X-A004(587) .....	5
Nashua-Merrimack-Bedford 13761 (ACOE as lead agency).....	6
Newington-Dover 11238S.....	7

**Claremont Municipal Airport (CFDA No: 20-106; R & C 5479)**

Participants: Bryan Burr, Claremont Fire Chief/Airport Manager; Zachary Brock, Ryan McNutt, City of Claremont; Janice Bland, Stantec; Carol Niewola, NHDOT Bureau of Aeronautics

Continued consultation and discussion of options for mitigating the demolition of the 1927 aircraft hangar at Claremont Municipal Airport that was recently determined to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion C.

**Project Overview:**

- The existing 1927 hangar at Claremont Municipal Airport is to be demolished and

replaced with a new terminal building. The existing hangar is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places under criterion C (embodies distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction) and requires mitigation.

### **Mitigation Options:**

The following mitigation options were discussed at the meeting:

- **NHAHS:** Stantec has reached out to the Aviation Museum of NH, part of the NH Aviation Historical Society (NHAHS), for mitigation ideas and is waiting on their response. Laura Black (NHDHR) asked that the Claremont Historical Society also be contacted for possible mitigation options in advance of selecting a mitigation option.
  - **Model:** A small scale model that could be showcased within the new terminal building with interpretive language on a story board. Ryan McNutt, City Manager of Claremont, explained that he would like to see something physically within the building, such as a scale model, and not a document that Airport users may never read or take interest in. He explained that the model could be a valuable tool to peak interest for people to view because of its approachability and visibility. Airport users and the public would be able to visually see and remember, or learn about the historical hangar and the value the airport brought to the community. School children touring the airport could be inspired to conduct research projects of their own about the hangar, the Airport, or their community. Janice Bland (Stantec) explained that the model could be located in a prominent spot in the new terminal building addressing Laura's (NHDHR) question.
- **Incorporating building features into the design:**
  - Signage – install similar signage on the front face (south) and roof of the new terminal building. The group discussed reusing the current signage, but Zach (Warrenstreet)/Janice (Stantec) explained that the historical signage was painted on and the current signage and not able to be reused.
  - Trusses within terminal building – Zach (Warrenstreet) discussed the option of designing wood and metal roof trusses for the new terminal building similar to the existing hangar.
  - Laura (NHDHR) commented that it is important not to try to replicate/ falsely recreate historical features, but agreed that the use of historical font and the trusses included in the design of the new terminal building is a good idea.
- **Context Study:**
  - Laura (NHDHR) explained that often times NHDHR likes to see context studies for topics and resource-types that NH is losing, and for which contextual information does not yet exist. She mentioned a current effort to research mid-century modern resources in the state; and a phased approach of aviation infrastructure as an example for a context study. No further discussion was held regarding this mitigation option.
- **Documentation:**

- Laura (NHDHR) explained that the National Park Service has a few Historical Documentation Programs including the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) and Historical American Buildings Survey (HABS). This type of documentation would ultimately be submitted to the Library of Congress. There are several different levels of documentation/effort/formats including archival photography, a report, or a high level outline that would include information from the individual area form.

In conclusion, Carol (NHDOT) explained that completing multiple historical mitigation items is not likely to be feasible or eligible for FAA's funding as being necessary, appropriate, reasonable and justifiable. Also, because she was not familiar with the Historic Documentation Programs, the project team (Stantec, CNH, NHDOT) would need to discuss this option internally. Laura (NHDHR) reiterated the importance of speaking with the Aviation Museum of NH and the Claremont Historical Society for mitigation ideas. Carol (NHDOT) confirmed that the city can move forward with the Memorandum of Adverse Effect now and can complete the Memorandum of Agreement detailing the mitigation efforts later.

### **Ossipee 29315, X-A003(995)**

Participants: Meli Dube, Mike Dugas, Sally Gunn, Trent Zanes, NHDOT

Continued consultation on the NH RT 28 intersection improvements, the eligible property and effect finding, and potential mitigation.

Meli Dube, NHDOT Bureau of Environment, provided an overview of the project and the history of Section 106 consultation up to this point. The proposed project involves intersection improvements at the intersection of NH Route 28 and NH Route 171 in Ossipee. The original scope of the project involved installing a right turn lane on NH Route 28 southbound, updating signage and re-aligning the existing islands at the intersection. This work was reviewed by NH Division of Historic Resources and the Federal Highway Administration and the project was given a "No Historic Properties Affected" determination in August, 2016. The Town of Ossipee had requested a more substantial improvement at the intersection due to public input and concern regarding the high incidence of crashes, however, the Department had selected the alternative described above due to cost and impact considerations associated with more severe alterations. Before the project was scheduled to advertise, a crash involving a double fatality occurred which increased public demand for more substantial safety improvements and prompted the Department to re-evaluate the design alternative selection. The Department presented two alternatives to the Town, including installation of a traffic signal and installation of a roundabout. The public has indicated a preference for the roundabout option and the Department supports this selection because it fully addresses all safety concerns at the intersection.

M. Dube explained that installation of a roundabout would increase the footprint of the roadway, including impacts to right-of-way on three properties. Individual inventories were completed for two of the properties and one, the Horace Webber House located at 5 Courthouse Square in the northeast quadrant of the intersection, was determined to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places under Criteria C. Increased pavement due to the round-about installation will remain within existing Department Controlled Access Right-of-Way so impacts to

this parcel are limited to slope grading and landscaping. There are no anticipated impacts to the structure.

Laura Black, NH Division of Historic Resources, inquired about the differences in safety improvements associated with signalized intersections and roundabouts. Sally Gunn, NHDOT Bureau of Highway Design, explained that roundabouts are the ideal safety solution for three and four leg intersections because they slow traffic down and provide continuous flow through the intersection. M. Dube provided an explanation of the safety issues at the intersection as determined by the 2009 Road Safety Audit, which included high speeds, poor sight distances and visibility resulting in failure to yield or see turning vehicles and an existing skewed intersection. A roundabout would address all of the safety concerns fully while a signal would address some but would increase the likelihood of rear-end crashes due to high speeds.

David Trubey, NH Division of Historic Resources, asked if permanent stormwater treatment will be required. M. Dube confirmed that it would be necessary and that the Department's Water Quality Program Manager had reviewed the project and made suggestions for placement of a treatment swale, including an existing ditch line in the southwest quadrant along NH Route 28. Trent Zanes, NHDOT Bureau of Highway Design, explained that the project is being designed by a consultant and options have not been fully examined yet but the intent is to keep all treatment structures inside the existing right-of-way.

L. Black asked if access to the Horace Webber House, which is currently a lawyer's office, would be impacted. T. Zanes explained that the roundabout would be designed to allow normal access from all directions to the property. L. Black also inquired about the need to clear trees on the property, however, pictures of the current condition show that no trees are growing in the proposed work area so no clearing is anticipated. L. Black inquired about the possibility of installing some landscaping features to provide a screen between the proposed roundabout and the historic structure, T. Zanes explained that any agreements on landscaping would be coordinated through the Department's Right-of-Way Acquisition process. Pictures also showed the presence of a granite right-of-way marker at the corner of the property, T. Zanes stated that this could be reset during construction.

L. Black asked if the owner of the Horace Webber House has been consulted during the public outreach process. T. Zanes confirmed that the owner was not in attendance at most recent public informational meeting where the roundabout alternative was presented. L. Black suggested reaching out to the owner directly to gather input on the proposed impacts to the property. She also suggested including need for the impacts due to the safety issues at the intersection in the affect memo.

### **Swanzey 40485, X-A004(415)**

Participants: Marc Laurin, Leah Savage, Sally Gunn, DJ Doherty, NHDOT

Continued consultation and discussion of intersection reconstruction at Old Homestead Highway (NH 32) and Sawyer's Crossing Road.

Leah Savage made a brief presentation on the proposed project. This project is a highway safety improvement project due to the high accident rate, number of traffic conflict points and the high

number of pedestrians use as it is located adjacent to an elementary school and high school. The project is proposed to replace the existing triangle intersection of NH 32 with Sawyer's Crossing Road with a small 120 foot diameter roundabout that will mostly fit within the existing intersection's footprint. Drainage will be replaced and a treatment swale provided between the high school's parking lot and NH 32. A new sidewalk will be added along the east side of the roundabout. Pedestrian crossings will be added to all legs of the roundabout that will connect to the existing sidewalks. The project is located within the Swanzey Civic Historic District and ten properties within the project area were identified as contributing to the District. There are a few direct minor slope impacts to these properties, mainly driveway matches. Small planted maple trees on the high school property, and a row of pine trees, which are not healthy, located along the high school parking lot will be removed. The project was designed to avoid impacts to the historic stonewalls located within the project area. The project is anticipated to be advertised in September 2018 for construction in the summer of 2019.

Jill Edelmann asked what effect, if any, would the removal of the existing triangle configuration of the intersection, and the large pine tree within the triangle, would be to the District. Laura B. responded that the alternative would be impactful to the District as the road infrastructure and landscape features contribute to the District and this configuration has been documented since at least 1805. The impacts would be adverse. Laura B. inquired if other alternatives that would avoid or minimize impacts to the District were investigated. Leah S. responded that the Road Safety Audit conducted for this intersection did investigate alternatives, including a "T" intersection with the potential for a traffic signal. Laura B. stated that these alternatives will need to be further evaluated and presented to provide DHR the opportunity to compare the impacts.

Sally Gunn asked what the process would be if the roundabout alternative were chosen as the preferred that meets the needs of the project. Laura B. stated that as it would be an adverse effect, an MOA would need to be developed and appropriate mitigation provided. Sally G. stated that the alternatives' impacts will be evaluated and described, and brought for review at a future Cultural Resource meeting.

### **Haverhill-Benton 41297, X-A004(587)**

Participants: Jennifer Riordan, Smart Associates; Lisa Mausolf, Architectural Historian; Ron Crickard, Bill Saffian, NHDOT

Initial consultation on the preservation/rehabilitation project for two NH RT 25 over Oliverian Brook bridges. David Scott (NHDOT) provided an overview of the project, which involves preservation work on two concrete deck on steel beam bridges:

- NH Route 25 over Oliverian Brook (067/092), located in the Town of Haverhill; and
- NH Route 25 over Oliverian Brook (058/052), located in the Town of Benton.

Work on the 1975 Haverhill bridge will consist of the removal and replacement of bridge pavement and membrane, partial and full depth concrete deck repair, and installation of new deck joints. In addition, the surface of the wingwalls will be repaired. The coping on the guardrail on the southern side of the bridge will also be replaced. The removal of an existing sidewalk on the bridge and along a segment of NH Route 25 was originally proposed but was discussed at a Public Information Meeting and is no longer part of the project. The Haverhill bridge is located near

several buildings, including Pike Hall to the southeast and an abandoned brick building to the northeast.

Work on the 1960 Benton bridge will be similar to the Haverhill bridge, except that the guardrail will not be replaced and there will be no work on the abutments/wingwalls.

Both bridges will remain open during construction and traffic will be shifted on the existing bridges.

Jenn Riordan (The Smart Associates) provided an overview of the cultural resources present. Independent Archaeological Consulting (IAC) just completed a Phase IA study for the Haverhill bridge. A draft report has been prepared but not submitted to NHDOT yet. IAC's study recommends no further surveys since the project impacts fall within the existing bridge/roadway footprint which is not sensitive for archaeological resources. IAC identified two sensitive areas adjacent to the bridge and the abandoned brick building but these will not be affected.

No excavation is proposed at the Benton bridge so no archaeological resources will be impacted. There are also no buildings or potential historic districts within the vicinity of the Benton bridge. A Program Comment for Post-1945 Concrete and Steel Bridges form will be completed for this bridge.

Since the Haverhill bridge is located within a potential historic district, there was discussion as to whether an Area Form would be required. Laura Black felt that since the impacts are limited to the non-historic bridge, there is no need to do an Area Form. If the impacts change, then this requirement would need to be reviewed again.

Jill asked if the project could be covered under the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement even though the Haverhill bridge is in a potential historic district. Laura stated that although the work itself doesn't require an Area Form, NHDOT should use the regular Section 106 review process for this project. The Effects Memo should mention the potential historic district.

Jenn said that it was in The Smart Associates' scope of work to prepare a draft Effects Memo. Jill said that she could provide examples.

#### **Nashua-Merrimack-Bedford 13761 (ACOE as lead agency)**

Participants: Jed Merrow, McFarland Johnson; Bill Ashford, CHA; Lynne Monroe, Preservation Company; Wendy Johnson, Jon Evans, NHDOT

Continued consultation to discuss the material presented in the amended Request for Project Review submitted for the Everett Turnpike widening project. This material pertained to the improvements proposed at the properties along the turnpike with structures over 50 years old. Archeology was not addressed at this meeting.

Laura Black has reviewed the material and found the photos and captions helpful. She noted some possible indirect effects related to viewsheds, noise or atmospheric effects, smaller tree buffer. At this point in the meeting, based on the information provided, no inventory was recommended.

Ms. Black asked about detention basins within the Pennichuck Water Works land.

The Army Corps will be the lead federal agency. Mike Hicks indicated the Corps Section 106 jurisdiction would only occur where there are aquatic resources under their jurisdiction. He will review project mapping and determine what areas they have jurisdiction over. The Corps' Section 106 procedures are described in "Appendix C". The EPA may comment on findings.

Jon Evans asked about detention basins that outlet to wetlands. Mr. Hicks noted that if there is no wetland fill, they would be regulated only as indirect impacts.

Two public meetings have occurred. DOT reported that noise is a "hot button issue for the public." Mike H. noted a past experience where the ACOE was sued due to noise. This prompted a discussion regarding noise, public concerns, and how to assess effects from a noise perspective. Decisions for noise are being made at the state level, with only state DOT regs being used. Ms. Black asked whether state noise policy was stricter than federal. Mr. Evans responded that the state sets its own policy but it is consistent with federal guidelines. NH applies it to both federally funded and other highway projects.

Ms. Black noted that noise can result in indirect effects, and public concern is a factor in determining whether it is advisable to complete the identification step of the Section 106 process through inventory. She suggested the Department may benefit from examining the effects of noise further.

Mr. Evans noted that noise impacts are defined in federal regulations. If such impacts are identified, noise abatement would be considered. Ms. Black noted that noise regulations are different from Section 106; Section 106 criteria of adverse effect can be a qualitative analysis. Suggested looking into how other agencies who deal with noise and Section 106, such as FAA, assess the need for inventory and this type of effect. Use these agencies' experience for questions that can be asked to make these assessments.

Lynne Monroe asked whether noise barriers could have an effect on historic properties. Ms. Black noted that a tree buffer would remain in most locations, and the setting is already a built highway landscape. Ms. Edlmann said she would consider properties over 50 years old where noise barriers are not proposed.

Mr. Merrow asked which agency will be making effects determinations. Where there is Army Corps jurisdiction, they will make the determinations. In other areas, the Department will make an opinion and consult with DHR.

Ms. Edlmann has developed a draft No Adverse Effects memo. Mr. Hicks will review project information and determine whether the Corps has concerns regarding Section 106 effects.

### **Newington-Dover 11238S**

Participants: Nicole Benjamin-Ma, Greg Goodrich, Pete Walker, VHB; Keith Cota, Ron Crickard, Bob Juliano, Marc Laurin, NHDOT ; Michael Hicks, ACOE; Via telephone: Kitty Henderson (Historic Bridge Foundation), Nathan Holth (historicbridges.org), Consulting Parties; Senator David Watters, District 4

Continued consultation and presentation of the Reasonable Range of Alternatives to be evaluated in the SDEIS.

We met to further the Section 106 Consultation regarding the potential rehabilitation or replacement of the General Sullivan Bridge (GSB). The goal of the meeting was to discuss a list of preliminary alternatives that would be screened as part of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) currently being prepared for the project.

K. Cota provided a brief project status update. The 2007 Newington-Dover Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and 2008 Record of Decision (ROD), as well as the Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) executed as part of the EIS, stipulated the General Sullivan Bridge (GSB) would be preserved in the long-term for bicycle/pedestrian use. However, based on the results of intensive structural inspections and engineering analysis conducted from 2009 to 2017, NHDOT has found that rehabilitation of the General Sullivan Bridge may not be possible. NHDOT made a request of FHWA for an opportunity to reconsider alternatives to the rehabilitation of the GSB; FHWA indicated that a SEIS would be necessary to re-evaluate alternatives.

As a first step in the SEIS process, NHDOT prepared a Coordination Plan, which outlines how NHDOT will handle communication and coordination. Coordination to date has included a public announcement via newspaper, a public information meeting on Jan. 30th in Dover, and previous cultural agency coordination meetings (August 11, 2016; December 14, 2017). The public information meeting included information about Section 106 and how to become a consulting party. One additional consulting party was identified as a result of the meeting, Karen Saltus, President of the Seacoast Area Bicycle Riders (SABR). Jill Edelman confirmed that K. Saltus did receive an invitation to the current meeting. A second public information meeting is expected to occur in June or July. Keith explained that progress has been made on identifying alternatives. Once alternatives are identified, NHDOT will apply a set of screening criteria to eliminate unreasonable alternatives. The remaining alternatives will constitute a “reasonable range of alternatives” for evaluation of potential impacts.

G. Goodrich presented a summary of the alternatives currently under consideration, some of which were identified during the public involvement process. The alternatives are explained and illustrated in more detail in a memorandum from VHB to NHDOT dated April 5, 2018, *General Sullivan Bridge Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Description of Bridge Alternatives*. This memorandum was distributed to the coordinating agencies and consulting parties in advance of the current meeting.

G. Goodrich began with some general notes:

- Design guidelines of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) use a minimum path width of 12 feet for bicycle/pedestrian paths (10 feet for the path plus one foot on each side to clear obstructions). The desired path width for the Newington-Dover crossing is 16 feet (12 feet for the path plus two feet on each side for obstructions) – allows two-way traffic and passing maneuvers.
- VHB was asked to evaluate the possibility of extending the existing southbound Little Bay Bridge (LBB) pier cap, to accommodate a wider deck. The west bridge fascia would need a 13.5-foot pier cap extension, which is problematic.
  - Required new dowels would be in constant tension without additional support columns (see Alt. 6).



- Post-tensioning could help relieve the problem, but may shorten the service life of the LBB and is expensive.
- Extending pier cap cantilever from eight feet to 21.5 feet is not feasible with existing LBB cap thickness.
- Alternatives 1-4 were discussed in the 2017 Type, Size and Location report (TS&L):
  - Alt. 1: Complete rehabilitation of GSB (consistent with MOA)
  - Alt. 2: Complete superstructure replacement of GSB, retaining substructure
  - Alt. 3: Partial rehabilitation of GSB – rehabilitation of central spans 4-6, replacement of approach spans 1-3 and 7-9
  - Alt. 4: Complete replacement of GSB
- New Alternatives have been added, based on input received since TS&L. Many include the use and/or modification of the LBB:
  - Alt. 5: Reconfigure existing southbound LBB
    - Provides only two feet wide path for bicycle/pedestrian traffic
    - Would not meet purpose and need, would be eliminated in initial screening process
  - Alt. 6: Widen the southbound LBB - Adds girder and pier extension to existing GSB substructure to support widened LLB bridge
    - Alt. 6A: Widen to the minimum roadway/minimum path extent
      - Adds one girder line
    - Alt. 6B: Widen to the desirable roadway/minimum path extent
      - Adds two girder lines
    - Alt. 6C: Widen to the desirable roadway/desirable path extent
      - Adds two girder lines
  - Alt. 7: New separate pedestrian/bicycle path superstructure – adjacent to southbound LBB superstructure but not connected to the LBB deck.
    - Set on girder and pier extension, similar to Alt. 6
  - Alt. 8: Rehabilitation of the GSB with a 75-year life span
    - Similar to Alt. 1, but consistent with expectations of new construction alternatives
  - Alt. 9: Superstructure replacement of GSB, girder/frame option
    - Similar to Alt. 2, but replaces GSB superstructure with a steel girder system rather than a truss (visually inconsistent with current GSB)

Sen. Watters asked whether the planning accounts for the 75-year level of sea level rise? G. Goodrich says VHB will consider this during design and evaluation of alternatives.

P. Walker reviewed the screening criteria for the first step of the alternatives analysis. At this point, the alternatives are just being defined; no decisions have been made.

- Purpose and Need: does the alternative meet the project's purpose and need – provide bicycle and pedestrian access between Newington and Dover
- Feasibility: is the alternative technically feasible, providing a practical duration, without excessive impacts (environmental and access)
- Cost: is the cost for construction and life cycle in line with other alternatives
- Safety: is the alternative safe for automobiles, non-motorized vehicles, and pedestrians
- Transportation Capacity: does the alternative maintain or improve the vehicle capacity on LBB, a major recent investment

K. Cota summarized the Jan. 30<sup>th</sup> public information meeting. About 150 people attended (including several from SABR). The public strongly supports maintenance of a bicycle and pedestrian connection between Newington and Dover; the public supports the project Purpose and Need. Many comments expressed concerns about the safety and age of GSB. Major concerns expressed were also expressed about maintaining a bicycle/pedestrian crossing during construction of whatever alternative is selected.

J. Edlmann and P. Walker noted that only one or two comments addressed retaining and rehabilitating the GSB; several other commenters suggested that saving the GSB would not be a practical decision.

L. Black provided comments from NHDHR:

- Under the feasibility screening criterion, “impacts to environment” should separate out cultural impacts from other environmental impacts.
- Screening criteria analysis also needs to meet Section 106 and Section 4(f) requirements.
- As the GSB is not just any old bridge, our responsibilities as stewards of this nationally-significant resource is just as important as the public's focus on connectivity rather than preservation

Sen. Watters suggested using the potential cost of mitigation as part of the initial screening. P. Walker, J. Sikora, and K. Cota noted that the initial screening is a fatal-flaw analysis and mitigation is usually considered in the EIS as part of the evaluation of alternatives and the identification of the Preferred Alternative. However, given that mitigation for some alternatives could be quite expensive, K. Cota said VHB/NHDOT will consider ways to potentially incorporate mitigation costs into the screening.

Sen. Watters asked about whether/how this project relates to the 10-year highway plan and the likely adoption of a state law that would prohibit use of state funds for rehabilitation of the GSB. K. Cota noted that some directives may be included in the plan that affect the project, but they are required to follow Section 106 and Section 4(f); if a rehabilitation of the GSB is the Preferred Alternative, which may not be in compliance with the state law at the time, NHDOT will have to approach the legislature for special consideration.

N. Benjamin-Ma reported that VHB will be moving forward with an update to the GSB historic inventory form. It was completed in 2004 and forms over 10 years old are usually reevaluated under Section 106.

- The bridge was previously determined eligible for the National Register under Criterion A for changing the transportation routes on the Seacoast and between the Seacoast and Concord, and Criterion C as an early example of a continuous truss, which influenced countless other bridges of this type across the country.
- It is assumed that the bridge description will be updated in the form to address changes in setting and new abutment construction; N. Benjamin-Ma asked for input regarding what else should be addressed.
- L. Black noted that the historic context for early continuous bridge design should be updated, to reflect the reconstruction of the Lake Champlain Bridge, rehabilitation of Cape Cod Bridges, and other MA bridges part of this early design context.
- K. Henderson and N. Holth will provide other potential ideas regarding the GSB form update once they've had a chance to review the form. The 2004 form is included on the project website as an appendix to the EIS, but J. Edelmann will email it to the consulting parties. The form will also be separated out in the project website for ease of access.
- P. Walker asked about specific requirements for the form update. L. Black confirmed that the update will include the first page of the form, along with continuation sheets for relevant sections.

Submitted by: Sheila Charles and Jill Edelmann, Cultural Resources

Please fill in all of the requested information.

April 19, 2018

CR mtg

Name	Agency	Phone #	Email Address
Stephela Cholewicki	DOT	271-4049	Stephela.Cholewicki@dot.nh.gov
Bill Edelmann	DOT	X 79168	billiam.edelmann@dot.nh.gov
Amy Stantez	via telephone		
Laura Black	NHDHR	271-6438	Laura.Black@dnr.nh.gov
SAND TRUBBY	NH DNR	271-2318	sand.trubby@dnr.nh.gov
Ron ewekand	NHDOT	271-3222	Ronald.ewekand@dot.nh.gov
Ryan Mchost	Clemmont	542-7002	citymanager@clemonnt.nh.com
Carol Nicewala	NHDOT/TRANSPORT	271-1675	carol.nicewala@dot.nh.gov
Zoe Ha-y Brook	Warenesstruck Bvch. Techs	225-0640	zbrook@warenesstruck.coop
Janice Bland	Stantez	207-887-3821	Janice.Bland@stantec.com
Bryan Burr	Clemmont Fire	542-7012	firechief@clemonnt.nh.com
Meli Dube	NHDOT	271-1612	mellotus.dube@dot.nh.gov
Trent Zanes	NHDOT	271-7432	trent.zanes@dot.nh.gov
Stacy Gunn	NHDOT	271-1599	Stacy.Gunn@DOT.NH.GOV
Michael Hicks	ACOE	978-318-8157	michael.c.hicks@usace.army.mil
Leah Savage	NHDOT	271-2247	Leah.Savage@dot.nh.gov
Marc Laurin	NHDOT	271-4044	
DT DOHERTY	NHDOT	271-2824	DOUGL.DOHERTY@dot.nh.gov
Tenn Riordan	The Smart Associates	224-7550	Triordan@smartenviromental.com
Lisa Mausolf		781 944 5959	lmausolf@att.net
Jed Merrow	MS	603 225 2978	jmerrow@njinc.com
Reagan Rueding	Preservation Co	603-778-1799	rbraydon@gmail.com
Bill Ashford	CHA	508-561-9149	bashford@chacompanies.com
Jon Evans	NHDOT	603-271-4049	jonathan.evans@dot.nh.gov

