

# BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT CONFERENCE REPORT

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

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

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

**ATTENDED BY:**

**NHDOT**

John Butler  
Sheila Charles  
Ron Crickard  
Jill Edelmann  
Bob Juliano  
Bob Landry  
Marc Laurin  
Jennifer Reczek

**NHDHR**

Laura Black  
Richard Boisvert

**FHI**

Stephanie Dyer-Carroll

**Fuss & O’Neill**

Chris Bean

**HDR**

Jim Murphy

**Louis Berger**

Leo Tidd (via phone)

**VHB**

Nicole Benjamin-Ma  
Greg Goodrich  
Mike Chervincky  
Peter Walker

**Preservation Co.**

Lynne Monroe

**Consulting/  
Interested Parties**

Kate Bashline  
Gary Bashline  
Denise Pouliot  
Paul Pouliot

**Consulting  
Parties (via  
telephone)**

Kitty Henderson  
Nathan Holth  
Senator David Watters

**FHWA**

Jamie Sikora

**PROJECTS/PRESENTATIONS REVIEWED THIS MONTH:**

*(minutes on subsequent pages)*

Derry-Londonderry 13065, IM-0931(201).....	1
Dummer-Cambridge-Errol 16304A, X-A003(835) .....	3
Seabrook-Hampton 15904, X-A001(026) .....	4
Newington-Dover 11238S, NHS-027-1(037) .....	7

**Derry-Londonderry 13065, IM-0931(201)**

Participants: Chris Bean, Fuss & O’Neill; L. Tidd, Louis Berger; Lynn Monroe, Preservation Co.; John Butler, Ron Crickard, Jackie Hozza, Marc Laurin, NHDOT; Denise Pouliot, Paul Pouliot, Consulting Parties

The purpose of the meeting was to update the agencies on progress made on the cultural resource evaluations. Chris B. explained that a lot of progress had been made in the last couple months. Following the May 28, 2018 Public Information Meeting, Lynne Monroe completed NHDHR survey forms on the five individual properties and one historic district that were now old enough to be potentially eligible for the National Register, along Alternative A, which continues to be the Preferred Alternative.

Chris B. explained the latest project schedule milestones which include a Public Information Meeting on July 25, 2018 at the Derry West Running Brook School, followed by issuance of the Draft SEIS in September and the Public Hearing in October. Chris B. thanked everyone involved for their efforts in making this project a priority. Richard Boisvert, of NHDHR noted that

whenever a project is identified as a top priority, it is handled as such however it is important to understand that other projects are negatively impacted in their review processes. Laura asked about having a chance to review the completed Cultural Resource section of the SDEIS prior to its issuance. Currently Laura B. has access to a nearly completed Chapter 4. Subsequent to the meeting, it was agreed that Laura B. will be provided an opportunity for review and comment on the Effects Tables which will be added into the finalized document prior to it being made available to the public and all agencies for review a couple weeks prior to the Public Hearing.)

Early in July, at a meeting with the Town and NHDOT Steering Committee, the decision was made to add two gap sections along Tsienneto Road, each about 1,400 feet long that had originally been excluded from the project back in 2007, when the previous DEIS and Public Hearing was held. A recent review of these areas is showing there are several design deficiencies that should be addressed as part of the project. Jill E. showed the gap sections on a revised APE map and Chris B. showed the gaps and discussed some of the engineering deficiencies referring to a colored plan. The APE map has been revised to incorporate the gap sections. Lynne M. will develop information on properties over 50 years old along the gap sections. She will prepare a table that assesses integrity and the project effects that will be submitted to NHDHR to determine which properties will be surveyed. She will then undertake the additional survey effort. At the same time, she will begin preparation of Effects Tables for the three properties that have been determined eligible.

Except for the gap sections recently added to the project, surveys and inventory forms for properties along the Preferred Alternative were submitted to NHDHR for review at the July 11, 2018 DOE Meeting. The outcome of that meeting is that several properties are considered eligible for the National Register including::

1. 3 Manchester Road, Fireye, formerly Knapp Shoe Co.
2. 72 Tsienneto Road
3. 76 Tsienneto Road
4. Manchester and Lawrence RR Historic District.

The group then discussed the next steps.

1. **Lynne M. will work with the engineers and develop an Effect Table for each potentially eligible property.** The group agreed the effects tables could be completed no later than August 15 to enable time for the findings to be incorporated in the SDEIS before production begins in late August [received by DHR 9-4-18]. Laura B. emphasized the importance of demonstrating that steps have been taken to avoid and minimize impacts as much as possible. Colleen Madden, a Section 106 Consulting Party asked why the horizontal alignment could not be shifted to avoid impacts to 72 and 76 Tsienneto Road. Chris B. explained that we will need to investigate this further, but it is likely that an alignment shift away from these two properties would likely result in substantial impacts to properties on the other side of the road. This alternative and other steps to minimize impacts will be provided to Lynne M. for inclusion in the Effects Table.
2. **Regarding the gap sections, Laura B. will review any additionally eligible properties as soon as Lynne M and her team are ready to submit them to Jill E. for transmittal to Laura B for review.**
3. Some concern was voiced by Laura B. about the property at 2 Ferland, which is currently shown as being taken by the project where in plan view it appears the impacts are not that severe. **Chris B. explained that he will investigate and he will be prepared to provide**

**more details on why it is being proposed to be taken at the upcoming Public Information Meeting.**

**Dummer-Cambridge-Errol 16304A, X-A003(835)**

Participants: Jennifer Reczek, Ron Crickard, NHDOT; Denise Pouliot, Paul Pouliot, Interested Parties

Continued consultation and discussion on an effect determination for the NH Route 16 Roadway widening and reconstruction, beginning .3 miles north of NH Route 110A and continuing north 1.3 miles in Dummer, NH. The alignment is a NH scenic and Cultural Byway (the Moose Path Trail which extends 98+ miles). Project Design alternatives included rehabilitation on the same alignment, and widening and/or shifting the roadway to the west away from the Androscoggin River due to slope failure and the high encroaching water table. This project was previously reviewed under Dummer 16304A X-A003(835) and was renamed to distinguish the parent 16304 project.

Although the cultural resources review for this project resulted in a No Historic Properties Affected Memo (executed on January 22, 2014), the project design changed and the proposed alternative includes the off-alignment roadway placed approximately 50 feet to the west of the existing roadway away from the Androscoggin River. It includes stormwater treatment areas.

At one of the 2017 public hearings, a concerned citizen mentioned that a Native American walking trail was located adjacent to the Androscoggin River, between the river and the roadway. It was also mentioned that the walking trail was used by loggers during log drives at the turn of the century. The realignment option and public meeting response led to further historical and archaeological resources review. An updated No Historic Properties Affected Memo was fully executed on December 19, 2017, noting that there were no above ground resources in the undeveloped area of potential effect and that Archaeological Phase IA/IB investigations would need to be conducted. Should these surveys identify an archaeological site, all necessary phases of archaeology would be completed and the No Historic Properties Affected finding for the project would be reviewed again by FHWA, NHDHR and NHDOT.

Phase IA/IB and Phase II archaeological investigations revealed that the 1974 Chester Price map indicates that three Native American trails, the Pontook, Androscoggin and the Anasagunticook, intersect in the vicinity of the project area, although no “ancient” Native American villages, trading posts, forts or missions, or English forts are depicted in the vicinity. Two sites were identified, 27-CO-148 and 27-CO-149. Each represents a discrete, single component occupation with intact subsurface deposits and both sites yielded an assortment of lithic tools and manufacturing debitage. The sites are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places as they have the potential to add to local and regional archaeological research and enhance public knowledge and understanding of New Hampshire’s Native American past.

Discussion identified that the preferred alternative was the realignment, the design cannot avoid impacting these sites and preservation in place is not an option. Discussion pertaining to Archaeological Phase III Data Recovery at the two sites included their environmental setting, boundaries, soils, block excavation and other field methodology, artifact and feature content, laboratory processing, and specialized analyses including radiocarbon dating, paleobotanical

sampling, and X-ray fluorescence of lithic materials to determine source locations. Strategies for data recovery at each of the sites were discussed and two different excavation methods were recommended by Dick Boisvert and Sheila Charles. Dick Boisvert recommended the use of 1/8<sup>th</sup> of an inch mesh at 27-CO-148. Sheila Charles brought up the question of water screening opportunities at 27-CO-149, however logistically water screening and use of 1/8” mesh may not be possible. Discussion of funding was also undertaken and it was affirmed that Phase III Data Recovery project scopes need to include curation costs, at \$300 per box. As for scheduling, NE ARC confirmed they could conduct the field work this summer.

Phase III Data Recovery public outreach elements were discussed. Gemma Hudgell noted that on site presentations were not optimal. Preferred outreach instead included compilation of a PowerPoint which could be presented in the Town of Dummer and/or at professional archaeological society meetings; the compilation of a mobile exhibit comprised of two poster-size panels similar to the display created for the Manchester Workers’ Housing Site. In addition, publication of a professional article, for example in the *New Hampshire Archaeologist* or another professional journal, will also be considered.

Subsequent to the meeting, an Adverse Effect Memorandum was executed on August 16, 2018. All mitigation stipulations will be memorialized in a Memorandum of Agreement.

#### **Seabrook-Hampton 15904, X-A001(026)**

Participants: Stephanie Dyer-Carroll, FHI; James Murphy, HDR; John Butler, Ron Crickard, Bob Juliano, Marc Laurin, Jennifer Reczek, NHDOT; Kate and Gary Bashline, Kitty Henderson and Nathan Holth (via telephone), Denise Pouliot, Paul Pouliot, Cowasuck Band/Penacook Abenaki as Consulting and Interested Parties

The first coordination meeting with New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources (NHDHR) and Consulting Parties on the Hampton Harbor Bridge Project was held on July 12, 2018 at the offices of the New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NHDOT). Jennifer Reczek, NHDOT’s Project Manager, opened the meeting by welcoming participants, running through the agenda, and explaining the primary objectives of the meeting. She explained the objectives include reviewing and getting input on the preliminary Area of Potential Effects (APE); identifying any resources of concern; and identifying additional organizations and individuals to invite to participate as Consulting Parties in the process.

Jim Murphy, HDR’s Project Manager, then provided some background on the project. He explained that the bridge is a vital transportation link which accommodates up to 18,000 vehicles per day during peak periods. He explained that the harsh saltwater environment increases the need for maintenance on the bridge. The Hampton Harbor Bridge has been rehabilitated numerous times over the last 50 years, including most recently emergency repairs to the bascule span mechanical system in March 2018. He said the project is necessary because the bridge is now structurally deficient and functionally obsolete; it is on NHDOT’s “red list” of bridges requiring rehabilitation or replacement; and the bridge has long-term operational issues. The project is also necessary in order to improve pedestrian and bicycle mobility. Mr. Murphy said they have begun evaluating the condition of the bridge and the feasibility of rehabilitation. Additional alternatives that will be investigated are Replacement with a Fixed Bridge and Replacement with a Bascule Bridge

Stephanie Dyer-Carroll, Cultural Resources Specialist with Fitzgerald & Halliday (FHI), provided a brief history of the bridge. She said it was constructed in 1949, replacing the “Mile-Long” Bridge at the crossing, and that it’s one of two remaining bascule bridges in the state, the other being the NH 1B Bridge in New Castle and Rye, NH. Ms. Dyer-Carroll then went on to explain that in 1994 a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) was executed for the replacement of the Alexander Scammell Bridge in Dover, NH. At that time, the Scammell Bridge was one of three bascule bridges in the state. In the Scammell MOA, NHDOT and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) committed to the preservation of the two bascule bridges except under exceptional circumstances, including prohibitive cost for rehabilitation, natural disaster, or severe environmental impacts. In 2012, NHDOT began planning for the rehabilitation or replacement of the NH 1B Bridge in New Castle and Rye. Due to concerns expressed during the Section 106 consultation process about the potential loss of the bascule bridge type, compliance for the Hampton Harbor Bridge and the New Castle-Rye Bridge are now being aligned.

Ms. Dyer-Carroll then showed a map depicting the boundaries of the Direct and Visual Areas of Potential Effect (APEs). She said the Direct APE will be used to evaluate the effects to archaeological resources, while the Visual APE will be used to evaluate effects to above-ground resources. Major elements of the Visual APE include the Hampton Beach State Park; Ocean Boulevard and Ashworth Avenue; and areas west of the bridge across the marsh. Ms. Dyer-Carroll then showed views of the bridge from a series of points within the Visual APE in order to support the definition of boundary. Viewpoints included: south from Hampton Beach State Park; south on Ashworth Avenue from Q Street; north from Campton Street at Portsmouth Street; north on NH Route 1A south of River Street; northeast from near the west end of River Street; northeast across the marsh from the east end of Farm Lane; southeast across the marsh from the east end of Depot Road; and southeast from the south end of Island Path. Within the Direct and Visual APEs, two historic resources were identified, the Hampton Harbor Bridge, which has been identified as potentially eligible for listing in the National Register, and the Eastern Railroad Historic District, which has been determined eligible. In addition, there is the potential for archaeological resources to exist within the Direct APE. Ms. Dyer-Carroll explained that there are the remains of piles under and adjacent to the existing bridge which residents have suggested may be remains of the Mile-Long Bridge. Ms. Dyer-Carroll then showed a series of photos of characteristic buildings located within the Visual APE including a c. 1940 shotgun house, an early 20<sup>th</sup> century seasonal cottage, mid-20<sup>th</sup> century one-story commercial properties, a c. 1960 one-story ranch house, contemporary multi-story condominiums, and a mid-20<sup>th</sup> century hotel.

Ms. Dyer-Carroll then turned the discussion to the project schedule, explaining that the project is just beginning. The Design Team has begun the evaluation of the rehabilitation alternative. Once this analysis is complete, they will study and compare a full range of alternatives. Based on the current schedule, the Environmental Assessment for the project will be released to the public in the summer of 2019. She then outlined outreach which has been undertaken to date. She said a Public Advisory Committee (PAC) has been formed and that the first meeting will be held in Hampton later that afternoon. A public meeting is planned for August. She shared that several organizations and individuals had been invited to participate as Consulting Parties in the Section 106 process. Existing Consulting Parties include Kate Bashline, a Hampton resident, and Kitty Henderson with the Historic Bridge Foundation. Ms. Dyer-Carroll said NHDOT had also invited Eric Small with the Historical Society of Seabrook and Betty Moore with the Hampton Historical Society to participate as Consulting Parties. Betty Moore declined to participate, and Eric Small had not yet responded.

Ms. Dyer-Carroll closed the presentation with a review of next steps. She said NHDOT looked forward to receiving NHDHR's response on the Request for Project Review Form. They want to finalize the Visual APE with input from NHDHR and Consulting Parties and initiate an Individual Inventory Form and a Phase 1A Archaeological Study.

Following the presentation, Jamie Sikora with FHWA asked about marinas in the area. Mr. Murphy said the Design Team is looking at the lift logs to determine which boats require regular lifts. He said there are fishing boats that are moored in the harbor. Ms. Dyer-Carroll said there is a Fishermen's Cooperative south of bridge. Mr. Sikora then suggested the team consult with the US Army Corps of Engineers about the nearby jetties, since the Section 4(f) evaluation will require the examination of different alignments. Dick Boisvert with NHDHR said the Phase 1A should include an assessment of nautical archaeology. Jill Edelmann with NHDOT shared that NHDOT is having a context prepared for movable bridges in the state which will help inform the Individual Inventory Form for the bridge.

Kitty Henderson asked who will sit on the PAC and if there will be communication between the PAC and Consulting Parties. Jill Edelmann said the PAC includes town officials, emergency personnel, conservation organizations, the Hampton Historical Society, the Chamber of Commerce, representatives from the fishing community, charter boats, a bicycle advocacy group, and an abutter. She said some people will serve on the PAC and participate as Consulting Parties. Laura Black with NHDHR expressed concern that the Hampton Historical Society is sitting on the PAC but is not serving as a Consulting Party. She wants to ensure that information is shared between the two groups. Ms. Dyer-Carroll said the PAC will be briefed on the Section 106 process as it progresses. Similarly, NHDHR and Consulting Parties will be informed of relevant input received through the PAC. In addition, minutes from all the meetings, as well as presentations, will be available on the project website.

Jim Murphy asked if attendees had any input on the Visual APE. Laura Black said she would defer to people who live in the area to define the APE. She said the analysis should determine whether there are public recreational areas which may be affected visually. She also said that when the Project Area Form is being prepared the consultant should be sure to examine properties just outside the Visual APE to determine if there are potential historic districts that could be affected. Kate Bashline said Neil Underwood, a member of the US Army Corps of Engineers, was responsible for building the bridge. She said he kept the grade of the bridge intentionally low so that it appeared like a road. The bascule was purposefully used to achieve this effect. Dick Boisvert asked if the Visual APE was defined using software. Stephanie Dyer-Carroll said it was defined in the field but that it was intentionally conservative. Mr. Boisvert said the Visual APE could be verified through GIS.

Gary Bashline, who lives adjacent to the bridge, asked if the Project Team had talked to the US Coast Guard. Jim Murphy said they hadn't yet, that they are waiting for studies to be completed. Stephanie Dyer-Carroll said a wetland delineation has been undertaken and no tidal wetlands were documented on the site. Mr. Bashline then asked if the Project Team had contact Audubon. Ms. Dyer-Carroll said they had not, but they had contacted environmental agencies. Jamie Sikora asked how many public meetings are proposed. Jennifer Reczek said four meetings are planned. Kate Bashline then asked how the public meetings will be advertised. Ms. Reczek said the

meetings will be advertised in the local news, and abutters will be notified by mail. Environmental agencies will also be notified.

**Newington-Dover 11238S, NHS-027-1(037)**

Participants: Greg Goodrich, Nicole Benjamin-Ma, Mike Chervincky, Pete Walker, VHB; Keith Cota, Ron Crickard, Bob Landry, Bob Juliano, Marc Laurin, NHDOT ; Kitty Henderson, Nathan Holth, Senator David Watters, Consulting Parties

Continued consultation on the General Sullivan Bridge project and review of revised project alternatives, cost estimates, and screening of alternatives in preparation for a public meeting,

We met to further Section 106 consultation regarding the potential rehabilitation or replacement of the General Sullivan Bridge (GSB). The goal of the meeting was to discuss the results of the preliminary screening process and cost estimates. Updates regarding the current status of historic resource inventory efforts and anticipated time frames for upcoming public information meetings were provided as well. Handouts provided at the meeting included a summary of cost estimates, as well as a screening matrix (see attached documents).

G. Goodrich provided a recap of the alternatives used in the screening process, including drawings of additional alternatives developed to supplement those included in the Type, Size, and Location (TS&L) report (additional Alternatives include 5, 6A-6C, 7, and 9). These alternatives were discussed previously at the April 12, 2018 cultural resources agency coordination meeting. It was noted that there are two potential frame options for Alternative 9, as shown on Slide 10 of the presentation.

Cost estimates for each alternative include both initial capital costs and life cycle maintenance costs, and were developed for both 12'-wide and 16'-wide multi-use paths for each alternative. Initial capital costs reflect the cost to bring the alternative into service, while the life cycle costs reflect the initial capital cost plus the cost of maintaining the structure for 75 years. Generally speaking, alternatives involving new construction have lower life cycle costs than those incorporating rehabilitation of the bridge superstructure.

Following a question by R. Boisvert, G. Goodrich clarified the use of the term "desirable" in the context of the alternatives analysis; this term refers to a 16'-wide path as the "desirable" path width as defined by American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) criteria, not as a synonym for "preferred alternative."

P. Walker summarized the alternatives screening process. He emphasized that this is not the full alternatives analysis which would be completed for the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS); the screening analysis is used to winnow down the large list of potential alternatives to a range of reasonable alternatives that will be carried forward for full impact analysis. A higher level of evaluation will be used in the SEIS for those alternatives that are carried forward.

Screening criteria include whether the alternative meets the project's purpose and need; feasibility from a practical and technical standpoint; relative cost in comparison with other alternatives; safety

for users; impacts to cultural resources; and whether the alternative maintains the vehicle capacity of the Little Bay Bridge (LBB). Based on input provided at the April 12, 2018 meeting and during subsequent discussions with NHDOT, the screening criteria were updated to include: 1) consideration of cultural resources as an independent criterion, namely whether the alternative preserves some or all of the GSB; and 2) expansion of the safety criterion to consider whether the alternative provides safe access for inspection, maintenance, and emergency vehicles. A screening matrix was presented, utilizing a system of green, yellow, and red dots for each criterion under each alternative. A green dot indicates the alternative meets the criterion; a yellow dot indicates the alternative partially meets the criterion; and red dots are used when an alternative does not meet the criterion. For the cost estimate column, the initial capital and life cycle costs in dollar amounts are presented, with red, yellow, or green shading to broadly represent the relative costs compared to other alternatives.

P. Walker reported the results of the screening as follows:

- Alternatives which propose a 12'-wide path were eliminated. Cost estimates indicate there is only a 1-3% differential between a 12'-wide path and a 16'-wide path. However, the narrower path width impacts safety and emergency access. Therefore, only the alternatives that provide a 16'-wide path will be carried forward.
- Alternative 4 has been eliminated based on the fact that it would completely remove the GSB superstructure and substructure, representing a total loss of the historic resource.
- Alternative 5 was also eliminated. This alternative would reduce the transportation capacity of the LBB and would provide only a 2' wide path.

L. Black asked for clarification regarding the difference between Alternative 4 and Alternative 9. Alternative 9 retains the substructure of the GSB and was therefore determined to partially support the historic preservation criterion. L. Black and K. Henderson commented that the superstructure is what defines the bridge and people's image of it. The construction date and classification of the bridge are based on the superstructure, not the substructure; therefore, loss of the superstructure is tantamount to loss of the entire bridge.

J. Sikora asked whether widening the Little Bay Bridge (Alternative 6) would require the removal of the GSB due to navigation requirements; G. Goodrich clarified that the existing GSB piers would remain in Alternative 6, meeting navigation considerations.

Sen. Watters commented that the state's 10-year highway plan eliminates the possibility of rehabilitating the bridge. P. Walker and J. Sikora responded that federal regulations require the inclusion of rehabilitation as an avoidance alternative, to meet legal sufficiency under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Section 4(f) of the US Department of Transportation Act. P. Walker asked for further input regarding the screening. Specifically, should any of the alternatives recommended for elimination, based on the screening, instead be carried forward? There were no comments in the affirmative.

P. Walker reported that NHDOT is anticipating the next public information meeting to be held in August, with another public information meeting to be held before the end of 2018. The intention is to have a cultural resources agency coordination meeting prior to the fall/winter public information meeting.



Sen. Watters requested that the August public meeting be coordinated with his schedule; it was confirmed this would be the case. He asked what level of detailed analysis for the alternatives will have been completed prior to the meeting, and what drawings will have been developed. P. Walker and G. Goodrich confirmed that the level of analysis presented will be similar to that presented at the current meeting, in order to solicit feedback, but that renderings and drawings will be developed for the meeting that are more visual than the engineering drawings used today. Visualizations of the alternatives from specific vantage point(s) will be used at the meeting. Sen. Watters suggested including schedule information for each alternative in the screening matrix. M. Chervincky reported that information has been developed and should be relatively easy to include. P. Walker also noted that the cost estimates include costs related to maintaining connectivity for bicycles and pedestrians during construction, and that information would be presented at the information meeting.

Regarding the life cycle cost estimates, R. Boisvert asked whether NHDOT is obligated to actually spend the maintenance amount reported in the estimates. He also asked whether there is any analysis regarding how long bridge structures last if the actual maintenance spending are only a portion of the estimates. R. Landry responded that there are no written obligations, because it is impossible to predict the state and federal revenue systems several decades into the future so funding cannot be guaranteed. The question regarding analysis of actual maintenance spending is part of a nationwide conversation. NHDOT realizes it is easier to save a bridge by preserving it and maintaining it over time. An internal NHDOT document currently under review outlines funding strategies, and how preservation as a strategy has evolved and will be approached in the future.

N. Benjamin-Ma reported that the updated NH Division of Historical Resources (DHR) inventory form for the GSB is underway, incorporating comments provided to J. Edlmann by consulting parties, and should be ready for review in the next few weeks. She noted that the updated Project Area Form (PAF) is in the beginning stages, and asked for input or suggestions regarding information or strategies to be used in the PAF. L. Black commented that she hasn't reviewed the previous form in detail, but that one of the considerations for updating PAFs is not just to update the specific information, but to ensure the approaches to contexts and evaluation in the original PAF are appropriate considering modern standards and methodology. If they are not appropriate, this should be remedied in the updated PAF. N. Benjamin-Ma noted that since PAF efforts are just starting, comments or input from meeting attendees are welcome as the effort continues. J. Edlmann noted that NHDOT endeavors to keep the discussion as open as possible, and thanked the meeting participants for continuing the discussion.

Submitted by: Sheila Charles and Jill Edlmann, Cultural Resources

# New Hampshire Department of Transportation Cultural Resources Agency Coordination Meeting

Date July 12, 2018

Please initial next to your name.      Guests: Please use reverse side to sign in.

Initial	Name	Agency	Email Address
<i>LB</i>	Laura Black	NH Division of Historical Resources	<u>Laura.Black@dncr.nh.gov</u>
<i>RB</i>	Richard Boisvert	NH Division of Historical Resources	<u>Richard.Boisvert@dncr.nh.gov</u>
	Sheila Charles	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	<u>Sheila.Charles@dot.nh.gov</u>
	Victoria Chase	NHDOT – Highway Design	<u>Victoria.Chase@dot.nh.gov</u>
<i>RC</i>	Ronald Crickard	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	<u>Ronald.Crickard@dot.nh.gov</u>
	Mel Dube	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	<u>Melilotus.Dube@dot.nh.gov</u>
	Michael Dugas	NHDOT – Highway Design	<u>Michael.Dugas@dot.nh.gov</u>
<i>JE</i>	Jill Edelmann	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	<u>Jillian.Edelmann@dot.nh.gov</u>
	Ron Grandmaison	NHDOT – Highway Design	<u>Ronald.Grandmaison@dot.nh.gov</u>
<i>LL</i>	Bob Landry	NHDOT – Bridge Design	<u>Robert.Landry@dot.nh.gov</u>
	Marc Laurin	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	<u>Marc.Laurin@dot.nh.gov</u>
<i>ML</i>	Leigh Levine	Federal Highway Administration	<u>Leigh.Levine@dot.gov</u>
	Don Lyford	NHDOT – Highway Design	<u>Donald.Lyford@dot.nh.gov</u>
	Rebecca Martin	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	<u>Rebecca.Martin@dot.nh.gov</u>
	Beth Muzzey	NH Division of Historical Resources	<u>Elizabeth.Muzzey@dncr.nh.gov</u>
	Kevin Nyhan	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	<u>Kevin.Nyhan@dot.nh.gov</u>
<i>JS</i>	Jamie Sikora	Federal Highway Administration	<u>Jamie.Sikora@fhwa.dot.gov</u>
	Pete Stammas	NHDOT – Highway Design	<u>Peter.Stammas@dot.nh.gov</u>
	David Trubey	NH Division of Historical Resources	<u>David.Trubey@dncr.nh.gov</u>
	Cindy Vigue	Federal Highway Administration	<u>Cindy.Vigue@dot.gov</u>
	CR Willeke	NHDOT – Planning	<u>Charles.Willeke@dot.nh.gov</u>

Please fill in all of the requested information.

June 14, 2018

Name	Agency	Phone #	Email Address
Paul Pouliot	COWASUCK BRAD/REURACK	ABENAK 603.776.1090	COWASUCK@TDS.NET
DENISE POULIOT	COWASUCK BRAD/REURACK	ABENAK 603.776.1090	TIGERY@TDS.NET
Jackie Horzer	NHDOT Bridge Design		jacqueline.horzer@dot.nh.gov
LYNNE MONROE	PRESENTATION COMPANY	778.799	PRESENTATIONCOMPANY@comcast.net
Chris Bean	Foss & O'Neill Royal Team Property		Cbean@tando.com
Bob TULLAND	NHDOT - BRIDGE DESIGN		ROBERT.TULLAND@DOT.NH.GOV
Gary Bashline			bashline@gcomail.com
STEPHANE VIKER-CARROLL	FEH	860/256-4972	sdyer-carroll@feh.com
Jim Murphy	HDR	617-357-7113	James.Murphy@hdrinc.com
Jennifer Rezek	NHDOT	603-271-3401	Jennifer.Rezek@dot.nh.gov
Kate Bashline	abutter	603-429-2112	bashline@abutter.com
Gary Bashline	"	"	bashline@gmail.com
<del>Bob</del> Nicole Benjamin	MA	617-602-2657	Nbenjamin@nrc.com
Mike Clements	UHB		mich@nicky@uhb.com
Greg Goodrich	VHB	603-391-3952	ggoodrich@vhb.com
Pete Walker	VHB	391-3942	pwalker@vhb.com