BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT
CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: NHDOT Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting
DATE OF CONFERENCE: December 21, 2011
LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building
ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT
Kevin Nyhan
Christine Perron
Marc Laurin
Bob Landry
Mike Dugas
David Scott
Darrel Elliott
Bob Juliano
Bill Saffian
Tim Mallette
Kevin Russell
Wayne Roswell
Carol Niewola

FHWA
Jamie Sikora

EPA
Mark Kern

USFWS
Maria Tur

NHDES
Gino Infascelli
Lori Sommer

National Marine Fisheries Service
Mike Johnson
David Bean (via conf call)

NH Fish and Game
Carol Henderson

Central NH RPC
Mike Tardiff
Nik Coates

HNTB
Kevin Slattery
Jim Fisher

Archer Western
Brent Mawdsley
Stephen DelGrosso

McFarland-Johnson
Darren Benoit
Vicki Chase
Jeff Santacruce
Jed Merrow

FST
Steve Riesland
Dave McNamara

Smart Associates
Jennifer Riordan

(When viewing these minutes online, click on an attendee to send an e-mail)

PRESENTATIONS/ PROJECTS REVIEWED THIS MONTH:
(minutes on subsequent pages)

Finalization of November Meeting Minutes....2
Portsmouth-Kittery, A000(911), 13678F....2
Plymouth, X-A001(161), 15882A....4
Conway, X-A001(161), 15864....4
Loudon, 16188 (non-Federal)....5
Hampstead, 16420 (non-Federal)....7
Mt. Washington Regional Airport, SBG 17-08-2010....7

(When viewing these minutes online, click on a project to zoom to the minutes for that project)

NOTES ON CONFERENCE:

Finalization of November Meeting Minutes

The November 16, 2011 meeting minutes were finalized.

Portsmouth-Kittery, A000(911), 13678F

Kevin Nyhan introduced the project explaining that the last time the project was discussed was in April of 2011. The project is proceeding using a Design-Build (DB) delivery method. Archer Western Contractors (AWC) was awarded the contract based upon "best value" selection process. The design is advancing and changing from the preliminary design, and the Department is seeking feedback from resource agencies in accordance with commitments made during the NEPA process.

Jim Fisher (HNTB) introduced the DB team and discussed the project using a PowerPoint presentation, and provided an overview of the changes that were made since the preliminary design that was evaluated in the NEPA document. The project involves a complete replacement of the existing Memorial Bridge, Scott Avenue Bridge and Kittery Approach Spans. The preliminary design anticipated a complete replacement of all piers for the Memorial Bridge. The advanced design will re-use the Memorial Bridge Piers (Piers 1-4), by reinforcing using internal drilled shafts or micro-piles. The change eliminates the substantial in-water work by re-using the existing substructure. Another change is the re-design of the fender system. The existing fenders are timber systems that surround Pier 2 and Pier 3. The proposed fender is the "Super Cone" system that attaches to the pier on the channel faces and upstream and downstream pier points, and does not extend into the water. The proposed system eliminates the in-water components of the fender system.

The Scott Avenue bridge is entirely on land and its northerly end pier is common with the Memorial Bridge (Memorial Bridge Pier 1). The Scott Avenue Bridge will be entirely replaced and will use concrete drilled shaft supports and is not substantially different from the preliminary design.

The Kittery Approach is currently a 10- span bridge that also shares its end pier with the Memorial Bridge (Pier 4). The preliminary design (shown in the RFP) included a three-span substructure with two large piers with substantial impacts to the intertidal area. The DB team design includes a five-span structure, with four pairs of 5-foot drilled shaft piers. The drilled shaft piers have considerably less footprint impacts than the preliminary design, and only the five-foot diameter pier columns will impact the intertidal area.

The demolition of the bridge is scheduled to start on January 30th, 2012, and the overall project construction will continue until August 2, 2013.

Steve DelGrosso explained the anticipated method of containment of the drilled shaft work. AWC plans to use 8-foot casings to surround the drilled shafts at the Kittery Approach. The casings will be set on the bottom and slightly bedded in the sediment and sealed on the bottom interior with sand bags. The timing of the containment removal may extend beyond the allowed in-water work window of November 15 – March 15.

Mike Johnson of NOAA asked if the cofferdams can be installed prior to the restricted period to avoid being delayed. David Bean of NOAA asked about the methods for removal of the casings. Will they be removed during high tide? After the in-water work window of March 15, the work must be out of the water. The existing Kittery Approach footing tops are above mean high water and will be used to support a temporary construction trestle after removal of the existing superstructure and columns. The footings are not being touched (removed) during the first season. They will be used until the trestle is no longer needed.

D. Bean asked about the duration and vibrations from drilling micro-piles in the existing piers and foundation shafts and the potential effect on fish such as sturgeon sp. Even though that work would be out of the water, in the absence of a cofferdam, the effects could be transferred to the water column. S. DelGrosso believes the vibration and noise from those operations are minimal. As such, it was requested that AWC prepare a memorandum describing the anticipated methods of construction, including preparation, demolition, containment, dewatering, sediment control, vibration, construction and the timing. AWC will provide a final memorandum.

M. Johnson asked about the removal of the casings. If they are buried partially in the sediment (estimated 6” to 1 foot), will that cause a release of sediment? S. DelGrosso suggested that the casings could be removed at low tide, therefore would not be in the water column. M. Johnson asked about the drilling operation and when that would occur.

Kevin Slattery described the impact changes between the preliminary design and the current DB design. The preliminary design was permitted for both the NH Dredge & Fill and Maine Natural Resources Protection Act. The permitted NH impacts include approximately 5,300 square feet of temporary and 1,225 square feet of permanent wetland impact. The DB design has no permanent impacts and decreases the temporary impacts to 4,054 square feet. The permanent impact change is associated with the re-use of Pier 1 and the elimination of riprap around the pier. The temporary impacts are attributable to temporary work platforms around Pier 1 and Pier 2, and eight temporary dolphins for barge work when floating and setting bridge sections. The Tidal Buffer Zone impacts remain the same at 15,000 square feet. Plan illustrations of the impacts from the preliminary design (permitted) and the proposed reduction were shown.

The Maine side impacts are reduced from approximately 4,000 square feet of permanent wetland impact to 157 square feet for the new drilled shaft piers. Approximately 16,000 square feet are identified for the temporary disturbance for work platforms around Pier 3 and Pier 4, for removal of the existing Kittery Approach piers and footings, and for eight temporary dolphins for barge work.

Kevin Slattery summarized the permits and amendments that are underway or needed due to the reduction of impacts. In summary, the DB design changes reduced permanent wetland impacts from approximately 5,200 square feet to 157 square feet.

Kevin Nyhan confirmed that amending the permits is the appropriate course considering the impacts and regulations, in lieu of filing new permits.

The agencies reacted favorably at the impact reduction due to the proposed design changes pending receipt and review of the narrative by AWC describing construction methods and timing.

This project was previously reviewed on the following dates: 9/15/2004, 9/21/2005, 5/16/2007, 1/16/2008, 11/19/2008, 3/17/2010, 10/20/2010, 4/20/2011, 6/15/2011.

Plymouth, X-A001(161), 15882A

Bill Saffian provided an overview of the project. The project is located at the bridge carrying NH Route 25/3A over the Baker River. The project was originally part of the Plymouth 15882 contract, which consisted of bridge rehabilitation including replacement of the deck, shoes, and expansion joints, and cleaning and painting structural steel. The subject project was split off from the original contract and includes scour mitigation. Work will consist of the placement of riprap on the inside faces of the two bridge piers. Access will be from the SW quadrant. A temporary stone causeway will be needed to access the far pier. Total wetland impacts will be 4,150 sq. ft. permanent and 10,200 sq. ft. temporary.

Carol Henderson asked about the timing of the proposed work and said that brook trout would be spawning in the river in the fall. B. Saffian replied that work would be carried out during the summer and fall of 2012. He suggested that pipes could be installed in the causeway to allow for fish passage during constructed. Gino Infascelli said that he would like to see pipes in the causeway. C. Henderson explained that her concern was with spawning activity and destruction of eggs in the substrate of the river bottom. She asked if it would be possible to finish the work by September 1st to avoid spawning season (approximately September 1 to October 31, although it depends on weather and water temperature). B. Saffian and David Scott explained that it probably would not be possible to finish by September since the project will not advertise until June 2012 due to right-of-way issues. G. Infascelli asked about the possibility of using the Plymouth water and sewer easement to reduce right-of-way involvement. This, however, had been explored but would not result in less time spent on the right-of-way process. Mark Kern asked if it would be possible to do the work the following spring and summer. D. Scott said that the Department prefers not to award a contract and then make the contractor wait a long period of time before starting work. C. Henderson suggested blocking off areas of permanent impact with sandbags or turbidity curtains to prevent fish from spawning in those areas prior to construction. Christine Perron stated that the Department would look into ways to minimize impacts to spawning trout, either by adjusting the work schedule or by blocking off the work area. The permit application would be submitted within the next week.

M. Kern did not object to the project qualifying for coverage under the NH PGP.

This project was previously reviewed on the following dates: 5/19/2010

Conway, X-A001(161), 15864

Kevin Nyhan discussed this project, which consists of the replacement of the bridge that carries US Route 302 over the Conway Lake Outlet. A bridge type and size has not yet been selected, but will generally be the same length or longer, without piers in the river.

The Department completed an assessment of this Tier 3 crossing this summer. The existing bridge is 105' long, with a bankfull width of 40', a slope of approximately 0%, and a sandy substrate. There are currently piers located in the river. Data at an upstream reference reach generally match the conditions at the crossing. Due to the similarities in streams at the crossing and in the reference reach, and the inaccessibility of the reference reach without a boat, a longitudinal profile was not collected.
Kevin Nyhan asked if this were enough information to comply with the Stream Crossing Rules given the compatibility of the site with the reference reach and the fact that a replacement bridge would be as long as or longer than the existing. Gino Infascelli indicated that with a 0% slope the design can proceed without collection of a long profile. The system is generally flat, with good access to a broad floodplain and the

absence of stream features such as riffles and pools. G. Infascelli asked what the toe-of-slope to toe-of-slope distance was under the bridge. It is approximately 45'.

Lori Sommer asked if there would be any work on the slope. Bill Saffian responded that there would be some disturbance. L. Sommer then asked if there would be a terrace for land based wildlife to cross under the roadway. K. Nyhan responded that the Department would look into it, but generally speaking it could be incorporated. Currently at low flows there is some dry ground under the bridge on either side of the watercourse.

G. Infascelli indicated that it appears that with the 105' long bridge, the structure may have room to move back or modify the embankment to meet the requirement for a structure to be 1.2 x bankfull width, plus 2'.

K. Nyhan indicated that the Department would present the project again once additional information is gathered on the proposed replacement structure.

This project has not been previously discussed at a Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting.

Loudon, 16188 (non-Federal)

The purpose of this presentation was to re-introduce resource agency staff to the project, update them on its status, describe the approach and likely impacts, and get agency feedback. McFarland Johnson staff gave a brief history of the project starting with the 1994 Public Hearing and 1995 Environmental Assessment and ending with the current corridor study. The 1995 EA, based on traffic growth trends and anticipated future growth, had proposed an ultimate typical section of four lanes with a wide median, resulting in a total paved width of 92'. A reevaluation of how traffic has actually grown in the intervening years has concluded that volumes are less than had been anticipated in the 1995 EA, and that the 1995 ultimate typical section is not warranted for the foreseeable future. An interim typical section that would retain the existing two through lanes and widen the highway for 12' shoulders and a 16' median lane is now proposed and would provide operational and safety benefits. The current footprint of the project was created by superimposing the proposed 3-lane cross section (64 foot width of pavement) onto the existing horizontal and vertical alignment of Route 106. McFarland Johnson (MJ) explained that there are three areas where the proposed alignment would deviate from the existing alignment in order to reduce the impacts to environmental or cultural resources. These resources are the Soucook River (near Wales Bridge Road), Shaker Brook and the Lovering Mill Site (near Clough Pond Road), and an unnamed pond adjacent to Clough Hill Road. The key resource issues associated with this project are wetlands, stream crossings, wildlife habitat, and water quality.

MJ indicated that the project would impact approximately 5 acres of wetlands of which 0.5 acre is stream and river areas and 0.4 acre is vernal pools. The total amount of impacts may change as the stream crossings and BMPs are further analyzed. The impacts to the vernal pools consist of two or three areas, with the biggest impact to one pool that is parallel to the roadway.

MJ indicated that as part of this project they are looking at the corridor to identify potential wetland mitigation sites, but that there will be neither final decisions on locations nor any design of the sites as part of the current phase of the design. This area has several gravel pits that could be potential mitigation sites; however, most of them are still in active use.

MJ gave an overview of the stream crossings, noting that there are six Tier 3 crossings, four Tier 2 crossings, and three Tier 1 crossings within the corridor. MJ went on to further discuss the Tier 3 crossings with photographs and plans and suggested that the improvement of some of these crossings could be part of the wetland mitigation for the project.

MJ presented a Habitat Connectivity Plan that was created from Wildlife Action Plan mapping. This plan depicts the existing habitats and identifies areas that have particular value for maintaining habitat connectivity. These findings may be combined with the stream crossing analysis to identify crossings that warrant improvement, possibly as part of wetland mitigation. Also, several rare species are on record within the corridor including Blanding's turtles, wood turtles, and brook floater mussels. In addition, MJ encountered one rare plant species within the corridor, small whorled pogonia, which is outside the expected project impact area. Although the project will probably not impact these rare species or their habitats, some special considerations may be required in areas where ponds (Blanding's turtle habitat) are adjacent to the roadway.

MJ explained that there are several impaired waterways within the corridor, including impairments for pH, E. coli, and aluminum, but of these only aluminum is normally associated with roadway runoff.

MJ explained that the corridor contains a number of existing closed drainage systems and ditches or swales to convey runoff, but that there are no existing water quality treatment BMPs within the corridor. The proposed improvements would result in the creation of approximately 22 acres of new impervious area, and the current recommendation is to treat a minimum of 22 acres of impervious area using BMPs (most likely gravel wetlands), preferably at the existing closed system outlets.

MJ explained that waterways were tested for chloride concentrations in the late summer, and the results indicate chloride levels are well below water quality criteria and unlikely to be a problem. The low chloride concentrations in the waterways are also an indication that the groundwater does not have a high concentration of chloride either. Therefore it is not anticipated that any of the public wells along the corridor would be negatively affected by the project. MJ will reach out to Phil Trowbridge to further discuss the implications of the chloride issue.

The meeting was opened to questions:

Q- Jamie Sikora – Will the study recommend breaking the project up into phases?
A- Mike Dugas – The project is shown in the draft Ten Year Plan, however no funding has been identified for the project. It is expected that any construction along this corridor would be broken up into smaller projects. Some projects may even be completed as part of a public/private partnership with New Hampshire Motor Speedway or using Safety Improvement funds at some of the intersections.

Q- Carol Henderson – Will this project be going out for public comment?
A- M. Dugas- This project was presented to Town of Loudon officials on November 12, 2011, and there was some attendance by additional members of the public. It is anticipated that there would be a follow-up public informational meeting at the completion of the study.

Q- J. Sikora – Would mitigation for this project be constructed in advance of the construction project?
A- M. Dugas – Not likely.

Q- Mark Kern – How much detail will be put into the mitigation plan (for the corridor study)?
A- Jed Merrow – The mitigation will include general concepts and potential locations only.

Comment - Lori Sommer recommended reaching out to the Five Rivers Conservation Trust to let them know about the project and the potential mitigation locations in case they come across an interested landowner or know of other potential mitigation locations.

This project has not been previously discussed at a Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting.

Hampstead, 16420 (non-Federal)

Tim Mallette gave an overview of the watershed by discussing manmade alterations (historic sawmills, roads, minor impoundments, and crossing replacements constructed by the State and the Town of Hampstead from 2008-2011). He also stated that beaver activity contributes to tailwater at culvert outlets and build-up of existing minor impoundments. He explained that the NHDES Dam Bureau and the NHDOT Design Services Section of Highway Design were asked to evaluate the flooding that occurred in March of 2010 in response to complaints that were filed with the respective Agencies.

Sliplining of the deteriorating 42" Bituminous-Coated Corrugated Metal Pipe (BCCMP) under NH 111 at Johnsons Pond was proposed as a possible BMP to other alternatives. The merits for doing so included a proposed liner with interior corrugations, minimum excavation disturbance, minimum traffic impact, and downstream constraints. T. Mallette suggested that the Tier 3 location should be considered a Tier 2 because of the existing secondary flow that develops through the neighborhood west of Johnsons Pond (effectively sharing the peak flow under existing conditions). He stated that in his opinion the general design conditions of Env-Wt 904 could be met by stating the facts in the new wetlands permit application.

T. Mallette stated that the natural conditions seemed to point to a Tier 3 crossing that is impractical because downstream constraints are controlled by public and private interests for the foreseeable future (non-menace dam and local road culvert). He also stated that the approach to recent flooding problems in this watershed seemed to concentrate on individual crossings (State & Local) or limited areas (FEMA-2005) rather than the broader view.

Gino Infascelli stated that he was aware of the work done recently (Town & State) and also the sliplining that was done a number of years ago under NH 111 by NHDOT at Hog Hill Pond approximately a half mile downstream from Johnsons Pond. He said that he did not see any way that sliplining could be considered a BMP using the existing Routine Roadway Maintenance Manual. He also stated that it was not his opinion alone, that he had asked management for a second opinion when preparing for the meeting.

Others in attendance stated that there was not enough time to understand the issues. It was suggested to put off further discussion until the next meeting. A definitive answer of no was given for the use of Notification of Routine Roadway Maintenance; any future sliplining proposal would require a full Dredge and Fill permit application with the associated requirements. After the meeting a decision was made not to pursue the sliplining any further.

This project has not been previously discussed at a Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting.

Mt. Washington Regional Airport, SBG 17-08-2010

Stephen Riesland of Fay, Spofford & Thorndike (FST) presented the project. The goal of the meeting was to update the group on the alternatives being reviewed, receive feedback or comments on those alternatives, and provide an update on mitigation efforts.

S. Riesland first described the full parallel taxiway options:

- Alternative 1 – This option includes the extension of the existing parallel Taxiway 'A', by approximately 2,300 ft to the end of Runway 28. Existing Taxiway 'A' extends for approximately 1,370 feet east from the Runway 10 end, and provides access to the paved apron and hangars. The extended Taxiway will maintain the existing 35-foot pavement width. The taxiway profile will generally follow the runway profile. This alternative impacts 7.67± acres of wetlands.

- Alternative 1A – This alternative consists of the same horizontal alignment as Alternative 1, but has an approximately 2-foot lower vertical alignment. This is accomplished by shifting the low point further east, and extending the taxiway up at a slope steeper than the runway in order to meet the existing taxiway at the Runway 28 end. The slopes follow maximum allowable by the FAA. This alternative will result in approximately 7.37 acres of wetland impact. The 2-foot lower taxiway elevation in this location will involve the removal of unsuitable material, as well as the addition of underdrain to minimize the potential groundwater entering the taxiway sub-base material. The new underdrain would potentially cause secondary affects by lowering the water table in the surrounding intact wetlands.

- Alternative 2 – This alternative consists of locating the taxiway to the north of the runway, adjacent to the railroad tracks. The wetland impacts associated with this alternative are approximately 8.77 acres. This alternative will result in the construction of an approximately 1,400-ft longer taxiway than Alternative 1 in order to meet the Runway 10 end, resulting in approximately twice the construction cost as Alternatives 1 or 1A. This alternative would result in a less safe maneuver where aircraft must cross the active runway each time to utilize the taxiway.

Mark Kern asked about the ballpark costs for the taxiway options. Steve responded that he didn't have the exact costs, but felt it was on the order of $1 million for Alternatives 1 and 1A, and $2 million for Alternative 2. (A review after the meeting of the preliminary estimate indicated that the cost to construct Alternative 1 is approximately $1.8M while Alternate 2 is approximately $2.8M.)

S. Riesland then discussed the MALSR. This project involves the proposed installation of a medium intensity approach lighting system with runway alignment indicator lights (MALSR) to Runway 10. This approach lighting system consists of configurations of white lights mounted on pylons and positioned symmetrically every 200 ft. along the extended runway centerline, beginning 200 ft. from the runway threshold and extending outwards from the approach for 1,200 ft. Beyond these lights are the sequenced flashing lights, extending another 1,200 ft., making the total length of the approach lighting system to be 2,400 ft. Installation of a MALSR system will require installing light structures in Airport Marsh. There would be approximately three structures located within the limits of the water body, spaced about 200 ft. apart. The structures will be supported on concrete foundations, between 12 and 18 inches in diameter.

The Localizer Antennae was the final piece of the project described. The proposal calls for the installation of a localizer located 950-ft beyond the end of Runway 28, The localizer critical area between the localizer and the Runway 28 end will be graded to create a smooth surface. The wetland impacts due to this installation are 5.7± acres (this was originally stated as 9.7 acres, but was later corrected).

M. Kern asked if these impacts would be the result of building up the land between the runway and the localizer. S. Riesland replied that it would. The localizer itself would have very little impact. He explained that the existing localizer is owned and operated by the State. They have had problems with keeping the localizer in operation due to the vegetation located in the critical area. M. Kern asked if the vegetation can be maintained. Steve replied that the area is difficult to maintain since it is so wet. The vegetation would have to be cleared by hand. It is not possible to get machinery in to mow the area during the summer months.

At the previous coordination meeting, Rich Roach of the Army Corps had requested that cumulative impacts of potential future projects also be considered in this Environmental Assessment. S. Riesland described potential future runway extension options, as well as their respective impacts. A runway extension is not expected to occur within the next ten years and is not part of this EA. It would take a significant change in the economy of the North Country to necessitate this extension. There are two potential alternatives for this work:

- East end – 11.35± acres of wetland impact (includes new localizer and critical area), OR

- West end – 8.51± acres of wetland impact (fill in Airport Marsh)

In summary, without the runway extension, the cumulative permanent wetland impacts for the preferred alternative are approximately 13.4 acres. Handouts (wetland impact plans and wetland impact summary tables) were distributed.

Maria Tur asked if any of the alternatives would impact the Pondicherry Wildlife Refuge. S. Riesland replied that the localizer build alternative would have a slight encroachment. M. Tur mentioned that in her conversations with Barry Parrish he had indicated a desire to see alternatives that have no impact on the Refuge, and she asked if there were other alternatives and if off-site alternatives (other airports) had been considered. S. Riesland replied that the only other alternative at Mt. Washington Airport would be a No-Build alternative. An offset alignment is possible, but this would create additional wetland impacts. As for an off-site location, an FAA study a couple of years ago determined that Berlin was not feasible due to surrounding terrain. An offset Localizer alternative will be presented in the DRAFT EA.

Carol Henderson asked if the Berlin study would be included in the EA. S. Riesland said that a discussion would be included and the report would be attached. He also noted FAA has deemed Mt. Washington Regional Airport to be a feasible site. C. Henderson stated that there are other wildlife impacts (moose, harrier, etc.) that need to be included in the EA.

M. Tur asked what types of lights will be in the MALSR. S. Riesland replied that they are white, steady-burning lights, except for the last 1,200 feet, where there is a sequence of flashing lights. They are only on when the pilot is approaching and remain on for 15 minutes. The pilots turn the lights on through their radios. The light towers will be approximately 20 feet high within the pond.

C. Henderson asked about impacts resulting from the lights in Airport Marsh. S. Riesland said that permanent impacts would be limited to the 12 to 18 inch diameter concrete footings, but there would be larger temporary impacts due to the construction of the light towers. Steve said that the lights are an added safety feature since the airport and the surrounding area is very dark and, according to FAA, the MALSR may not improve the landing minimums. C. Henderson asked if the light spacing is a FAA requirement. S. Riesland replied that some changes can be made (±50’ or so), but 3 lights will still need to be in the pond.

Lori Sommer asked about cumulative impacts, as she was getting a different number than the one stated in the presentation. S. Riesland explained that the impact area of the Localizer was 5.7 acres, not 9.7, making the total impact area approximately 13.4 acres.

M. Kern commented that an argument could be made that the parallel taxiway to the north is not practicable due to the cost differential. The EA will need to look at total project costs and not just directly for the taxiway when making this argument.

Jenn Riordan mentioned that the functions and values for the wetlands on the north and south sides of the runway are similar, but the wetland complex on the north side is more fragmented due to the railroad embankment.

Carol Niewola said that having the taxiway on the north side of the runway is not preferable since pilots would have to cross the runway to access the taxiway.

M. Tur asked when the Draft EA will be available and S. Riesland responded that it was expected in the Spring of 2012.

M. Tur asked if the need for the project will be based on actual demand at the airport and S. Riesland replied yes.

L. Sommer asked about the status of mitigation. S. Riesland replied that he has talked with David Govatski (Jefferson Conservation Commission) and Dick Mallion (formerly on the Whitefield Conservation Commission) to identify possible preservation properties. FST has also begun looking to identify potential individual parcels that could be preserved, and will be contacting those property owners directly. Letters seeking input and possible preservation locations have been sent to several agencies and commissions in the State and region.

M. Kern mentioned that it might be cheaper to do preservation than in-lieu fee or some combination of preservation and in-lieu fee and S. Riesland agreed.

M. Tur stated that coordination with Barry Parrish regarding the Pondicherry Wildlife Refuge should continue and S. Riesland agreed to continue that coordination.

M. Tur asked if the EA will include a study to determine how much the underdrain will impact the wetlands for Alternative 1A. The response was that FST will quantify that impact as much as possible. FST's contract does not include soils testing or monitoring wells.

Gino Infascelli asked if all three taxiway alternatives will be evaluated in the EA. S. Riesland responded that all will be described in the EA.

This project was previously reviewed on the following dates: 2/16/2011