BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT
CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: NHDOT Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting
DATE OF CONFERENCE: September 17, 2008
LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building
ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT
Jon Evans
Kevin Nyhan
Cathy Goodmen
Christine Perron
Alex Vogt
Steve Johnson
Dave Scott
Bill Saffian
Laurel Kenna
Ron Kleiner
Joyce McKay
Jim Marshall
Carol Niewola

Federal Highway Administration
Jamie Sikora

NHDES
Gino Infascelli
Lori Sommer
Steve Couture
Tim Drew

NH Fish and Game
Kim Tuttle

NHDHR
Nadine Peterson

EPA
Mark Kern

Army Corps of Engineers
Rich Roach

Lebanon Airport
Dave Gobin

CLD Engineers
John Byatt

McFarland Johnson
Vicki Chase
Gene McCarthy
Jed Merrow
Rick Dymert

Hoyle Tanner & Assoc. Inc.
Bob Furey

Pathways Consulting
Mike McCroty

(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 August 20, 2008 Meeting Minutes 2
Durham, 14453 (Non-Federal) 2
Lebanon, NH - Hartford, VT, A000(627), 14957 3
Epsom X-A000(668), 15266 5
Meredith, STP-F-X-0241(014), 10430 6
Lebanon Airport Master Plan Supplement, AIP #3-33-0010-32-2007 & AIP #3-33-0010-34-20078

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

NOTES ON CONFERENCE:

Finalization of August 20, 2008 Meeting Minutes

The August 20, 2008 meeting minutes were finalized.

Durham, 14453 (Non-Federal)

John Byatt presented the project with Nadine Peterson. A presentation of the results of the historic review of the project area was requested at the October 2007 Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting. J. Byatt discussed the project background. The two existing bridges were severely damaged in the Mother's Day storm of 2006 and the bridges were closed. A temporary bridge is now being used to keep the bridge open. In April, the Engineering Study was submitted to NHDOT, which recommended replacing the two bridges with one single span bridge and removing the island/pier that was constructed between the two bridges. It was recommended that the existing easternmost and westernmost stone abutments be replaced with new concrete abutments at the same location. Rehabilitation and re-use of the existing abutments was not possible due to the approximate 5-foot rise in the profile being proposed.

Historic and archaeological reviews of the bridge and surrounding area were requested by NHDHR. The bridge site is adjacent to the historic Wiswall Falls Mill site. The archaeological review request was later rescinded but the historic review was completed by Preservation Company, Inc. The review found the stone abutments both at the rivers edge and at the pier to be historic. NHDHR concurred with this finding. As removal of these elements is planned, the project will have an adverse effect on historic properties.

As FEMA is contributing funding for the bridge reconstruction, FEMA was determined to be the lead Federal agency and therefore organized the request for mitigation. The other groups involved in this request were: NHDHR, National Parks Service, Lamprey River Advisory Committee, National Marine Fisheries Service and the Durham Historic Association. After several meetings the following was requested:

- Façades constructed of the existing stone blocks should be considered
- Color tint the concrete to give a darker more weathered look
- Use a low profile railing and paint it a dark color
- Install a permanent interpretive display that identifies the historic bridge
- Complete the formal documentation necessary to expand the boundaries of the current National Register mill district.

The Durham Town Council's preference is to have the most cost effective bridge constructed and therefore considered but ruled out stone façades due to their cost. The cost, including extra concrete to support the 2-foot wide stone blocks, was estimated at approximately $150,000. A meeting was held on July 11, 2008 with the parties involved in the mitigation request, representatives of the Town of Durham and CLD Engineers. Compromises were reached which include:

- FEMA would pay 75% of the cost for placing a façade made of the existing stone on the west abutment face and the southwest wingwall only. No other substructure surface would receive a façade unless another group could provide funding.
- It was determined (at a later date than the above meeting) that the tinting of the concrete would not be necessary.
- It was decided that the bridge and approach rail did not need to be painted. A galvanized coloring was appropriate.
- The interpretive display would be constructed.
- The formal documentation to expand the National Register boundaries would proceed.

FEMA agreed to pay for 75% of all of the items noted above.

FEMA was preparing the Memorandum of Agreement to be signed by all parties including NHDHR.

Discussion: N. Peterson asked if NHDOT would like to sign the agreement. Joyce McKay responded that they would. Several environmental issues were discussed. Kim Tuttle mentioned that she had been working with Cheri Patterson of NH Fish and Game with the dam drawdown restrictions. Kim had sent comments to Dori Wiggin of NHDES. J. Byatt mentioned that the dam drawdown would begin in mid-August and end in late October. Rich Roach asked if the bridge design precludes fish passage. J. Byatt stated that the fish byway was apparently off the table but a fish ladder may still be built. However, the bridge would be constructed before the fish ladder, therefore fish migration would not be affected. J. Byatt noted that an Essential Fish Habitat report had been sent to the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) for review. Gino Infascelli noted that depending on when the permit application was submitted, the project might be considered vested and therefore may not require a shoreland permit as required by the revised Comprehensive Shoreland Protection Act. J. Byatt mentioned that he had corresponded with the Shoreland Program and that they indicated that all issues would be covered in the wetland permit so a shoreland permit was not required. J. Byatt said the wetland permit application had been submitted and had been found to be administratively complete.

This project was previously reviewed on the following date: 10/17/2007.

Lebanon, NH - Hartford, VT, A000(627), 14957

The presentation involved an initial review of conceptual alignments for the US Route 4 Bridge over the Connecticut River (Bridge #058/127), located approximately 1 mile downstream of the Wilder Dam. The bridge consists of two riveted High Pratt Trusses and one riveted Warren Pony Truss placed on stone abutments and piers with concrete caps. The abutments are located at the edge of the water and two piers are located in the river. The bridge was built in 1936, with a major rehabilitation completed in 1975. The bridge has deteriorated since the last rehabilitation, with significant corrosion throughout the bottom chord and truss system. The curb-to-curb width is only 24 feet and the existing bridge approaches have poor geometry.

The bridge was recently posted for 10-tons after the last inspection revealed substantial deterioration. This posting prevents fully loaded trucks from using the bridge. An advanced

temporary bridge was considered to allow truck traffic to continue crossing at this location; however, this option has been rejected due to the high cost. NHDOT has instead determined that the replacement or rehabilitation of the existing bridge should be accelerated in its program.

Steve Johnson described the alternatives that are being considered, which currently include the following:

- New bridge upstream of the existing bridge (traffic would continue to use existing bridge during construction)
- New bridge on the existing alignment, or new on alignment bridge with modified alignment (would require the placement of a temporary bridge downstream)
- Rehabilitation of the existing bridge (would require the placement of a temporary bridge downstream)
- New bridge downstream of the existing bridge (traffic would continue to use existing bridge during construction)

Rehabilitation may not address deficiencies of the existing bridge. This alternative, however, will be studied as part of the NEPA process. A downstream alignment is not practical since it would result in a more deficient alignment, would impact two buildings, and require the construction of a new railroad underpass in Vermont. Other alternatives, which are the preferred alternatives at this time, involve an upstream alignment or a refined online alignment. With the exception of the downstream alignment, all alternatives will be studied in detail. The downstream alignment will be studied at a conceptual level to allow a comparison of impacts and costs with the other alternatives.

Christine Perron described the resources in the project area and coordination to date:

- Floodway/ Floodplains will require coordination with FEMA (David Knowles) and Office of Energy & Planning (Jennifer Gilbert), which has already been started. A Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) to study impacts on the floodway will likely be required.
- Hazardous materials exist on both sides of US Route 4 in NH. Coordination is ongoing with DES
- Bald eagles and dwarf wedge mussels occur in the vicinity of the project; however NH Fish & Game (NHFG) and the US Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) have been contacted and neither agency has any concerns regarding these species.
- Areas under the jurisdiction of DES, Army Corps of Engineers, and possibly the US Coast Guard consist of the Connecticut River, associated wetlands and its protected shoreland (Dredge & Fill, Shoreland Permit will be necessary).
- Connecticut River Joint Commissions has been contacted for input.

Rich Roach asked why a CLOMR would be necessary. S. Johnson replied that any alternative, with the exception of rehabilitation, would impact the floodway and would therefore require further study to determine the extent of impact. R. Roach prefers that the abutments be moved back away from the riverbanks. S. Johnson confirmed that the feasibility of moving the abutments further from the banks would be analyzed if a new bridge were proposed. R. Roach asked the group if there were any objections to dropping the downstream alternative from detailed study due to the involvement with buildings, a new railroad underpass, and the deficient alignment. There were no objections.

Steve Couture asked when a choice would be made between the rehabilitation and replacement alternatives. S. Johnson said that each alternative would need to be studied before a decision was made. Also, because the bridge is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, the Cultural Resource Agencies will play a role in this decision. Alex Vogt said that a Public Hearing is scheduled for early spring and a preferred alternative needs to be selected prior to that.

S. Couture stated that he agrees in the need for a floodway study. He would like to see impacts to the floodway reduced as much as possible, and would prefer to see the abutments moved further away from the riverbanks.

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

Epsom X-A000(668), 15266

This project involves the replacement of an existing 13-foot long bridge located on NH Route 107 over Griffin Brook. Associated roadwork will also be completed due to the flood damage caused by heavy rains in April 2007.

Bill Saffian introduced this project and explained that in addition to the bridgework, the project would include the installation of guardrail. Two gravel driveways, providing access to abutting fields, are expected to be impacted in association with the guardrail installation and may require slope modification beyond the existing right-of-way. He went on to say that the project would be taken to a Public Informational Meeting at the end of September (September 30, 2008), after which it would be determined if there will be a need for a Public Hearing.

Laurel Kenna addressed the environmental concerns for this project. She indicated that there was a hit for Blanding's Turtles indicated by the NH Natural Heritage Bureau (NHNHB) data search within a mile of the project site. As the project replaces an existing bridge on alignment, the Department feels that the project would have a negligible effect on the Blanding's turtle population or the desirable marshland habitat for these turtles. Kim Tuttle agreed with these statements and indicated that no further action was necessary.

L. Kenna also inquired about vegetative support for the banks of the stream. B. Saffian responded that there would be no stream improvements, but that wing walls would be flared to direct water through the structure. K. Tuttle then inquired about the abutting land and asked about the upstream habitat. B. Saffian indicated that during field visits, it was observed that the fields were being used for grazing livestock and that during a recent visit, had observed evidence of haying operations. L. Kenna indicated that there was a fence that was installed by the farmers, as well as some shrubby vegetation around the fence, that had protected some of the bank and roadway from being washed away during the flooding.

Gino Infascelli stated that the wetlands permit needed for this project would have to be filed in two (2) towns (Epsom and Deerfield) because the impacts would cross the town line.

K. Tuttle requested that riprap not be installed across the channel and that only natural round stone or the original material from the bottom of the brook be used in order to maintain a naturalized habitat and facilitate movement of amphibian and other aquatic organisms along the streambed.

Rich Roach mentioned that the Department should indicate clearly in the application or the Categorical Exclusion that the widened bridge structure (18' wide from 13' wide) is a design modification that offsets the proposed jurisdictional wetland impacts. He indicated that the new ACOE rules would require an explanation of this information and asked that the Department indicate the size of impact and exactly what had been done to improve the stream. Kevin Nyhan of the Bureau of Environment noted that if the project impacts less than 10,000 sf of wetland areas, it would not require mitigation at the State level. L. Kenna indicated that she would make mention of how the bridge structure alleviates impacts to the natural environment in the environmental document.

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

Meredith, STP-F-X-0241(014), 10430

The intent of this Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) project is to address congestion and safety issues on the US Route 3 and NH Route 25 corridors in the town of Meredith.

An overview of the current status of this project was presented. Jim Marshal noted that this was one of the first true CSS projects in NH, including 3 stakeholder groups, which include: Transportation, Town of Meredith and Regulatory Agencies. There have been 24 meetings over approximately two years. Part A of the CSS process includes determining reasonable alternatives to correct the problems associated with traffic and pedestrians that occur at the intersection of US Route 3 and NH Route 25 and the NH Route 25 corridor toward Center Harbor. Part B is expected to begin in 2009 and will include writing the environmental document and outlining the suggested alternatives. Part C is expected to begin in 2010 and will be the design of the project. Construction is scheduled to start in 2011.

Gene McCarthy presented the status of Part A. This part of the process should be completed by the end of this year. The Public Advisory Committee (PAC) has: determined a Town Vision, produced a Problem Statement, looked at various alternatives that would fix some of the problems and screened these alternatives to eliminate any that are infeasible and should not be considered in Part B. The scoring system is qualitative, not quantitative, so it just states if an alternative should be evaluated in the environmental evaluation. There were three public meetings in August 2008, and in general the attendees of these meetings agreed with the committee's findings.

Vickie Chase noted that a draft summary report of environmental setting of the area has been completed. This was based on published information, not new investigations. There are some large tracts of undeveloped and farm land outside of the village which are fragmented by NH Route 25. There are several small palustrine wetlands in the area and Hawkins Brook is a prime wetland emptying into Lake Winnipesauke. There are several perennial and intermittent streams that empty into the lake and an aquifer that runs northwest to southeast under the area. The water

quality of Lake Winnipesauke is quite good at this time except for mercury. K. Tuttle noted that this year was the first time a cyanobacteria outbreak occurred in Meredith Bay.

The only record of a rare or threatened species is the occurrence of the Common Loon. There are some instances of invasive plants in the area, e.g. Purple loosestrife and Phragmites. The soils are sandy-loam glacial tills around Lake Winnipesauke.

Agricultural resources include Moulton Farm, which is an important feature of the Meredith area. There are several town properties that are protected conservation land. The NH bicycle route guide lists NH Route 25 as a route for bicyclists with "advanced skills," as vehicle speeds are fast and there are no shoulders along this section of roadway.

Liz Hengen has reviewed the cultural resources and identified 18 additional structures to add to those proposed in a 1997 study. She also noted that the village of Meredith is an historic district. Victoria Bunker has reviewed the area for archaeological sensitivity and determined that the potential for archaeological deposits is low given the disturbance of the area.

There are likely some contaminated parcels as there was an asbestos factory here and K. Tuttle noted that at one time there was a clock factory that used radioactive paint/mercury. There is also a high potential for petroleum contamination in selected areas.

Mark Kern asked if there has been a vernal pool study. V. Chase noted that there hasn't been one yet, but a detailed wetland study will be conducted when the environmental assessment is started. J. Sikora asked if there is a project website with the reports. G. McCarthy noted that it is www.meredith3-25.com.

G. McCarthy also stated that the project was broken up into two parts, the village of Meredith/ US Route 3/ US Route 25 intersection area and the NH Route 25 corridor to the Center Harbor town line, as these areas have different needs. In discussing the alternatives, no one at the public meeting or within the Project Advisory Committee had any positive comments about the no-build option or the capacity scenario of 4 lanes and 2-lane roundabouts within Meredith Village. Most people liked the alternative with 3 lanes and signals or roundabouts.

The committee has determined that one of the main problems is with pedestrian traffic. There are several options to treat this problem, including a grade separation to keep the traffic away from the pedestrians, signals, roundabouts and traffic directors. M. Kern asked if granite curbs are needed, as these are not wildlife friendly and maybe sloped curbs could be considered. G. McCarthy stated that for storm water treatment, curbs are needed, but sloped curbs would be considered. Rich Roach asked about the budget. J. Marshal said it was $5 million but at this stage the committee was not considering price.

One alternate includes 3 lanes and bike lanes with multiple roundabouts. Aesthetics is of particular concern to the Committee and the public who see this as an opportunity to visually enhance the area.

Another option is the school bypass, which takes a new road behind the High School. This alternative passes through forested areas and ends on NH Route 25 at the Meredith Community

Center. This option hasn't been fully screened yet so the opinions of the committee are not known at this time. R. Roach asked if this helps with the traffic. G. McCarthy said not really and it goes through some undeveloped land.

It was asked if the traffic is just going through Meredith to Conway. G. McCarthy said no, a license plate traffic count was completed on a Friday evening and much of the traffic is staying in the area. Most of the problem is seasonal and on weekends. M. Kern asked if the committee had studied a bridge over the bay. G. McCarthy said it was not considered as no one thought it could be built. It would also change the aesthetics of the lake view.

The committee is also looking at the intersection with Route 25 and Pleasant Street, as there is a traffic problem with people exiting Pleasant Street on to Route 25. There is an option of a bypass behind the bank and over Hawkins Brook, which would potentially impact a prime wetland. The environmental impacts of this option have not yet been screened. R. Roach noted that this would only be worth considering if it is highly effective.

The rural part of NH Route 25 has some safety issues, which could be addressed with maintaining the current road configuration and fixing the intersection safety problems or changing the character of the road to slow it down possibly to 35 mph.

R. Roach asked about wetland impacts. G. McCarthy noted that most of the probable options do not have many wetland impacts. J. McKay encouraged a DHR review before this phase of the project is finished. G. McCarthy noted that they have been invited to every meeting, but will schedule a presentation at a future SHPO meeting.

This project was previously reviewed on the following dates: 5/21/1992, 6/15/1995, 4/16/1997, 5/18/2005.

Lebanon Airport Master Plan Supplement, AIP #3-33-0010-32-2007 & AIP #3-33-0010-34-2007

Bob Furey introduced the presentation. B. Furey noted that presentation would cover two topics: Airport Master Plan Supplement and Update on the South Apron Mitigation Project

Airport Master Plan Supplement:
The Airport Master Plan and status of the South Apron Mitigation. B. Furey gave a background on the airport and the Master Plan Supplement relating to alternatives. He indicated that previous wetland mapping was revised by field delineation supplemented by hydrologic monitoring. B. Furey noted that part of the Supplement is to update the Airport Layout Plan (ALP). It was found that four areas were not shown as airport property and these parcels should be transferred to the airport and the ALP revised accordingly, as the parcels are obligated to the airport. The four areas are located east and west of the Runway 18 end, south of Runway 7-25 and east of Runway 18-36 and north of Runway 7-25. Dave Gobin provided additional background on this issue.

B. Furey discussed that the airfield Alternatives effort began with 9 alternatives for Runway 18-36 (primary runway) and 11 alternatives for Runway 7-25 (crosswind runway). The effort has resulted in 3 alternatives for Runway 18-36 and 4 alternatives for Runway 7-25 being brought

forward for further consideration. B. Furey then summarized each alternative. The preferred alternative by the airport for runway 18-36 is (PR-12) to rotate and extend the runway to an alignment of 1-19. This measure will improve safety, accommodate runway length needs, and accommodate improved instrument approach utility. The preferred alternative by the airport for Runway 7-25 is to leave it as-is, extend/rotate Runway 18-36, then change the classification of Runway 7-25 to "B-II" which requires a smaller Runway Safety Area.

D. Gobin noted that correspondence form the Transportation Security Administration requesting a perimeter road around the airport was included in the handouts. Also, the parcel adjacent to runway 36 may have more value for the airport as a revenue-producing area rather than a mitigation area.

D. Gobin discussed that the hill within and north of the 26-acre easement is planned to be removed for safety purposes.

Rich Roach suggested that a new North-South Runway (RW 1-19, Option 12 as presented by B. Furey) appears to be a reasonable safety improvement project and voiced no objections to the various options presented.

Mark Kern stated he was not going to second guess the presented RW options (from a planning and engineering standpoint) and generally had no significant concerns with any of them. He asked that the Airport present the preliminary wetlands impacts and make a distinction between mowed wetlands and pristine wetlands.

Discussion followed that the City would submit some bullet-point items to show impact of the preferred airport improvement alternatives that B. Furey noted that in order to obtain preliminary Natural Resource Agency input on the alternatives. Information to be provided will include: estimated wetland impact, functional value of the wetlands that may be impacted, potential mitigation measures/sites, and estimated land acquisition and mitigation development/management costs.

South Apron Mitigation Project:
Mike McCrory then discussed mitigation for the South Apron project and potential options for mitigation of future projects. M. McCrory described the recent wetland delineation process (field evaluation and hydrologic monitoring for the 2007 growing season, and follow-up field work in the 2008 season). M. McCrory showed the wetland line from the earlier delineation and the substantially smaller wetland line from the recent delineation.

M. McCrory noted that the $150,000 mitigation payment related to the South Apron project has been made and deposited to the Lebanon Conservation Commission's "LOST" fund (Lebanon Open Space Trust). It is understood that the Conservation Commission's use of the $150,000 must be for land acquisition approved by Army Corps of Engineers and NHDES. M. McCrory discussed the South Apron Mitigation program further. Dave Gobin noted that a copy of the NHDES Notice of Partial Compliance and payment of the $150,000 is included in the handouts.

M. McCrory noted that a study had been made of many areas within Lebanon to mitigate the South Apron project. The two alternatives that remain in discussion are: a conservation easement over a

93-acre parcel east of the Runway 36 end (on one of the parcels that needs to be transferred to the airport) and a 53-acre area adjacent to the existing Boston Lot mitigation area. The 93-acre parcel is an area of relatively low mitigation value due to the value of existing wetlands and consideration by the City for a perimeter road. The Transportation Security Administration has commented to the Lebanon Airport that a perimeter road would improve airport security by providing law enforcement clear views of the runway and taxiway areas. The "Gold" area adjacent to the existing Boston lot, as shown on handouts, would be a higher value mitigation area as it is adjacent to an existing mitigation area and has higher environmental value.

R. Roach asked if use of the conservation easement for the parcel adjacent to the Boston Lot was "double-dipping" as he recalled that the parcel was transferred to the City as part of mitigation for another project. M. McCrory mentioned that the property was transferred to the City by Dartmouth College as part the Sachem Village expansion project, but the transfer included no conservation easements. Applying a conservation easement to the 53-acre area would provide 10:1 mitigation of the South Apron wetland impact. D. Gobin confirmed this based on a review by the City Attorney. R. Roach mentioned that it had to be clear if there were any deed restrictions and/or conservation easements on the property transferred to the City as part of the Sachem Village mitigation. It was noted that documentation needs to be provided to demonstrate the purpose of the transfer and what conditions, if any, should be included in the transfer of the Sachem Village mitigation property.

D. Gobin discussed that the Lebanon Conservation Commission would prefer to receive letters from the Natural Resource Agencies stating their position/s on the mitigation issues rather than approved minutes from the monthly Natural Resource Agency meetings. A number of people discussed that it may be better for the Natural Resource Agency group to meet in-person with the Lebanon Conservation Commission and City Council, preferably the same day as the monthly Natural Resource Agency meetings. Gino Infascelli mentioned that agencies would need to receive a letter/proposal before they would provide a letter to the Conservation Commission.

M. McCrory indicated that a possible use of the adjacent parcel (approximately 55 acres, also transferred as part of the Sachem Village project) could be used to consolidate the three existing on-airport conservation easements.

The Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests (SPNHF) has established interest in being the 3rd party holder/manager of a conservation easement over either conservation parcel presently discussed.

Lori Sommer mentioned that payments for such a conservation easement would not be "an in-lieu fee payment.

M. McCrory noted that the existing 26-acre conservation easement, at the south tip of airport property, was a permit requirement for mitigation of a taxiway extension project. He also noted that this extension project never occurred.

R. Roach mentioned that the Army Corps of Engineers may require a public review as this project involves relocating the easement and/or using the conservation easement to mitigate for another

purpose. L. Summer mentioned that a lot of steps would be required to swap existing on-airport conservation easements to the Boston Lot area.

D. Gobin stated that the City is not looking to "take back the 26-acre easement", but since it is in fact in-place, the City is looking to relocate the easement elsewhere.

Consensus was reached that in concept it would be better to consolidate easements than have on-airport easement or fractionalized easements over an area. M. Kern mentioned that switching conservation easements appears to make sense. He further wanted to clarify that adjoining conservation parcels is not the primary objective and that consideration is given to natural resource value of the parcel. For example, for a disconnected parcel located on shoreland, providing a riparian buffer zone could be just as valuable as a parcel connected to another conservation parcel with less natural resources value. Mark also noted that there may be some level of protection by law in riverfront areas. M. McCrory suggested the City prepare a proposal and submit it to the Resource Agencies for consideration.

Questions were also asked if there were any conditions involved with acquisition of the parcel containing the 26-acre conservation easement.

R. Roach said some information should be included: value of the 93-acre parcel, value of the 26-acre conservation easement and other on-airport conservation easements would have to be described, and a request to "switch" the conservation easements made. There was general agreement with the concept and that relocating conservation easements from relative low environmental value areas to higher environmental areas would be beneficial.

Mike McCrory noted that the 26-acre conservation easement is routinely mowed for airport approach surface protection.

M. McCrory reviewed the City-wide search of mitigation for the South Apron project and noted that some areas that were determined not to be suitable for South Apron mitigation may be suitable for future wetland impact mitigation efforts.

L. Sommer asked about the schedule for the Boston Lot; specifically when SPNHF would be prepared to take over a possible easement for the 53-acre area near the Boston Lot.

M. McCrory said that a "pre-meeting" with the agencies in the early-October timeframe would work. M. Kern mentioned that the next Monthly Natural Resource Agency meeting was Oct. 15.

K. Tuttle noted that the Natural Heritage Review that was provided in the handout needs to be updated. B. Furey acknowledged this and noted that the review in the handout was just for informational purposes.

It was agreed that the City would submit some additional background information on: acquisition of the airport parcel that now contains the 26-acre conservation easement, confirmation of any controls/restrictionsplaced on the Boston Lot "Gold" parcel and adjacent parcel.

This project was previously reviewed on the following date: 7/18/2007.