

EFFECTS MEETING MINUTES FOR THE MEMORIAL BRIDGE PROJECT

[A000(911), 13678F]

November 18, 2010, 10:00-3:30

Location: NH Federal Highway Conference Room

Participants:

NHDOT:

Jill Edelmann

Bob Landry

Joyce McKay

Kevin Nyhan

Beth Muzzey

Linda Wilson

FHWA

Jamie Sikora

Jed Merrow

Maine DOT

Gerry Audibert*

NHDHR

Laura Black

Peter Michaud

McFarland-Johnson

Vicki Chase

Gene McCarthy

Maine SHPO

Kirk Mohoney*

Consulting Parties

Richard Candee, Portsmouth Historic Society

Ken Herrick, Albacore Park

Betsy Merritt, National Trust for Historic Preservation**

Richard Wilder, Albacore Park

Rebecca Williams, National Trust for Historic Preservation

*Participation via video conference

**Participation via phone conference

Introductions were made.

Joyce McKay asked if there were any changes to the agenda. None were suggested, and the agenda was approved as written.

Purpose and Need/CE/(4)f Documentation

Bob Landry had drafted the statement for the new replacement project. The draft statement was circulated in-house at NHDOT, but it had not been circulated for comment. B. Landry said he would forward it to the group as soon as possible.

Bob Landry then reviewed the CE/4(f) document that would be completed for this project. The connections study was just a planning document, and did not formally document Section 106. B. Landry asked FHWA if the Categorical Exclusion (CE) was appropriate. Jamie Sikora from NH FHWA was the only FHWA representative at this meeting and agreed that this project does qualify for a CE. 23CFR771 qualifies bridge replacements as categorical exclusions. Beth Muzzey, NHDHR, asked that J. Sikora describe in detail the CE process. J. Sikora explained that a CE is a project that does not have individual or cumulatively significant environmental impacts. Historical resources are included among these environmental impacts. However, B.

Muzzey wanted to know how those impacts were quantified. J. Sikora stated that projects could have adverse effects and still be a CE.

In reference to the Memorial Bridge, B. Muzzey wanted to point out to the group that NHL's are usually listed as such because the owner has pursued that listing. The DOT does not typically place eligible properties on the National Register or list them as NHL's. However, the Memorial Bridge is eligible for the National Register at the national level. The DHR has been internally struggling with the use of a CE for this project.

J. Sikora suggested that this project be reviewed with other FHWA personnel, and that ACHP be consulted early in process.

No Build (Removal without Replacement)

B. Landry explained that under a no build option, the Memorial Bridge would become unsafe for vehicular and navigational traffic, and it would then be removed. The Scott Avenue and Kittery approaches would be left in place for the time being. New Hampshire would likely remove the Scott Avenue Bridge under a separate project.

1. Memorial Bridge (3 spans)

As the no build alternative would ultimately involve the removal of Memorial Bridge, it would have an adverse effect on all aspects of its integrity due to the removal of the nationally significant bridge. Richard Candee agreed that it would have an adverse effect on everything. Check physical destruction and #2 neglected property.

2. Memorial Bridge Historic District

As the district is also of national significance, the no-build would be adverse on all elements of integrity. It was noted that 'National Significance' should be checked on yellow sheet. B. Muzzey also suggested that it might be helpful to check boxes 1-5 on the yellow sheet.

K. Mahoney added that the John Paul Jones Park has not been discussed, and is part of the Memorial Bridge District. At the moment, the committee did not have Maine's official determination. However, K. Mahoney believed that it would be an adverse effect, however no physical impacts were taking place. B. Muzzey asked about other resources in Maine. Gerry Audibert answered that Maine was moving forward with the analysis for SML, and questioned if there was a way to dovetail the two analyses so as not to have duplicate meetings. J. McKay asked if it would make sense for Maine to do a response/concurrence and that can be tagged onto what NH is doing. K. Mahoney said he would be sending all findings to NHDOT. It was also noted that the Eastern Railroad should be included in the SML effects meetings, as it is not affected by the Memorial Bridge project.

3. Memorial Park

B. Landry explained that under the no build alternative, the park would not be destroyed. But, R. Candee added that the eventual removal of the Scott Avenue Bridge under the no-build would change the park design. B. Landry stated that its removal was not assumed in the cost estimate,

however for practical reasons it would have to be removed, and the slopes of the park would be altered, resulting in an adverse effect from the destruction of the park.

4. Scott Avenue Bridge

It was agreed that Scott Avenue Bridge would have the same impact as described in Memorial Park, i.e. eventual removal. There would be an adverse effect on the resource.

5. Portsmouth Historic District

B. Muzzey asked which determination of eligibility was listed on the green sheet. Jill Edelmann noted that the green sheet did not list an official determination, and it was noted on the green sheet that a consensus determination was made at the time. B. Muzzey asked what the determination for the Court Street project was, as it is part of the Portsmouth Historic District. R. Candee also noted that the boundaries have changed since 1976, and the new boundaries should be checked with the city. Peter Michaud agreed that the boundaries have expanded, as it now extends down to the Frank Jones Brewery. Kirk Mahoney add that in Maine districts that contain NHL's are listed at a national level. B. Muzzey would like to add to the yellow sheet: "given the presence of NHLs, the level of significance would be national."

Kevin Nyhan asked if Memorial Bridge was included in the Portsmouth Historic district. B. Muzzey voiced her frustration with the Connections study, saying that these aspects were not included, and that it did not do its due diligence in making sure these points were already laid out. P. Michaud concluded that yes the Portsmouth Historic District should include the Memorial Bridge.

With the knowledge that the Portsmouth Historic District is at a national level of significance, it was determined that there would be an adverse effect on the whole district, as all seven aspects of integrity would be compromised. B. Muzzey added that criteria 1-4 on the effects sheet would be adversely affected.

6. Jackson House (NHL)

Linda Wilson pointed out that the Jackson House location needs to be corrected on the planning study map. R. Candee noted that you can see the top of Memorial Bridge's lift span from the Jackson House, and that it has been in that view shed for 90 years. L. Wilson noted that in buying the Jackson House Sumner Appleton expressed the historic preservation impulse that was then being threatened by industrial scale changes. It was determined that there would be an adverse effect on the Jackson House due because it would be harder to navigate to the property and because of increased traffic. Feeling, setting, and association would be compromised, adding to that adverse effect.

7. Warner House (NHL)

R. Candee advised the group that the Warner House is the NHL most closely related to the bridge. It sits next to the Memorial Bridge District. The effects will be disastrous if the bridge is removed. The no build option will affect visitation, access, traffic patterns/issues, and result in economic impacts to the Warner House. It was agreed that this alternative would have an adverse effect to setting, feeling, and association; impacting criteria #2, 3, 4.

8. Moffat-Ladd House (NHL)

R. Candee noted that the Moffat-Ladd House has a better view of the bridge than the Jackson house, and almost identical traffic issues, with increased noise, traffic, and impacts to visitation. B. Muzzey added that anything that makes it more difficult for the visitor would be adverse. It was agreed that there would be an adverse effect to setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association; and checking criteria #2, 3, and 4, noting that 1 is potential.

9. Wentworth Gardner House (NHL)

The Wentworth Gardner house, which is on Mechanic and Gardner Streets, is currently not on the planning study map, and needs to be added. It was agreed that the no-build option is not likely to impact this NHL, since access issues already exist. It was determined that there is an effect; however it is not adverse to the house's setting.

10. Gov. John Langdon Mansion (NHL)

It was agreed that the effects seen here would be similar to the Wentworth Gardner House. P. Michaud added that the significance of the property does not link to Memorial Bridge, and that traffic would not be an issue. There is an effect on setting, which is not adverse.

11. Albacore (NHL)

Ken Herrick stated that he had sent an email asking that all aspects of integrity be checked, and asked if there a reason they were not. Albacore Park believes that the park adds to the setting and the feeling and location, because it maintains its waterfront setting. It was examined under the National Park Service Bulletin 20, and its interpretation for the Albacore suggests that it is adversely affected under all seven aspects of integrity. P. Michaud added that there also needs to be a discussion of the Albacore Connector Road, and whether or not the Connector road is eliminated in any of the options. To the best of K. Herrick knowledge, under all options, the Connector Road remains in place, and is needed with the no build option. The Connector Road was built by NHDOT in 2006 when repairs were being made to the Sarah Mildred Long Bridge, as an access road. Traffic has since increased to around 800 cars a day, which suggests that the Connector Road is a permanent feature.

J. McKay concluded that it would continue to be listed under National Register Criteria A and C. It was agreed by all that the permanence of the Connector Rd is an adverse effect on design, setting, feeling and association, with the criteria. #2 and 3 check, and the potential for 4.

DHR will look at the boundaries of the Albacore as part of its determination of eligibility process.

12. Sarah Mildred Long Bridge (SML)

It was agreed that the no build alternative for the Memorial Bridge would have an adverse effect on the SML's setting, feeling, association, and design, with a potential for adverse effects on materials and workmanship (given that you can't predict the future). Checked criteria would include #2 and 3, with #1 as a potential. The major concern was the increase in traffic and loading that the bridge would be forced to carry.

13. US Route 1 Bypass District

The permanence of the Connector Road was discussed again, and it was determined that in all alternatives the road will be reviewed as in place. The US Route 1 Bypass includes the SML within its boundaries, and therefore there will be an adverse effect on the resource. All seven aspects of integrity will be compromised, and criteria #1-3 should be checked off on the effects sheets.

14. Christian Shore Historic District

R. Candee suggested that the group treat the Christian Shore Historic District the same as the Jackson House when thinking about effect, and all agreed. It was also noted that to be consistent, the level of significance on the effect sheet should be listed as National because it contains a National Historic Landmark. Similarly, the Portsmouth Historic District is considered to be significant at the national level because it contains multiple National Historic Landmarks.

Review of Prudency for the No Build (Removal without Replacement) Alternative

R. Candee believes there is a universal agreement that the no build alternative is not prudent from a cultural resources perspective. J. Sikora added that under the purpose and need statement, it is also not prudent. B. Muzzey asked if the extent of impact to the historic resources was taken into consideration in the purpose and need statement. J. Sikora questioned the need to go thru this no build alternative analysis in detail because it does not meet the purpose and need. R. Candee agrees that the only reason the no build analysis was reviewed was to provide baseline documentation. It was agreed by all that the No Build Alternative (removal without replacement) was dismissed as an alternative for the purposes of cultural resources analyses at 11:40 on November 18, 2010.

Rehabilitation Alternative

Review of the Details Associated with this Alternative

Memorial Bridge, Memorial Bridge District, Memorial Bridge Park, Scott Avenue Bridge, and Portsmouth Historic District were reviewed in 2007. B. Muzzey asked about the level of deterioration to the bridge between 2007 and the present that now made the feasibility of bridge rehabilitation so difficult. The rehabilitation had been determined feasible in the 2007 review. B. Landry explained that the 2007 rehabilitation alternative was based on a 2003 inspection of the bridge, and the bridge has since suffered an accelerated deterioration. The severely deteriorated bottom chord meant that to complete the rehabilitation today, the bridge would have to be dismantled; floated down the river; taken apart, removing 250,000 rivets; cleaned and sandblasted; reassembled with bolts; and floated back up the river. The lift span and bottom chord would be replaced. Many of the riveted connections would need replacement. The lifecycle of this bridge, about 25 to 50 years, was much less than a replacement bridge. Although it is feasible to rehabilitate the bridge, it is not prudent to spend that amount of money to replace 60 or more percent of the fabric. The rehabilitation cost is estimated between 125-140 million dollars as opposed to the cost of replacement at \$70 to 80 million dollars for the three-span bridge. The lifecycle of the replacement is 100 years with a major rehabilitation at 75 years

whereas the rehabilitation would require replacement in 50 years. The rehabilitation does not meet the purpose and need of the project.

L. Wilson thought that Jim Garvin should be involved in these discussions, since he was involved in the early stages of the overall project, and is more knowledgeable about the situation. MacFarlane-Johnson was tasked with completing an alternatives analysis to examine the alternatives in sufficient detail to dismiss the no-build and rehabilitation in favor of the Skyline replica. DHR would need to review a detailed alternative analysis to see if they concur with the dismissal of the rehabilitation alternative.

Determination of Effects

It was agreed that the following properties would not be affected with the rehabilitation alternative:

6. Jackson House
8. Moffatt-Ladd House
9. Wentworth Gardner House
10. Gov. John Langdon Mansion

7. Warner House

It was determined that there would be an adverse effect to the Warner House, as the proposed project *MAY* have an effect on the setting, materials, and workmanship. Also, the effect would include #1 –3 criteria. See discussion of the Warner House under the Replacement Alternative.

11. Albacore

It was agreed that the rehabilitation alternative would have the same impact as the no build alternative, an adverse effect on design, setting, feeling and association, with the criteria #2 and 3 checked, and the potential for 4. This determination assumes that the Connector Road remains in place.

K. Herrick added that with the Memorial Bridge rehabilitated, there would no longer be a need for the Connector Road, however there would still be a need associated with the SML. B. Landry agreed that the Connector Road is still needed to handle the truck traffic that cannot cross SML, and that the effect would remain adverse because there are still impacts to the park with the addition of the Connector Road.

1. Memorial Bridge

B. Landry reminded the group that with the rehabilitation alternative, there is still a 50% to 70% replacement of the bridge, including the lift span. It was agreed that there would be an adverse effect on all 7 aspects of integrity, and #1 under criteria.

2. Memorial Bridge Historic District

It was agreed that there would be an adverse effect on all 7 aspects of integrity, and #1, 2 and 3 under the criteria. R. Candee noted that there was an even greater impact because of the Scott Avenue replacement.

3. Memorial Park

Memorial Park would be impacted during construction, however it would be returned to its original state. Because the park would be destroyed for construction, it would be an adverse effect on all 7 aspects of integrity; and criteria 1, 2, and 3. Gene McCarthy noted that this should be the same as the 2007 determination.

4. Scott Avenue Bridge

It was agreed that there would be an adverse effect on all 7 aspects of integrity, and criteria #1, 2 and 3 because the Scott Avenue Bridge would have to be replaced. G. McCarthy noted that this should be the same as the 2007 determination.

5. Portsmouth Historic District

Under the rehabilitation alternative, the Portsmouth Historic District would look the same, however, with the replacement of the Scott Avenue bridge, there would be an adverse effect on all 7 aspects of integrity and #1 criteria.

12. Sarah Mildred Long Bridge

Everyone agreed that the rehabilitation of Memorial Bridge would have an effect on SML, however it would not be adverse.

13. Bypass

If the Connector Road is a temporary structure, there is an effect on the setting, however that effect is not substantial enough to be considered adverse. It was noted that there would also be a longer period of impact to the bypass than the 2007 determination for the rehabilitation of the Memorial Bridge determined.

14. Christian Shore

It was agreed that although there is an effect on the setting of the Christian Shore neighborhood, it is not substantial enough to be considered adverse.

K. Mahoney added that Maine would like to include their determinations and weigh in at a later date.

Presentation of Engineering Information

B. Landry presented the engineering report PowerPoint to the group, which depicted some of the key issues with Memorial Bridge. Some of those issues included rivets that needed to be replaced with bolts, surface rust, catch areas, and separating elements (due to pack rust).

B. Landry explained that the gusset plates are so deteriorated and that they are inaccessible for repair on site. The bridge must be floated down river and dismantled. L. Wilson asked how this bridge rehab compares to other bridges that have been successfully rehabilitated. Recently FHWA had a webinar on successful bridge rehabilitations and re-uses, which included some heavily deteriorated trusses. B. Landry is unsure how others have attacked the same problem that Memorial Bridge is facing, however he was alarmed at the costs involved with rehabilitating and maintaining Memorial Bridge. Pete Davis, from HDR estimated the cost of rehabilitation

between \$125 to \$140 million, adding a 10% range on either side. The majority of the cost is the labor involved with dismantling, removing all the bolts, cleaning, spraying, and reassembling. Although floating the bridge in and out of place is expensive, it is not the majority of the rehabilitative costs. If the bridge were to remain in place during the rehab, it would have to be heavily braced and the redistribution of stresses could be detrimental as pieces are removed. B. Landry guessed that time timeline for rehabilitation would be around 24 months; however an exact time could not be pinpointed. Life cycle comparisons were included in the Connections Study.

Review of Prudency for the Rehabilitation Alternative (from a 4(f) perspective)

J. Sikora initiated the prudency review stating that based on the in-depth inspection data from the consulting bridge experts and DOT experts, the rehab alternative did not meet the purpose and need, and was no longer a viable option. However for NEPA requirements, all alternatives needed to be reviewed. J. Sikora suggested that based on additional information presented in the Connections Study, from the engineers, and with the rehabilitation costs, it should be reasonable to conclude that rehabilitation is not prudent.

L. Wilson pointed out that in reviewing HDR's report, Jim Garvin observed that it did not state that the bridge could not be rehabilitated. B. Landry disagreed, and stated that HDR made the conclusion in their document that the bridge could not be rehabilitated. L. Wilson countered that it was not stated clearly that rehabilitation was feasible but not prudent. R. Candee noted that everyone had been in agreement that rehab was feasible, it was the prudency argument that had to be made. B. Muzzey again voiced her frustration with the documentation to date, and the fact that these issues need to be written in a manner understandable to the layperson.

In reviewing the prudency issues, B. Landry noted that the replacement option will cost between 60 and 70 million, but does not include life cycle costs. Life cycle costs are based on 100 years. In 75 years a major improvement would be needed on the replacement bridge. Under the rehabilitation option, after only 50 years the rehabilitated bridge would need to be totally replaced. In his opinion it does not make sense to save a bridge now that will have to be replaced in 50 years. R. Candee asked why after 50 years the rehabilitated bridge would need to be replaced. It was explained that the older members supporting the newer members do not have as long a shelf life even when rehabilitated, and would eventually need replacement. R. Candee suggested that Mary Ann Nabor's FHWA PowerPoint on historic bridges might be helpful in answering the question of prudency.

G. McCarthy stated that McFarland-Johnson (MJ) is writing a detailed analysis, which included comparison with other significant bridges. Once MJ writes the analysis, the Division of Historical Resources can either approve or dismiss their findings. A draft should be completed by the end of 2010. B. Muzzey promised that DHR would do everything in their power to review the draft in an expedient fashion; however the prudency argument needs to be clearly laid out.

Replacement Alternative

Review of the Details Associated with this Alternative

Based on the current accelerated schedule, NHDOT needs to continue forward with the replacement alternative. A skyline replica of Memorial Bridge is proposed. The new bridge will look more robust than the existing and connections will be made with bolts. It will hopefully widen the shoulders to 5 feet, with 6-foot sidewalks on the outside of the truss, and include a solid deck. The operator house will be wider and moved off the lift span to provide a better work environment, and allow for general services to be piped to that location. The machinery house will remain on the lift span. Currently the piers can be reused, however the abutments may need to be replaced. The Coast Guard will also need to be involved regarding their new fender rules. It is anticipated that the large plaque and other smaller plaques will be saved, restored, and reattached as originally planned. NHDHR also requested a modern dedication sign at the bridge. There will also be signage in Prescott Park honoring Memorial Bridge, and informing visitors that the present bridge is not the original.

B. Muzzey noted that the 1923 bridge was so innovative for its time and asked if B. Landry found the proposed replacement bridge to be innovative. B. Landry did not believe the skyline replica was innovative, however it is visually the best fit for the location and surrounding districts. This type of bridge is not the least expensive bridge that could be placed there. R. Candee believed that the innovation in the skyline replica comes from the ability to reuse the piers and in new steel, decking and the multi-modal system, while still maintaining the skyline replica of the camelback trusses and lift span. He also noted that the camel back is important to the look of the crossing.

L. Wilson pointed out that some of the applications and details of the replica bridge be used to test out, and institutionalize ways to treat the corrosive nature of this area. If that's the case, the new bridge would continue to carry on that tradition of innovation that the 1923 bridge was known for.

Some snow removal treatments have been examined, however they will have to be examined further. Some removal methods include steam and heating elements rather than salt to de-ice the bridge. G. McCarthy added that scuppers might also help with snow and water removal.

P. Michaud asked why green paint was depicted in the renderings. B. Landry answered that the green was chosen out of the original project even though the City reached a general consensus to paint the bridge black. He noted that black tends to fade fairly quickly as for example on the double deck bridge over the Suncook River. NHDOT liked the compromise of painting the bridge green and the rail black. P. Michaud added that because this is a new bridge, the paint conversation changes. B. Landry noted that the paint color could certainly change in the final product.

The need for vibration monitoring in the Portsmouth Historic District and especially adjacent to any of the NHL's during the construction of the bridge and along approaches would be very important.

It was noted that the Albacore might not be considered a 4(f) resource because it is classified as an object. Peter Michaud will look at the definition of the boundary in the current National Register nomination to assess the current boundary. The potential for constructive use at the Albacore site was also briefly mentioned. It was asked if alternatives to the existing Connector Road to reduce the impact on the Albacore had been considered.

Determination of Effects

1. Memorial Bridge

Adverse effect under all 7 aspects of integrity, and #1-3 under criteria are checked.

2. Memorial Bridge Historic District

Adverse effect under all 7 aspects of integrity, and #1-3 under criteria are checked, with the added effect of Scott Avenue Bridge being replaced.

3. Memorial Park

Adverse effect under all 7 aspects of integrity, and #1 under criteria are checked, which is the same as the rehabilitation alternative.

4. Scott Avenue Bridge

Adverse effect under all 7 aspects of integrity, and #1-3 under criteria are checked.

5. Portsmouth Historic District

It was decided previously that Memorial Bridge would be included in the Portsmouth Historic District, and Maine will need to be consulted on the boundaries. There is an adverse effect to the district under all 7 aspects of integrity and #1-3 under criteria in part because of the loss of two structures, the Scott Avenue Bridge and the Memorial Bridge that is large and nationally significant. The Memorial Bridge can be seen from most locations within the district. Also, the temporary construction impacts will cause an adverse effect. B. Landry stated that the timeframe for replacement should be less than 18 months. B. Muzzey added that traffic flows would need to be examined since many of the local museums and attractions rely heavily on tourism brought about by through traffic.

6. Jackson House

The project would not have an affect on the Jackson House, based on the assumption that changes in traffic patterns would not have an adverse effect to the building during construction season.

7. Warner House

P. Michaud mentioned to the group that during construction tourism to the Warner House could be adversely affected with detours and vibrations from construction. The Warner House has the oldest English murals in the country and is one of the most visited NHL's in New Hampshire. It is the second oldest NHL in the area, and its fabric is fragile, hence the concern for vibration. Thus, the impact could be both physical and economic.

It was determined that there would be an adverse effect to the Warner House, as the proposed project *MAY* have an effect on the setting, materials, and workmanship. Also, the effect would include #1 –3 criteria.

8. Moffatt-Ladd House

It was determined that there would not be an effect to the Moffatt-Ladd House, assuming that there would be no changes in traffic patterns that would be adverse to the building during construction season.

9. Wentworth Gardner

It was determined that there would be no effect to the Wentworth Gardner House since it is not located in the gateway setting and it would not be impacted by changes in traffic pattern.

10. Gov John Langdon Mansion

It was determined that there would be no effect to the Gov. John Langdon Mansion since there are no proposed traffic pattern changes at this location during construction.

11. Albacore

It was agreed that the replacement alternative would have the same effect as the rehabilitation alternative. There would be an adverse effect on design, setting, feeling and association under criteria. #2 and 3, and there is a potential for impact under criterion 4.

B. Landry stated the reasons for the presence of the Connector Road are, first, when the Memorial Bridge is closed, and secondly, as a bypass for the SML because of the lowered weight limits for truck traffic. However, the second reason is not part of the Memorial Bridge efforts and will be looked at in more detail when SML is discussed.

K. Herrick stated that based on J. Sikora's letters regarding Albacore Park, it is not a 4(f) resource. However, they did propose in a letter to FHWA their definition of the boundaries and the land contributing to the property. B. Muzzey suggested that Albacore Park be re-reviewed at a Determination of Eligibility Meeting, and if appropriate, the current determination can be updated. It was noted that if the Albacore Park were a 4(f) resources, it would not preclude having the Connector Road go through the park, however other alternatives for the road and their feasibility would have to be examined and weighed.

P. Michaud added that the DHR had made the comment before that the Albacore Park Connector Road has not been inserted into any of the formal documentations, even though it has been requested numerous times.

12. Sarah Mildred Long Bridge

Everyone agreed that the skyline replica replacement of Memorial Bridge would have an effect on the location and setting of the SML, however the effect would not be adverse. It was noted that there would also be a shorter construction period than the rehabilitation option.

13. Bypass

Everyone agreed that the skyline replica replacement of Memorial Bridge would have an effect on the setting of the Bypass, however it would not be adverse. This determination is based on the Connector Road being in place temporarily during construction, and then being removed.

B. Muzzey added that it would be beneficial to find an alternative route for Connector Road, one that doesn't cut through the Albacore Park.

14. Christian Shore

It was agreed that although there is an effect on the setting of the Christian Shore neighborhood, it is not substantial enough to be considered adverse.

Review of Prudency for the Skyline Replica Replacement Alternative/Timeframe for the Acceptance of the Alternative

B. Landry believes the replacement to be the best option available. B. Muzzey explained that it is the DHR's responsibility to go through each of these adverse effects and see if there is a more prudent way to avoid them. Under Section 106, DHR has to review each alternative to see what, if anything, can be avoided. If nothing can be avoided, and FHWA agrees, then those are the 4(f) impacts. She also agreed that the replacement might be the most prudent alternative.

Maine hoped to have their effects concurrence available in the next week or two. The APE for Memorial Bridge needs to be redefined, and Maine is tasked with establishing an APE for SML. Once Maine has established an APE for SML, while taking queue from the Memorial Bridge APE, it will be forwarded along to interested parties for their review along the Maine's concurrence.

Next Steps

The next meeting will discuss mitigation for the Skyline Replica Replacement. G. McCarthy stated that McFarland-Johnson is working on the alternative analysis, and will try to distribute it to parties prior to the December 16th meeting for review.

J. McKay announced that the next meeting would be on December 16th to discuss mitigation for Memorial Bridge. It was requested that all parties reserve the third Thursday of every month for meetings associated with Memorial and Sarah Long Bridges. The January meeting will be held on the 20th.