BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT
CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting
DATE OF CONFERENCES: December 2 and 9, 2010
LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building
ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT
Charlie Blackman
John Butler
Chris Carucci
Keith Cota
Jill Edelmann
Jon Evans
Steve Johnson
Marc Laurin
Steve Liakos
Brian Lombard
Don Lyford
Joyce McKay
Kevin Nyhan
Christine Perron
Matt Urban
Alex Vogt
Tony Weatherbee
CR Willeke

Federal Highway Administration
Jamie Sikora

NHDHR
Laura Black
Dick Boisvert
Edna Feighner
Jim Garvin
Beth Muzzey
Linda Wilson

FNRT
Alex Bernhard
Dick Mackay

Gorrill Palmer
Ralph Norwood

Hoyle Tanner
Sean James

NSPCB
David Wright

City of Portsmouth
David Moore

Town of Windham
Allan Barlow
Mark Samsel
David Sullivan

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

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

December 2, 2010 2
Walpole 660170 2
Stewartstown 99019Z 2
Newington-Dover, NHS-0371(037), 11238 3
Windham, X-A000(558), 14830 4
December 9, 2010 4
Pelham, 99409Z 4
New Castle 15895 (no federal number) 5
Pelham. X-A000(415), 14491 6
Enfield, X-A001(087), 12967B 6
Swanzey, 15348 (no federal number) 8
Swanzey, 14918 (no federal number) 8
Bath, X-A000(901), 14439 8
Rumney (no project number) 9
Portsmouth (no project number) 10

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

December 2, 2010

Walpole 660170
Participants: Brian Lombard, Christine Perron

Brian Lombard provided an update on the effort to repair the damaged stone arch culvert on Houghton Brook. The overburden has been removed from the top of the culvert and an access road has been constructed to provide access to the culvert inlet. The debris that had fallen through the hole in the culvert has been removed. No additional granite blocks have fallen from the culvert since the debris was removed, and the remaining blocks appear to be stable. The effort thus far has taken 2 months and has cost the Bureau of Rail & Transit approximately $140,000.

B. Lombard recently met with Steve Johnson (Bureau of Bridge Maintenance) regarding the culvert repair. He emphasized to S. Johnson that repairs would need to be made around existing blocks and that no additional blocks should be removed. A Bridge Maintenance crew will be at the site in 2 weeks to install a 20' long by 8' high concrete wall in the gap at the bottom of the culvert and back fill the area on the outside to help stabilize remaining blocks and prevent scour. Also, a crack in the blocks at the top of the culvert will be sealed. Tarps will then be placed over the culvert and the site will be left until final repairs can be completed in the spring. The project cannot be completed before spring because access to the culvert would be dangerous in winter conditions and a Bridge Maintenance crew is not available this year. Details on the final repairs will be determined in the spring.

Linda Wilson was appreciative of the efforts made thus far. No questions or concerns were voiced.

Stewartstown 99019Z
Participant: Christine Perron

Christine Perron provided an overview of the Bridge Maintenance project to repair a 1940 I-Beam Concrete bridge on NH Route 145 over Bishop Brook in Stewartstown. Repairs will consist of facing the existing concrete abutments and wing walls with 12" of new concrete, and replacing a 30' long x 9' tall concrete retaining wall located in the NE corner with a wall of the same dimensions built with concrete blocks. There will be no changes to the bridge structure. A wetland permit application for the project will be submitted to DES in the near future; Edna Feighner at DHR will receive a copy.

Linda Wilson asked about the dimensions of the concrete blocks, if the slope behind the wall is fill, and if there would be excavation in previously undisturbed areas. Subsequent to the meeting, C. Perron spoke to Steve Johnson in the Bureau of Bridge Maintenance, who responded that the face of the blocks would be 2' x 4' with a depth of 2'. Also, he confirmed that the slope behind the wall was fill and that there would be no excavation in previously undisturbed areas.

Joyce McKay asked if the proposed repairs could be considered No Adverse Effect and DHR agreed. It is understood that this bridge type will be incorporated into the bridge inventory and

management plan as a priority once the overall contract is let. Additional consultants capable of undertaking the survey include Lichtenstein.

Laura Black noted that there appeared to be no unique decorative elements on the bridge. She asked if the bridge would be eligible for listing in the National Register. J. McKay said that eligibility is unknown because the bridge would need to be compared to others of its type. L. Wilson commented that the bridge could be considered eligible by consensus.

No other questions or concerns were raised, and a No Adverse Effect Memo will be signed at the next meeting.

Newington-Dover, NHS-0371(037), 11238
Participants: Marc Laurin, Keith Cota, and Charlie Blackman, NHDOT

K. Cota and C. Blackman presented the additional impacts that will occur to the City of Portsmouth's Water Works property at Exit 2 in Newington. This impact is a result of the Public Service of NH's requirements to have a 100- foot easement, rather than a 50-foot easement as anticipated during the effects determination for the project. There would be 25' between the Water Works and the easement. They need this easement to relocate their existing transmission line and to accommodate up to three transmission lines within this easement. This expansion prevents the DOT from meeting the previous commitment to provide a tree buffer at this location.

This expanded easement will place the easement boundary along the eastern edge of the existing driveway and parking lot to the building and in the vicinity of the cleared area adjacent to the water tower. This will entail more clearing of the wooded area between the building and the Turnpike. The existing entrance will be within the easement area and will need to be relocated to the west side of the property, directly off Arboretum Drive. The Department will be doing a land swap with the City of Portsmouth and providing 1½ acres of adjacent undeveloped land north of the water tower for their future expansion needs. Ledge will be removed during construction, and vibration monitoring is already planned as part of this construction activity.

J. McKay stated that a Phase 1A/B will be done on the parcel in the spring. [J. Mckay and M. Laurin subsequently examined the 1.5-acre parcel, found that a portion of it was archaeologically sensitive, and requested VHB to expand IAC's scope of work to accommodate the additional survey.]

L. Wilson and L. Black stated that the property is eligible with the building and water tower as contributing elements. They expressed concerns on impacts to the existing parking area, any landscaped areas or tree line due to the expanded easement. Photos of the area are needed and these new impacts will need to be shown indicating how they will affect the property. K. Cota stated that the structures will not be impacted, and the area around them is lawn. There are no landscaping features. He will meet with the City and will discuss their access requirements, how this may affect the existing parking area, the possibility of plantings (e.g. - cedar buffer along the PSNH easement). He will provide this information at a future meeting in early summer for further discussion and resolution.

As there was a previous determination of Adverse Effect on the property, J. Sikora stated that there would be no need to revisit the MOA, nor the 4(f) determination for these additional impacts.

Windham, X-A000(558), 14830
Participants: Dave Sullivan (dsullivan@WindhamNewHampshire.com), Allan Barlow, Mark Samsel, Town of Windham

The Town of Windham came before the committee to propose using a wooden railing on the restored freight house, instead of the galvanized steel that was proposed in the original design plans. In pricing the galvanized steel railing, the town realized that the price was very steep compared to the price of using wooden railing. The wooden railing would be built to code, however stairs would not be included, as those would need to be ADA compliant, and the current use of the building does not require public access. If in the future, access would be required, the building would become ADA compliant. The railing would be painted Train Engine Red, as suggested by Lynne Monroe in her preservation plan.

Linda Wilson added that because the railing would be removable, under the Secretary of Interior Standards 9 and 10, the railing would be compliant with the preservation of the building. Laura Black noted that the wooden rail painted Train Engine Red appears to be less obtrusive, and more in keeping with the design of the freight house.

J. McKay concluded that because the building is owned by the state, and leased to the town of Windham, a No Adverse Effect Memo could be signed for the proposed wooden rail.

December 9, 2010

Pelham, 99409Z
Participants: Matt Urban, Tony Weatherbee, and Steve Johnson, NHDOT

The proposed Bridge Maintenance project is located off Main Street (bridge 110/090) over Beaver Brook in the Town of Pelham. This project consists of filling the large voids on a twin stone arch structure, built circa 1839 and expanded in 1929. The concrete would be limed grout, soft enough to work with the adjacent stone. However, the grout could not be removed. The proposed work is not intended to prevent the drainage a stone arch structure like this would need. The work is intended to prevent further rocks from falling out of place, resulting in a possible collapse of the structure. Alternatives for avoidance were assessed, and it was determined that this was the preferred alternative based on what is feasible and least impacting to the structure in the long term.

Steve Johnson, Matt Urban, and Anthony Weatherbee presented the project plan in addition to photos of the proposed work. DHR was concerned about filling all of the voids on a structure that is intended to self-drain. S. Johnson concurred and stated that it was not the intent to fill all of the voids, only those that compromise the structural integrity. Due to concerns, DHR has asked that Bridge Maintenance return to the next meeting with some more information a new treatment option.

Linda Wilson stated that the first step is an Inventory Form to determine its eligibility and learn more about the history of the bridge and the crossing. It was noted that another stone arch in Pelham was previously recorded, and information could be taken from that form to help populate this one. Joyce McKay stated that a reconnaissance level form would cost around $1,000. S. Johnson would need to ask the Front Office to proceed with the reconnaissance level form. L. Wilson suggested that John Wastrom be hired, even for half a day, to consult on the bridge repairs.

S. Johnson explained that for the bridge to be repaired in the immediate future, the only feasible way is to grout the voids, which would prevent stone loss, using a more heavily limed mixture. If a total rehabilitation were to be planned it would have to go into the bridge program for Bridge Design to look at, which could be 10 years down the road. L. Wilson asked if a membrane could be installed under the asphalt. S. Johnson stated a membrane does help control water getting into the cracks, however it does not solve the immediate problem of filling in the large voids to prevent stone loss.

J. McKay summarized that S. Johnson will talk to the Front Office, and if agreeable, will hire a consultant to complete a reconnaissance level inventory form, and it was understood that adding grout could be considered an adverse effect. L. Wilson stated that she would inquire Jim Garvin's opinion, and look into alternatives and mitigation.

It was agreed that this project would return to the January 6th meeting.

New Castle 15895 (no federal number)
Participants: Chris Carucci, Matt Urban, NHDOT

Matt Urban and Chris Carucci presented this project that proposes the rehabilitation of NH Route 1B causeway between Goat Island and New Castle Island, including replacement of existing cable guardrail with new beam guardrail, formalizing the typical section to reflect 11' travel lanes and 2' shoulders, paving existing gravel shoulders, doing full width overlay of the roadway, and repair of existing slopes. Photographs of the area were also provided.

There was concern about the proximity of the cemetery to the proposed work. C. Carucci and M. Urban reassured DHR that the project would not extend beyond the existing paved areas immediately adjacent to the cemetery. E. Feighner also noted that as long as the postholes for the new guardrail are in the vicinity of the old postholes, there would be no archaeological concerns. Photographs in conjunction with the plans of this area were used to show where the proposed work would be in relation to the cemetery. After review the photographs of the other nearby houses and structures, DHR found that the project would not impact the surrounding area, as long as the new guardrail did not extend beyond the end of the existing guardrail location. The project is staying completely within the existing ROW.

Linda Wilson and Laura Black noted that there is a New Castle Historic District and there is a consensus that the district would be eligible for the National Register, however no additional information would be required.

Because of the location of the District, it was decided that a No Adverse Effect memo could be singed at the next meeting, and further coordination is not necessary, unless plans change.

Pelham. X-A000(415), 14491
Participants: Kevin Nyhan, Chris Carucci, Don Lyford, NHDOT

Kevin Nyhan and Chris Carucci reviewed this project. K. Nyhan indicated that the project proceeded to a public hearing with both roundabout options (Alternative A & B). As the Town has not voted to relocate the fire station, the Department is proceeding with Alt. B, which avoids the fire station. Following the hearing, stonewall impacts were identified.

- The first stonewall impact is at the corner of Nashua Road and Windham Road at the parsonage for the First Baptist Church. The Department proposes to rebuild this stonewall, in-kind. C. Carucci noted that all construction would follow the stone wall policy.
- The second stonewall impact is along Nashua Road, in front of Parcel 25. Although the wall will not be physically impacted, roadway fill is proposed up against it. After discussion, it was determined that the Department should coordinate with all landowners to understand if there is any concern. Toppled sections of wall would also be rebuilt. Geotechnical fabric would be used between the fill and the wall to make sure that fine materials are not lost through the wall. Laura asked about pressure against the wall from the fill. Chris indicated that since only approximately 8" to 12" of fill would be against the wall there are not concerns for this pressure. The potential for a curb cut was discussed at two woods road access points at this parcel as well.
- The third impacted location is across the street from the town complex along Marsh Road and down Acorn Lane. Field review of the stonewall along Acorn Lane found that the wall is just a line of stone and not a formalized stonewall. The stonewall along Marsh Road is not maintained, and the wall is only a few stones high. There will be limited impacts to this wall, and the Department does not propose to reconstruct this wall.
- The last stonewall section is in front of the cemetery along Acorn Road. This wall will not be impacted, but delineates the Town of Pelham cemetery. Edna asked if there were old headstones near the wall. Kevin indicated that it appeared that there are. Edna indicated that the work in front of the cemetery would need to be monitored by an archaeologist, with limited transects, if needed.

J. McKay will prepare an updated memorandum of no adverse effect that addresses the stonewall issues, and indicates that the Department is moving forward with Dual Roundabout Alternative B. As indicated at previous meetings, work in areas outside the paved way around the village commons would require archaeological investigations.

Enfield, X-A001(087), 12967B
Participants: John Butler, Jonathan Evans, and Alex Vogt; Alex Bernhardt (aabernhard@comcast.net) and Dick MacKay (dickmackay@comcast.net), FNRT

This project involves the reconstruction of Main Street in Enfield, NH, in the area of the Northern Rail-Trail (formerly the Northern Railroad) overpass. Jon Evans and Alex Vogt gave a brief

overview of the project. A. Vogt explained that this project was originally included as part of the Enfield 12967 project which involves the replacement of the Shaker Bridge over Lake Mascoma and the reconstruction of Main Street and NH Route 4A. Due to concerns regarding the reconstruction of Main Street in the area of the Northern Rail-Trail, this section of the project was broken into a separate effort.

A. Vogt passed out meeting minutes from a Public Informational Meeting held on November 17, 2010. He explained that the intent of the Informational Meeting was to provide the public with an opportunity to express their concerns associated with the existing conditions. The Department also requested input on possible design alternatives, which would address any of the issues associated with the existing condition.

A. Vogt indicated that the public was largely concerned about the safety of the existing underpass and its inability to adequately accommodate lager vehicles, including emergency vehicles. They were also concerned about the speed of both vehicles on Main Street and snowmobiles on the rail-trail. They were also concerned about the cost of constructing a new grade separated crossing. He noted that overall there appeared to be more support for an at-grade crossing but that safety of pedestrians and rail-trail users is important.

A. Vogt noted that the Department is now in the process of preparing several alternative designs which would attempt to address as many of the public's concerns as possible while still meeting the Department's design constraints.

J. Evans and Joyce McKay indicated that during the previous project, the Department reviewed the area for historic and archaeological resources. The house on parcel 8 was reviewed and was determined ineligible for the National Register. The area was also reviewed for the presence of any historic districts. The only district found within the project area was the Northern Railroad corridor itself. An archaeological site was also located on parcel 20, well outside the area of project effect.

J. Evans noted that one alternative which was expressed at the meeting, which seemed to hold some potential, was to bypass the existing underpass by moving the road closer to the alignment of the temporary bypass road, which was constructed in August 2010. This alternative would create an at grade crossing by raising the profile of the roadway close to that of the rail-trail, eliminating the need for extensive modification of the rail-trail profile A. Vogt noted that the Department still needs to evaluate this alternative to determine if it can meet the Department's roadway design constraints.

Alex Bernhard expressed his desire for the grade separated crossing because one major concern was rail trail users heading downhill into traffic if the bridge is removed and the other the loss of continuity of the historic Northern Rail Trail. He believed the permanent use of the bypass road to be a great compromise between rail users and the DOT.

Those present indicated preliminary support for this alternative as it would minimize impacts to the railroad and the existing rail-trail overpass. Once the Department has developed the alternatives, the project will again be reviewed with DHR to determine the effect of each alternative on the Northern Railroad Corridor. Although this project was reviewed to some extent

during the development of the previous project, DHR felt that there have been enough changes that an RPR form should be submitted.

Swanzey, 15348 (no federal number)
Participants: Sean James, Hoyle Tanner (sjames@hoyletanner.com); Steve Liakos, CR Willeke, NHDOT

There was one question whether there was a stone headwall at the pipe culvert; there is not. The Effect Memo was completed as "No Historic Properties Affected " and signed at this meeting.

Swanzey, 14918 (no federal number)
Participants: Sean James, Hoyle Tanner (sjames@hoyletanner.com) ; Steve Liakos, CR Willeke, NHDOT

The Effect Memo was completed as "No Historic Properties Affected" and signed at this meeting.

Bath, X-A000(901), 14439
Participants: Sean James, Hoyle Tanner (sjames@hoyletanner.com); David Wright, Consulting Party; Jim Garvin, NHDHR; Steve Liakos, NHDOT

This project has previously been discussed at the 9/11/2008, 10/9/2008, 4/2/2009, 4/8/2010, 8/5/2010, 9/9/10 and 11/4/10 Cultural Resource Committee meetings.

The revised Effect Memo was signed at this meeting as an Adverse Effect with a Programmatic 4f.

D. Wright provided a photo that showed the west end of the bridge with two slightly raised decking sections at each side as sidewalks. The date of the photo was unknown but was believed to have been taken in the 1940's. S. James noted that the only issue he could see with two sidewalks is that for a downstream sidewalk, there is no room on the approaches to the bridge to continue them. He will discuss this option with representatives of the Town of Bath.

There was some discussion on the longitudinal load distribution stringers proposed by D. Wright at the last CRC meeting. He noted that while the majority of the floor beams are not historic, it is preferred to retain existing material wherever possible. S. James is not in favor of the additional stringers for several reasons discussed at the last CRC meeting. He will investigate the use of longitudinal steel beams down the center of the bridge under the floor beams to determine if this would allow for retention of the existing floor beams.

D. Wright noted that it would be preferable to have the interior bridge lights bright in the day for visibility and lower at night to reduce light pollution from the bridge. He also suggested that the bridge posting be kept as low as possible. S. James noted that the bridge has to be load rated for a minimum of 6 tons as a condition of the project funding, however the Town could post at a lower value if they wish.

D. Wright provided a written narrative with suggestions on how the siding could be reviewed, stored and replaced during construction. There were not objections to this narrative, and it will be incorporated into the final design.

D. Wright noted that the added arches in the bridge are very important and the bearings warrant special attention. S. James noted that they are looking at several options for the arches, however the design is challenging due to their steep angle at the bearings. J. Garvin noted that concrete bearing blocks under the arches would be acceptable in theory to NHDHR, however care should be taken not to destroy, impact, or cover up any stone technology. J. Garvin also asked that consultation with DHR continue after the design phase, as stated in the MOA.

D. Wright requested that the west portal siding be reframed to match the circa 1940 photos discussed earlier. This will be incorporated into the final design.

Rumney (no project number)
Participants: Christine Perron, Steve Johnson, Tony Weatherbee, NHDOT

Steve Johnson provided an overview of the project. The project entails replacing the deck and rail of a 1937 I-Beam Concrete bridge (no. 138/075) that carries Quincy Road over Stinson Brook in Rumney. The bottom of the deck has deteriorated and some places have required shoring to support the deck and prevent debris from falling. The existing rail is concrete and must be removed in order to replace the deck. The preferred replacement rail has not been determined but will need to be a DOT-accepted rail. Options include T101 rail (guardrail with steel rail behind it) and aluminum rail and standard steel tube rail. S. Johnson explained that Bridge Maintenance recently got an exception to install precast concrete rail in Haverhill. The concrete rail required a design exception because it is not crash tested. Concrete rail is also much more expensive.

Linda Wilson asked if the existing rail in Rumney consisted of standard modules used during that time period or if it was designed specifically for that bridge. S. Johnson was not sure if standard modules were used at that time, but did say that the rail in Rumney was likely specific to that particular bridge. L. Wilson suggested that if it became more standard to use precast concrete rail, then this option would become more economical. S. Johnson thought that this might be true; however, the Department would need to use a lot of it for it to become a more economical option. He also pointed out that concrete rail is not always welcomed by towns, and he described a bridge in Newmarket (this was mis-stated, the Town was Durham) where the town complaints actually resulted in the replacement of newly installed concrete rail.

Laura Black asked if the subject bridge had been inventoried, and Joyce McKay said it had not. L. Black explained that a deck replacement would not be of concern but the rail on this bridge is a design element that needs to be better understood. If it is found to be a significant element, then mitigation for its replacement could be discussed. S. Johnson said that he would need to discuss the availability of funds with the Commissioner's Office, and he noted that it would be helpful to have an understanding of potential mitigation since that would also impact overall project costs.

L. Wilson asked about the project timeline. S. Johnson said that construction needed to happen earlier rather than later. A wetlands permit would be required and that would take about three months to obtain.

There was discussion about the potential for a historic district and the presence of other historic features such as ruins, dams, or foundations. L. Wilson said that the Groton Wind Project was required to complete a District Area form for Rumney and that document may contain information that would be useful for this Bridge Maintenance project. S. Johnson noted that there had been an older bridge upstream from the existing. The granite blocks from the abutments were still evident. No other features were noted on the 1937 survey that he had.

J. McKay asked if, conceptually, mitigation would consist of installation of new concrete rail and completion of a survey form. L. Black asked that concrete rail be fully explored as an option before being discounted. S. Johnson noted that the Department is very budget constrained these days. There was potential for this project to be given to Bridge Design since more federal funds may be available through that Bureau. Looking ahead, he wanted to know if concrete rail was always going to be considered a historic element. Installing new concrete rail more often may present issues from a long-term maintenance point-of-view, and he was trying to better understand long-term impacts while looking ahead in his program. L. Black noted that the questions of significant elements and historic significance would be easier to answer once the bridge inventory is completed. Right now, however, she said that these questions need to be addressed on a case-by-case basis. She explained that structures over 50 years old could have character defining features, potentially making them eligible for the National Register, and that proper survey would need to be completed to determine this, through individual survey or, in the future, the bridge inventory. L. Wilson added that in the case of the Rumney bridge, the existing concrete rail has a decorative quality, and at the time it was built there was an effort to make it more attractive. This is considered “design intent”. On this bridge, the rail is the most visible element of the bridge. S. Johnson explained that his concern wasn’t necessarily this individual bridge, but the snowball effect going forward. Additional costs for historic mitigation, such as installing concrete rail, takes away from the mission of Bridge Maintenance. L. Black said that issue needs to be looked at for each project, and L. Wilson said that they were not saying that concrete rail would need to be used from this point forward.

S. Johnson agreed to look at how common concrete rail is on older bridges currently, and to explore the use of concrete rail on the Rumney bridge. The District Area form completed as part of the Groton Wind Project would be obtained for more information. The project would be discussed again in January.

Note: Edna Feigher was not at the meeting, however did review the plan briefly, and noted that no archaeology would be needed if the project were staying within the footprint of previous disturbance. Any additional disturbance for the replacement of the bridge or staging areas would need an archaeological study.

Portsmouth (no project number)
Participants: David Moore, City of Portsmouth (dmoore@cityofportsmouth.com); Ralph Norwood, Gorrill Palmer (rnorwood@gorrillpalmer.com)

Ralph Norwood gave an overview of the project to reconstruct Concord and Raleigh Ways in the Atlantics Heights neighborhood. Reconstruction of Concord and Raleigh Ways will be similar to the reconstruction of the previous streets in the neighborhood with new granite curb and concrete sidewalks. The amount of required on street parking was evaluated in order to provide only the minimum amount of spaces required to limit the amount of roadway pavement. In addition the one-way circulation that exists on the streets helps to minimize the amount of pavement width required. NHDHR had questions regarding the existing trees. D. Moore and Ralph Norwood explained an evaluation of the existing trees and their condition was completed by landscape architect/arborists. Several of the trees will need to be removed due to their condition and the construction activity; however numerous new trees will be planted to replace the trees that are removed. Based on the review by the NHDHR and the information presented at the meeting, they said that there would not be any adverse effect caused by this project. DHR also noted that it would be helpful for future projects to include landscape plans for reference in the RPR submission.

****Memos/MOA's**: Bath, X-A000(901), 14439; Swanzey 14918; Swanzey, 15348; Windham, X-A000(558), 14830; Errol, 15925; Portsmouth, 14493; Wentworth, 15908; Seabrook, 66021A

Submitted by: Joyce McKay, Cultural Resources Manager
Jill Edelmann, Cultural Resources Assistant

http://www.nh.gov/dot/org/projectdevelopment/environment/units/technicalservices/crmeetings.htm