

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT

CONFERENCE REPORT

DATE OF CONFERENCES: July 7 and 14, 2005

LOCATION OF CONFERENCES: JO Morton Building

ATTENDED BY: Jon Evans, Marc Laurin, Cathy Goodmen, Kevin Nyhan, Mary Monahan, Dale O'Connell, Mike Dugas, Russ St. Pierre, Nancy Mayville, Chris Waszczuk, Ralph Sanders, and David Rodrique, NHDOT; Jim Garvin, Linda Wilson, and Edna Feighner, NHDHR; Harry Kinter and Ed Woolford, FHWA; Jamie Paine, CLD; Sylvia Smith, Horizons Engineering; and Carolyn and Mr. Russell, Town of Washington; Nathan and Lorraine Merrill, resident, Town of Stratham; and Deb Loiselle, DES.

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

NOTES ON CONFERENCE

Thursday, July 7, 2005

Stratham 14399 (no federal #). Participants: Ralph Sanders and David Rodrique, NHDOT, and Nathan and Lorraine Merrill, Resident, Town of Stratham.

Ralph Sanders and Dave Rodrique opened the meeting by describing the proposed work at the intersection of NH Route 108 and Squamscott Road. The improvement is about .5 miles from the Stratham-Newfields bridge project. It involves the construction of a by-pass shoulder along Route 108 within the Right-of-Way and adjacent to the Stuart Farm. Its greatest width is ten feet at the intersection. The project will need a catch basin. The central issue is the stone wall, which is in the 15' clear zone of the shoulder. However, moving the wall back 15' would place it directly against the trees, which would eventually kill them.

Linda Wilson indicated that the whole area is National Register-eligible, representing a seventeenth century farm. The farm is under a protective agricultural easement. The layers of historical trends that the farm represents give the farm heightened significance. The trees are mature and are apart of a typical historic farm landscape, which was captured in a painting by Child Hassam, a noted turn-of-the-century impressionist artist. Any kind of encroachment will diminish its historical values. L. Wilson suggested traffic calming measures that would narrow the road in that area. It was noted that motorists, many of whom are commuters, come off the bridge and maintain speeds above the limit until the traffic circle. She stated that if it were a federal project, the effects would be considered a constructive use under 4(f).

It was suggested that the centerline of the road could be shifted away from the Stuart Farm to the east to provide room for the clear zone. However, this landowner had been adamantly against selling land to provide for this design.

The Stuarts were also concerned about the safety of the intersection, particularly with egress and ingress from the driveway, as well as with the historic landscape of their farm. Their farm operation is of considerable size, and large delivery trucks use the drive. The speed of traffic was too fast for the design of the road. A by-pass shoulder would only increase the speed. The police have been trying to reduce the speed at this intersection and along this stretch of road for a long time.

R. Sanders and David Rodrique agreed to review their design with the police chief and to take a closer look at the safety issues, including means to lower the speed of the traffic.

Nashua, NRBD-X-531(021), 10040A. Participant: Nancy Mayville.

The Broad Street Parkway is becoming a municipally managed project, and the city has revised its design. It is currently searching for funds to move forward. In the interim, the NHDOT needs to address some components including the rehabilitation of the chimneystack, treatment of the coalhouse, and completion of the HAER document.

The coalhouse currently contains hazardous materials, which need to be remediated. The corrugated metal siding covers the original brick coal house and encompasses later additions. Because of serious leaking over the years, the building appears to be in poor structural condition. Floors and a portion of the wood support system have significantly deteriorated.

The NHDOT is advertising the rehabilitation of the chimney in August. NHDHR had previously agreed to a fiberglass cap to block moisture from the structure. The top approximately 20 feet will require rebuilding. Steve White of FST and N. Mayville had discussed the type of mortar to use in the pointing and rebuilding of the stack with Jim Garvin. J. Garvin has suggested using Type N mortar. This work needs to be done before the NHDOT works on the coalhouse.

Contamination in the coalhouse includes asbestos and petroleum storage tanks. The poor structural integrity of the building makes the removal of these materials difficult. N. Mayville suspected that the city would elect to remove the building. In the next few weeks, consultants will enter the building in a relatively safe area and video what is accessible and assess structural condition. They will also take digital images that will be converted into large format black and white photographs. It was noted that the adjacent cotton storage building shared a portion of its roof with the coalhouse, and the treatment of this area will also need assessment. Harry Kinter requested that Bill Janelle brief him on the right-of-way status of the project in the near future.

Newington-Dover 11238: Participants: Marc Laurin and Chris Waszczuk.

C. Waszczuk briefly reviewed the previously presented Newington Alternatives 10a and 12a, and compared them with Alternative 13, the newest alternative developed. Alternative 13 was developed based on inputs by the Town to simplify the concepts presented in Alternatives 10a and 12a. It removes the proposed industrial traffic connection road from Exit 3 to River Road, provides for full southbound access to the Turnpike at Nimble Hill Road, and proposes that the Pease Railroad Spur line spans the Turnpike, rather than the Turnpike going over the Spur line as in the other alternatives. The Department will commit to a future restoration of the Spur line connection, if and when the Spur line is reactivated by Pease. This would require that 5,000 feet of the Spur line be reconstructed, and several hundred feet of the Newington Branch tracks would

also be raised to tie into the new grade of the Spur line. River Road would need to be bridged by the spur line. There is the potential that another bridge may be required to accommodate a possible access road, if proposed by others, that may parallel the turnpike along the west side of the Turnpike. J. Garvin inquired if the elevation of the tracks would interfere with the operations of the Newington Branch. M. Dugas stated that it would not since the line is not in use at that location. H. Kinter inquired if River Road could be lowered to potentially lessen the height of the bridge and proposed fill. M. Dugas stated that due to the high water table it is doubtful that River Road or the Turnpike alignment could be lowered. H. Kinter, E. Feigner and J. Garvin agreed that there would not be cultural resource impacts to the Newington line, as the proposed work would bury a linear corridor and would maintain the existing location. The archaeological survey areas were sufficiently broad to cover this area.

Plaistow, X-A000(377), 10044D: Participant: Marc Laurin, Mike Dugas, and Chris Waszczuk.

C. Waszczuk described the next construction contract to be advanced for the Plaistow-Kingston, 10044B project: the improvements to the Old County Road intersection with NH 125 and the replacement of the Kelly Brook culvert. Several areas within this project area were identified as archaeologically sensitive in the Draft EA. The owner of the Spindle Eye property (in the southeast quadrant of the intersection) is planning development of the parcel and has requested he be allowed to have a driveway to Old County Road. J. McKay stated that there is the potential for historic archaeology within this lot. H. Kinter stated that if the Department will be constructing the proposed driveway then an archaeological investigation would need to be done. If the Department is just compensating him for the loss of access to NH 125 and the owner constructs a driveway to Old County Road, then there would not be any requirements for further investigations.

E. Feighner stated that all the drainage easement areas need to be assessed for sensitivity. Construction is scheduled for early in 2007, the drainage concepts should be completed in mid-2006, which will provide enough time to evaluate the impacts to these areas. It was agreed that J. McKay will have consultants conduct a Phase IA evaluation of the three drainage easement areas, a Phase IB in the impacted sensitive areas, and an evaluation of the Spindle Eye parcel within the next couple of months. H. Kinter suggested that the Phase IB evaluation extent from the Old County Road impact area about 50 feet in the potential driveway location to reveal if there is a potential for archaeological resources if the Department constructed the driveway.

Tuftsboro M311-2: Participant: Cathy Goodmen.

Cathy Goodmen noted that the district will change its project plans according to the recommendations of NHDHR. L. Wilson requested that the culvert be documented before it is filled. The documentation would include black and white photographs, a description, and mapping. It should be sent noting that the form was completed just for documentation and not for review. A memo of No Adverse Effect was signed.

Surplus Lands in Hillsborough and Warner. Participant: Russ St. Pierre.

Hillsborough (Collins):

R. St. Pierre described a seven-acre parcel of land located on the east side of NH Route 31 and obtained by the Department in 1950 as a sand and gravel pit. The parcel has no frontage on Route 31 and is accessed by a 20-foot right-of-way across and abutting private parcel. The land is mostly forested today. Shedd Brook and Black Pond Brook bound the parcel on the easterly and southerly sides respectively. One part of the parcel that was previously excavated has been subsequently refilled with sand and debris consisting of paving materials, tree trunks, and junk. It was noted that an abutter's household waste dump spilled onto the property in a separate location. It was also noted that there were no structures on the property.

After review, it was determined that FHWA had no interest in the parcel because it was acquired before FHWA participated in right-of-way acquisition. Much of the property was probably impacted by the sand and gravel extraction operations. The intact and sensitive areas were the corridors along the creeks. It was noted, that, depending on the intended use of the property, any activities that required a "Notice of Intent" submission to the EPA for work near the creeks would also trigger the need for a "Section 106" review. Several noted the lack of adequate access.

It was concluded that NHDOT would not have to make provisions for an archaeological survey of the property.

Phil Miles has since spoken to Town officials about the development of this parcel and they stated that any development of that parcel would need a variance. Because the parcel only has a 20' right of way to the parcel it would only be developed one (1) house lot. The Town would require a 75' buffer from the brook that runs along the back boundaries of this parcel. Flood maps of the area show this parcel is not in the flood plain

Warner (Hudson-Mitchell):

Russ described a 3.3-acre parcel located between NH Route 103 and Waterloo Road at Exit 9 off of Interstate 89 in the Town of Warner, NH, which was acquired by the Department in 1941 and used as a maintenance facility. The parcel is mostly paved and has three remaining buildings: the wood-framed maintenance building, a concrete and wood salt storage shed, and another wooden salt storage building of pole barn style construction. The building appears to date to the 1950s.

After review, it was again determined that the FHWA had no interest in the parcel. There were no concerns for archaeological resources within the parcel. The Department was asked to complete an area form for the old maintenance site with black and white photographs, mapping, description, and any information or plans the district has for it.

Warner (Barnett):

R. St. Pierre described a second parcel located between NH Route 103 and Waterloo Road in Warner, NH. The land is a triangular-shaped parcel containing 0.1 acre of forested land, and it is the remnant of land acquired by the Department in 1954 for the relocation of Route 103. An old fieldstone foundation measuring approximately 10' x 10' is located on the property.

After review it was decided that transfer of the property would be accompanied by covenants protecting the foundation and associated landscape from removal, alteration, or disturbance. The cellar hole would either be preserved as is or packed with clean fill if the owner wishes to utilize that portion of the property. It was also decided that the Department would complete a site

inventory form for the lot with photographs and mapping. The foundation may have been picked up by a stone wall survey in the town.

Surplus Lands: Richmond, SP-2005-7 and Bedford SP-2650V/LS1863(1).

Participant: Jon Evans.

J. Evans described the subject areas. The Richmond parcel was purchased for the storage of a salt hopper, which has since been removed. The parcel is located on a fairly steep slope adjacent to a wetland and perennial stream. The Bedford parcel is roughly 7 acres located to the south of the US Route 3 overpass next to the F. E. Everett Turnpike. The parcel contains an old asphalt road, which runs down the turnpike edge of the property.

E. Feighner requested that information be sent to her office prior to her making any determination concerning the archaeological sensitivity of the two parcels. Harry Kinter confirmed that there was no federal funding for either of these properties.

Dover, STP-TE-X-5125(023), 13482: Participant: Jamie Paine.

Jamie Paine, from CLD Consulting Engineers, and Bruce Woodruff, from the City of Dover, presented a municipally managed project to construct a new 1.5-mile bicycle and pedestrian trail through Dover using the former Newington Branch Rail right-of-way. The proposed trail begins at the Dover Passenger Rail Station, crosses the Cocheco River on the abandoned rail bridge to Washington Street and continues southward along the former rail corridor between Washington Street and Central Avenue, including reconstruction of the Silver Street culvert. The typical section of the pathway will be a 10-foot width and 2-foot offsets to railings where needed. The trail would be paved through the residential section on the northern half of project and unpaved through the more rural southern section of trail.

- ***Rehabilitation of the rail bridge over the Cocheco River: Work anticipated for the rehabilitation includes deck replacement and installation of railing and safety fence to meet current standards. Although the bridges substructure and superstructure will be investigated for potential concerns, it is anticipated that these current conditions will be fairly suitable for reuse in a pedestrian/bicycle trail.***

The following was considered regarding the existing structure and proposed use as a pedestrian/bicycle bridge:

- ☒ Overall structure is still intact; the original structure was designed for railroad loading (shown on existing plans received from RR). Proposed loading is 2.5% of rail loading (this includes a maintenance vehicle for snow plow).
- ☒ Some areas where bracing has worn through; and will therefore require some rehabilitation.
- ☒ Substructure has some cracking, and the bearings need cleaning.
- ☒ Existing plans show piers are on timber piles; inspection of piers above water revealed very good condition with 2-3 stones having slight cracks. The joints are tight, and there is no appearance of movement.

- ☒ The work will include removal of the existing ties, addition of a timber deck w/ timber rails to provide an 11.5-ft width.
- *Reconstruction of the Silver Street culvert:* The original wooden bridge structure crossing the rail line has been removed and filled in as roadway embankment. In order to facilitate the implementation of the trail, installation of an underpass will be required. Silver Street will be closed while an oversized corrugated metal pipe is installed and backfilled. Lighting will be provided within the structure and along portions of the trail.

Determinations

No one present had concerns with the project. Due to the fact the Cocheco River bridge is being rehabilitated, it was determined that there will be no adverse effect on historic or archaeological properties.

Rochester 14350 (no federal #): Participant: Jamie Paine.

Jamie Paine, of CLD Consulting Engineers, requested clarification on scope of work required to review the project area. The City of Rochester’s Washington Street/Strafford Square project had been presented at the June monthly meeting. The direction given by NHDHR at that meeting was somewhat different or less detailed than the formal written request received from NHDHR after they had reviewed Preservation Company’s report. The intention of this meeting was to receive clear direction on what is to be provided by Preservation Company for additional information.

Determination

It was determined that CLD’s historic consultant, Preservation Company, shall provide the following information:

- ☒ Individual inventory forms for Strafford Square and the two properties proposed to be acquired.
- ☒ Provide an approximate or rough outline of the historic district boundary.

Harry Kinter stated that the historic district boundary should not be a full review or detailed delineation of the boundary, but should follow the method that applies to big district, little impact.

Black and White Photographs. Participant: Joyce McKay.

J. McKay noted that consultants were or anticipated having trouble getting black and white prints at a reasonable cost. L. Wilson indicated that Lisa Mausolf and the Manchester Planning Department continued to get black and whites without a problem and recommended L. Monroe call them.

Newfields-Stratham: Participants: Jim Garvin and Mary Monahan.

Mary Monahan and Jim Garvin reviewed the images needed for the interpretive signs at the Newfields-Stratham Bridge. J. McKay will call the prison sign shop to determine in what medium it receives material for its signs. [J. McKay subsequently contacted the sign shop and found that it needs black and white images.]

HAER documentations: Participants: Joyce McKay and Jim Garvin.

J. McKay and J. Garvin reviewed and selected the color views that will be taken as large format photographs for the following HAER documents: Haverhill 10436, Bartlett 13043, Enfield 12967, Rye 3269.

Thursday, July 14, 2005

Bartlett Roundhouse: Participants: Dale O'Connell.

D. O'Connell noted that the Bartlett Engine or Roundhouse and Freight House currently had activity and use restrictions primarily because of soil contamination (high PAH's). These restrictions include a preservation covenant. The occurrence of asbestos appears to be relatively limited. Because the roundhouse has been boarded, there is currently no exposure issue by entrance into the building. The floor of the round house is contaminated. Before use, it must be remediated by removal, which might damage the building and would be expensive, or by pouring a concrete floor. The leaking roof poses a problem to the stability of the building. Contamination on the freight house property is in the soils. The building appears to be in reasonable condition.

D. O'Connell noted that the historical society would like to renovate the roundhouse including the removal of one small wing of the building and the construction of a room inside the roundhouse. J. Garvin noted that the building had had additional bays at one time. J. McKay stated that the yard also included what appears to be a section house on the rear lot line.

Because the building is in fragile condition, hazardous material remediation may impact the buildings, and the fate of particularly the roundhouse is not well defined, NHDHR requested a HAER documentation of the three buildings: roundhouse, freight house, and the small shed. This study should include a careful discussion of the building materials and structural elements of the roundhouse, measured sketch plans with a section that illustrates its structure of the roundhouse and floor plans of the buildings.

Washington, 14424, X-A000(364): Participant: Caroline Russell, Town of Washington and Kevin Nyhan.

There will be no excavations on the Beede lot. The foundation walls are below the level of the highway pavement. We plan to overfill the entire basement area and leave everything there intact.

Then we will fill the entire lot area to the level of the roadway and gradually slope it to the top of the retaining wall near the back property line. We may extend the retaining wall partially around the side of the property or slope it off, whichever way will best protect the edge of the property while respecting that of the abutter.

The surface that the grading creates will have two types of plantings. There will be a rail or fence and suitable shrubbery around the perimeter on the south and west sides of the Beede lot. The northern edge will be completely filled level with the adjacent lot. The eastern edge is the roadway. In approximately the center of the basement area, there will be a single flowering crabapple tree, which our forester says has a small and non-invasive root system.

There will be a marker to tell a bit of the history of the property although we are not certain if it will be of a pedestal type, mounted vertically on a decorative stone or laid into the paving system. Mr. Beede's nephew has done much research on the history of the property and will provide more information than we can use for the marker. At this time, we are also considering a comparatively large type of display that will serve as a tourist directory to the town, including the story of the Beede property.

John's River Dam (#252.03): Participants: Deb Loiselle (NHDES); Lisa Cavallaro NOAA, via telephone; and Jim Garvin, Linda Wilson, and Edna Feighner, NHDHR

D. Loiselle facilitated introductions amongst the participants. L. Cavallaro noted she is assisting J. Turek relative to the 106 Consultation process needs for this project. D. Loiselle gave a brief background on the project as follows:

This project has been in the works off and on for approximately four (4) years.

- February 2000: A safety inspection was conducted by NHDES and deficiencies were noted.
- April 2000: NHDES was notified that a portion of the dam had failed causing a partial breach.
- The Town of Whitefield contracted with SFC Engineers in 2000/2001 to conduct an assessment of the deficiencies and provide recommendations.
- October 2001: The Town of Whitefield approved SFC Engineers to continue scope of work to complete a cost estimate for dam removal and dam repair.
- January 2002: Public Information Meeting.
- March 2002: Town of Whitefield voted to repair the dam.
- Late 2002/Early 2003: John Bergin (John's River Conservation Group) approached the Town of Whitefield.
- October 2003: Letter from NHDES River Restoration Coordinator to NHDHR to initiate cultural resource review. There was no lead federal agency identified at this time.
- 2003/2004 URS Corporation was retained for services and the project gained momentum again.
- Spring 2004 the Town voted against removal. Ramp alternative suggested.
- February 2005 Public Info Meeting (without consideration to historic resources and no public notice)
- March 2005 Public Info Meeting (with consideration to historic resources and public notice). Susan Garst (Archaeologist for URS Corporation) was present and made a brief presentation.
- May 31, 2005: River Restoration Task Force (RRTF) Meeting. Representatives from URS Corporation and John Bergin presented the proposed rock ramp design and there was much discussion and concern with this proposed design. At this same meeting, D. Loiselle noted the outstanding follow-up to comments from NHDHR (letter from B. Muzzey to Z. Wolf (URS) dated May 12, 2005). This topic engaged a lot of discussion as well. E. Feighner expressed to the RRTF members that NHDHR had never been contacted about any public meetings relative to this project and inquired where this project was relative to the 106 Consultation process.

- June 23, 2005: J. Turek contacts D. Loiselle to note he believes NOAA is the Federal Lead Agency and acknowledges that NOAA is behind on the Section 106 Consultation process.

D. Loiselle again noted that this was a brief overview (and does not account for all of the events that have occurred for the duration of the project) of the occurrences to date and the purpose of today's discussion is to move forward in a collaborative manner in accordance with the Section 106 Regulations. L. Cavallaro agreed and supported this effort on behalf of NOAA. Cavallaro also noted that NOAA will move forward in the most appropriate way- that is NOAA has potential to be lead federal agency, but recent discussions indicate ACOE may also be potential lead agency.

E. Feighner re-emphasized that NHDHR had not been invited, nor made aware of, any public meetings for this project. In addition, she is concerned relative to where this project stands on the Section 106 process. L. Cavallaro noted that NOAA provided funding initially in 2003 for a feasibility study evaluating dam removal but did not provide any additional funding for the current design or permitting nor is NOAA providing any construction funds. She expressed that NOAA has also been kept out of the loop on this project as well, until recently. NOAA has not been made aware of the most recent project developments, particularly historic resources review. Based on discussions with D. Loiselle, and representatives from NOAA, it is still unclear who the Federal Lead Agency is. It appears it could be NOAA (funding) or ACOE (permitting). Typically a Federal Lead Agency is discussed at a regularly scheduled RRTF and a representative comes forward. There is no indication that this ever occurred with this project. D. Loiselle confirmed this assumption. E. Feighner noted that ACOE typically does *not* take the lead because they don't feel they are the driving force behind these projects. E. Feighner also noted that it is not up to NHDHR to determine the Federal Lead Agency.

E. Feighner noted that the first information NHDHR received about this project was a letter from NHDES dated October 2003, and then not until the May 31, 2005 RRTF meeting. She did note that URS Corporation has been working with NHDHR regarding the archaeology and architectural survey for the project but no determination has been made. L. Cavallaro again expressed that NOAA has not been kept in the loop either. They have not received any of the survey reports, however, they have recently requested them from URS Corporation. D. Loiselle inquired if NHDHR has received a copy of the NHDES Wetlands/Dam application. E. Feighner believes that NHDHR has, and it is in their files.

L. Cavallaro expressed the need to work with the NESHPO earlier in the process for future projects. She understands that this project is coming in late relative to the Section 106 process, but now that we know where it stands, we will move forward as appropriate (lead federal agency still to be determined). NOAA has not yet reviewed the ramp design but anticipates completing review and submitting comments shortly, and J. Turek will be commenting to URS Corporation and John Bergin in the near future.

D. Loiselle felt that the Section 106 process had not been completely ignored due to the fact that NHDES did initiate a letter to NHDHR in 2003, and URS Corporation has been completing the necessary research and evaluation for the archaeological and architectural issues for this project. She did again note that although it is unfortunate this project has progressed this far without proper adherence to the regulations, NHDES and NOAA (and others) will rectify this situation. J. Garvin noted that in order to fulfill the Section 106 regulations, a Federal Lead Agency would need to be designated.

L. Cavallaro inquired if the Section 106 public meeting could be incorporated into any other meeting (e.g., combined with permitting process). L. Wilson noted that although it could be, it is not desirable to do it this way. E. Feighner noted that USFWS might be an alternative choice for taking the lead on this project. L. Cavallaro stated that she understands the definition of an undertaking to mean “funding” or “permitting” and didn’t know how this agency would fit in. Cavallaro noted USFWS to her knowledge had not provided any funding and was therefore questioning potential role as lead federal agency. She also noted that if ACOE were designated, she suggested NOAA might be able to assist them with the necessary requirements. NOAA will coordinate internally and with ACOE to determine lead agency.

J. Garvin noted the following groups as “typical” for any project relative to Consulting Party invitation:

- Local Historical Society
- Society for Industrial Archaeology
- Vernacular Architecture Forum
- National Society for the Preservation of Covered Bridges

Following is an overview of the discussions and future action items that were agreed to relative to this project:

NOAA Awaiting Materials:

1. NOAA has requested copies of the revised Phase 1, Phase 1A and Phase 1B Survey
(note: L. Cavallaro noted they have received the Phase 1B survey for the archaeology)

Next Steps:

1. Identify Federal Lead Agency
2. Federal Lead Agency sends “official” letter to NHDHR identifying the Federal Lead Agency and their responsibilities for Section 106 Consultation
3. Identify potential Consulting Parties (general and local)
4. Federal Lead Agency to send letters to potential Consulting Parties
5. Federal Lead Agency to post “Notice” for future Public Information Meeting
6. Public Information Meeting for Section 106

Action Items (responsible individual noted in *bold*):

1. Local list of potential Consulting Parties for this project (*Linda Wilson*)
2. Confirm Fifteen Mile Falls Mitigation and Enhancement Fund with John Bergin and/or Town of Whitefield (*Deb Loiselle*)
3. Identify a Federal Lead Agency (*L. Cavallaro and J. Turek*)

D. Loiselle and L. Cavallaro expressed their thanks to NHDHR and look forward to continued communication and collaboration on this project and future projects.

**Surplus Lands: Richmond, SP-2005-7 and Bedford SP-2650V/LS1863(1).
Participant: Joyce McKay.**

Both parcels were reviewed at the previous meeting and the requested information was sent to DHR. Edna determined that the Richmond property could be disposed of without concern for cultural resources. Due to the presence of multiple archeological sites in Bedford, Edna determined that a Phase 1A investigation would be necessary prior to disposal of the Bedford site.

****Memos:** Portsmouth (New Castle Ave); Hudson, STP-TE-X-5229(013), 13100;
Rochester (NH Route 11); Tuftonboro M311-2.

Other projects may also be reviewed.

Submitted by Joyce McKay, Cultural Resources Manager

c.c.	J. Brillhart	K. Cota	N. Mayville	Bill Cass
	C. Barleon, OSP	C. Waszczuk	D. Lyford	
	V. Chase	R. Roach, ACOE	H. Kinter, FHWA	

S:\Meetings\Shpo\Agenda\Newagen.doc