# BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT
## CONFERENCE REPORT

**SUBJECT:** NHDOT Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting
**DATE OF CONFERENCE:** February 17, 2016
**LOCATION OF CONFERENCE**: John O. Morton Building
**ATTENDED BY:**

**NHDOT**
Matt Urban
Ron Crickard
Anthony Weatherbee
Kerry Ryan
Marc Laurin
Sam Fifield
Joe Adams
Carol Niewola
Jon Evans
Bob Juliano
Mike Dugas
Keith Cota

**Army Corps of Engineers**
Michael Hicks

**NHDES**
Gino Infascelli
Lori Sommer
Katie Zink
Greg Cummings
Deb Loiselle

**NH Fish & Game**
Carol Henderson

**NHB/DRED**
Amy Lamb

**Consultants/Public Participants**
Jed Merrow
David Nelson
Christine Perron
Rick Dyment
Brian Colburn
Josh Lund
Rob Faulkner
Bill Ashford
David McNamara
Vicki Chase
Jennifer Riordan
John Trottier
Chris Bean
Ian Broadwater
Mark Hutchins
Leo Tidd

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


Finalization of January 20, 2016 Meeting Minutes ..... 3
Acworth, 40750 (104/063) ..... 5
Gorham, 40826 (098/071) ..... 14
Meredith, 40492 (131/105) ..... 20
Harts Location, 40828 (063/090) ..... 26
Harts Location, 40827 (060/091) ..... 31
Lebanon Taxiway B ..... 36
Lebanon-Hartford, 16148, A001(154) ..... 46
Northfield-Tilton, 16147&14744A, X-A001(153) & A001(042) ..... 72
Barnstead, 14121, X-A000(208) ..... 92
Derry-Londonderry, 13065, IM-0931(201) ..... 103


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

**NOTES ON CONFERENCE:**

**Finalization of January 20, 2016 Meeting Minutes**

Gino Infascelli indicated he would like to request some more time to review and submit comments. Matt Urban agreed to keep the minutes open for another week and that he would finalize them thereafter.

## Acworth, 40750 (104/063)

Tony Weatherbee provided an overview of the project. The scope of the project is to rehabilitate the bridges that carry Rte. 123A over Slater Slide and Dry Brook (104/063 & 105/064). The existing structures are twin concrete slab bridges. Proposed work consists of the following: place sandbag cofferdams, install toe walls and place riprap.

Tony explained that the retaining wall on the Cold River is undermined. The gravel point bar that will be dredged to dewater the retaining wall will be accessed with large sandbags. Matt Urban said that the OHW and TOB lines on the southern side of the Cold River have been delineated and the gravel point bar has been called out as well. Tony asked if the material from the point bar could be used to chink in the riprap in front of the wingwall.

Lori Sommer asked how the point bar would be accessed. Tony showed pictures of where the point bar would be accessed with sandbags. Mark Hemmerlein asked what the sequence was to install the sandbags. Tony said that the sandbags would provide access to the point bar and then once the point bar was dredged the sandbags would be further sealed off to divert water into the dredged channel.

Mike Hicks asked what size stone the point bar was compiled of. Matt Urban said that it was tennis ball size. Mike asked if it would wash away and Tony said no because it would only be chinking in the riprap. Mike Hicks said EFH.

Gino asked what the river designation was and Matt Urban said it was ‘community’.

Carrol Henderson asked if there was concern for flows causing the deterioration. Tony asked if there was a preference as to what was done with the gravel after the project was completed, should it be returned to its original location, or can it be used to chink in the riprap.

Lori Sommer asked if a contractor or Bridge Maintenance would be doing the work and Tony said that Bridge Maintenance would be doing the work.

Mike Hicks said that using the gravel from the point bar with the riprap makes sense to him. Gino agreed and said that gravel will naturally fill in to where it was removed from the point bar over time.

Lori Sommer said that no mitigation would be required.

*This project has been previously discussed at the 10/21/15 Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting.*

**Gorham, 40826 (098/071)**

Tony Weatherbee provided an overview of the project. The scope of the project is to rehabilitate the bridge that carries Rte. 16 over Brook (098/071). Existing structure is a concrete slab bridge with a 14'-0" span that is 32'-9" wide. Proposed work consists of the following: place sandbag cofferdams, install toe walls, construct upstream wingwalls, replace deck and place riprap. The structure will be widened on the upstream side 6'-4".

Lori Sommer asked if the invert was perched and Tony said yes. Carol Henderson asked if anything was planned to remove the perch. Tony said that working downstream of the structure was outside of the scope of the project. Lori mentioned how the Agenda Item Request Form said downstream wingwalls and Tony said that the scope of the project has changed since the form was put together and it is the upstream side that will be widened.

Gino Infascelli asked if there would be new riprap installed beyond the existing riprap. Tony described where the existing riprap was and where the new riprap would be placed. Tony added that the exact amount of linear feet of riprap required will be verified after a field visit.

Gino asked if a downstream fish weir could be installed to fix the perched outlet. Gino said that this could be installed in place of paying mitigation for riprap and coordination should take place with Fish and Game.

Lori Sommer said that there is no mitigation required if a fish weir is installed to fix the perched outlet condition. Carol Henderson noted that there was no NHB hit at this location.

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

**Meredith, 40492 (131/105)**

Tony Weatherbee provided an overview of the project. The scope of the project is to rehabilitate the bridge that carries Meredith Center Road over Wickwas Pond Outlet (131/105). Existing structure is an IB-C bridge that has a 58'-0" span that is 33'-9" wide. Proposed work consists of the following: replace concrete deck and repair the substructure. The environmental impacts are for access.

Tony said that no riprap is proposed. He asked how to impact within the GIS Prime Wetland layer, as the layer showed even the nearby gravel parking lot as Prime Wetland. Gino Infascelli said to pull the wetland file at DES to review the report submitted for that Prime Wetland and the wetland should be delineated in accordance with the methodology used including the specific evaluation data.. Matt Urban said that he will pull the file.

Gino said that this is a major permit in a prime wetland. Per the prime wetland rules, approvals require 20 day notice prior to permit issuance. Carol Henderson asked if the project would have to go to Governor and Council. Gino said no. Carol mentioned that there were no NHB hits.

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

**Harts Location, 40828 (063/090)**

Tony Weatherbee provided an overview of the project. The scope of the project is to rehabilitate the bridge that carries US 302 over Silver Cascade Brook (063/090). The existing structure is a concrete slab bridge. Proposed work consists of the following: place sandbag cofferdams, repair undermined east abutment, point voids in abutments and wings and install geotextile wrapped gravel behind abutment.

Tony said that the project is within a quarter mile of the Saco River designated river so this project gets kicked out of the Permit by Notification category. Tony said that there will be no permanent impacts and that there will be only temporary impacts for sandbags and scaffolding. Tony said that we are still waiting on the NHB report but that coordination with Fish and Game will take place. Carol Henderson said that no concerns were anticipated. Carol also asked where the geotextile fabric would be installed. Tony said the road would be cut open and the fabric would be installed there.

Lori Sommer said that no mitigation would be required for this project.

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

**Harts Location, 40827 (060/091)**

Tony Weatherbee provided an overview of the project. The scope of the project is to rehabilitate the bridge that carries US 302 over Flume Cascade Brook (060/091). Existing structure is a concrete slab bridge. Proposed work consists of the following: place sandbag cofferdams, repair spall to underside of downstream curb, point voids in stone in both abutments and seal cracks in deck.

Tony said that the project is within a quarter mile of the Saco River so this project gets kicked out of the Permit by Notification category. Tony said that there will be no permanent impacts and that there will be only temporary impacts for sandbags and scaffolding. Tony said that we are still waiting on the NHB report but that coordination with Fish and Game will take place.

Lori Sommer said that no mitigation would be required for this project.

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

**Lebanon Taxiway B**

Dave Nelson and Jed Merrow described the project, which involves rehabilitating the east end of Taxiway B. It will be narrowed from the existing 50 feet to approximately 35 feet wide, with a net

decrease in impervious surface. Stub taxiways between Taxiway B and the runway may be relocated. There will be minor drainage improvements but no change in drainage patterns or infrastructure. There is an ongoing erosion problem north of the Runway 18 end that should be addressed. If excess material is available from the taxiway project, it could perhaps be used to fill in the erosional area. The erosional area has groundwater seepage, intermittent channels, and delineated wetlands. Stone fill may be the best solution for this area. Other areas to stockpile excess material (if any) have not yet been identified, but could be on airport property.

There are four small pocket wetlands, estimated at 6,000 square feet but later determined to be 8,323 square feet overall, between the east end of Taxiway B and Runway 7-25. The taxiway rehabilitation work may result in the filling of these wetlands. Lori Sommer noted that, since the proposed work will occur within 5 years of previous wetland impact projects at the airport, mitigation for the proposed project will be required for cumulative wetland impacts. An in-lieu fee would be the most likely form of mitigation. The airport will set up a meeting with the Lebanon Conservation Commission to discuss impacts and mitigation during the design and permitting process.

Based on the former runway safety area project work, there are two state-threatened plant species in the vicinity. Fringed gentian has been found on airport property, and barren strawberry has been found nearby. An updated rare species query needs to be submitted to the Natural Heritage Bureau. It may be necessary to check for these plants within the impact area prior to construction.

As this is still being designed, Gino Infascelli noted that the grading plans must show why there is a need for impacting the infield wetlands.

The project is planned to be advertised for construction bids in April, and permits should be obtained by May 1. The state dredge and fill application will need to be submitted as soon as possible to meet the schedule.

**Lebanon-Hartford, 16148, A001(154)**

Brian Colburn provided an overview of the project, which consists of the rehabilitation of the Interstate 89 bridges over the Connecticut River between Lebanon, NH and Hartford, VT (Bridges 044/103 and 044/104). The existing superstructure steel will be replaced with new steel and an in-fill will be constructed in the gap between the bridges to provide a single 110’+/- wide bridge deck to facilitate traffic control. The in-fill will require new footings between each of the four pairs of existing piers. The resulting bridge will provide 2 through lanes in each direction and auxiliary lanes between Exit 20 and I-91 ramps, and will require realignment of I-89 on both approaches.

Construction access issues were summarized. Construction access to the western-most bridge pier could be achieved from Connecticut River Road with an access road built along the railroad, beginning at a point where Connecticut River Road and the railroad are at the same elevation, approximately 600 feet north of the bridge. Much of this access road could be constructed by bringing in fill material. A temporary crossing of the railroad would be required. This option would require coordination with the railroad, which sees daily passage of freight and passenger trains, and this coordination can become costly due to flagger and insurance requirements.

A second option to access the westernmost pier is from the New Hampshire side of the river. This option would involve constructing a work trestle across the full width of the Connecticut River. The Contractor would have the option of placing this trestle on either the upstream or downstream side of the bridge. Fingers off the main trestle would be needed to access each pier. A temporary causeway would be needed off each bank of the river to provide a platform from which the trestle would be constructed. The trestle would be in place for the duration of construction, which is expected to be approximately three years.

Based on available information, it appears the portages in this area of the river are for car-top access such as canoes and kayaks. The State of Oregon *Minimum Channel Clearance Guidelines for Recreational Boating* was located online and provides minimum height clearances for typical boat types. Based on the typical types of boats that would likely be found on this section of the river, between six to eight feet of clearance is needed to pass under a structure. The elevation of ordinary high water in this location is 331' and the 10-year event is 342'. There will be a stipulation in the contract that the Contractor must construct at least one section of the temporary trestle above the elevation of the 10-year event. This would provide adequate clearance for boaters during most flow conditions.

Carol Henderson commented that this section of the river may be used for bass fishing, which involves boats larger than a canoe or kayak. Based on the minimum clearances in the Oregon guidance, the trestle as proposed would provide adequate clearance for boats up to 27' in length. It was agreed that this would be adequate for bass boats.

Josh Lund provided an overview of proposed scour protection measures. Three of the four piers require scour protection. The fourth, westernmost pier is located on bedrock and does not need scour protection. A-Jacks concrete armor units are proposed for the three piers. Mats of these interlocking units would be constructed on land or a barge and then lowered by crane to the river bottom around each pier. The mats would be placed on top of the channel substrate, with no excavation or placement of bedding materials required. The work would be facilitated by divers.

Due to the new piers and scour protection, the work as proposed would result in an increase in base flood elevation of 0.05'. To compensate for this increase in flood elevation, bank cuts are proposed in order to widen the capacity of the river during flood events and create a zero increase in flood elevation. This would entail cutting into the river bank to create a narrow shelf, staying about one foot above ordinary high water. The bank cut could also make it easier for wildlife to traverse the river banks under the bridges. This floodplain mitigation could be achieved with a bank cut entirely on the Vermont bank, or a combination of the NH and VT banks. As shown on the plans for purposes of discussion, the bank cut extends the width of the right-of-way, which is approximately 432 linear feet of bank. From a wildlife passage perspective, the bank cut would have more value on the Vermont bank, which is steeper and higher than the NH side.

Christine Perron provided an overview of preliminary wetland impacts:

Permanent channel impacts from the new footings: 3,119 sq ft
Permanent channel impacts from scour protection: 17,498 sq ft
Permanent bank impacts from floodplain mitigation ("worst case" scenario): 3,508 sq ft (432 LF)
Permanent palustrine wetland impacts (NH): 1,531 sq ft
Temporary impacts: overall footprint to be permitted will be 92,706 sq ft. This includes 3,800 sq ft for 3 areas of temporary causeway, plus adequate area to allow contractor to choose where to construct the trestle. Actual impacts from the trestle would be limited to the piles that support the trestle, which would be a total of approximately 600 sq ft.

The project will require a NH Dredge & Fill Permit, which will be classified as a major impact permit since this is a Tier 3 stream crossing. In addition, the project will require a permit from the Army Corps, a

Shoreland Permit by Notification, a VT River Corridor Permit, and VT Stormwater Discharge Permit. Additional federal approvals were reviewed. The US Coast Guard has concurred that the project is exempt from a Bridge Permit under Section 144(h). The Coast Guard is requiring coordination just prior to construction to review construction plans. Mike Johnson from the National Marine Fisheries Service reviewed the project a year ago and had no concerns regarding Essential Fish Habitat. However, the scour protection measures were not known when the EFH Assessment was completed, so additional coordination with NMFS will be necessary. Dwarf wedgemussels occur one mile downstream of the project; the USFWS has no concerns regarding this species. Northern long-eared bat may occur in the area. This species will be addressed in the coming months as limits of tree clearing become better defined. Finally, Section 106 consultation has been underway. There are three areas of archaeological sensitivity on the VT side of the project area. Only one of these areas may be impacted for construction access, and a survey will be completed in the spring to determine if the area contains significant resources. There are no historical or archaeological resource concerns on the NH side of the project. A determination of No Historic Properties Affected is anticipated for the overall project, pending the results of the archaeological survey.

Regarding the Army Corps Section 404/Section 10 Permit, C. Perron noted that the impact threshold for an Individual Permit for work in navigable waters in NH is 1 acre. The project as proposed will result in approximately 0.56 acres of impact from permanent and temporary fills, so the project may qualify for the NH General Permit. This total includes impacts from the new footings, scour protections, and temporary causeways. Impacts within the VT-owned portion of the river have not been quantified yet, although it is anticipated that VT impacts will only be temporary in nature and would qualify for authorization under the VT General Permit. The US Route 4 bridge replacement project that was completed a few miles upstream was covered by both the VT and NH General Permits.

Mike Hicks commented that the thresholds in the General Permits are advisory only. Other factors need to be taken into consideration as well when determining the need for an Individual Permit, such as public concerns and the concerns of other resource agencies. He needed to consider the project further before making a determination on permit requirements. B. Colburn noted that the project has been presented to town officials of Lebanon and Hartford, as well as the general public, and no concerns with the project have been raised.

M. Hicks asked if the need for a Section 408 permit had already been determined. C. Perron replied that she has an email from the Army Corps that states the 408 permit would not be needed. She would forward the email to Mike.

C. Perron asked for input on mitigation requirements that will need to be taken into consideration as impacts are finalized. She noted that it was assumed that the permanent channel impacts from the new footings would require mitigation, and it was also assumed that impacts from scour protection would not require mitigation since the impacts were necessary for the protection of existing infrastructure. Both L. Sommer and Gino Infscelli concurred. Regarding the impacts from proposed bank cuts, C. Perron noted that it was hoped that wetland mitigation would not be required since these impacts were proposed only for floodplain mitigation. L. Sommer and G. Infascelli did not agree with this and commented that mitigation for linear bank impacts would be required. In addition, mitigation will also be required for the temporary impacts resulting from the proposed causeways.

G. Infascelli asked that other options be explored for floodplain mitigation to determine if feasible alternatives to the bank cutting concept exist. L. Sommer noted if the bank cutting concept is carried forward, her preference would be to limit the impacts to one bank rather than impact both banks. In general, there are concerns regarding the bank cutting concept. C. Perron noted that the concept will be discussed with VT resource agencies to get additional feedback.

M. Hicks suggested that a site visit with agencies from both states would be beneficial. This could be scheduled in the spring. Based on the current project schedule, permit applications will be submitted in mid-summer of this year. It is anticipated that the project will be discussed at least once more at a Natural Resource Agency Meeting prior to application submittal.

**Northfield-Tilton, 16147&14744A, X-A001(153) & A001(042)**

This project involves rehabilitation and pier scour protection for two bridges carrying I-93 over the Winnipesaukee River in Tilton and Northfield. The two projects will be advertised as one contract. Vicki Chase introduced the project, which is located just south of Exit 20 on I-93. The subject bridges cross over the Winnipesaukee River and the New Hampshire Railroad. The existing bridges which were built in 1960 and reconstructed in 1980.

V. Chase provided an overview of existing natural resources at the site.

- The Winnipesaukee River is a 5$^{th}$ order Tier 3 Stream that drains all of the lakes region – the drainage area = 467 square miles. Silver Lake lies directly upstream which is not controlled by damming.
- The NHB check for the project indicated that there were Bald Eagles and Narrow-leaved Arrowhead at the site. NHFG has confirmed that they have no concerns with bald eagles. A survey was undertaken for narrow-leaved arrowhead and the plant was not found.
- The river is impaired by non-native aquatic species (milfoil).
- Northern Long-Eared Bat coordination will take place under the agreement between USFW and FHWA.
- An Essential Fish Habitat assessment was undertaken by Normandeau because of the potential for Atlantic Salmon in the river. It was determined that there would be no effect to salmon habitat and NHFS has concurred.
- Coordination for floodplain and floodways is ongoing. There will be fill within the mapped floodway, and NEPA requires that the project must demonstrate that there will be no impact to the base flood elevation.
- The Winnipesaukee River Trail parallels the river and will be used for construction. DOT will be coordinating with the town to acquire clearance under Section 4(f).
- The project will require a major impact wetland permit.

Dave McNamara described the deck rehabilitation. The decks are in poor condition and other elements are deteriorating, necessitating a full deck replacement. Alternative were studied for traffic control, and the preferred alternative uses full crossovers with traffic moving to each bridge as the other bridge is rehabilitated, with one lane of traffic being maintained on the bridge being rehabbed. There is a median wetland that will be temporarily impacted by the crossovers, which will be restored to its existing condition.

Bill Ashford introduced the scour mitigation project. The purpose of the project is to protect the center and southern piers which are scour critical. Permanent impacts will involve adding riprap to the existing riprap around the southern piers and installing precast concrete “A-Jacks” around the center piers. For the center piers existing material will be excavated, bedding material installed, A-Jacks installed, and re-use of the existing stream bed to be material placed over the A-Jacks (no net

change to the riverbed). A coffer dam (sandbags) will be placed around the work area to divert flow and inside of the coffer dam a turbidity barrier will be placed, but the work will occur in the wet. For the southern piers riprap will be placed from the northern work pads around the piers by a crane, eliminating the need to disturb the southern bank. There will be temporary impacts to the riverbank and riverbed for the scour protection operation with three workpads proposed to be installed within the river (clean stone). A-Jacks are manufactured ahead of time and banded together on land, and placed in a group on the riverbed.

Matt Urban noted that the project would not require mitigation because the permanent impacts were all for the protection of existing infrastructure and so is exempt from the need to mitigate. Matt also asked if the sandbag footprint had been included as impact, and noted that it should be. The entire area within the sandbags need not be counted as impact, only the areas to be directly impacted.

Carol Henderson asked if access within the river would be maintained. B. Ashford indicated that the south side of the river would remain open to boaters.

Rob Faulkner asked if the A-Jacks would be considered permanent impact since they would be covered with natural material. Lori Sommer and Matt Urban concurred that it would be permanent impact.

Outstanding issues for this project – NEPA and Section 4(f) have not yet been completed. Wetland and shoreland permit applications will be submitted in the near future.
Mike Hicks noted that if floodplain mitigation is required that it should be adequately sized.
Jon Evans noted that although DOT's checklist required existing and proposed conditions for erosion control plans, this project has very little in the way of contour changes and confirmed that proposed contours would not be needed.

**Barnstead, 14121, X-A000(208)**

The project involves improvements to NH Route 28 in Barnstead and is the next in a series of projects along Route 28 in Barnstead and Alton. Within the project corridor, Route 28 is narrow and has no shoulders. There is also poor sight distance at the Route 28/North Barnstead Road/North Road intersection. The purpose of the project is to widen the road, add 4-foot shoulders, and improve sight lines at the intersection. Both the horizontal and vertical road alignments will be adjusted. Route 28 will be shifted to the west in order to avoid residential impacts to the east of the road. Vertical alignment adjustments will include lowering the crest and raising the sag near the Route 28/North Barnstead Road/North Road intersection. Work along North Road and North Barnstead Road is proposed to match the lower Route 28 vertical alignment.

The project is approximately 1 mile in length. The southern end matches into the Peacham Road project (Project No. 14121E). Construction is scheduled for 2019.

Wetlands are located along the project corridor. Permanent wetland impacts are estimated at approximately 0.5 acres. Approximately 1 acre of new impervious surface is proposed from the addition of 4-foot shoulders.

One perennial stream (Tier 2) crossing is located in the project corridor. The crossing may be impacted since the existing culvert is old, but impacts are currently not known.

Lori Sommer asked if there are any Natural Heritage records nearby. Jenn Riordan replied that one record is located nearby, but the report indicated that no impact is anticipated. Jenn added that the US Fish and Wildlife Service IPaC report indicated that small whorled pogonia and northern long-eared bat may occur within the project area. Since the wetland delineation was completed late last fall, a spring/summer survey for small whorled pogonia is proposed. No clearing restrictions are anticipated for northern long-eared bat under the new 4(d) rule.

There are no impaired waters within the project corridor, although some of the downstream waterbodies have impairments. Locke Lake and Halfmoon Lake are located east of the project. No shoreland impacts are anticipated. The project is located just beyond Halfmoon Lake's Protected Shoreland (project limits are approximately 300 feet from the edge of Halfmoon Lake).

Historic and archaeological reviews are ongoing. There are several potentially historic buildings within the project corridor and also several areas that need Phase IB archaeological testing.

The project will likely need to be presented at a future Natural Resource Agency meeting once the design and impacts have been refined. The project will involve ROW impacts and a public hearing is proposed. The first public information meeting is scheduled for March 16, 2016.

**Derry-Londonderry, 13065, IM-0931(201)**

**1. Purpose of Meeting**

a. To provide overview of the proposed scope of work to update the Exit 4A EIS, based on a series of EIS Review Team meetings that have now been completed.
b. To discuss eNEPA.

**2. Overview of Proposed Scopes of Work**

a. Base Mapping: Update aerial and contour mapping from 1998/1999 to 2014.
b. Traffic: Update traffic counts to 2015. Utilize Southern NH Regional Planning's Traffic Model taking into consideration latest available population and employment projections, projects in the State's Ten Year Transportation Plan and known projects in the area that are reasonably foreseeable. 2020 Opening Year and 2040 Design Year traffic capacity conditions will be evaluated.
c. Socioeconomic: Update all previous data sources and trend analyses.
d. Air Quality and Noise: Perform updates that conform to the latest regulations.
e. Cultural Resources (Historic): Consider if additional properties greater than 50 years old now require National Register eligibility evaluations.
f. Cultural Resources (Archaeologic): Perform updated file searches to identify potential prehistoric and historic sites.

g. Botanical and Wildlife General and Sensitive Species: Update broad land use and forest types using more current mapping. Reassess the potential sensitive plant and wildlife species through coordination with NHNHB and USFWS. Field surveys to be conducted as needed.
h. Water Resources: Previous NHDES comments will be addressed. The work will include an assessment of private wells, pollutant loading and water quality. A quantitative chloride study will be conducted to determine project impacts and mitigation.
i. Wetlands, Vernal Pools and Streams: Stream crossings, vernal pool and wetland data within the project corridor will be updated. L. Sommer noted the existence of a prime wetland in the vicinity of the stream crossing at the easterly end of Tsienneto Road. Field verification of the existing delineations will be completed and updated as needed. The potential of utilizing recently completed vernal pool surveys completed by specialists in connection with the Woodmont Commons East project will be considered. C. Bean noted that he was aware of ongoing meetings the Woodmont Commons Developer have been having with the Resource Agencies relative to the recently completed update of vernal pools on the site. M. Kern noted that no official study had been submitted however the updated information that has been presented by the wetland specialists at their meetings has seemed reasonable. There were no concerns voiced relative to the Exit 4A project utilizing this vernal pool study information, as long as the Department and Normandeau are comfortable with it. L. Sommer noted that there remains some confusion as to who the owners the Woodmont East and West of I-93 were. C. Bean noted that this information will be clarified and presented consistently in the Exit 4A SEIS document. Expect requests to meet and discuss proposed updated impacts and mitigation in the future.
j. Indirect Effects and Cumulative Impacts: Standalone chapters addressing each one of these areas will be provided in the EIS.

## 3. Caras Parcels Mitigation Site

a. A brief discussion took place on the status of the Caras mitigation site. The viability of working out a site purchase with the owner based on the appraised value of the land still needs to be completed.
b. If a purchase and sale agreement can get worked out, the Project Team will complete archaeological and historical related investigations as needed especially in areas of proposed vernal pool creation.

## 4. Preferred Alternative

a. G. Infascelli asked what the designation of the Preferred Alternative was. C. Bean responded Alternative A.

## 5. Westerly Connection

a. M. Kern asked if there was any consideration given to a connection to the west. C. Bean responded that a westerly connection is not included as part of this project and it is not reasonably foreseeable in the future.

## 6. eNEPA

a. NHDOT is proposing to use eNEPA for this project to facilitate the interagency review and consultation process. An overview of the eNEPA system and benefits was provided (see attached PowerPoint).
b. The Resource Agencies will confirm this will work with their security requirements. The Exit 4A SDEIS scope will include a task to provide assistance to the Resource Agencies in getting setup with eNEPA access.

## 7. Next Steps

a. Keith noted the Project Team will be putting together a Scope and Cost Proposal to begin the updating of the EIS. A copy of the approved scope and task listing will be provided to the Resource Agencies for their information.
b. The EIS work is expected to begin in April 2016 and be completed (FEIS/ROD) in 18 months.
c. A new Joint Public Hearing (ACOE, NHDES, NHDOT) is anticipated to be held in the spring of 2017.