

**Consulting Parties**  
**Section 106 Process**  
**Portsmouth Armory/JFK Building**  
**Meeting held May 27, 2003**  
**City Hall Conference Room A**

Present: Cindy Hayden, Community Development Director  
Sherm Pridham, Library Director  
Linda Wilson, Preservation Planner, NH Division of Historical Resources  
Edna Feighner, NH Division of Historical Resources  
John O'Leary, Chairman, New Library Building Committee  
Phyllis Eldridge, Chairperson, Portsmouth Public Library Trustees  
David Witham, Architect, Vice President Portsmouth Advocates  
Gordon Bliss, Chair, Preservation Committee, Coast Defense Study Group  
Leah Caswell, Save the Armory Group  
Christine Duffy, Abutter  
Carvel Tefft, Abutter  
Diane Kelley Tefft, Abutter

Cindy Hayden called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. Ms. Hayden explained the background of why we are here today. As you know the City has gone through an extensive site selection process since the fall of 1999. There are at least 14 different sites in the City for potential location of the library and criteria in assessing those sites, such as does the City own the land, cost to city, proximity to downtown, population centers, etc. The JFK/Armory Building was selected as the site for the library and was endorsed by the New Library Committee, City Council and Planning Board. The Armory is eligible for National Historic Register and this is the primary reason why we are here today because the library project will necessitate removal of that building. This meeting today is part of what is known as the Section 106 historic review process and we are assisted in this project by New Hampshire Division of Historic Resources, Edna Feighner and Linda Wilson who are here today. The reason or the need for going through the Section 106 historic review process is triggered by the fact that the City needs an EPA stormwater discharge permit. This permit application is not available yet, it is a new permit by EPA so the City has submitted a notice of intent to apply for the permit and once the application becomes available the City will apply for the permit.

Ms. Hayden referred to the informational handout provided that explains the section 106 historic review process. She said the building has been determined to be eligible to be on the National Historic Register. It has been determined that construction of the library on this site would have an adverse effect on the historic building. She stated that right now we are at Step 4 in the process, which is resolution of adverse effects. Essentially we are looking at ways to achieve the project purpose, which is to construct the new library but also at the same time identify ways to avoid, mitigate or minimize the negative impacts on that resource. Avoiding could be other sites that meet all the project needs and again those needs are costs, city owned, downtown proximity, population centers, etc. minimizing or mitigating negative impact might be reusing portions of the Armory, might be creating a permanent exhibit with the library recognizing the Armory's military and architectural significance.

In terms of who is here today, Section 106 process directs you to invite consulting parties to the table to discuss ways to avoid or mitigate impact on a historic resource. So we have identified interested parties from the City, Chair of Library Trustees, Phyllis Eldridge, John O'Leary, Chair of Building Committee, Sherm Pridham Library Director. I'm here chairing this meeting on behalf of the City Manager who is unable to be here today. A representative from EPA was unable to be here today due to a meeting conflict. We have invited all the abutters and have invited a representative from groups who have interest in historic buildings such as Historical Society, Portsmouth Advocates, Leah Caswell on behalf of group to Save the Armory, and the Coast Defense Study Group, which has an interest in military history.

Our primary reason for meeting is to discuss ways to avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on this historic resource. I will ask that you identify yourselves when you speak and we will try to do this in an orderly fashion to give everyone a chance to speak.

Edna Feighner stated that we are here today to be informed and listen to representatives. This is an ongoing process so whatever comes from this discussion we will go back into discussion again.

Diane Kelley Tefft, stated that the regulation effective March of this year is new in that EPA was triggered because of disturbance of a development that was over an acre and this rule only applied to developments over 5 acres so people are trying to figure out what to do. When I spoke with Abby Swain of EPA she indicated that consulting parties would have to fill out an application to receive consulting party status and we were told that wouldn't be available until June 1, so we are waiting for that form for other consulting parties to be here today and before we knew it we were invited to come. I guess we were designated as a consulting party and it just seems like it was a little bit out of step in the process and we had about a weeks notice and I know there were other people who would like to have been here and there were other people who were not designated as consulting parties because they were not abutters and I think the record should reflect that people concerned for the site are not merely abutters but citywide.

Cindy Hayden stated that consulting parties are not just abutters and that is why we tried to invite all parties that we were made aware of that do have interest from a historic standpoint including the Save the Armory Group, the abutters, the City on behalf of the library project, EPA, State Historic Resources, Advocates, Historical Society and Coast Defense Group. There are certainly a lot more people with an interest and a lot of people at the last meeting. Today's meeting is meant to be a discussion process and meant to have a representative of each of these groups.

Edna Feighner commented that normally what would happen is an interested party that wants to be considered a consulting party, generally sends a letter. There is no form, no document that has to be filled out, it is a letter of introduction of yourself to the Federal agent stating that you are concerned and interested in being a consulting party. I don't know why EPA told you that, it is not true. It is not anew process, it has been in effect

for better than ten years and EPA is implementing it. Section 106 has been ongoing since 1960's.

Carvel Tefft stated he had spoken to Cindy earlier about this and the City was being proactive and asking what you would normally consider consulting parties to the table and that seems reasonable. Also I'm picking up on the fact that this discussion may continue and consequently I'm assuming that if somebody comes to the table not as a consulting party and seems reasonable that they are, they would be allowed to come to one of these meetings for discussion as well. In other words we are not closing the door based upon today's meeting to somebody that might come to the floor as a consulting party.

Edna Feighner responded it depends, projects do have schedules. Section 106 is not a process to hold up the project it is a way that we do get all concerns out, and to find some way to mitigate and if we can't avoid negative impacts, then we try to minimize. Certainly everyone is given an opportunity to discuss.

Carvel Tefft stated that we are not in the business of refusing consulting parties if they are legitimate. If they identify themselves and if we are in that phase, still in that phase and have not gone to the next phase, that we are assuming that those people could technically be recognized. If we have a meeting today and all of a sudden somebody comes to the floor that is a legitimate consulting party and we are still in the process I'm assuming they can be recognized as one whether they do it in writing. They may not show up at a meeting but they might send a letter. Would that be legitimate?

Edna responded they might not need to attend a meeting, however, their request for consulting party needs to go to the EPA to be identified.

Diane Kelley Tefft stated there may be some confusion at the last step in this process. At the meeting with Dr. Betterly, it was kind of reviewed as a head count of who wanted a library and who didn't and we had that referendum vote and that is clear, it was about the site and how to avoid, mitigate or minimize the impact on a historic structure. Library supporters find this very annoying to go through all these meetings, but probably not as annoying as others of those who would like to get other information out there so we are very grateful for this forum today. Thank you.

Cindy Hayden stated that the major thing we want to talk about today is are there any other sites in town that were identified that people want to bring up and say why not this site, how did this not meet the criteria of a potential site for the library. And if we go forward on the JFK, can we reuse part of the building, can we do a historic exhibit?

Carvel stated that he didn't think there was just one alternative, he thinks there is more than one that meets the criteria. But there is a particular alternative that seems interesting and he showed a drawing of the Bridge Street site. Historically he thinks that it has been difficult for those of us who felt marginalized in the discussion of a new library because as Diane pointed out she and I since the beginning have supported the idea of a new

library, but I voted against the site, not voting against the library, voting against the site. As an abutter as I am living on Richards Ave. you automatically are thought to be someone who just doesn't want it in your backyard you get marginalized and that is how Diane and I have felt over the number of months now. It really goes back a little further than that. I was on the Economic Development Commission back in 1997-98 and we commissioned a study using UDAG money of the City, \$77,000, a considerable amount of money, to tell us where the next big public edifice should be built. The two possibilities were things like library #1 and the other thing was a public market. The idea was finding an anchor to regenerate or begin to introduce a weaker part of our urban area, which was the North End. We have a portion of our downtown that has lain fallow since 1960 after HUD came in and virtually destroyed almost everything that was there and left one-story buildings and also the least and worse use of real estate in an urban area. I don't think anyone with any land use intelligence disagrees with me. So a city that is going to spend \$7 million or \$8 million which in today's dollars could be \$9 million to build a building of this nature, this is a significant investment. It has also been discussed and somewhat proven by experience that any public investment of consequence gets a higher return than private investment. Thinking about this while on the Committee I became very convinced at least conceptually, that if this town was to do anything big it should starting thinking either an entrance to the North End or the North End itself for a new project just to get private capital excited to come in and build around it. If I lived on Dennett St. or Ocean Rd. or Richards Ave. it makes no difference to me, I'd make the same arguments for the library either on the library building committee or as you see me making today. So, as an abutter I just want to make sure the record holds that I am not "not in my backyard". In fact if I felt there was enough parking and enough space, I'd love a library in my backyard, I'd love to be able to walk a block to the library. I've never had a problem with the concept of that, I've had a problem with what the legacy is for our kids. I don't want 20 years from now facing a situation where the only thing you can do is blacktop our central park because we don't have enough parking when my kids are 25 years old. I don't want a situation where we have to get rid of ballfields and put blacktop on it and encroach upon trusts because we don't have enough room. I simply want to make the case for the betterment of the City of Portsmouth we make an investment in the right place even if it costs money, although in this alternative it doesn't necessarily cost money because we own the Bridge St lot as well. Another historical fact is that of the 14 sites that the Library Building Committee discussed it wasn't until very very late in discussions that we even got serious about the Armory site, early on it wasn't on our radar screen. It came on our radar screen when the City Manager made it very clear that he was able to move the Rec. Dept. from the JFK area up to Spinnaker Point and therefore the property became available. When the property wasn't available, it wasn't available so how could we be discussing it. So it wasn't one of the initial properties that we brought to the table. He asked John O'Leary if the JFK was one of the 4 top sites.

John O'Leary responded that he didn't think it was one of the four, if he wasn't mistaken there was concentration on three sites and I don't believe this was one of the four.

Cindy asked John or Sherm to address the issue of why the Bridge St. site was not selected.

Carvel Tefft continued with his opinion of what happened. The Bridge St. site had been discussed in a very specific way, we have pages and pages of study of this particular site. What happened to this site in my mind is that it got marginalized for two reasons: 1. There was the thought that we had to connect it to the current building to make it work so consequently it brought into play the old library as well as the potential new building and brought into play "how do you connect it?" And then it brought into play, the expense of connecting it which included everything from an overpass to a walkway or a tunnel underneath which would be very expensive. He stated that Paul McEachern made an extremely good argument that he was concerned about the attachment effect because he said if you have the old library entrance to the new library you kind of lose everything that the old library could be giving you and it turns out to be an entrance way and kind of a wasted space and then we end up going to the new library anyway. So this along with the underground parking issue was really how this got marginalized because it became too expensive. The other thing that came up was the fact that this parking lot (Bridge St.) was on an incline and had ledge, which would be difficult to deal with. Also part of the report was considering making a 3 story underground parking garage. Whatever forces were in play at the time, they were very powerful and made this project into a very expensive undoable kind of marginalized issue. For this reason I went back to look at it. What I found is: 1. On the site itself any building up to 38,000 s.f. easily could be built and achieved in 2 stories. 2. The lot is actually built on fill so you can backhoe it, not really an issue of ledge. 3. I was told by an engineer/architect that you could easily build a 1-1/2 story underground parking garage that would not be enclosed, therefore the air would move and you wouldn't need any special types of equipment to keep it ventilated and consequently the expense would not be what we think it would be. We could actually put 150 parking spaces in there. This report specifically says that this library would need about 100 parking spaces, another interesting point. The same engineering group/traffic study group, that said we were fine at Parrott Ave. with 65 spaces, said in this report that you need 100 for a building of this size. He feels we need 100 parking spaces and if in fact we have parking sprawl at the JFK, the sprawl will go into the neighborhoods. If we have a parking sprawl in the downtown site, the sprawl will go to downtown parking sites, which it does now and would be a much more favorable sprawl to downtown than in a residential area. Last and not least the parking in the JFK, if you take the double wide handicap sites that you really need now and the 9 spaces that are planned for Sherm and staff from 65 spaces, you end up with about 50 spaces for the general public which is about half the number that you need.

Diane stated that they also took away 30 residential spaces without any alternative so these people will be forced to park on the street and essentially be vying for the same spots that library users will be looking for.

Carvel Tefft continued with talk of building a new parking garage downtown in the Worth Lot. The development of the Islington Street corridor, the development of the entrance way into the North End, etc. is very important for the continuation for the

expansion and attracting private development into that area of town and also consequently adjacent to the North End. This site is free too, meaning the City owns the site, we don't have to tag \$1 million or more on, although I think it is short sighted not to pick the perfect site and pay the money for it. As far as the old building is concerned, if I had my druthers, I would take the JFK and make it our building of antiquities. Have only historical volumes there and our historical maps and all things that deal with Portsmouth as an historical entity, have executive offices there, have a lovely meeting room there. The library for the library sake would be a stand alone building. When you get to the JFK the real question is if we didn't have an alternative that would be one thing, but this is one of several very viable alternatives that meets the majority of the criteria that we have. The downtown thing is very important, the parking thing is very important, the traffic thing is very important, these are very viable and high priority criteria that this meets. Last but not least, for the record, I am on the Portsmouth School Board and I've also made a statement at many public meetings and will make again today because I feel very strongly about this. I know of no community in the United States of America, unless they have no alternative, that plans for adding more traffic and parking in school zones. Thank you very much.

John O'Leary stated that Carvel made some very good points and one of the things I would like to talk about is the process and again why did we end up with the JFK site. I think this is an appropriate subject to discuss. There were 17 members of the Committee and we looked at numerous sites. We looked at some sites and summarily dismissed them without going into a lot of detail. Sites like the Lafayette School, we knew that had been dealt with on a couple of other issues and was a political hot potato and stayed away from it. We looked at some other sites around the City that were summarily dismissed for various reasons. But what we did do, we looked at 14 sites with a great deal of detail. We hired an architect, Steve McHenry who did an analysis of all 14 sites. There is no perfect site. The City of Portsmouth does not have a perfect site for a library. Any site where a library is sited involves a level of compromise. We have looked at all those sites and as Carvel points out we went through the sites that rose to the top and at that point in time the JFK site was not one of the final sites. One of the things we took into consideration was the fact that the JFK site was the only site in the City for adult recreation. As Carvel correctly pointed out then an alternative developed for adult recreation. Just for those of you who are not from Portsmouth, there is an apartment complex that had an adult recreation building that was being paid for by their residents. The City made an offer to lease that building for 20 years (I could be wrong with the time frame) and cut a deal with the residents so that became the new City adult recreation. At that point in time there were roughly a couple of hundred residents that were members; it has increased by 5 times now, so in other words it was a great move for the City to have that facility. What it did was open up the JFK site. We took a vote saying that if the Parrott Ave./JFK site did become available that would be our preferred site and I believe that at that meeting the vote was unanimous to go forward, I don't think Carvel you were there. Again, the vote was (please don't hold me to the verbiage) that if that site became available or if negotiations between the City and the developers succeeded that that site would be our preferred site.

Subsequent to that there were two other votes to reaffirm that and of those members who voted on the committee Mr. Tefft was the only one to vote against that site so it was unanimous less one on two occasions and unanimous on the other occasion. If I'm wrong with these numbers certainly I'll be corrected. We as a committee looked at 14 sites, they all had pluses and minuses. The Bridge St. site certainly was looked at and I highly agree that the whole idea of tying it into the old building just didn't work any way, shape or form. It was one of those things we spent way too much money and time because some people felt that was a good downtown location. We had a library consultant come in and tell us how much time it would take for a person to walk from one end of the library to the other and from a staffing perspective something broken up as that would certainly be costly to staff. We came to the second issue of a stand alone facility on that site. I think that was considered as were many sites within the City. I can't remember the exact discussions but I think certainly there were a few things that were taken into consideration. One is yes, in addition to building the library you would need to build parking under the library and that was an additional substantial expense. The second thing was that Portsmouth is hard pressed for parking in the downtown area. That entire lot which is a substantial parking lot would have been unusable for the whole period of construction so the people who park in the Bridge St. lot would be forced into other locations around the City because once you start construction there is no more parking on that site. These are some of the considerations. Also the fact is that when you are building a 2-story library on top of a parking garage, down on the far end of the library you would end up with a 2-story library in effect on top of a two-story parking garage, so it would become a massive building on that site. These as I recall are some of the issues that were taken into consideration with regard to this site. Let me talk again about the process and if I could pick up on a couple of things Carvel said. There's something about "the forces made things work into a particular site." We had a committee that the Mayor established that was a very diverse committee. We had representatives from the taxpayer's Association, Portsmouth Advocates, and representatives from various neighborhood committees. It certainly was not a homogeneous group in any way. If anyone of you have dealt with a committee of 17 people, even if all show up at a meeting, you don't really direct that many people, especially people who are of their own mind. I don't think this committee was forced into any particular site. I think this committee looked at the various sites and made determinations on what they as individuals saw as priorities. I supported other sites other than the Bridge St. site and in fact I think at one point Carvel you were supportive of the heliport site. We supported different sites at different points in time. I think that they all had their pluses and minuses. I think as a committee what we were charged to do is look at all the sites and make a determination as to what was the best site for the City. With one exception the committee has felt for the last couple of years that the JFK is the preferred site. I'd like to pick on one last point. When we started looking at sites we said at public meeting, said at Council meetings, we asked any individual in the City to identify any site that they felt was worthy of consideration. We got all kinds, we got some sites that people didn't even know existed and many of them didn't work. There was a site off Cate St. where the old B&M bus terminal used to be. A site off Market St. which was a nice lot except it had a huge pond, wetlands in the middle. We did try to look at everything and with regard to the JFK site and especially with the school in consideration, completely unsolicited we

received a suggestion from the principal of the middle School who suggested that building a library connected to the middle school was actually a viable solution for everybody. We got a sketch plan from the principal to connect the library to the middle school. Although one member of the school board may not think it's a good idea, the principal of the middle school at that time, felt it was a very good idea. Thought enough about it to submit it to the committee.

John O'Leary asked Phyllis Eldridge if she would like to add anything. She responded that she was on the committee prior to when the 14 sites were considered. She said she was there when the old hospital was considered but that the process goes back way before the 14 sites were considered in detail.

Leah Caswell of the Save the Armory Group said that coming in from the Bridge St. has been her idea for a year since this process began. I called the Tefft's and said we have to come in on the same page for a site so that we are strong and the City backs us on one site and we're not going to have to look at 8 or 10 or 14 others. I want the library not on that historic Armory and I don't want the parking on the Pierce Family Trust land which it most certainly will be. The ballfield will be paved and the trust will be broken and that park will be paved. She has spoken to many people in the City and there is great public support for the Bridge St. lot. She has petitions put together with a good number of signatures and there will be more. I believe we should preserve our history and the history that exists. A few of the things we didn't talk about on the JFK lot is the fact that it is filled with quick sand, to get a firm footing on that land would cost a great deal of money.

Sherm Pridham stated that the process is a very long one, over 15 years. The process as the folks from the state would know, is not a simple one. When I started this and realized we desperately needed something done about the library as it was not ADA compatible, was not user friendly and not able to do the kinds of things we needed to do to have library service, my conception was very simple. Get a library, I didn't care about ballparks, recreation, historical anything, all I cared about was getting a library and after 15 years I have learned more about historical preservation, recreation, soils, parking terminology and radon even. It is very difficult because you have to make a tremendous number of compromises to make this fit within the complexities of the City. We have had many many false starts, the Bridge St. lot being the primary one. That was my first choice. But after \$40,000 expended on studies, it was very clear to me that it could not be done. Do we want to revisit that?

Carvel Tefft commented that he reread the study and came to the exact opposite conclusion, I thought to myself I would like to have been part of that process because it made so much sense to me. Yes, there were some mitigating factors, like, 3-story underground parking garage, yes problem with overhead or underground connection and things like that. For example, there were all kinds of wonderful reasons, library patrons may also make use of commercial areas as part of the trip to the library, Islington Corridor as we discussed before. The interesting thing about it was the parking, but now at the JFK site that is the case unless we approach elsewhere and cut curves, ballfields



and whatever. The best case we have there as far as parking spaces, is a total of 65, 9 of which is staff, and double wides for handicapped parking, which leaves a net of 50. This means we will be going in with a new 38,000 sf library with lack of parking from the day it opens. I can't understand that concept. School pressure and trying to fix the parking there with 102 employees and the overflow bleed over in the lot between the JFK and the school as there are not enough spaces and when the court is in session all the spaces on Parrott Ave. are taken. I think it will be a parking nightmare and people will sprawl into the residential area. The church will not consent to parking for the school. Right now there are a total of 75 spaces in the Bridge St. parking lot and you would double the number of spaces and get what you want for the library in that lot. I think the killer of your first choice was all these little accessory problems that people brought up about connections and underground parking and not because it wasn't doable as far as a building on that site and whether that was a good downtown location. Again, if we have an alternative that means we can go to a place like that and save the JFK, because I think that is the anchor and as I mentioned at the last meeting I see that building as an epicenter to our central park. It is still used by many kids, lots of ball games, summer recreation. It is still a hub. If we have a building, why tear a building down, why not use it and then if we have open space, build a building on open space. We've got a place to build a library and therefore we don't have to tear a building down.

Diane Tefft stated that the building generates revenue for the City. It was built as an Armory, it is rock solid, if we have an option to have a building that does not to be put on life support, a building that can take care of itself, a building we can rent out and perhaps provide revenue that will help build a library it seems to make a lot of sense. I can understand your argument where you feel that the library would work well with the recreational resources down there, but because there is not enough land for parking, there will be no recreational resources, ultimately that's where the parking would end up going. A hardship proven after the fact where they're forced to take the ballfield, essentially that's what it comes down to. To have the connection to the Middle school on that location doesn't make any sense as the City is talking about building a new middle school. Another point was concern of displacing downtown parkers during the construction. We've got to make some sacrifices. We also have to recognize that while we may prefer a 2-story building, the scale of our City is changing, look at 100 Market St., a 6-story building there. I think it can be done at the Bridge St lot. We could have a separate exit if we expanded onto Bridge St. and we could overcome the obstacles and actually there are far less obstacles to overcome on that site than the Armory site.

Cindy Hayden stated that there is clearly a difference of opinion on the best site. One thing we need to be doing in this process is to determine whether there is another site amongst the 14 or any additional sites that meets all the objectives of the City to carry on this library project. However, we do need to talk about if the library project does go forward on the JFK site, what can we do to minimize the negative impacts. What would the community want to see in terms of recognizing whatever historic resources are there.

David Witham, on behalf of the Portsmouth Advocates, a historic preservation group said they took a vote on the issue of should the Armory be preserved. Originally our Board

was very much in favor of preserving the building. When push came to shove at what cost to preserve it, is it at the cost of not having a library. I think that's where the community is, they want a library so bad that we can do without this. I feel the Board's position now is people feel it is almost a done deal, lets look at mitigating, and how can we incorporate the Armory into the new plans, but that can't be done, it's not feasible. I personally think and a lot of the Board members feel this could go further and we can have a more significant section of the building saved and incorporate this part into the design. I feel in the end the project will be significantly stronger for the community and our history to get a significant portion of that Armory incorporated. I think this can be done and overall be a better project. In terms of speaking for the Portsmouth Advocates we would like to see a portion of the building preserved --- a portion that has significance so you have some reflection of what was once there.

Gordon Bliss from the Coast Defense Study Group. I'm here for information, we are researching the City, basically our position is our level of involvement is to determine the coast defense relationship to the Armory and other things in the area. I'm here more to see what is going on so I don't have anything directly to say.

Christine Duffy, an abutter, stated she moved here when in grammar school and the site, the whole area over there is the central recreation area of this entire City. After graduating I left the area only to return after retirement to green space, which Huntington Ave. in Boston doesn't have and not the traffic here as there is in Boston. Recreation was moved out to Spinnaker and it is amazing that the area has been as busy since they moved out. I can sit and watch the SUV's driving up on weekends going to the JFK, folks dropping their kids and driving away. I went there to see what was going on, the kids were having a wonderful time, playing basketball, tables set up with vegetables for snacks, summer camp is so busy and one night asked one of the parents what they thought of the building being torn down. "What do you mean tear it down?" was the response I got. I don't think you realize how many people don't know what's going on with the Armory, they don't read the paper. Then I go downtown and the town has become a disappointment, there is no anchor down there and to me that's where you need the library, you need an anchor to this town. I read where the North Church is looking for funding which is the other anchor, if that goes, we'll have restaurant row because that is what downtown has become, restaurant row. A coffee shop in the new library, we have a coffee shop on every corner in Portsmouth, do we need one in the library. I saw how the traffic increased when they built the courthouse. Come fall the kids play soccer, the kids are dropped off and running across the street, traffic people said we'll have crosswalks there. Do you think these 8 and 9-year-olds kids will look for a crosswalk, they're running back and forth across the street. Parades start here, races, bike races start here, people always coming here, now we're putting things on every corner outside of town. I think we need to keep something in the town and I do think it's a great recreation area. I don't know about preserving it, it has preserved itself all these years. Nobody has done anything to that Armory to keep it up, it has stood there solid. In another 20 years you'll be glad it was preserved, it has stood along all these years. I asked the kids what they would do when they can't come over here anymore. "What do you mean?" they said. I said to come home and speak with your mom and dad to find out what's going on

because they really don't know what they're going to lose. Another thing I think about the library, the way computerization is coming now books are outdated when you get them so you go on the computer to find out what is going on today. If you want your data you go to the computer. As an abutter my concern is really I love this area as a recreation area. I went to a meeting recently and people talked about the amount of tar, they had ariel views and there was tar here and tar there and that's what I'm afraid will happen in the City because once you take the green space away you're never going to get it back. Thank you.

Phyllis Eldridge commented that we need to be careful and not look at this with blinders, it's not just the JFK. The whole City doesn't live in this neighborhood, their children play in Dondero, New Franklin and other playgrounds all over the City. Nobody thought this was an historical building up until a few months ago. No one wanted to preserve the original windows or doors when it was completely gutted for exercise rooms. This is a pretty recent development in the City's concern with historical buildings. I think it's kind of jumping the gun to say "that if the library is built, we will lose the ball field and it will be paved over". We don't know that, we don't know that the middle school will be there and if it goes then it could be our new recreation building. Right now we are not interfering with the Pierce Trust, or for the foreseeable future. I guess I would be happy to trust the work of our soil engineers, that's why we hire experts to do this. The other thing I want to talk about is the 150 parking spots in the new building, now 75 of those spots are filled every day, probably a lot with non-library people. If the Bridge St. site were to be looked at again we have some of the same issues as any other site. Maybe your daughter might not want to go to the library after school, but a lot of kids might want to, not just to do homework but to do puppetry, drama, use meeting rooms, or for other kinds of recreation. What about those 30 residential spots, are we supposed to be mitigating those.

Carvel Tefft said no but there are a lot of homes on Richards Avenue on the first block that don't have adequate driveway space and some are multi-dwellings, so a deal was struck with the City some years ago whereby these people, rather than park on the street, were given the opportunity to park at the JFK. There's between 20 and 30 cars parked there every night. One neighbor actually made their own parking lot by taking a driveway and pushing it into what is encroaching into the Pierce Trust, fenced it off and allowed parking there because they needed extra parking as it is a multi-use house. Others don't have the luxury of doing that. We are just letting the City know that these are some of the many issues that this neighborhood has to face as an abutter. This is simply a human issue, not a historical issue. Up until 1974 people could park in front of their homes on Richard Avenue, and in 1974 the City said no parking from Middle St. to Parrott Ave. and then the City offered a lease saying we had the length of our property and we can go back 3 ft and that was what they did at that time.

Phyllis stated that no school in the country would want more cars. I think a lot of the schools would be happy to have a library at their side.

John O'Leary stated we could sit here and talk about the pluses and minuses of multiple sites, we have 14 sites here. There was the Parrott Ave. parking lot. We can talk about sites forever, talk about the parking issues, the school issues, but I don't know if that will get us any place. As Cindy attempted to do and as David addressed, what happens if the will of the community is to build on this site? The parking issues have gone before Traffic & Safety, they've gone through site review, they've gone through the various land use boards. The JFK site has received approval from all City boards so the questions of parking, quick sand, all of those issues have been addressed in the appropriate forums. So let's deal with what we are here for today, which is the site. The first question is "are there alternatives?" I think we have talked well to that issue with regards to alternatives. Now if it be the will of the community to build on the JFK site, then we go to the next step on the list. What can we do to mitigate, to some extent, the impact that such an action would have. I'm not going to say anything but would appreciate hearing from others in regards to this.

Cindy Hayden stated she would ask Linda or Edna, who are familiar with other sites where mitigation has worked well, to talk about how portions of historic facades have been reused and what has worked well.

Linda Wilson stated that one of the important things is what you are doing right now is to identify other viable alternatives and/or other viable alternatives, because if something goes to the advisory council, they will learn this has been a long public process. So that first of all having other viable alternatives is very important and the other aspect is if it does turn out to be the Armory site then what is the maximum of the historic fabric that can be incorporated? Because the way this whole process works is first of all try to maximize the retention of historic property. What we are here to enjoy is what we have inherited. Portsmouth has been a leader, not only in New Hampshire, but nationally in recognizing the benefits of keeping and using its historic fabric. There is also this continual process of evaluation and reevaluation of what our grandparents thought was brand new modern. This also has been a similar process with the Armory. The person who designed it is one of the preeminent architects of New Hampshire and town and cities who have his work can be very proud. The first goal of the preservation process is to retain the maximum amount of historic fabric in its context. If it can't be done, what is the next most important part that can be retained? 100% preservation is always the goal. What we are trying to do is achieve the goals of the City with respect to the library, which both directly and indirectly seems everybody agrees that the library needs to be expanded. Ironically, I was part of this same discussion 28 years ago. The first project that I bumped into when I first started my job was inheriting the expansion of the Portsmouth Public Library. So whatever collectively can be worked out here has the benefit for lots of community pluses over time and we have seen amazing things. On the basis of new information people were able to work together to say look we have got something special here, we need to maximize it, we also need to meet some new needs, let's be creative. I don't know if that means putting the library into the Armory or means finding an alternative place. This discussion today is the kind of thing the Advisory Council wants to make sure takes place and also our other Federal agency partners. The participation of the consulting parties actually enriches the process and also expands the

discussion and the consideration because it brings new ideas and brings back old ideas for reconsideration so that collectively with good spirit we can move forward. She stated she really commends Cindy for the way that you moderated this meeting today in every sense of the word. Together we can go forward and I hope that is what we can achieve here.

Carvel Tefft before leaving wanted to thank both John and Sherm. He said we have disagreed over the past several months, but we have always been very professional with each other and John has always been extremely good at listening and this has never become a personal thing and those of you that want to follow the democratic process really feel good about that and I wanted to say that for the record. The \$64,000 question is really, I think, the will of the community is to build a new library and I think the Mayor has said that very distinctly and we had a referendum that proves that. The will of the community as to where to build the library is probably up for grabs. It's a very controversial site and the site came into play after the idea of building a new library and then we had a tendency to attach the idea that if we're going to build a new library the site is connected therefore that's what everybody wants. I think that is what they call a high degree of inference. That is really not necessarily where the community stands if we were to take another referendum vote, OK you wanted it at the JFK or do you want it somewhere else. We don't know where that vote would come out. We know it went to the land use boards, and all we know is that we feel not only as neighbors but as community members two things. 1. The Armory is worth finding a way to use; it is a substantial building whether you call it historical or not, it has been standing there for many years without any maintenance and 2. We have an alternative and that's the question I put to John Bohenko one day. I said I don't know why you don't have a contingency. What if the preservationists win what are you going to do then, why don't you have a contingency to go hand in hand. The preservationists win the battle, you can just jump to the next site and do it, so you don't have to lose any money building the library? I've never understood the idea of not having a contingency. I offered the Bridge St. site in conjunction with what Leah pointed out because I wanted it on the record that there is a legitimate alternative that meets as many of the criteria that the library initially deemed a priority as does the JFK site. Those arguing the JFK site can come up with as many good reasons as I could for the site at Bridge St. Those arguments are very hard to debate sometimes. I would probably be favoring the JFK site if I really truly believed there was not an alternative. I think that is where we are really coming from.

Cindy Hayden said we have an affirmative referendum from the voters to build a library and the City Council appointed representatives of the City to the new library building committee, and the committee assessed many sites using a number of criteria. The discussion today is whether the library site should be the JFK that the Library Committee Council and Planning Board have endorsed, or is it another potential site such as Bridge St.? What does the state look at in terms of the process? Because as Carvel says you can ask 100 people on the street and they'll select the JFK site, and another 100 will say yes Bridge St. is a great site. Do we open that can of worms again and go back, and 20 years from now we'll still be looking for a site? We're looking for guidance from the state as to what the next step in the process is now as far as Section 106 is concerned.

Linda Wilson stated that the next step is to basically report to the public on this meeting and the Bridge St. alternative as discussed and why it's being mentioned as an alternative. There may be another alternative that hasn't been mentioned that might be viable or that for whatever reason the City chose not to explore further. If the JFK is the site that the City ultimately chooses, the focus will be on how to maximize the amount of fabric that could be incorporated into the new library on that site.

Cindy stated our next step is to have a public meeting and basically summarize the information from today's meeting.

Edna Feighner said the City should prepare the information to compare the sites, show the differences, why you have chosen this one over the others that may have been available. If there is something with that Bridge St. site that doesn't lend itself to development then it needs to be presented.

John O'Leary commented on the fact that the 14 sites were talked about and asked if she were suggesting that the fact the committee took the sites under consideration and took a vote, in and of itself doesn't have any bearing on the matter.

Linda Wilson stated it does have a bearing because the 106 process is separate from the local public process to consider alternatives, but once there is a connection with section 106 there is the need to address this just as there is a need to address wetlands and things of that nature.

John O'Leary said that what he was hearing was that if there were 18 sites we need to do is compare this site with all the other sites again.

Linda Wilson stated that the City has done that in the material you have already generated. I don't know if you have a copy of the memorandum that Dr. Betterly prepared, which outlines the history of the project to date. He talked about the purpose for today's meeting to clarify step 4 in the Section 106 process. He talked about needs must be evaluated for information for alternative proposals that may or may not have been considered when the City was looking for sites. Once the consulting parties study group has resolved the issues or at least suggested alternatives for consideration, a public meeting will be held to inform the citizens of the results of this step. The resolution of the adverse effect determination will need to show the public what has been suggested to avoid, minimize, or mitigate the project's adverse effects and to allow the public to comment on the alternatives considered or suggest other alternatives not considered. He then mentions additional study group meetings may be necessary, additional public meetings may or may not be necessary, but the bottom line is the public needs to be informed about the new results to resolve the adverse effect and those would include whether or not a new site or other alternative site has been included, and whether a means to minimize or mitigate damage to the Armory has been approved.

John O'Leary said he is trying to make sure that we take the right steps. What I'm hearing is at that at this meeting there was an alternative site presented and in order to pick up on

what Dr. Betterly indicated what we should be doing is responding to that alternative site as presented at this meeting.

Linda Wilson said yes that is the case.

Edna Feighner stated if you have a change in plans, if there's not going to be a 3 level parking facility that might be incorporated, perhaps that does meet your siting possibility, and then discuss that unless you really want to continue with multiple parking levels and the needs of that particular area. At least present that so everyone is really more familiar with the study and what the results were of that site compared to this site.

John O'Leary, said, good, I appreciate that.

Linda Wilson said it's basically a fair evaluation at this point in time considering that public thought is involved about the Armory site and other sites as well and factors we heard today. She said factors came into the process and went out of the process at different times, and basically what is needed is the matrix of the evaluation. The other aspect if it does come down to mitigation for the Armory is the maximum possible retention and incorporation that might be done.

Cindy Hayden asked on the second item, "what is the maximum amount that can be retained."

Linda Wilson answered I don't know that we really know that. The other aspect is that using a charrette would be a possibility of getting people involved who could donate time and services so it won't be a big expense to the City. That could be used to develop some very viable alternatives using Plan NH and AIA involvement.

Gordon Bliss stated he wanted to be included because we are still doing research to see if there is a coastal artillery tie to this particular Armory. I know our position ordinarily would be to as much as possible use the entire structure as has been done in other locations and that would be our ideal solution and anything back from that is a compromise. We have seen a number of cases where the entire structure or other coastal building type structures have been used in their entirety for totally different purposes. I'm well aware of the special architectural requirements and certain other aspects of the library structure so I know it's a lot tougher issue.

Cindy Hayden asked Sherm Pridham to speak to this. She said I know you and other NLBC members have visited some other building re-use locations that didn't work out so well.

Mr. Pridham stated that architects in the City have said they don't recommend charrettes for a couple of reasons. One, it is misleading because people say oh that looks great, go build it and then you start looking at it and you have to look at what the expense really is and you find it adds \$100,000 and you find you can't do it. We did that with about

\$60,000 looking at the 1895 building over here, it was not doable for that kind of money. So I'm very anxious about a charrette.

Linda Wilson commented that you have to be very up front as this is not a competition it is simply a way for peoples ideas to work through and look at some alternatives and see if anybody has a bright idea that solves the question, if not we say fine we've looked into it.

Sherm Pridham stated you have to be very, very careful.

Linda Wilson said the architects would be asked to donate their services.

David Witham stated that if you are considering a charrette or looking at some alternatives based on all the information gathered today, the charrette should include two sections: the JFK site and the Bridge St. site. But if you have to make a decision based on what is presented to you and you have two sites presented to you and both worthy of the same attention. By the time the charrette goes through you would then have the one site narrowed down because at that point we should have the information that either cuts out Bridge St. if its not usable.

Cindy Hayden stated that the site selection has been an open issue now for how many years, 15 years. Speaking on behalf of the City, this needs to be finalized in order to move forward with the project. Just to clarify for people, the Division of Historical Resources is a technical resource to us, and ultimately the City will be signing a memorandum of agreement with them, assuming we go forward with the site, but ultimately this is a City Council decision. The Council will decide whatever they're going to decide. The City is acting in as good faith as possible. She also stated for clarification that for all intents and purposes, the City has gone through the public participation process laid out in Section 106 over the past 2 or 3 years. It is just that over the last 2 or 3 years it wasn't called Section 106. Unlike many communities that would just say we're tearing it down, we have gone through this painstaking public process of identifying a site and whether or not to build a library and how to fund it. We have already done all that and this is last step here is icing on the cake. This is one final look at this through the eyes of section 106. We're not going back to square A. I think people really need to understand this. We're looking at this process through section 106 and that's not to say that everything we have done relative to assessing sites over the last 12 years, in particular since the fall of 1999, hasn't been done in very logical, careful way.

John O'Leary stated that he has been involved in City government for 20 years and this process here has had more public hearings, more public information disseminated than any public process this City or anyone in this City has ever been involved in. We invited everyone and anyone to submit sites to us when we were looking at this process. I recognize that there are people who do not agree with this site and I respect their right to disagree with this site. But the process that we have followed has been the most open process that has been followed by any project the City has been involved in at least the last 20 years. That includes the purchase of this building, the building of the athletic fields, the building of any of the school buildings and I have been involved in most of



these things for the last 20 years. This process has been as open a process as one could hope for and I think the intent of 106 as I understand it is to allow the public to be aware of a process, basically the intent of the law is to make sure that things aren't done in secret.

Cindy Hayden stated that relative to the historic resources in particular, that's where we are at now. This is another opportunity to get the information out to the public and that's what we'll do at the next public meeting.

John O'Leary stated that's what we're doing. There's been a lot more effort to scrutinize this site to make it work than there has been given to other sites because it was selected.

Phyllis Eldridge stated just as in private life, make a decision and you go with it and then you do everything you need to do to complete it.

Leah Caswell said it's always been a bad decision and although it was supposedly an open process, I would like the people who are not familiar with the City government to know that I have been gaveled down more than once as Diane has. This is the first time in my experience with the City that I have been able to say what I wanted to say, when I wanted to say it about anything. We have been told what we can say and that has been very, very limited. We have not had freedom of speech in the City, this is my hometown and I would like to see that change. Leah Caswell also stated the other thing that Dr. Betterly said is we have not been going through this 106 process; the 106 process begins now and what he said to me repeatedly was that as far as all that other work on the other sites was concerned it is negative now. We begin now looking at sites, looking at alternatives as far as the section 106 process is concerned.

Cindy Hayden stated she disagreed with that, and asked the state to respond.

Linda Wilson stated that all the work to this moment is part of the information based on which alternatives are considered. The formal section 106 process with consulting parties sitting around a table, being heard, asking questions and so forth, that has begun now and that proceeds to a logical conclusion.

Edna Feighner said it is not that everything to this point is negated. What is the case is that now there is a federal agency identified, EPA, which means we can and have to proceed with 106, but otherwise in good conscience and good faith Portsmouth, and you folks, have done the best job possible with no one telling the City they had to do it. This is also an interesting part of section 106, which I have had trouble myself justifying, because this is for pollution prevention, runoff from a proposed project that didn't need any review until now. So pollution prevention is causing the project to be reviewed under Section 106. So you have that sort of odd placement of this project in a review process. I wanted everyone to know this is different.

Linda Wilson stated that just like the wetlands process looks at wetlands, the 106 process is looking at historic resources, that is what Section 106 was created to focus on.

Cindy Hayden thanked everyone for coming today and the next step will be a public meeting to present the highlights of the issues raised at this meeting.