

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT CONFERENCE REPORT

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

DATE OF CONFERENCES: November 13, 2014

LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building

ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT

Sheila Charles
Robert Hudson
Stephen Liakos
Karen Malburne
Nancy Mayville
David McNamara
David Scott

**Federal Highway
Administration**

Leigh Levine

NHDHR

Laura Black
Edna Feighner

CMA

Britt Audet
Jason Gallant

Hoyle, Tanner

Sean James
Aaron Lachance

Preservation Co.

Lynne Monroe

**Quantum Const.
Consultants**

Jim Bouchard
Lisa Martin

City of Rochester

Michael Bezanson

Town of Hooksett

Sidney Baines

Frank Kotowski

Bruce Kudrich

Leo Lessard

Dean Shankle

**Hooksett Heritage
Commission**

Kathie Northrup

Town of

Merrimack

Kyle Fox

PROJECTS/PRESENTATIONS REVIEWED THIS MONTH:

(minutes on subsequent pages)

<i>November 13, 2014</i>	1
Merrimack 13923 (no federal number)	1
Barrington 26722 (no federal number).....	3
Hooksett 29655 (no federal number).....	3
Rochester 14350, X-A000(320)	6

November 13, 2014

Merrimack 13923 (no federal number)

Participants: Nancy Mayville, Robert Hudson, NHDOT; Kyle Fox, Town of Merrimack; Lisa Martin, Jim Bouchard, Quantum Construction Consultants, LLC; Lynne Emerson Monroe, Preservation Company

Continued consultation and update on project previously reviewed on November 7, 2013. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss mitigation options associated with the adverse effect determination for removal of the historic jack arch bridge (116/137). J. Bouchard handed out an overview aerial photo that identified the Bigwood Historical District and the McGaw Bridge Road bridge location for reference.

J. Bouchard continued with an update on process of outreach efforts to identify consulting parties for the bridge replacement, and solicitation of input for mitigation efforts which included the following:

- Distribution of electronic copies of the Bigwood Historical District Area Form and Individual Inventory Forms, including the McGaw Bridge Road Bridge, to the Merrimack Heritage Commission and the Merrimack Historical Society.

- Notification of general public, Town Administration, Town historical entities, abutters to project and landowners within Bigwood Historical District of public outreach meeting.
- Conductance of public outreach meeting in which the prominent desire was for a historical signage at the bridge, while other efforts included posting of information on the Town's website. One comment was mailed to QCC following the meeting endorsing the use of signage.
- The subsequent meeting of the Merrimack Historical Society endorsed placement of historical signage at the bridge.
- QCC undertook a draft of text for a State Historical Marker at the bridge site [see below]. This was reviewed and edited by the Merrimack Historical Society. The revised draft copy was submitted to NHDOT Cultural Resources for distribution.

At this point, QCC, on behalf of the Town, is requesting the development of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to enable the project moving to general bid.

L. Black inquired if the bridge was not a contributing element to the Bigwood Historical District. L. Monroe confirmed that it was not a contributing element. J. Bouchard noted that all the work will be contained within the existing right-of-way except the need for proposed grading around the proposed wingwalls. Minimal slope work within contributing properties to the historic district will result in no adverse effect to that historic resource. The roadway horizontal and vertical geometrics remain consistent with existing conditions. It was noted that no historic properties, aside from the bridge, will be adversely affected.

Discussions relative to utilization of the State Historic Marker noted that this sign type has limited space available for telling the story of the bridge. Furthermore, the draft text would need to be enhanced for approval. Lastly, the location is not typical for installation of a State Historic Marker.

The provision of an interpretative panel was suggested. L. Monroe noted that the expressed intent of the community was the desire for an interpretative panel versus the historical marker. It was further discussed that the interpretative panel could be mounted on the bridge as a sidewalk is provided for pedestrian traffic. The interpretative panel typically provides the opportunity to include photographs and other graphics and enhanced text for conveying the story of the bridge. Large-format photo documentation of the bridge will also be completed, following submission guidelines for the "outline" format of New Hampshire Historic Property Documentation.

Photo documentation of the existing bridge will be undertaken while the foliage is currently gone and the water levels within the waterway are conducive to being under the bridge. The Town, QCC and Preservation Company will coordinate photo documentation and development of an interpretative panel for review and approval.

The Town inquired as to the ability to continuing the project for bidding purposes. It was resolved that once a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) has been drafted, reviewed and approved, the project can then continue to bidding and construction while the interpretative panel is being developed. The Town was cautioned that photo documentation must be completed prior to authorizing the removal of the existing bridge.

L. Black noted that the Memorandum of Effect for the project must be completed.

QCC will draft the MOA and submit to NHDOT Cultural Resources for review and approval. No further consultation meetings with NHDOT Cultural Resources will be required.

Barrington 26722 (no federal number)

Participants: Aaron Lachance, Sean James, HTA; Nancy Mayville, NHDOT

Initial consultation to review the alternatives for the replacement of bridge 109/162 carrying Greenhill Road over Isinglass River, to discuss other structures in the APE, and share results of the coordination with the Historical Society and the Town.

The project was presented to update information on the current status of the bridge replacement project for bridge 109/162 and to solicit input on the project development process. A. Lachance presented a PowerPoint slideshow which highlighted the background of the project, discussed alternatives considered so far in the design, and showed photographs of the abutter homes within the project limits. The bridge, which was constructed in 1955, is in overall satisfactory condition, but with a curb to curb width of 18 feet, it is very narrow. The existing roadway geometry only meets a 20 m.p.h. design speed because of the vertical roadway profile.

The Engineering Study is in progress now and preliminary tasks have been completed, including topographic survey, geotechnical drilling, hydrology/hydraulics, conceptual structural engineering, and conceptual roadway design. Some outreach and coordination has also been completed, including correspondence with the Barrington Historical Society who stated that they do not have concerns with any historical aspects of the existing bridge.

The results of study-phase design tasks and coordination with the Town indicate that a 95' span complete replacement structure with a roadway width of 24' and a design speed of 30 m.p.h. is the preferred alternative. This direction was given via a vote of the Selectboard at a public information meeting. This alternative will place new abutments and wingwalls behind and outside of the horizontal limits of the existing granite block abutments.

L. Black said that inventory forms for the abutting homes would not be required (specifically for the ca. 1860 #204 Greenhill Road) since there was not tremendous impact to the roadway profile because of the project. The bridge is in a low point and therefore changes shouldn't cause visual impacts. She said that an inventory form for the bridge is required. A complete alternatives analysis to document why rehabilitation isn't a feasible alternative is also required.

E. Feighner requested that a Phase 1A archaeological assessment be completed only in the vicinity of the bridge, in the area of anticipated substructure impacts.

N. Mayville commented that the alternatives analysis discussion in the engineering study should demonstrate why a shorter span structure would not be a viable alternative for this project.

Hooksett 29655 (no federal number)

Participants: Jason Gallant, Britt Audet, CMA Engineers; Dean Shankle, Kathie Northrup, Leo Lessard, Town of Hooksett; Sidney Baines, Frank Kotowski, Bruce Kudrick, Hooksett

Sewer Commission; Kathleen Northrup, Hooksett Historic Commission; Nancy Mayville and Steve Liakos, NHDOT

Follow up to the November 5, 2014 Cultural Resources Agency Coordination meeting, and continued consultation for the 1909 Hooksett Village Bridge (Lilac Bridge) over Merrimack River (NHDOT Br. No. 083/150) to update the committee on the status of the emergency bridge stabilization project and to gain committee input on next steps.

J. Gallant presented a Powerpoint slideshow which included history of the bridge, historic use, current conditions, previous efforts to restore the bridge and draft alternatives analysis developed to address critical deficiencies of the bridge.

The project was presented to the committee in September 2014 to receive input on a plan for emergency bridge stabilization after several critical deficiencies were observed on the bridge during inspections by NHDOT and CMA Engineers in July and August 2014. A construction contract to stabilize the bridge and reconstruct the gravity sewer main was bid in September which received one nonresponsive bid. Accordingly, the Sewer Commission is currently taking measures to temporarily bypass wastewater flow around the sewer main on the Hooksett Village Bridge to the pump station on the south(east) side of the Merrimack River, until the critical deficiencies on the bridge are addressed and / or a long-term alternate sewer crossing is developed. The Town of Hooksett is considering several alternatives to address the current condition of the bridge:

1. Secure bridge and rehabilitate it to allow pedestrian access;
2. Remove the bridge spans 2 and 3 and replace with new pedestrian bridge and rehabilitate span 1.
3. Remove the bridge and replace with a new utility bridge;
4. Remove the bridge and secure piers and abutments to be left in place;
5. Secure the existing bridge and repair critical areas;
6. Bridge removal and superstructure replacement;
7. Do nothing.

Following the presentation, the following items were discussed.

L. Black clarified that the Hooksett Village Bridge is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under criterion C (for engineering) and A (for being part of the 1936 WPA-funded flood recovery). The bridge was placed on the State Register of Historic Places in 2008. It is one of the state's five surviving metal truss bridges designed by engineer John William Storrs.

S. Baines clarified that the Sewer Commission had secured a \$150,000 sewer grant for use as part of the matching funds needed to utilize a Transportation Enhancement (TE) grant appropriation in 1999. Ultimately, the grant was not accepted because Town Council didn't approve funding for the remaining amount needed for the matching funds.

S. Baines asked about the possibility of rebidding the stabilization project in the spring to receive more competitive bids. J. Gallant responded that given the high risk nature of the project and the public availability of the previous bid, we should not expect significantly more competitive bids in the spring. N. Mayville noted that the high risk of stabilization projects has been reflected in the prices of recently bid projects.

S. Baines asked if there was an opportunity to work with the Contractor selected for the DOT Main Street bridge re-decking project (slated to begin in Spring 2015). It was noted that the Town and State Bridge aid programs have requirements for open bidding procedures. David Scott noted that if the same Contractor is selected to work on the Hooksett Village Bridge, that contract would not be overseen by the DOT.

F. Kotowski asked about the need to get public input on the proposed alternatives, along with concurrence from resource agencies. J. Gallant provided an overview of the project approval process, noting that all of the project alternatives will require input from a Federal agency for impacts to historic resources (Section 106). The agency may be Federal Highway or Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), depending on which alternative is selected. The project team is seeking input from the Cultural Resource groups today on the Section 106 process so that the Town can move forward with its decision making progress. Without significant money invested by the Town, an alternative including reuse of the bridge will not be possible. F. Kotowski followed up with a request for expeditious review of the project and also for clarification on how long the review process will take. L. Black noted this project is well beyond the point of how the Section 106 process is intended to work. Section 106 consultation is intended to assist in the development, analysis, and tweaking of project design alternatives to avoid and minimize adverse effects to historic resources, with mitigation as a last resort. DHR noted the atypical nature of this project because of previous decisions regarding the use and maintenance of the bridge, leaving little opportunity for the consultative process. Once submitted, DHR will review the alternatives analysis. The statutory review period is 30 days, though it rarely takes them that long.

E. Feighner noted that it would be appropriate time to get ACOE involved with the project. They will likely be signing the Memorandum of Agreement for this project. She noted that the applicant and the Lead Federal Agency drive the schedule of the project, and the applicant needs to make sure that the ACOE is updated and has material to review. It is the federal agency that determines if a project Alternatives Analysis is sufficient.

B. Kudrick asked if PSNH had jurisdiction over the project. Committee members were not aware of PSNH having jurisdiction over the cultural resources that that may be impacted by this project. D. Shankle asked about the mitigation requirements for adverse impacts to bridge. E. Feighner stated that the next step is to take the project to the community for their input on the project. Their input may provide opportunities for appropriate mitigation measures. S. Charles noted that a Storrs monograph is in development. L. Black stated that acceptable mitigation for removal of the bridge would likely include large format photography. J. Gallant stated that the DOT Bureau of the Environment had already commissioned an Individual Bridge Management Plan (April 2011) by the Historic Documentation Company, Inc. which includes details on structural, geometric, environmental and planning considerations, as well as comparative analysis, alternatives and recommendations for further study.

L. Black encouraged a creative mitigation proposal to document what is being lost and made available to the public in a creative fashion. e.g. interpretive panels, pockets parks, kiosks, etc. D. Shankle asked about duration of mitigation negotiations and what the Town's next step should be. E. Feighner recommended getting ACOE involved. N. Mayville stated the Town needs to make a decision on the preferred alternative and then submit the proposal to DHR. She also suggested that an option 2b be considered which would include removing spans 1 and 2 and rehabilitating span 3. J. Gallant noted that could be considered but a long term solution for the

sewer main would also need to be considered. E. Feighner noted that keeping the existing span will have long term maintenance needs that should be considered.

D. Shankle asked if the proposed construction staging area near Veteran's Park will be comprised by the Contractor working on the Main Street Bridge. D. Scott responded that it is the Contractor's responsibility to secure permission for construction staging on property not owned by the State.

Rochester 14350, X-A000(320)

Participants: David McNamara, FST; Michael Bezanson, City of Rochester

Continued consultation for the City of Rochester and FST to present an update to the Strafford Square project in Rochester. The project had previously been approved as a non-programmatic Categorical Exclusion, which had included a Section 4(f) evaluation. The process had led to a Memorandum of Agreement, which was finalized in October of 2012.

The proposed work included in the approved NEPA documentation is to replace an outdated, unsafe intersection with a new roundabout. Following NEPA approval, the City of Rochester contracted with an outside roundabout expert to review the proposed plans. That process led to a change in the geometrics of the roundabout. The changes in the limits of impacts due to the new geometric layout are considered minor. The City and FST have had discussions with NHDOT and FHWA regarding the changes and their impacts to the approved NEPA document. The City and FST will update the NEPA document as follows:

- Prepare a detailed description of the proposed revisions to the original roundabout design included in approved NEPA document.
- Add discussion of new roundabout alternative and update preferred alternative to reflect this change.
- Present new limits of disturbance at Natural and Cultural Resources meetings for confirmation that the minor changes in these limits will not trigger additional study needs.

The intent of appearing at this Cultural Resources Meeting was to update the agencies about the proposed changes and confirm that the stipulations of the original Memorandum of Agreement were still applicable, and that no additional studies would be necessary.

Currently, the FST Team is scoped to perform the stipulations outlined in the MOA, which includes:

- Producing a NH Historic Property Documentation Form for the dwelling at 2-4 Walnut Street
- Market the same building to the public for relocations
- Complete Archaeological Investigations, beginning with a Phase 1B and continuing as necessary.
- Minimizing the impacts of the proposed reconstruction.

General discussion followed the presentation, with the following conclusions:

- The existing MOA was still valid for the revised layout
- No additional studies are necessary at this time
- Should there be additional design changes, those would need to be brought back to a future Cultural Resource Meeting to assess their impacts on the existing approvals.

Submitted by: Sheila Charles and Jill Edelmann, Cultural Resources