BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT
CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting
DATE OF CONFERENCES: December 1, 2011
LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building
ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT
Keith Cota
Dean Eastman
Jill Edelmann
Cathy Goodmen
Bob Hudson
Bob Juliano
Bob Landry
Kevin Nyhan
Mark Sanborn

Federal Highway Administration
Jamie Sikora

NHDHR
Laura Black
Dick Boisvert
Peter Michaud
Beth Muzzey

Albacore Park
Ken Herrick

AWC
Steve DelGrosso

CLD Engineers
Michael Haley

NHTB
Jim Fisher
Theodore Zoli

Kleinfelder/SEA
Michael Croteau
Kate Willis

National Trust for Historic Preservation
Rebecca Harris

Portsmouth Historical Society
Richard Candee

Quantum CC
Lisa Martin
Jennifer Reczek

Trust for Public Land
Gregg Caporossi

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

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

December 1, 2011 1
Antrim, 14940 (no federal #) 1
Antrim-Bennington, 15349A (no federal #) 2
Bradford, X-A001(089), 16032 3
Manchester, X-A001(086), 16016 4
Albany, X-A001(274), 21425 7
Portsmouth-Kittery, A000(911), 13678F 8

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

December 1, 2011

Antrim, 14940 (no federal #)
Participants: Jennifer Reczek (jreczek@quantum-cc.com), Lisa Martin, Quantum Construction Consultants

The Individual Inventory Form has been submitted to NHDHR. The concrete arch bridge is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A and Criterion C. QCC is seeking input from NHDHR on the requirements for rehabilitation and for replacement of the bridge.

If the Town chooses to rehabilitate the bridge without changing the character defining features, QCC would submit an Effect Memo with a plan of the proposed rehab. QCC explained that the rehabilitation would involve excavation of the existing roadway to allow for the installation of a cast-in-place concrete slab over the arch. The slab would distribute the wheel weight into the backfill beyond the arch and reduce the loads that it must carry. Concrete repairs would be needed in the form of epoxy injection and patching. Also included in the rehabilitation plan is the addition of guardrail at the bridge approaches. NHDHR noted that if the guardrail will be attached to the existing concrete parapet, the integrity of the arch could be affected.

The two reasons the Town is contemplating replacement are that the rehabilitated structure will not have the 75 year lifespan that NHDOT looks for in bridge replacements and that there are safety concerns due to the roadway and bridge alignment. The curb-to-curb width on the bridge is 19 feet and the paved roadway width averages 21 feet. The roadway tapers sharply on the eastern approach and aligns the northern travel lane with the north parapet. Coincidently, there was a recent accident in this very location and QCC plans to schedule a site visit to the bridge to assess if there was any structural damage to the arch.

If the Town wishes to replace the bridge, QCC will first have to look at all possible means of rehabilitation and demonstrate why it is not possible to keep or rehabilitate the existing structure. If the bridge is removed, Town will have to perform mitigation for the loss under both criteria. The options for mitigation would be discussed at a later meeting.

QCC will relay the information discussed to the Town for their consideration and will attend a future meeting if the Town would like to proceed with replacement.

Preservation Company would be contacted regarding submission of current photos for the inventory form.

Antrim-Bennington, 15349A (no federal #)
Participants: Jennifer Reczek (jreczek@quantum-cc.com), Lisa Martin, Quantum Construction Consultants

The existing bridge, built in 1946, is a steel girder bridge with concrete deck founded on dry laid stone abutments. The steel girders and concrete deck are severely deteriorated and in need of replacement. An assessment of the existing bridge abutments was performed to determine if a superstructure replacement is feasible. The assessment showed evidence of settlement and bowing in the existing abutments, as well as cracked stones, voids between stones and exposed backfill. It was determined that a superstructure replacement is not feasible, and the bridge will have to be replaced. The bridge is located at the junction of two watercourses, Great Brook and the Contoocook River.

The proposed bridge will be supported on pile caps, which will be placed approximately 10 feet behind the existing abutments. The tops of the abutments will need to be removed to allow for installation of the new superstructure, but the bottom stones will be left in place to protect the new abutments from scour. The new superstructure will likely be a steel girder superstructure.

The bridge is currently located in the floodway of the Contoocook River, and therefore, minimal changes will be made to the roadway bridge profiles. The horizontal alignment of the bridge will shift downstream about 3 feet to soften the curve on the western approach. The disturbance area will be mostly contained within the right-of-way and because the abutments will be supported on piles, the excavation is expected to be no more than approximately 10 feet deep.

NHDHR requested that an Individual Inventory Form be completed for the bridge because it is older than 50 years and founded on stone abutments. There are also concerns that the site may have archaeological significance because the junction of two watercourses is a prime location for Native American settlements. It was also noted that there is a known burial site along the banks of the Contoocook River in close enough proximity to the bridge to suggest there may be other archaeological resources in the area.

QCC will hire a consultant to review the history of the structure and complete the required Individual Inventory Form. QCC will also hire a consultant to perform a Phase IA Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment of the site. Once the required work has been completed, QCC will follow up with the Cultural Resource Committee.

Bradford, X-A001(089), 16032
Participants: Kate Willis (kwillis@kleinfelder.com) and Michael Croteau, Kleinfelder/SEA

Kate Willis began the meeting by addressing the additional information regarding the construction history of the sidewalks and a potential historic district that was requested at the July 14, 2011 meeting. There was not enough evidence that substantiated a claim that the WPA constructed the sidewalks.

Additionally, Michaela Jergensen, an Architectural Historian with Kleinfelder/SEA, completed field work to determine if a historic district was eligible was present. She indicated in a memo that because of changes to properties as well as infill the area did not appear to be eligible for listing on the National Register as a historic district [under Criterion C].

A memo outlining this information was submitted to NHDOT and NHDHR. The memo also included digital photos of the properties in the area with a photo key as well as physical and historic images. NHDHR reviewed the memo in the meeting.

Michael Croteau presented design plans that showed more detail than those presented in July. The plans show that the project is fully within the Town of Bradford’s right of way. He was also asked what materials would be used for the sidewalks and curbing to which he responded they would be a replacement in kind of concrete and granite. Currently concrete is visible and damaged granite curbing is present, though it has partially been obscured by overlay paving.

Based upon current streetscape and property photos presented, Laura Black of NHDHR stated that eligibility as a historic district could not be dismissed under any National Register criteria, particularly under Criterion A for community development and the area was potentially eligible as a district. FHWA, NHDOT, and NHDHR concurred, however, that because the work is to take place within the right of way [no Section 4(f) issues] and the plans are for the in kind replacement of sidewalks and curbing [no obvious adverse impacts], a formal determination of eligibility

through the preparation of a Historic District Area Form would not be necessary. A consensus determination of an eligible historic district was confirmed for the purposes of this project.

The group acknowledged that there is an individually National Register-eligible property (Bradford Community Center; Central School [BRA0003]) in the project area.

A No Adverse Effect finding for the project was made by the committee, comparing historic photos and research compiled by the project team with project plans showing minimal streetscape and property impacts.

It is understood and agreed upon by all parties that if the planned materials for sidewalks and curbing change or if other project elements are added to the project scope, the project will need to undergo further consultation with this committee. NHDHR, NHDOT and FHWA approved the action item of completing and submitting the No Adverse Effect Memo after Kleinfelder/SEA meets with the Town of Bradford on December 6, 2011 to confirm the use of concrete and granite curbing and communicate that a change in these materials will require further consultation with all parties.

Manchester, X-A001(086), 16016
Participants: Michael Haley (mikeh@cldengineers.com) CLD Consulting Engineers; Bob Hudson, NHDOT

Michael Haley of CLD presented Phase I of the Project on behalf of the City of Manchester. Jamie Paine of CLD had previously presented a larger overall project scope to NHDHR in 2008. Since that time, the City had secured limited funding and determined that breaking the overall project into smaller more manageable phases was the best way to proceed with design and construction. Phase I consists of improvements to sidewalk, installation of trees and landscaping, and installation of decorative lighting along the west side of Elm Street between Old Granite Street and Auburn Street. Additionally, Phase I includes a pedestrian crossing near the Green Street intersection. Phase I will be limited to the Elm Street corridor; work in the Gaslight District is not included and will be completed in the future when the City secures funding. Bob Hudson is the NHDOT Project Manager.

I. Project Overview

The City plans to replace existing sidewalks in the same locations with concrete sidewalks that have a decorative edge. The City determined that a brick edge creates maintenance challenges and has determined that a brick colored stamped edge is the best alternative.

Existing sidewalks along the west side are of varying materials and are in poor/fair condition. In addition to sidewalk improvements, tree wells and landscape areas will be scattered between Old Granite Street and Auburn Street as needed and as can be safely designed. Currently there are cobra head lights that provide lighting along both sides of Elm Street in this area. There are no existing landscape features in the area of Phase I. Lighting is proposed to be powered by underground conduit.

Drainage improvements are limited to adjusting pavement grades to drain to the existing drainage system along Elm Street. Near the Green Street intersection a catch basin may be proposed to alleviate ponding near the intersection.

Temporary easements will be necessary along the west side of Elm Street in order to grade driveways to join existing elevations. No permanent easements are currently planned as part of Phase I.

II. NHDHR Determinations

A. DHR determined in 2008 that a Project Area Form should be completed to determine which buildings in the overall project area could be considered historic.

1. L. Black/J. Sikora determined that although Phase I consists of work within the Elm Street corridor, the Project Area Form should be completed for the entire project area. It was noted that it was difficult for DHR reviewers to make a decision on whether Phase I work will have no adverse effect on the surrounding area without having additional data available. L. Black/J. Sikora noted that the intent of the Project Area Form would be to collect that information for the Phase I work and any future phases.

2. L. Black/J. Sikora felt that Phase I was likely to result in a determination of no adverse effect; however, without the Project Area Form complete, a final determination could not be made.

3. M. Haley noted that the City had hoped to avoid the Project Area Form for Phase I because work was limited to the Elm Street corridor. The City understood that it was likely that additional historic work would be required once work within the Gaslight District was started.

   a. J. Sikora expressed concerns with continuously breaking the overall project into small phases which could avoid the Project Area Form; it could ultimately circumvent the Section 106 process entirely. If Phase I was allowed to proceed without having a Project Area Form in place, it could be perceived that future phases could then be completed without the Area Form. L. Black/J. Sikora/R. Boisvert were concerned that by the completion of the overall project, no Area Form would had been complete and any historic resources may have not properly documented and/or preserved.

   b. M. Haley expressed concern with the potential costs and delays associated with completing the Project Area Form. Phase I work currently is stretching the available funding as much as possible.

      1) J. Sikora asked what the potential cost could be for a Project Area Form. J. Edelmann said that it varied by project, but a price range of $10,000 - $30,000 was likely. J. Sikora did not feel that price was unreasonable compared to the $1 million available for Phase I.

      2) R. Hudson felt that the 6 month time that would be associated to complete the Area Form was not unreasonable. He felt that a spring 2012 advertisement was highly unlikely; summer/fall 2012 was more reasonable.

      3) R. Hudson confirmed with DHR that the Project Area form could be completed concurrent with preparation of the Engineering Study and Preliminary Design documents. J. Sikora noted that design could proceed, but some risk would be associated with that approach in that if the Area Form resulted in historic properties being identified, changes to the design may be necessary.

4) R. Hudson requested that CLD provide an updated schedule with dates/milestones to determine the potential impacts associated with completing the Project Area Form.

c. L. Black did clarify that the Project Area Form should be completed only for the overall project area (Master Plan Project Area). It should not expand to areas outside of the proposed overall project. L. Black/J. Sikora recommended working with the historian that prepares the form so that it is clear what the limits should be. They also recommended working with the historian during the design phase to determine what impacts the proposed design could have on historic properties/resources.

d. It was also noted that the Project Area Form, as a planning document for above-ground cultural resources, would help in planning/scheduling/funding this and future phases of the Master Plan project.

B. R. Boisvert expressed interest in the proposed tree wells/locations.

1. Currently at this time, final locations and tree species have not been determined. [Subsequent to the meeting M. Haley recalled that tree species were to be similar to those recently installed as part of the Market Basket improvements adjacent to the Phase I work.] Locations of tree wells will depend on lighting, as well as meeting ADA accessibility requirements.

R. Boisvert recommended reviewing the project for alternate tree locations. Example, if the City wants 6 trees, the design should provide 8 locations where trees can be planted. That way, if during construction a sensitive area is uncovered, the area can be documented, preserved, covered back up and the tree can be relocated to another location. He also recommended that a historic archaeologist be available during construction for such documentation work. He noted this approach also provides an opportunity to plan work in any phases.

Note: Following the meeting Edna Feighner from NH Division of Historical Resources (not present at the meeting) reviewed the project notes and requested a Phase IA Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment be completed for the Master Plan Project Area, for similar reasons stated for the Project Area Form.

Albany, X-A001(274), 21425
Participants: Greg Caporossi, Trust for Public Lands (gregg.caporossi@tpl.org); Dean Eastman NHDOT

Gregg Caporossi from the Trust for Public Lands, along with Dean Eastman who runs the scenic byways program at the NHDOT presented this project for the towns of Albany and Conway to acquire approximately 293 acres of land through a simple fee acquisition for the Albany Town Forest. There will be no subdivision of the land, and buildings will not be allowed. Recreational trails may be widened for additional use, however the goal of the towns is to maintain the forest as is. Dick Boisvert noted that one archaeological site is located within the property and a second site is located in or near the property. It was agreed that these sites would not be disturbed and language would be written into the conservation easement to protect those sites. Laura Black asked if the Conway Scenic railroad runs through the property. G. Caporossi stated that the rail

line is adjacent to the property and the TPL is working with the scenic rail road to help maintain the views in the area.

D. Boisvert suggested that a similar project with the TPL occurred in Randolph, and to use the language in that easement, as a template for this easement. It was agreed that this purchase would result in a No Historic Properties Affected finding, and a memo could be signed as such.

Portsmouth-Kittery, A000(911), 13678F
Participants: Keith Cota, Jill Edelmann, Bob Juliano, Bob Landry, Kevin Nyhan, Mark Sanborn, NHDOT; Jamie Sikora, FHWA; Laura Black, Dick Boisvert, Peter Michaud, Beth Muzzey, NHDHR; Stephen DelGrosso, AWC; Jim Fisher, Theodore Zoli, HNTB; Richard Candee, Portsmouth Historic Society; Rebecca Harris, National Trust for Historic Preservation (via phone); Ken Herrick, Albacore Park

Discussion Items

Proposed NHDHR 30 day Design Reviews:

- 30% (this meeting), 50%, 80% and 100%
- The end of the 30% review period is 12/14/11

Ted Zoli presented a PowerPoint presentation describing the design of the new bridge and adherence to the Standards 9 and 10 of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in relation to the Portsmouth Historic District and other historic resources in the bridge's vicinity.

The general consensus was that the new bridge meets the Secretary's Standards 9 and 10 by clearly consisting of a design of its own time period, though compatible with the surrounding historical environment.

Richard Candee from the Portsmouth Historical Society indicated that he supports the design of the new bridge and does not agree with adding cables to the tower legs as suggested in the recent Public Information Meeting.

Lighting Design:

- NHDHR agrees that an architectural lighting design for the new bridge could be developed to emphasize innovative engineering features or visually enhance the structure. The use of LED lighting was suggested for their sustainability benefits. Any lighting design should be compatible with the historical resources that surround the bridge.
- It was agreed that old fixtures do not fit the new bridge.
- Portsmouth street lighting fixtures may be different than the bridge lighting fixtures.
- A lighting design will be developed and discussed at future review meetings.

Proposed Bridge Color:

- Ted proposed a metalizing coating system consisting of a zinc coating for the new bridge in lieu of a 4 coat paint system. The color of the metalizing is silver.
- Richard Candee is in favor of the metalizing system with a clear coat.

- The NHDHR has no concerns with the zinc coating system, and the resulting silver color, proposed in place of the green paint depicted in the original renderings.
- The pedestrian railing may be a different color from the rest of the bridge structure.

Bridge Plaques:

- Ted indicated that he is not comfortable placing the existing plaque on the new bridge.
- The NHDHR would like to continue discussions regarding placement of the historic bridge plaques. The NHDHR suggested one option of placing the portal plaques, using a similar arch "portal" structure, in the large open space off Memorial Park. This concept will also be vetted with the Public Outreach Advisory Committee and may be an opportunity for more public art.
- The existing plaques will be removed at the end of January 2012 and will be done carefully to protect the portal as plans have not be determined on how to present the existing plaques.

Action Items

- Submit renderings of plaques on the bridge indicating a non- recommended solution.
- Prepare and submit a proposed lighting design for the new bridge.

****Memos/MOA's**:

Submitted by: Jill Edelmann, Cultural Resources

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