

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT CONFERENCE REPORT

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

DATE OF CONFERENCES: February 12, 2015

LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building

ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT

Charles Blackman
Sheila Charles
Victoria Chase
Ron Crickard
Jillian Edelmann
Robert Hudson

Marc Laurin
Steve Liakos
Rebecca Martin

NHDHR

Laura Black
Edna Feighner

Quantum

Jim Bouchard
Lisa Martin

Town of Merrimack

Kyle Fox

PROJECTS/PRESENTATIONS REVIEWED THIS MONTH:

(minutes on subsequent pages)

<i>February 12, 2015</i>	1
Bedford 13953, X-A000(143)	1
Merrimack 13923 (no federal number)	2

February 12, 2015

Bedford 13953, X-A000(143)

Participants: Victoria Chase, Charles Blackman, Marc Laurin NHDOT

Prior to review of the stonewalls within the project limits, Sheila Charles gave a brief discourse on the Stonewall Policy. She stated that DOT has been reviewing the past practices and forms to see how best to proceed with stonewall reviews. The policy and evaluation process may need some minor tweaks, which will be presented at a future time, but overall they still makes sense. However, there was a need to modify the format of the Rating Sheets to make them easier to fill out and review.

Marc Laurin handed out the new forms for all of the stonewalls located within the Bedford project limits. He first reviewed the Project Rating Sheet that concluded that the project does not qualify for total reconstruction of all the stonewalls. A minor change was suggested, which did not change the results, and all agreed with this assessment. M. Laurin proceeded to review the Individual Stone Wall Rating Sheets. Google aerial and street views were used to supplement the photographs attached to the sheets. Reconstruction feasibility, costs and wetland impacts were discussed. Laura Black commented that further discussion is needed at a future date regarding Stonewall Policy (i.e. significant stone walls as defined by the policy for reconstruction v. these other “competing resources”).

There was agreement on the determination of the stonewalls reviewed that met the cutoff to qualify for reconstruction apart from the NH 101 wall located north of Olde Bedford Way (Station 196L to 197+25L). DHR contended that the wall has historic value as it is located adjacent to the Bedford

Village Historic District and is remnant of the road leading into the District. This changed the total so the stonewall qualifies for reconstruction.

Three walls will need to be evaluated for reconstruction: Nault property at Meetinghouse Road (Station 19+30L to 23L), Biscornet property at Pinecrest Drive (Station 60R), and State of NH property along NH 101 north of Olde Bedford Way (Station 196L to 197+25L). The impacts to the walls at Pinecrest Drive and along NH 101 Olde Bedford Way at will be re-evaluated to determine if they can be avoided.

Merrimack 13923 (no federal number)

Participants: Robert Hudson, Stephen Liakos, NHDOT; Kyle Fox, Town of Merrimack, NH; Lisa Martin, Jim Bouchard, Quantum Construction Consultants, LLC.

Continued consultation on the McGaw Bridge Road over Baboosic Brook (116/137) project, previously reviewed on November 13, 2014 regarding Section 106 Historical Mitigation stipulations for the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) and Cultural Effects Memo for Section 106 Historical Mitigation efforts.

Discussion focused on the discrepancy between the Town of Merrimack & Quantum Construction Consultants, LLC (QCC)'s understanding of mitigation agreed upon at the November 13, 2014 meeting, which identified the need for an interpretive sign panel and forwarding of documents to date to the municipal historical entities as requested by consulting parties versus NHDHR's anticipation that Historical Property Documentation (Outline Form) would be provided in addition to the interpretive sign panel due to the historical subconsultant's proposal to undertake large format photographic documentation of the bridge for interpretive sign panel.

QCC noted it was our understanding that the historical subconsultant identified the selection of large format photography as methodology of choice to enable high resolution for development of the interpretive panel and not as response to need for Historical Property Documentation (Outline Form). NHDHR noted that, it is their experience that new digital cameras provide high resolution required for interpretive sign panel, and that large format photographs are not required for an interpretive sign panel. QCC inquired if the NHDHR was requiring the Historical Property Documentation in addition to agreement with the consulting parties to provide panel. NHDHR responded that they do not require anything specific but review proposed mitigation for appropriateness on a case-by-case basis.

The Town of Merrimack formally requested that they only provide the interpretive panel that was agreed upon by the consulting parties. NHDHR responded that just an interpretive panel was not appropriate mitigation for the loss of the bridge.

NHDOT Cultural Resources championed a resolution that was then agreed upon by all parties. In addition to an interpretive panel, the Town will provide: Historic Property Documentation (Outline Format) that contains a contextual cover page, photo location plan, and index to photographs; and two-phase photography documentation with high resolution digital photographs of the bridge before and after the forms are removed. Submission of photos will be on archival quality disk. Large format photography is not required. NHDOT will provide the DHR with prints.

Town/QCC will revise DRAFT MOA and Effects Memo accordingly and submit to NHDOT / NHDHR for review and comment.

Discussion also occurred on how the process could be improved for future projects.

Submitted by: Sheila Charles and Jill Edelmann, Cultural Resources