BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT

CONFERENCE REPORT

DATE OF CONFERENCES: March 5, 2009 and March 12, 2009

LOCATION OF CONFERENCES: J.O. Morton Building

ATTENDED BY: Jill Cunningham, Jon, Evans, Charlie Hood, Tom Jameson, Steve Johnson, Brian Lombard, Jim Marshall, Nancy Mayville, Joyce McKay, Mark Morrill, Christine Perron, Davis Scott, Susan Soucie, NHDOT; Edna Feighner, Jim Garvin, Beth Muzzey, Linda Wilson NHDHR; Jamie Sikora, FHWA; Scott Newman, VTAOT; Lynne Monroe, Preservation Company; Steve Pesci, UNH; Jim Bouchard, Ryan Clay, Quantum Construction Consultants; Michael Haley, Dan Hudson, Dorna Hamer, CLD; Jeff Alder, Dubois and King; Dave Sullivan, Mark Samsel, John Mangan, Town of Windham; Jed Merrow, McFarland Johnson; Jeff Foote, Town of Bedford; Scotty Mallett, Town of Bartlett; William Parker, Town of Milford; Jason Lodge, Matt Low, HTA; Kirk Beek, Ed Tinker, City of Claremont; Michael Leach, Josh Lund, Jerry Fortin, André Betit, Stantec.

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

Durham, 14405
Lebanon-Hartford, A000(627), 14957
Antrim 15350 (no federal number)
Walpole-Charlestown, X-A000(487), 14747
Milford, X-A000(416), 14492; X-A000(565), 14837; X-A000(618), 14492A; X-A000(195), 14078
Auburn 15657 (no federal number)
Londonderry 15589 (no federal number)
Claremont, X-A000(418), 14494
Brentwood, 15277 (no federal number)
Pittsfield, 15853
Enfield, M207-4
Bartlett Roundhouse
Municipal Projects/Stimulus Projects
Bedford, 15670 (potential federal funding)
Windham, X-A000(558), 14830

Thursday, March 5, 2009

Durham, X-A000(345), 14405: Participants: Steve Pesci, University of New Hampshire

Steve Pesci reviewed the overall scope of the TE project for Main Street West and provided a handout that showed the project summary, map noting extent of work on USGS base. He discussed possible impacts on natural/historic/cultural resources. UNH does not feel that any buildings are substantially impacted but will highlight ages of structures within 500' of the project corridor. There are no known historic structures or resources in the project area. The project area in question that may have archaeological sensitivity is that part of the project that lies outside the existing pavement zone – this is limited to the pedestrian sidewalk and train system being proposed (solid pink on the map). The bike lanes lie within the existing paved road corridor and shoulders.

UNH will be submitting a Request for Project Review Form downloaded from the NH Division of Historic Resources website within the next week. It is anticipated that this review process can happen electronically, via email and phone calls. E. Feighner subsequently determined that the project area was not archaeologically sensitive.

From this point forward, the primary contact for follow up detail on this project will be the UNH Project Manger:
Paul Henry, PE
UNH Energy and Campus Development
Ritzman Lab
22 Colovos Road
Durham NH 03824
Tel 603-862-0290
Paul.henry@unh.edu

Lebanon-Hartford, A000(627), 14957. Participants: Christine Perron and Steve Johnson, David Scott, NHDOT; Scott Newman, Historic Preservation Officer, VTAOT (Scott.Newman@state.vt.us**).**

Christine Perron provided an overview of the environmental process for the full project. As part of the NEPA process, an environmental document is being completed, and it is expected that this project will be classified by FHWA as a Categorical Exclusion. Coordination with state and federal agencies, organizations, and local public officials from both communities, through letters, regular interagency coordination meetings, and public officials/public informational meetings, has been ongoing in order to determine for the environmental review what natural, social, and cultural resources are within the project area and how they might be impacted by the project alternatives. Concerning cultural resources, at the two public informational meetings that have been held, the Section 106 process was explained and interested parties were invited to become consulting parties to this process. There are no consulting parties to date.

Based on the information and comments collected to date, as well as engineering studies, each alternative has been assessed, as shown in the evaluation matrix. The result of this assessment is the identification of a preferred design alternative. This is where we are in the process now. To move forward, this preferred alternative will be discussed at this meeting, as well as at the Natural Resource interagency coordination meeting later this month. The alternative will then be presented to the public at a formal public hearing in June of this year. Based on comments we receive from Cultural and Natural Resource Agencies, this initial preferred alternative may not necessarily be the design brought forward to the public hearing. Following the hearing, all comments and testimony will be addressed and the design modified, if needed. If substantial modifications are required, we will revisit any needed changes to the environmental impacts, and discuss them with the appropriate agencies or individuals. Once all environmental issues are resolved and a final design is proposed, we will ask FHWA to reaffirm its original classification and we will move forward to final design.

Scott Newman asked that the range of alternatives be discussed at the public hearing.

Steve Johnson provided an overview of the condition of the existing bridge. The bridge has been down posted to a 10-ton weight limit, and the Department has concerns about maintaining that posting. Beth

Muzzey asked if the deterioration of the bridge was the result of its construction or deferred maintenance. S. Johnson said that both have been factors in the bridge's deterioration. One of the biggest maintenance problems with truss bridges is that material can accumulate on the trusses, which accelerates deterioration. The fact that the sidewalk is on the outside of the truss rather than the inside of the truss introduces additional paths for debris to reach the steel, which accelerates deterioration of the steel. Additionally, the bridge was originally owned by the City of Lebanon. Prior to its transfer to the state in 1975, there was a period of time when its ownership was in question and maintenance wasn't being completed on a regular basis. The 1975 rehabilitation by the city was not as extensive as it should have been.

S. Johnson discussed the evaluation matrix that was created to compare five alternatives (do nothing, rehabilitation, upstream alignment/retain existing bridge, upstream alignment/remove existing bridge, and refined online alignment). Area growth, roadway geometrics, safety, capacity, property impacts, maintenance, utilization, and cost were variables that were included in the matrix for discussion purposes.

There was some discussion on the colors used in the matrix. The general feeling from B. Muzzey and S. Newman was that the coloring was premature, and they disagreed with some of the colors that were chosen.

S. Newman asked about hydraulics and the low point of the existing bridge as compared to a new bridge. S. Johnson said that hydraulics would improve with a new bridge because the abutments would be set further back from the edge of the river. The low steel elevation for the proposed bridge will be slightly lower than the existing truss since the new VT abutment is further away from the river and the roadway elevation is lower at that point.

There was a lengthy discussion on what rehabilitation of the bridge would involve, what would need to be replaced, and what maintenance might be necessary in 20 years or more. S. Johnson explained that at a minimum, everything below the deck would need to be replaced, as well as the sidewalk, rails, a number of truss verticals and diagonals, all truss bearings, and miscellaneous lacing and portal framing. Also, he felt it would be necessary to replace the lower gusset plates and the bottom chords. It was also pointed out that if the existing bridge were rehabilitated now, it would necessitate a greater degree of maintenance in the future, which would require closing the bridge to traffic. Because of the development proposed for the near future in three quadrants of the bridge, the insertion of a temporary detour bridge for future rehab of the bridge after this project would be impossible or would result in substantial property impacts. The spaces that are currently available for such a bridge will be occupied by these developments. S. Newman stated that in his experience in Vermont, in very general terms, rehabilitation of a historic bridge is usually approximately the same or a little less as replacement in cost. S. Johnson agreed that this generalization applied to the subject project as well; however, the replacement bridge will be 50% wider at the same cost and other factors need to be considered, including geometrics, safety, capacity, and utilization. Thus, while rehabilitation is feasible, it does not meet the project needs.

There was much discussion on bicycle traffic. C. Perron stated that Route 4 is a state bicycle route and that there is strong public support for an improved bicycle crossing at this location. B. Muzzey asked what the pedestrian and bike counts were for this location, and S. Newman concurred that this was important information. However, these figures are not available to anyone's knowledge. Pedestrians regularly use this bridge to cross the river, but there are no data available on the number of pedestrians.

David Scott pointed out that bike counts for this crossing would likely be low at this time because the crossing is currently quite unsafe for bicycles.

B. Muzzey stated that some communities consider a narrow bridge to be an asset because of its traffic calming effect, and she asked if there has been any feedback from the City of Lebanon about the bridge. C. Perron said that the City supports the refined online alignment.

C. Perron asked for the group's thoughts on going forward with the preferred alternative being the refined online alignment. B. Muzzey, S. Newman, and Jamie Sikora would like to see more information on the rehabilitation option before making a determination. B. Muzzey requested that the AASHTO document – Guidelines for Historic Bridge Rehabilitation and Replacement – be used as a guide for further analysis of alternatives. S. Johnson suggested, and B. Muzzey agreed, that, rather than immediately preparing all information required in the Guidelines, he first prepare an outline of information to be gathered, so that there is consensus on what is expected.

Antrim 15350 (no federal number). Participants: Jim Bouchard (jbouchard@quantum-cc.com), Ryan Clay, Quantum Construction Consultants

Quantum Construction Consultants, LLC (QCC) has been contracted by the Town of Antrim for the design of a replacement bridge structure for Water Street over Great Brook. The Water Street Bridge over Great Brook is a corrugated metal pipe (CMP) culvert with stone masonry headwalls, installed in 1978. The CMP spans 10 feet, measures approximately 6 feet in height, and has an approximate 36-foot overall length of pipe. Due to structural deficiencies, this bridge is included on the NHDOT Municipal Red List of deficient bridge structures. During a recent municipal bridge inspection performed by the NHDOT, it was determined that the existing structure has experienced significant corrosion and was recommended for closure. As the structure serves as the principal haul route for winter maintenance by the Town, the Town has opted to install steel plates on the roadway surface over the culvert so that the bridge may remain open until it is replaced. QCC further noted that the bridge has been subjected to flooding and overtopping with flood flows.

QCC indicated that the new bridge will be a precast concrete open bottom bridge structure. NHDHR representatives inquired if the bridge impacts views from the abutting historical mill structure. QCC noted that it is proposed that the structure is to have cast ashlar stone relief face per downtown standards. Current views from that site are of the deteriorated CMP and disturbed/eroded embankments. QCC presented photographs of the existing historic building on lot 104-18 within the project area. Original building use is undefined though NHDHR representatives believed its use was cutlery manufacturing.

Approximately 225 feet of roadway will be reconstructed with new bridge and approach guardrail installed. Additionally, the driveway on lot 104-18 will be re-graded due to the slight rise in the proposed roadway vertical alignment. An existing 8" gravity sewer line, which is located under the streambed immediately downstream of the bridge, may be removed and replaced at an alternate location downstream of the proposed wingwalls. An existing granite post and wood rail fence along right-of-way for lot 104-19 will be relocated.

The majority of the proposed roadway work is within the right-of-way. Land takings are not required though construction and permanent easements will be required from abutting landowners. Bridge

replacement will require disturbances related to removal of the existing structure; excavation for new bridge foundations and roadway reconstruction.

NHDHR representatives determined that there were no adverse effects to cultural and historical landmarks within the project area caused by the proposed construction.

Walpole-Charlestown, X-A000(487), 14747. Participant: Jon Evans

This Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) project involves the reconstruction and associated improvements to NH Route 12 beginning at Main Street in North Walpole and continuing north approximately 3 miles to the NH Route 12A intersection in Charlestown. Jon Evans began by reviewing the project and giving an update on the project status. This section of NH Route 12 is located between an active rail line to the east and the Connecticut River to the west. The existing roadway has 12-foot travel lanes with no shoulders and substandard guardrail. Several sections of the roadway are also showing signs of instability and in some locations are sloughing into the river.

As this project is a CSS project, the project purpose, need and preliminary design are being guided by a Public Advisory Committee (PAC), consisting of local property owners, public officials, railroad personnel, members of NHDOT and other stakeholders.

The PAC recently developed the following conceptual alternatives:

1) "Do Nothing" – This alternative would not address the current safety and roadway stability concerns.

2) "Railroad as a control" (avoids impacts to the railroad) – This alternative requires the roadway to be shifted towards and in some cases into the Connecticut River. J. Evans noted that NHDOT has received strong feedback from the Natural Resource agencies against this alternative because of its potential impacts to the Connecticut River.

3) "River as a control" (avoid impacts to the river, but requires impacts to the railroad) – This alternative would require a new rail line to be constructed next to the existing railroad in order to maintain rail traffic on this active Amtrak line. The new rail line would require impacts to the steep slope to the east of the current rail line.

4A) "The other side of the tracks" (relocate NH Route 12 to the east side of the railroad utilizing the existing NH Route 12A bridge over NH Route 12) – This alternative would relocate NH Route 12 to the east of the existing railroad. This alternative does not require the relocation of the existing tracks or existing service road. However, as currently laid out, it does encroach into the existing railroad right-of-way. This alternative would also require impacts to the steep slopes to the east of the railroad as well as potential impacts to several wetlands and potential archaeological sites. Additionally, this alternative may require NH Route 12 to be shifted onto Main Street in North Walpole in order to tie back in with the existing roadway. Main Street in this area is wider than existing NH Route 12 (Church Street), and both are also in an existing or potential historic district.

4B) "Hillside" (relocate NH Route 12 onto the hillside to the east of the railroad tracks) – This alternative would relocate NH Route 12 to the east of the existing railroad. The road would be cut into the hillside, farther to the east than alternative 4A to avoid railroad impacts as much as possible. Natural and cultural resource impacts similar to those associated with alternative 4A are anticipated with this alternative.

5) "Retaining wall" (Construct retaining walls and engineered slopes to maintain the existing NH Route 12 and railroad alignments). This alternative would keep NH Route 12 and the railroad in approximately the same location by constructing retaining walls, engineered slopes, etc. to address stability and roadway dimensional concerns.

J. Evans noted that preliminary estimates indicate that all the alternatives are expected to cost approximately the same amount. He also noted that alternatives 2, 3 and 5 would allow the project to be constructed in phases. For fiscal reasons, phased construction is often desirable to the Department and will likely be a consideration when choosing the preferred alternative.

J. Evans and J. McKay indicated that a District Area Form had been prepared for the railroad and it was determined that the railroad as a whole was individually eligible for the Register. They also indicated that there are several potentially historic stone culverts located beneath the railroad throughout the project area. J. McKay noted that a District Area form had already been performed for the Main St./ Church Street area in North Walpole. A preliminary in-house review of this District indicated that the limits outlined in the form should probably be extended to the north to include more of Main Street, south of the Len-Tex buildings. This extension would stretch west to at least Church Street. It was also indicated that should alternatives 4 and 4A continue to be pursued, additional documentation of this area would be performed to determine the exact limits of the expanded District.

J. Evans and J. McKay indicated that a phase 1A archaeological investigation had been performed a distance of approximately 200 feet to either side of the existing roadway centerline. This investigation identified 14 potentially sensitive areas within the project area, 7 of which are located to the east of the existing railroad tracks. As this investigation was performed prior to the development of the conceptual alternatives, the study area did not include areas potentially impacted by alternative 4A, the "Hillside" option. It was indicated that should alternative 4B continue to be pursued, an additional phase 1A investigation would be performed in this area.

J. Evans indicated that the Department plans to go to a Public Informational Meeting in late April. Once this informational meeting has been held and public feedback obtained the PAC will meet again to choose the preferred alternative(s). Once the preferred alternative(s) have been identified, additional historical documentation and archaeological investigations will be performed to further determine the extent of the potential cultural impacts. Both Beth Muzzy and Edna Feighner indicated that the earlier these additional investigations are performed, the better.

E. Feighner and B. Muzzy acknowledged that this is a difficult project particularly since the potential for natural and cultural resource priority conflicts are high. They expressed particular concerns with alternatives 4A and 4B as they would likely result in increased historical resource impacts to the North Walpole Historic District and there is a high potential for archaeological deposits to the east of the railroad.

E. Feighner asked which Federal Agency would be the lead for this project. J. Evans indicated that it would be FHWA. However, given the natural sensitivity of the CT River, the Army Corps, USF&WS and the EPA will likely play an active roll. E. Feigner noted that the Federal agencies would have to weigh the potential cultural resource impacts along with the natural resource impacts during the permitting and project approval process.

Milford, X-A000(416), 14492; X-A000(565), 14837; X-A000(618), 14492A; X-A000(195), 14078. Participants: Michael Haley, CLD (mikeh@cldengineers.com); Lynne Monroe, Preservation Co., William Parker, Town of Milford; and Tom Jameson

This meeting was held to receive input from the NHDHR and NHDOT staff regarding proposed improvements along South Street and their associated potential to impact cultural resources (both historic and archaeological). The intent of the meeting was also to receive approval from NHDHR to proceed with a modified Historic District Area Form approach.

On behalf of the Town of Milford, Michael Haley of CLD and Lynne Monroe of Preservation Company presented the project to improve South Street. The project, which has Federal funds, would improve the overall safety of motorists and pedestrians on South Street from its northern intersection with Nashua Street/The Oval to the southern end of the proposed Project at the railroad crossing between Clinton Street and Lincoln Street. Tom Jameson is the NHDOT Project Manager.

The rough boundaries determined in the 1994-1995 historic study indicate that approximately 50 houses would be eligible for inclusion in a Historic District Area. Lynne Monroe expressed concern with the amount of work and the associated costs that would be required to survey each house within the district, when the proposed project would only be along the South Street corridor.

Lynne Monroe presented an alternative, hybrid approach to the requested Historic District Area Form. The idea presented would be to determine the District boundaries, assemble background information concerning the historical significance of the District, and then do individual surveys of properties along the South Street project, whose results would be placed in the district area form. The intent would be to satisfy the requirements of NHDHR, while minimizing the financial impact to the project and the Town.

A discussion was held about specific properties that could be impacted by the proposed work. It was determined that the Dahl property (123 South Street) and the Church property (103 South Street) would be the historic properties most likely to be effected. This determination was based on the proposed grading easements presented at the meeting.

NHDHR DETERMINATIONS

- The alternative hybrid approach presented was well accepted by NHDHR, and Preservation Company was given approval to proceed with creating a scope and fee for the proposed plan.
    - Preservation Company will provide a scope, fee, and schedule estimate to CLD for approval by the Town and NHDOT
    - Preservation Company needs to explain the method followed for the survey at the beginning of the district area form and explain why South Street contributes to the district.
- Edna Feighner had no concerns with potential archaeological impacts
- Tom Jameson expressed concerns with the impacts of the required work with regards to the budget and schedule
    - Since the TE funds are set, the costs associated with the required historical work would come out of the TE budget
    - Tom also was concerned about how the work could delay the project's schedule

- A mention was made regarding possible stimulus funding being available for this project, which would require plans to be ready for construction by late fall.

Thursday, March 12, 2009

Auburn 15657 (no federal number). Participant: Michael Leach, (Michael.Leach@stantec.com), Josh Lund, Stantec

Michael Leach and Josh Lund from Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. presented the project, beginning the meeting with a brief overview of the Old Candia Road Bridge over Maple Fall Brook (088/159). The concrete box bridge was constructed in 1929 and widened by 20 feet north and south in 1957. Old Candia Road was the former location of Route 101, and the roadway is owned by the Town. The culvert extensions in 1957 were originally constructed to address future traffic loading. The current Route 101 was eventually constructed, and the widened portions of the Old Candia Road Bridge were not needed, including the future roadway identified on the 1957 plans. Pictures of the existing bridge structure and the proposed plans for improvements were provided to the meeting attendees. In addition, the Request for Project Review (RPR) by the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources, location map and memo relative to NHDHR research was provided to the attendees.

J. Lund spoke about the conditions of the bridge discovered during an inspection conducted in July 2008. The bridge had developed a hole in its deck in 2007 and a steel plate had been placed over the hole. The steel plate was identified in the photographs provided to the attendees. In addition, the guardrail in this location is in disrepair. The project proposes to replace the 10" thick 1929 portion of the deck, including removal of a portion of the vertical walls that include the interior corner chamfers. A plan of the proposed repair was provided to all attendees.

The deck replacement will be conducted in 2 phases to maintain two-way traffic to accommodate the traffic volume of 3,000 cars a day. The first phase will divert the traffic to the northerly side of the bridge to allow the removal and reconstruction of a majority of the 1929 portion of the deck. The second phase will divert traffic to the south until the remainder of the work is completed. The traffic control plan outlining the phased construction and proposed temporary impact areas was presented to all attendees.

It was asked if Stantec knew about the stone masonry abutments that were noted on the proposed plan and if the abutments are visible. J. Lund indicated the abutments are encased and not visible and pointed out the location of the proposed plan relative to the stone abutments. M. Leach noted the location of the abutments on the record plans, however, stated that the actual conditions were unknown.

The committee questioned if photographs looking northerly were taken. J. Lund presented additional project photos and a few pictures in the northerly direction were reviewed. The large box culverts under Route 101 could be observed in the background of the northerly photos, and the additional photos were left with the committee.

M. Leach noted the project will require a shoreland permit since the project is adjacent to Clark Pond. The project intends to avoid wetlands impacts as much as possible and currently does not anticipate a wetlands permit. The project would use standard erosion control measures. The project disturbance would be along the roadway edges for excavation to place gravel under the temporary pavement areas.

Some minor clearing would be needed along the edges. B. Muzzey did not find it necessary to complete an individual form for the structure.

It was inquired if any archeological surveys were conducted in the area due to the gravelly soils. M. Leach noted the original location of Route 101 was part of the north temporary travel lane to the west and that a ledge cut was observed west of the bridge. In addition, research at NHDHR was conducted with no findings as noted in the memo provided. It was noted that only historic architectural information was available to researchers. However, due to the proximity of the project to the present location of Route 101, it is likely archaeological research was conducted in this area. NHDHR will review their records and determine if the project location is an archaeologically sensitive area. If the project is in an archaeologically sensitive area, additional information regarding previous disturbances, or an archaeological consultant may be required. The notation that NHDHR would research their files was written on the RPR form and provided to Stantec. Having searched the DHR records in the area, it was subsequently determined by E. Feighner that archaeological investigations were not necessary.

Londonderry 15589 (no federal number). Participant: Michael Leach, (Michael.Leach@stantec.com), Jerry Fortin and André Betit, Stantec

Michael Leach, Jerry Fortin and André Betit from Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. presented the project. M. Leach opened the meeting with a brief overview of the project location at the intersection of Rockingham Road (NH Route 28) and Page Road. Mammoth Road is located 800 feet east of the project area. It was noted that the committee knew of several historic buildings located along Mammoth Road in this general vicinity. The proposed intersection would address the existing traffic issues and future traffic demands associated with the Airport Access Road (currently under construction), Pettengill Road (currently under design) and anticipated development in northern Londonderry. Currently, Rockingham Road (NH Route 28) and Page Road are the primary routes for traffic serving the industrial area around the airport and with the completion of the Airport Access Road and Pettengill Road, some 700 acres of industrial land will be available for development. A copy of the conceptual plan with photos was provided to all attendees. In addition, the Request for Project Review by the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources, location map and memo relative to NHDHR research was provided to all attendees.

A. Betit indicated that the Rockingham Road (NH Route 28)/Page Road intersection was constructed by NHDOT in 1957. A. Betit discussed the proposed improvements to the intersection including lane widening to provide turn lanes at the intersection and installation of traffic signals. The shoulder widening would extend fill slopes further into the wetlands along the current toe of slope.

It was asked if the project was to be funded by stimulus money. J. Fortin noted the that project is a State Aid Highway (SAH) project with funding through the Municipally Managed Project and that the Town wants to update this intersection that is currently in failure. Any stimulus money would help the timetable for construction. It is anticipated that this project will go to construction this fall. M. Leach discussed the wetland impacts relative to the project. The fill slope extensions would impact several locations, which total to approximately 9,000 square feet. Where practical, the wetland impacts were minimized with guardrail extensions and 2H:1V slopes. A new guardrail would be installed to replace the current cable guardrail at this location.

Edna Feighner noted that this area did not appear archaeologically sensitive.

It was noted that the project extends along Page Road to just beyond an existing driveway. A. Betit pointed out the residential driveway located at the project limits, and little impact is proposed to the driveway. Mr. Fortin noted the house was a ranch style and likely built in the 1970's. It was asked if pictures of the house could be provided to NHDHR, as there was none included in the RPR form. Stantec agreed to take pictures and provide tax record information on the building date to NHDHR, noting that tax records may not be accurate. NHDHR asked that the pictures identify the type of foundation and general age of the structure. The notation that Stantec will provide images of the property at the SW corner of the intersection to NHDHR was written on the NHDHR RPR form and a copy was provided to Stantec.

These images were subsequently provided, and the property was too recently constructed to necessitate an individual form. The project received a no historic properties affected memo.

Claremont, X-A000(418), 14494. Participants: Dan Hudson (danh@cldengineers.com), Dorna Hamer, CLD Engineers; Kurt Beek (kbeek@claremontnh.com), Ed Tinker, City of Claremont; and Jim Marshall

Daniel Hudson, PE of CLD Consulting Engineers gave an up-date on the reconstruction and upgrade design of the Charlestown Road, West Pleasant Street, Maple Avenue, and Hillstead Road intersection, known locally as "Drapers Corner". It was explained that the current design has not changed since the initial meeting and that the proposed project will reconstruct the intersection to provide auxiliary turning lanes and improved pedestrian facilities. It would replace the existing span wire signal with a modern traffic signal system. A large concept plan of the proposed layout was used for discussion purposes. D. Hudson summarized the potential impacts to each property and discussion followed concerning further necessary steps.

It was understood that temporary impacts (temporary slope work and driveway reconstructions) resulting in a no adverse effect to the property would not result in a 4(f) taking. Small, permanent impacts that do not alter the character-defining features of the historic property would be a de minimis 4(f). Additional study will only be necessary for those potentially historic properties where right-of-way (ROW) acquisitions are required.

A summary of properties within the project area and associated follow-up action follows:

1 Charlestown Road ~ A ROW acquisition and the relocation of an aluminum fence (looks wrought iron, but is modern) is required for the construction of a slip lane and sidewalk improvements along with temporary slope impacts. Therefore, an individual full form is needed that also documents the importance of this property to the larger (potential) Charlestown Road Historic District.

2, 13 & 14 Charlestown Road ~ There will be no impacts to these properties; therefore no further study is needed.

83 West Pleasant Street ~ There will be temporary impacts to the slopes and drive. Existing guardrail will be replaced. Slope work is shown to impact existing trees. If it is not possible to remove impacts to the trees, then a full individual form is necessary.

86-88 West Pleasant Street ~ A ROW acquisition is required for the construction of the slip lane and sidewalk improvements, along with some temporary slope impacts. A form front for the former schoolhouse is needed to document changes made to the property over the years and its current condition.

4 & 25 Hillstead Road ~ There will be no impacts to either property; therefore no further study is needed.

9 Maple Avenue ~ Impacts will be limited to replacement of the existing stone box culvert. However, a form front should be completed for this property to document changes to the property. The stone box culvert was previously found not to be eligible.

8 & 10 Maple Avenue ~ There will be temporary impacts to these properties; however, no trees will be impacted. Therefore, no additional study is needed.

18 Maple Avenue ~ A ROW acquisition may be required along with temporary slope and drive impacts. Trees and bushes impacted should be replaced or transplanted. If a ROW acquisition or a permanent easement is required, then an individual full form is necessary that also documents the importance of this property to the larger (potential) Hillstead Historic District.

23 Maple Avenue ~ A ROW acquisition is required for the proposed sidewalk and roadway improvements, along with some temporary slope & drive impacts. Therefore, a full form is necessary. Trees being impacted may need to be replaced or transplanted.

25, 27, 31 & 35 Maple Avenue ~ Impacts to these properties will be temporary and limited to grassed areas and drives. No additional study of these properties is needed.

NHDHR Determination:
NHDHR requests that the following forms be completed: full forms for 83 West Pleasant Street and 23 Maple Avenue; form fronts for 86-88 West Pleasant Street and 9 Maple Street; and individual full forms that also document the importance of the properties to the potential historic districts for 1 Charlestown Road and 18 Maple Avenue.

Brentwood 15277 (no federal number). Participant: Jason Lodge (jlodge@hoyletanner.com), Matt Low, HTA.

The following items were discussed regarding the Crawley Falls Road Bridge (073/065):

- Preliminary discussions with regard to the adjacent Musso property. Mr. Musso has expressed concerns with special attention to the nearby archaeological resources.
- M. Low explained that the Town Volunteer Fire Department won a superior court case with regard to land on the southwest quadrant. There may be ongoing legal action between the Town and Mr. Musso, so land boundaries are still in question.
- M. Low explained that Hoyle, Tanner hired Preservation Company and Independent Archaeological Consulting, Inc (IAC) to do preliminary investigation. J. McKay stated that DHR did find the concrete rigid frame bridge significant but Preservation Company had not. J. McKay will provide a copy of the DOE to Hoyle, Tanner.
- J. Lodge provided an overview, including location, description of the bridge, pavement limits, and widening for phased construction, etc.
- B. Muzzey explained that the bridge has historical significance and that the crossing dates back to the 1650's.
- E. Feighner suggested recordation of the site within the limits of disturbance, which extends outside the right-of-way.
- Snow fence will be required during construction to delineate the allowable limits of disturbance.
- Hoyle, Tanner should evaluate or provide the following considerations with regard to the disposition of archaeological and historic resources:

    - Avoidance was not possible because of the limited legal loads imposed on the bridge and because of flooding issues.
    - Minimization – Evaluate preserving as much stonework as possible. Evaluate decreasing the project limits.
    - Mitigation – Evaluate if stone from the stone walls can be used elsewhere. Provide historic property documentation with history of bridge and stonework as well as a monograph on Clifford Broker (NHDHR can provide examples if needed). Incorporate a state historic marker into the contract. It could be placed in an adjacent parking area. Archaeological documentation would be done prior to construction. Field monitoring may be required during construction if the disturbance limits extend beyond the right-of-way.
    - Hoyle, Tanner should prepare a plan to show existing stonewalls and proposed work in order to evaluate how much stone work could be saved or explain why existing stone work associated with the bridge could not be saved or reused. This material was subsequently sent.
- A MOA will be required, and ACOE will be the lead agency.
- If this project is accepted into ARRA, then it will require programmatic 4(F) considerations and FHWA will then be the lead agency.

Pittsfield, 15853. Participant: Mark Morrill and Susan Soucie, District 3

Mark Morrill reviewed the repair of the retaining wall along the 1942 masonry arch bridge under Main Street over the Suncook River (090/104). The bridge is in a listed National Register District in Pittsfield Center. District 3 would need to shore up the base of the wall and replace the sidewalk. M. Morrill indicated that the project as planned would take down the portion of the retaining wall that has failed to the ground. District was planning to replace this segment with pre-cast, faced concrete blocks. The blocks were cast to resemble stone, and they are approximately the same size as the stone that is present in the wall. District would use linseed oil in the concrete to darken the appearance. The railing would retain the same general style as the current one. There is also a stone culvert under the bridge, and one of the granite lintels has failed. For this repair, district was planning to remove the fill over the culvert and replace the top of the culvert with a poured concrete cap. This is a 50' long area.

B. Muzzey asked if the retaining wall could be repaired with stone. It was noted that the portion of the wall that failed was constructed of rubble stone that did not match the stone in the remainder of the wall. It appears as if the wall had been previously repaired at this location. District would leave the stone on site to protect the bank. Given this information, B. Muzzey indicated that the repair using faced concrete block would be acceptable. Additionally, the repair to the culvert was accepted. She was willing to sign a conditional no adverse effect memo as long as plans for the repair do not change. Since a wetland permit is necessary for the project, Section 106 is involved.

Enfield M207-4. Participant: Christine Perron

Christine Perron provided an overview of the project. This is a district maintenance project that involves replacing the ceiling of a stone box culvert under NH Route 4A in Enfield. The 8'x6' culvert is 120 feet long. Many of the stone blocks in the ceiling have cracked and are shifting, threatening the integrity and safety of the roadway. District 2 is proposing to replace the stone blocks with precast concrete slabs from the west side of the road to the outlet end of the culvert.

A garage is located just upstream from the roadway over the stone box. The floor of this garage forms the ceiling of the culvert. A few years ago, a car fell through the stone box and the stones were replaced with concrete.

It was pointed out that this part of Enfield is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Edna Feighner said that the stone box was actually part of a canal. C. Perron showed excerpts from the digital Sanborn maps. Joyce McKay showed the Stone Culvert Inventory Form that was completed for this site in 2007.

Beth Muzzey said that this appears to be a very significant structure and rebuilding the ceiling of the stone box in kind needs to be considered. She suggested contacting a mason. C. Perron said that she would look into this. E. Feighner added that an RPR (Request for Project Review) form needs to be completed for this project. The form was subsequently completed and sent to DHR.

Bartlett Roundhouse. Participants: Jim Garvin, NHDHR; Scotty Mallett (scottylinda@yahoo.com); and Brian Lombard

Scotty Mallatt brought prints of Maine Central Railroad drawings of the roundhouse and freight house for discussion, and left them with Brian Lombard for digital copying. The committee discussed the leaking condition of the roundhouse roof and the fact that workers from the DOT Bureau of Bridge Maintenance and an independent roofing contractor have both reported that the roof planking is in failing condition. In the absence of readily identifiable funding from the Bureau of Rail and Transit, those present discussed possible grant assistance for both short-term and long-term repairs. For the short term, it was agreed that a Conservation License Plate grant application offers the best prospect; the deadline for these applications is March 27, 2009. For the long term, a Transportation Enhancement (TE) grant seems to offer the best hope for major repairs. It was agreed that a draft Conservation License Plate grant application will be prepared, and that Joyce McKay will inquire whether NHDOT is willing to submit the application by the March 27th deadline. If roof leakage can be stopped in 2009 with a rubber membrane, this measure would likely buy time to apply for a Transportation Enhancement grant during the next TE grant round to provide permanent roofing.

Municipal Projects/Stimulus Projects. Participants: Nancy Mayville and Charlie Hood

N. Mayville briefed the group on the municipal projects that are currently part of the stimulus package. She indicated that $ 11 million of the NHDOT stimulus package would be available for construction by municipalities. Nine of the 11 million are for bridges. These projects would be treated like federal aid projects, 60% federal aid and 40% municipal bridge funds. Since the final invoice for the project must be submitted in three years, stimulus funds would be applied to ready or near-ready projects. TE projects would receive 100% funding for construction only. 4(f) will be applicable to these projects.

If municipal bridge projects had received an effect memo under RSA 227C-9, a new memo would not be necessary if there were no project changes. Because they needed Army Corps Permits, many of these projects were reviewed under Section 106. And, again, it would not be necessary to change the federal agency in the memo if the project does not change. K. Nyhan will advise NHDHR about which municipal projects are chosen for stimulus funding.

Bedford 15670 (potential federal funding). Participants: Jed Merrow, McFarland Johnson, (jmerrow@mjinc.com) and Jeff Foote, Town of Bedford

Jeff Foote described the proposed project, which involves adding turning lanes on Route 101 eastbound and westbound for turns onto Nashua Road. Bell Hill Road would be restricted to a right-turn only from 101 to Bell Hill Road, with no access from 101 eastbound or Nashua Road to Bell Hill Road, and no access from Bell Hill Road onto Route 101. The only additional pavement would be a narrow strip along the existing roads and a larger turnaround on Bell Hill Road. All of this work would be within the right of way and either in road embankments or former disturbed ground.

There is an extensive recent history of disturbance in the areas of proposed work, and therefore a lack of sensitivity for archaeological resources. The buildings in the vicinity were individually discussed and determined to all be less than 50 years old. Therefore there do not appear to be any National Register-eligible resources in the project vicinity.

The town has designated a historic district near but not within this area, but eligibility for state and federal projects is determined separately from these districts. They are, however, taken into account.. Since all work will be in the ROW, it is unlikely there would be any concerns over effects on the local district. J. Foote has been in contact with the town's building official in this regard. NHDHR did request a photograph of the building on Map 20/Lot 16 to determine its age. This photograph was subsequently provided. It was determined that the project would not affect historic properties.

Windham, X-A000(558), 14830: Participant: Jeff Alder, Dubois and King (jadler@dubois-king.com), Dave Sullivan, Town of Windham, Mark Samsel, John Mangan (Windham Depot Advisory Committee)

DuBois & King, Inc. presented an initial review of the Windham Depot Rehabilitation Project, which is receiving TE funds. Historical photos were presented for review. The project will involve the rehabilitation of the existing Depot and Freight buildings, which were original construction in the late 1800's. They both have had additions constructed in the late 1960's. The intent would be to remove the non-historical additions and the recent salt shed and rehabilitates the exteriors of both buildings. In addition, improved parking, landscaping and site amenities (benches, picnic tables) would be included in the project. Later phases of the project would rehabilitate the interior of the Depot building.

Joyce McKay noted that the need for a Phase IA Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment and 1B Intensive Archaeological Investigation had been noted at a previous meeting. Notes of that meeting also indicated the need for an architectural historian to provide guidelines on the removal of the building additions and the rehabilitation of the exterior of the two buildings.

****Memos/MOA's**: **New Castle – Rye, X-A000(809), 15624; Portsmouth, X-A000(334), 14368.**

Submitted by: Joyce McKay, Cultural Resources Manager
Jill Cunningham, Cultural Resources Assistant

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