

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT CONFERENCE REPORT

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

DATE OF CONFERENCES: March 12, 2015

LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building

ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT	Leah Savage	Bruce Kudrich	
Joe Adams		Leo Lessard	
Gerard Bedard	FHWA	Christine Soucie	Historic Documentation Co.
Sheila Charles	Jamie Sikora		Richard Casella
Victoria Chase		CMA Engineers	
Ronald Crickard	NHDHR	Britt Audet	Interested & Consulting Parties
Kevin Daigle	Laura Black	Jason Gallant	Alden Beauchemin
Michael Dugas	Edna Feighner		Michael Bouchard
Jillian Edelmann		Fitzgerald & Halliday	Esther Kennedy
Bob Juliano	DRED	Stephanie Dyer-Carroll	Jeff Larrabee
Bob Landry	Ben Wilson		Kathie Northrup
Marc Laurin			
Steve Liakos	USACOE	FST	VTRANS-
Don Lyford	David Keddell	David McNamara	Via
Nancy Mayville			Teleconference:
Michael Pouliot	Town of	HDR	Jen Russell
Bill Saffian	Hooksett	James Murphy	

PROJECTS/PRESENTATIONS REVIEWED THIS MONTH:

(minutes on subsequent pages)

Nashua-Milford 10136D and 10136C, X-A001(264) and X-A001(265).....	1
New Castle-Rye 16127, X-A001(146).....	2
Stewartstown-Canaan 15838, X-A000(984).....	5
Lancaster-Guildhall 16155 A000(159).....	6
Hooksett 29655 (no Federal number).....	7
Exeter 15399 (no Federal number).....	9
Concord 28977, X-A003(902).....	10

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

Nashua-Milford 10136D and 10136C, X-A001(264) and X-A001(265)

Participants: Gerry Bedard, Ron Crickard, Mike Dugas, NHDOT; David McNamara, FST

Continued consultation to discuss changes in the proposed project on NH Route 101A. The NHDOT and FST presented an update to the Milford Nashua project involving three locations along the NH101A corridor. Two of the projects are in Merrimack, and one in Amherst. The

project had previously had a finding in March 2012 that no historic or archaeological properties will be affected. Since that time, modifications to the proposed improvements have been made. These changes were presented in order to determine if they would impact the original findings.

FST described the original projects, which include:

- A widening of NH 101A between Boston Post Road and Continental Boulevard in Merrimack, including the reconstruction of the intersection at Continental Boulevard.
- The dead ending of Craftsman Lane with a cul-de-sac and reconfigured connection to Boston Post Road.
- Improvements to the NH 101 Eastbound Off-Ramp to NH 101A with a new signalized intersection and double right turn lane.

FST then presented the current preferred alternatives at each of the locations, and describing the changes to the proposed work at Craftsman Lane and the NH 101 Off-Ramp. The current plans call for:

- No change to the Merrimack project that includes the widening of NH 101A and improvements to the Continental Boulevard intersection.
- The proposed work at Craftsman Lane has been modified to eliminate the need for a cul-de-sac by moving the intersection of Craftsman Lane and Boston Post Road closer to NH 101A. This allows direct access to Hall Avenue and the adjacent driveways to be retained.
- The signalized intersection at the NH 101 Eastbound Off-Ramp had been presented to the public and Town of Amherst. Feedback from the meeting made it clear that the public did not want a new signalized intersection along that stretch of NH 101A. Therefore, NHDOT and FST developed a concept that would not involve signalization. The new concept creates a slip-lane from the off-ramp to NH 101A eastbound, allowing an extended merge. The impacts are similar to the original proposal, widening and ditch work continuing further on NH 101A approximately 750 feet from current ramp end to an existing commercial driveway. All of the work will be done within the ROW. There is a slight realignment of the left turn lane from the off-ramp. This will be done within the existing median area.

It was agreed that the proposed revisions would not change the original finding of no impacts. The original Effects Memo will be updated to reflect the current preferred alternatives and initialed to reflect the revision.

New Castle-Rye 16127, X-A001(146)

Participants: Jim Murphy, HDR; Stephanie Dyer-Carroll, Fitzgerald & Halliday; Esther Kennedy, Consulting Party; Ben Wilson, NH Parks and Recreation; Victoria Chase, Ron Crickard, Bob Landry, Robert Juliano, Marc Laurin, NHDOT

Continued consultation to achieve an effect memo determination and update on developments for the New Castle-Rye Bridge, including the proposed fixed alternative.

The fifth coordination meeting with New Hampshire State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) on the New Castle-Rye Bridge Project was held on March 12, 2015 at the offices of the New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NHDOT). Stephanie Dyer-Carroll with FHI opened the meeting with a brief project update. She indicated that a Public Information Meeting was held on February 5, 2015. At the meeting, NHDOT presented the Fixed Bridge as their preferred alternative and discussed the findings of the Benefit-Cost Analysis. Ms. Dyer-Carroll shared that the towns of New Castle and Rye, as well as the Portsmouth Water Department, provided statements at the meeting, and that both the New Castle and Rye Select Boards now support a fixed span. Personnel from Portsmouth Ports and Harbors, as well as the U.S. Coast Guard, attended and answered questions. A public comment period was held through February.

Ms. Dyer-Carroll indicated that the Benefit-Cost Analysis was updated in February 2015 to address comments received by the project's Public Advisory Committee. The study examines the costs of construction, maintenance and utilities, and potential benefits of each of the Fixed and Bascule Alternatives including dredging; commercial fishing; boat-related economic activity, specifically moorings and impacts to local businesses; tourism revenue; livability improvements; sea level rise and coastal resiliency; safe harbor; and noise.

James Murphy, Project Manager with HDR, showed several renderings of the Fixed Bridge and compared the profile of the Fixed Bridge to that of the existing bridge. He also showed a more distant view from the Wentworth-Coolidge Mansion.

Ms. Dyer-Carroll concluded the presentation by outlining next steps. NHDOT has requested that the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources sign the Determination of Effects Memorandum. Additional steps include the establishment of a timetable for consultation, the preparation of the NEPA documentation and Section 4(f) Evaluation, and the preparation and execution of a Memorandum of Agreement. NHDOT will also obtain a permit from the U.S. Coast Guard. The project will be advertised in 2017.

Questions and comments followed the presentation. These included the following:

- Esther Kennedy, a Consulting Party, stated that the majority of attendees at the Public Information Meeting were not in favor of a fixed bridge, including the owner of the Heritage, area fishermen and marinas, and that the U.S. Coast Guard seemed to agree. She said that an attendee at the public meeting suggested a vote to determine how many people supported a fixed bridge, but a vote was not taken.
- Ms. Kennedy pointed out that when the Rye and New Castle Select Boards originally voted, the cost difference between running a new water line on a fixed bridge versus running a line under water was estimated to be \$3 million. However, now the City of Portsmouth estimates the difference to be \$600,000 and they have clarified that the cost would be split among their 97,000 users. Bob Landry asked whether she thought the New Castle Select Board would come to a different finding based on the new estimate. Ms. Kennedy said she didn't know. Mr. Landry indicated that he would check with the Town of New Castle.
- Ben Wilson, with the New Hampshire Department of Historic Sites, said that the bridge is a major route to get to Fort Stark and Fort Constitution and that NHDOT should notify his department in advance of the closure. He said he didn't believe a fixed bridge would affect

the Wentworth-Coolidge Mansion. He did indicate that they are trying to construct a historic maritime trail on the property and that they will want to reconstruct a dock at the Mansion. Pickering Marine will need to be able to get back to the site to erect it. Jim Murphy said that Pickering currently enter the Back Channel without a lift. Mr. Wilson said that the dock will be constructed within two years, before construction begins on the New Castle-Rye Bridge.

- Mr. Wilson also said that the channel is only eight to ten feet deep now and that dredging will need to be done soon. He said it would be great if it could be undertaken as part of this project. Mr. Landry said that dredging last occurred 20 to 30 years ago. Mr. Murphy indicated that the Back Channel is on the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' dredging list. Bob Landry stated that members of the Rye Select Board believe the Back Channel is no longer navigable. Mr. Wilson said that it is navigable but that it needs to be dredged.
- Mr. Wilson said that the State owns Leachs Island and that periodically people camp there illegally. Portsmouth Fire and Rescue needs to be able to get there. Ms. Kennedy said that they can get there without a lift bridge.
- Ms. Kennedy said that she has seen the Gundalow, a commercial sailing vessel, moored at Creek Farm in the Back Channel.
- Jamie Sikora with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) said that, based on conversations with the U.S. Coast Guard, an Environmental Assessment may need to be prepared. He also stated that the 4(f) evaluation will need to look at the constructive use of historic properties. Mr. Landry asked whether FHWA will be determining the level of documentation required under the National Environmental Policy Act. Mr. Sikora said yes, together with NHDOT.
- Ms. Kennedy said that she had been told that with a new bascule the time required for a lift could be reduced from four hours to 15 to 20 minutes. If the opening time could be decreased, there could be more use of the Back Channel. In addition, marine construction would not have to be tide based. Mr. Murphy clarified that while remote opening was a goal of the Bascule Alternative, it was not definite.
- Ms. Kennedy said that the New Hampshire Coastal Risk Hazard Commission is directing State agencies to consider sea level rise and that a recent Executive Order suggests that states should plan for the worst. She asked whether sea level rise would be considered in the Environmental Assessment. Mr. Sikora said that it would be discussed at a global level.
- Edna Feighner with the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources said that the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation needs to be notified. Laura Black, also with the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources, said that everything [Benefit-Cost Analysis and public input] seems to favor a bascule. She doesn't believe the project should be advanced at this stage without addressing critical issues that appear contradictory to the proposed fixed span alternative. Mr. Sikora said that signing the effects memorandum would only document that there is an adverse effect. It would not move the project forward, but just facilitate notifying the Advisory Council.
- Ms. Black then stated that the effects memorandum can be executed. She said that the memorandum should note the bridge removal. Both Ms. Black and Ms. Feighner indicated that indirect effects need to be examined as part of this process. Mr. Landry said there are no indirect effects, that the bridge is rarely opened.
- Mr. Landry asked Mr. Wilson whether he sees a benefit in a bascule span. Mr. Wilson said that this is the only access point for tall boats and that it's too bad that one access point for

these boats can't be maintained. He also stated that heritage tourism is expanding and that the boat clubs want crane access to repair their docks.

- Ms. Black asked what happened with the Advisory Council when FHWA contacted them regarding the previous MOA. Mr. Murphy stated that they directed FHWA to reference the Memorandum of Agreement for the Scammell Bridge within the agreement for the replacement of the New Castle-Rye Bridge.
- Ben Wilson asked whether bids would be received in 2017 with construction beginning in 2018. Mr. Murphy indicated this is accurate.
- Jill Edelman said that they would revise the effects memorandum and send it on to the New Hampshire State Historic Preservation Office. She said that they would also notify the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation of the finding. She asked whether it was appropriate to discuss mitigation at this point. Ms. Feighner said that NHDOT needs to go back to the community to discuss mitigation. Mr. Murphy indicated that the potential measures were developed in concert with the Public Advisory Committee.

At the end of the question and answer period, a list of potential mitigation measures was distributed to attendees.

Stewartstown-Canaan 15838, X-A000(984)

Participants: Bill Saffian, Marc Laurin, Kevin Daigle, NHDOT; Jeannine Russell, Vermont Agency of Transportation (via teleconference)

Continued consultation on the red listed bridge over the Connecticut River (054/163) to achieve an effects memo determination.

As the final Archaeology and Historic Structures reports have been submitted, Jill Edelman discussed the effects determination for the rehabilitation of the bridge. Jeannine Russell of the Vermont Agency of Transportation (VTrans) thought that the impacts may be a No Adverse Effect determination, though the final decision would be up to Kaitlin O'Shea and/or Judith Ehrlich, who were not able to participate in today's meeting. Laura Black commented that the Historic Structures Report was well done and provided useful information on the character-defining features of the bridge. A review of these features and the proposed impacts ensued. Bill Saffian presented a plan of the bridge showing the items that are proposed to be replaced in-kind. The floor beams will be manufactured as close as possible to the existing size and dimension. Not all structural members will need to be replaced. The arch plate will not be replaced as previously thought, though some columns may need to have a new plate welded to the arch plate to shore up their connections. The new connections will be bolted together rather than riveted, as existing. There are complicated connections in several locations which provide some difficulties in replacing the rivets. He showed a mockup of the intricate and compact space at these connections. Due to the tight space the nuts will need to be welded to make sure that the bolts can be properly tightened. These welds will mostly be located on the inside of these connections and be hidden from view by the configuration of the connections. The rail will be completely replaced with standard steel bridge rails with balustrade and a hand rail. The design has been previously reviewed by DHR and VTrans, and has been okayed.

Laura Black inquired about the curved floor beams shown on the 1930's design plans that seem to have been eliminated in the 1970's rehabilitation and if this design could be incorporated into the rehabilitation. Kevin Daigle responded that the existing floor beams on the bridge are the original beams that were constructed in 1930. Shop drawings indicate that this was a change in design that was made during construction and also included some change to the top of the columns. As such, the floor beams will be replaced with the configuration that presently exists.

Laura stated that in applying the Secretary's Standards for rehabilitation criteria, the necessary removal and sensitive replacement of the railing would be considered a No Adverse Effect, however there is concern with replacing the rivets with bolts and the irreversibility of welding the nuts to the steel. She inquired about the use of button head bolts. Bill stated that they would not be considered as they are smaller and there would be concerns that the proper tensioning could be achieved. Bill inquired if welding should be a concern as the majority of the welds would be hidden from view within the connections and they will not be in areas that the public would normally be able to see, unless from a boat on the river, although the structure is fairly high from the water surface. Laura inquired about the feasibility replacing with rivets rather than bolts. Sheila Charles noted that there is a NH company that has done riveting and Jill mentioned that Lansing Community College in Michigan would have information on the feasibility and costs associated with riveting. Bill Saffian will investigate further the feasibility of riveting versus using bolts. Jeannine will discuss with Kaitlin and provide feedback on the structures review. Laura noted that even if the effects are determined to be Adverse, a lot of the mitigation is already being done through the design of the rehabilitation.

Lancaster-Guildhall 16155 A000(159)

Jeannine Russell, Vermont Agency of Transportation (via teleconference); Bob Landry, Joe Adams, Marc Laurin, NHDOT

Continued consultation to achieve an effects memo determination and discuss mitigation options.

Jill Edelman stated that finalizing the Adverse Effect memo for the project has been unresolved as the Vermont Agency of Transportation (VTrans) had wanted to include mitigation, specifically regarding the potential for rehabilitation of the Vilas Bridge over the Connecticut River in Walpole, discussed in the memo. Bob Landry stated that due to the many uncertainties associated with the rehabilitation of the Vilas Bridge, including funding issues and discussion on cost sharing between the States, that other mitigation measures need to be proposed and evaluated for this project. Jeannine Russell stated that the Vilas Bridge is an important resource and its rehabilitation status is a concern of VTrans. As she has not been involved in the previous discussions on the Vilas Bridge, she could not comment on the status of VTrans' position and deferred any discussions/decisions on the Vilas Bridge to Judith Ehrlich, who was not able to participate in today's meeting. As such, it was agreed by all that the discussion of mitigation be tabled until next month. Jeannine will coordinate with Judith prior to that meeting.

Regarding the Effects Memo, Jeannine stated that VTrans would also not be able to finalize the memo until the outstanding archaeology has been completed. Jill mentioned that as the archaeological site is a hay field, consultation with the land owner is needed and will dictate the best time for scheduling the remaining archaeology.

Hooksett 29655 (no Federal number)

Participants: Leo Lessard, Hooksett DPW; Dr. Dean Shankle, Hooksett Town Administrator; Hooksett Sewer Commissioners Sidney Baines, Chairman, and Frank Kotowski; Kathleen Northrup, Hooksett Heritage Commission; Richard Casella, Historic Documentation Company, Inc.; Michael Hicks, USACE; Nancy Mayville and Steve Liakos, NHDOT; Jason Gallant, P.E. and Britt Audet, P.E. of CMA Engineers

Continued consultation for Hooksett Village Bridge (Lilac Bridge) over Merrimack River (083/150) to update the committee on the status of the bridge replacement project and to gain committee input on historic mitigation. The project was previously presented to the Cultural Resources Agency Coordination committee in September and November 2014.

J. Gallant provided a summary of the project since critical deficiencies on the bridge were observed in July 2014. A construction contract to stabilize the bridge and reconstruct the gravity sewer main was bid in September which received one nonresponsive bid. A presentation on the condition of the bridge and alternatives to address deficiencies was made to the Hooksett Town Council on December 10th and 17th, 2014. At the second meeting, the Town Council approved the replacement of the Lilac Bridge with a pedestrian/utility bridge and maintaining the existing substructure.

B. Kudrick gave an update on the measures taken by the Hooksett Sewer Commission to prepare for a failure of the gravity sewer main on the Lilac Bridge while replacement plans are being developed. A wastewater holding tank has been installed near the northern abutment of the bridge with piping and valves to divert wastewater to the tank. Several septic haulers are on call to provide 24-hr pumping services from the tank while a temporary force main is suspended from the adjacent railroad bridge. The temporary force main will be used until the replacement structure and new gravity main are constructed.

An Alternatives Analysis report was completed and transmitted to DHR, NHDOT CRM and the Town. Since the recommended alternative was replacement of the Lilac Bridge, a draft memorandum of agreement (MOA) with proposed mitigation measures for impacts to the historic structure was included with the report. The MOA was developed in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior guidelines and in consideration of the Town of Hooksett's interest in preserving the history of the Lilac bridge and John Storrs while being sensitive to the timeframe of the project and risk of structure collapse. Pending further determination, the ACOE is listed as the federal agency in the MOA since it is anticipated that a wetland permit will be needed for temporary impacts to the Merrimack River during removal of the bridge and rehabilitation of the substructure for the replacement bridge. It has been determined that a US Coast Guard bridge permit will not be required for the project and that further involvement by the USCG will not be needed. The mitigation measures proposed in the draft MOA include:

- Resource Documentation – Photographic, Written and Historic Drawings, prior to demolition
- Public Outreach and Education – Bridge History summary, State Historic Marker with QR link to summary on Town website

K. Northrup noted that the Town also has their own historic markers and asked if those could be used instead of the State markers. R. Casella noted that the State markers are known to withstand the test of time and vandals but that marker style selection could be determined by the Town.

M. Hicks noted that ACOE will sign the MOA as long as there are impacts to their jurisdiction. J. Gallant noted that a conceptual level impact plan had been developed for the January Natural Resources meeting which indicated potential impacts for in-river work during removal of the bridge and construction of the replacement bridge. The construction could be carried out in two contracts but it is likely there will be a single wetlands permit for both phases of the work.

L. Black noted that an Effects Memo had not yet been received by DHR describing the proposed effects to the bridge, the adjacent historic district or other eligible, listed or potentially historic properties such as the Library, Pinnacles or the Water Precinct building.

M. Hicks asked given the urgency of the project if parallel tracks could be followed to develop the effects memo while finalizing the MOA. R. Casella asked if the bridge had been declared an “emergency” per Section 106 definition. L. Black said it had not. R. Casella asked if it would be possible to move forward with the documentation of the bridge as proposed in the MOA in the interest of project progress. It was agreed that this was a good idea due to the deteriorated condition of the bridge.

S. Liakos noted the critical role the gravity sewer suspended from the Lilac Bridge plays in carrying wastewater generated at the new I-93 rest stops. He noted that all restaurants at the new facilities will be open after this weekend and wastewater flows are expected to increase. B. Kudrick noted that the cost of pumping wastewater water should the gravity main fail is significant (estimated at \$7,200 per day until the temporary force main can be installed).

M. Hick asked who will be the applicant for the wetlands permit. J. Gallant said the Town will be the applicant. N. Mayville noted the Lilac Bridge is a municipally owned bridge and the Town will be receiving funds through the State Aid Bridge program towards removal of the existing bridge.

E. Feighner asked why the Sewer Commission hadn’t already moved the sewer from the bridge given structural concerns about the bridge dating back to the 1970s. J. Gallant noted that there had been rehabilitation work done in the 1970s that likely corresponded with the construction of the sewer main on the bridge. B. Kudrick noted that removing the gravity sewer from the bridge has been studied by the Sewer Commission and that installing a pump station with force main under the river was the likely alternative to the gravity sewer. Construction of a pump station and regular operations and maintenances is much more expensive than maintaining the gravity line.

J. Edelman asked if documentation of the bridge could move forward. J. Gallant noted it may be beneficial to wait until a Contractor is mobilized to assist with access to the structure. R. Casella said it would be possible to start with some documentation now but that he would have to return when construction was underway for additional photographs using a large format camera.

J. Edelman suggested setting up an Effects determination meeting between the project team, DHR and CRM to make a final determination on the effects so that the MOA could be finalized. A tentative meeting date of March 25th or 26th was set.

L. Black asked to what standard the historic documentation would be prepared. R. Casella noted that the draft MOA stated that documentation would be prepared in the format of a New Hampshire Historic Property Documentation (NHHPD).

L. Black noted she would like additional discussion of the markers and other signage. J. Edelman said there should be consideration for what the Town prefers.

Exeter 15399 (no Federal number)

Participants: Sean James, Jillian Semprini, HTA; Steve Liakos, Nancy Mayville; NHDOT

Initial consultation on the rehabilitation of the String Bridges over the lower falls where the Exeter River meets the Squamscott River. These over 50 years old bridges are very similar and consist of 50'-0" clear span buried cast-in-place reinforced concrete rigid frames and are founded on ledge.

S. James presented a PowerPoint slideshow which presented an overview of the project which includes the rehabilitation of NHDOT Bridge No. 103/074 and NHDOT Bridge No. 102/074, both carrying String Bridge over Squamscott/Exeter River. The project is a municipally managed, state funded bridge project.

These two distinct bridges are separated by Kimball Island, with Bridge No. 103/074 on the west side and Bridge No. 102/074 on the east side of the island. Both bridges were constructed in 1935 and consist of cast-in-place concrete rigid frames. Known repairs were completed in 1992, which consisted of replacement of the membrane. Great Dam and Great Bridge are located upstream.

The bridges are located in the Exeter Waterfront Commercial National Register Historic District, however the bridges are not listed as a contributing resource due to their age at the time that the district was originally delineated. Historic Documentation Company, Inc. (HDC) evaluated the bridges and believe they are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places..

The Engineering Study is in progress and services completed to date include, topographic survey, concrete testing of rigid frames, visual and 'arms reach' inspection, NHDHR Individual Inventory Form, utility coordination, and preliminary roadway and drainage design. Inspection findings determined the bridges are in fair to good condition. The east concrete wingwalls are in poor condition. The roadway pavement is in poor condition and there are drainage issues as the profile is relatively flat over the bridges.

Three alternatives were considered; no build, rehabilitation and replacement. The rehabilitation alternative was chosen because it addresses the structural deficiencies of the bridges, is the least cost alternative, shortest constructed duration, and retains the historic fabric of the bridges. Rehabilitation would consist of concrete repairs, repair/replacement of concrete bridge railings, concrete sidewalks with granite curbs, removal of existing pavement, backfill and barrier membrane, installation of new barrier membrane, and backfilling and paving of bridges. One

bridge will be completed at a time to maintain access to Kimball Island throughout the construction duration. Water and sewer services will be maintained to Kimball Island. Overhead utility wires will also be maintained.

The rehabilitation project will coordinate with the Water Street project the Town is undergoing. The Town is investigating concrete and brick sidewalks and would like the String Bridge sidewalks to match. L. Black stated that she wouldn't want to introduce a new material on the bridges if it wasn't there during the construction of 1935. Therefore, concrete would be acceptable on the bridges as the existing 1935 drawings show concrete sidewalks, however, brick would not be preferred. Keep apprised of outcome of Exeter's downtown sidewalk project as that could impact sidewalk material decisions on the bridges.

N. Mayville noted that the bridges were moved to FY2016, which starts July 1, 2015. Advertising is anticipated to be January 2016.

S. Liakos suggested replacing the underground utilities at time of construction if necessary. S. James stated Hoyle, Tanner had a meeting with the Exeter DPW and they were looking into the underground utilities. S. Liakos also suggested sleeving the underground utilities for access for future maintenance. S. Liakos noted that the most recent inspection of the bridges was in August 2014 and there are new inspection reports.

Hoyle, Tanner will be presenting the project to the Exeter Historic District Commission on Thursday, March 19, 2015. Meeting minutes from the presentation will be distributed to NHDHR.

Concord 28977, X-A003(902)

Participants: Don Lyford, Mike Pouliot, Mike Dugas, NHDOT

Continued consultation on the Concord Transportation Center Parking and discussion of results of consultation with the Heritage Commission.

Jill Edelmann discussed and summarized the March 5, 2015 meeting with the Concord Heritage Commission regarding the removal of 3 buildings to accommodate parking needs at the Transportation Center. The Commission expressed some concern about developing a mitigation package for the entire Stickney Avenue Highway Garage complex when 3 ancillary structures were being impacted as part of this project, however the entire complex will likely be impacted in the future with the I-93 expansion project. J. Edelmann informed the Commission that the current mitigation would be developed for the proposed parking lot project only, but that it could be built upon as additional impacts occur. The Heritage Commission suggested an archival documentation with additional research on the three buildings proposed for removal, which could be compiled into a larger documentation packet if additional remaining buildings are removed or other impacts occur. J. Edelmann informed the Heritage Commission that The Department will continue consultation with the Concord Heritage Commission if/when additional impacts occur to the complex, and mitigation options can be discussed.

Laura Black expressed some concern that the level of documentation for this project should be its own stand-alone package and should not be dependent on any future I-93 expansion projects to document the remaining complex.

The Department proposed the following mitigation items based on conversations with the Heritage Commission:

- An abbreviated New Hampshire Historic Property Documentation (NHHPD) form will be completed by a 36 CFR 61 qualified architectural historian. Focus would be on the three buildings proposed for removal, however exterior archival photographs would be taken for the entire complex
- The Department will commit to adding to and/or completing the NHHPD on the complex if/when additional impacts occur; degree of documentation will be dependent on the impacts.
- Aerial photography (digital) will be completed, prior to and after the removal of the three buildings.

L. Black also noted that the buildings may have some interior features worth noting. The proposed mitigation package will be reviewed by NHDHR and comments will be submitted to NHDOT.

It was agreed that the removal of three buildings would result in an adverse effect. J. Edelmann will draft the Adverse Effect Memo and will send to Jamie Sikora (FHWA) and Laura Black, Edna Feighner (NHDHR) for review.

Submitted by: Sheila Charles and Jill Edelmann, Cultural Resources

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