BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT
CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting
DATE OF CONFERENCES: April 2 and April 9, 2009
LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building
ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT
Joyce McKay
Jill Cunningham
Jon Evans
Tom Jameson
Steve Johnson
Wendy Johnson
Jim Marshall
Nancy Mayville
Kevin Nyhan
David Powelson
Christine Perron
Mark Richardson
David Scott
Matt Urban
Alex Vogt

Federal Highway Administration
Jamie Sikora

NHDHR
Beth Muzzey
Edna Feighner
Linda Wilson
Dick Boisvert

VTAOT
Scott Newman

Army Corps of Engineers
Rich Roach

Eckman Engineering
David Eckman

CLD Engineers
Michael Haley

Fluet Engineering
Paul Fluet

HL Turner Group
Jim Spaulding

Holden Engineering
Thomas Levins

HTA
Sean James

Preservation Company
Lynne Monroe

Quantum Construction Consultants
Lisa Martin
Jim Bouchard

SEA Consultants
Scott Newnan

Underwood Engineers, Inc
Philip McDonald

Town of Boscawen
Michael Wright

Town of Milford
Bill Parker

Town of Sanbornton
John Thayer
Bob Valosky

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

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

Lebanon-Hartford, A000(627), 14957 2
Walpole, A000(687), 12905 2
Swanzey, X-A000(713), 14195 3
Bath, X-A000(901), 14439 4
New Boston, X-A000(563), 14835 5
Boscawen, X-A000(342), 14402 6
Antrim, 14944 (no federal number) 7
Brentwood, X-A000(826), 15619 8
Milford, X-A000(416), 14492; X-A000(565), 14837; X-A000(618), 14492A; X-A000(195), 14078 8
Boscawen-Canterbury, 15281 (no federal number) 12
Antrim-Deering, 14237 (no federal number) 14
Andover, X-A000(697) 15335 &15335A 15
Antrim, 14944 (no federal number) 15
Economic Stimulus Contracts, Historical Mitigation Updates 17
Sanbornton (no project numbers) 17

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

April 2, 2009

Lebanon-Hartford, A000(627), 14957
Participants: Scott Newman, VTAOT; Christine Perron, David Scott, Steve Johnson, Alex Vogt, NHDOT

A summary of the project was completed using "Guidelines for Historic Bridge Rehabilitation and Replacement," per Beth Muzzey's request at the March 5th Cultural Resources meeting. This summary was emailed the day before the meeting to those in attendance so that participants would be aware of what would be discussed. B. Muzzey stated that she needs 30 days to review project information and, therefore, could not provide official comments at this time.

Step 1 of the summary was discussed, as well as a portion of Step 2. There was no time to discuss Steps 3 and 4. B. Muzzey commented that the Warren Pony truss was not addressed in Step 1, and she did not think that this step adequately addressed what makes the bridge historic and to what degree. She indicated that a bean counting approach was not appropriate. Under Step 1, B. Muzzey commented that the character defining features were chosen from the general list in the Guidelines and not specific to the bridge. In Step 2, B. Muzzey said that the answers to the questions from the Guidelines did not adequately discuss a full range of possibilities. Are there high tech approaches to rehabilitating some of the elements that would result in reduced effects? There was lengthy discussion on raising the portal and its visual impact, load-carrying capacity, the geometry of the bridge approaches, and adding a sidewalk on the upstream side of the bridge. B. Muzzey asked why the bridge had been over-designed. Was it an attempt to strengthen the bridge following the 1936 flood?

It was agreed that B. Muzzey would provide written comments on the project summary to the Department by May 1. Once her comments are received, they would be discussed at the June meeting.

Walpole, A000(687), 12905
Participants: Scott Newman, VTAOT ; David Powelson, Mark Richardson, David Scott, Jon Evans, NHDOT; Dick Boisvert, NHDHR

This discussion involved the Vilas Bridge, which carries Bridge Street over the Connecticut River between Walpole, NH and Rockingham, VT. The bridge is a two-span, open spandrel, reinforced concrete arch constructed in 1930. It has a total length of 230 ft and a width of 32.5 ft, including a 5 ft sidewalk.

The Vilas Bridge is structurally deficient, has been on the Red List for many years, and is currently #18 on the Department's Bridge Priority List. It currently has a Federal Sufficiency Rating of 2.3 (of 100) and had been posted with a 10-Ton capacity. A bridge inspection conducted in March 2009 resulted in the immediate closure of the Vilas Bridge as a result of the deteriorated condition of the structure. Traffic has been detoured onto the Church Street Bridge (Br. No. 058/043) located about a mile upstream from the Vilas Bridge.

Mark Richardson indicated that a project addressing this structure (Walpole-Rockingham, 12905) is in the NHDOT Ten Year Plan for 2015. He also noted that $3M is programmed however an estimated $6M to $8M would be needed for a rehabilitation.

M. Richardson indicated that what needs to be done to reopen the bridge to traffic is unknown at this time. Testing of the concrete for strength and chloride (road salt) infiltration will occur later this spring. The results of this investigation will be used to determine the extent of rehabilitation work needed, if that option is considered prudent, or if a complete replacement of this structure is warranted.

Joyce McKay indicated that the Department is aware that an MOA concerning the Vilas Bridge was developed in 1994 when the Kellyville Bridge in Newport was removed. This MOA indicated that the Department would not remove the existing Vilas Bridge barring any exceptional circumstances. It was also noted that the MOA contains a clause committing the NHDOT to long-term maintenance.

Beth Muzzy expressed concern that the commitment to long-term maintenance was not being met.

Dick Boisvert noted the existence of the petroglyphs not only on the south side of the west abutments but also along the New Hampshire side. Because the location of the New Hampshire petroglyphs is less well known, they are more intact. Prior to work on the bridge, petroglyphas on both sides of the river will need to be located and protected. It is assumed that other areas adjacent to the bridge are no longer sensitive given the amount of development in the vicinity; but this assumption would need to be checked with a phase IA sensitivity survey.

M. Richardson stressed that the structural investigations will begin shortly and that until these have been completed, it is just too early to tell what can be done to reopen the bridge to traffic.

Jamie Sikora was concerned about early coordination with the Advisory Council. Local concern about the site has been expressed. He will check with the Advisory Council about the appropriate timing of coordination.

> Follow Up: J. Sikora 5/8/09: As a follow-up to the Walpole-Rockingham, 12905 Project discussions, J. Sikora did not contact the ACHP and instead reviewed guidance from the ACHP Section 106 Review training manual. Also reviewed was the Newport 10664 project Environmental Study/Section 4(f) Evaluation which was approved by FHWA 5/2/94 and the Section 106 MOA that contained the commitment related to the Vilas Bridge. The ACHP was not a signatory. Given the before mentioned guidance and fact they were not involved with the previous MOA J. Sikora believes it's premature to request their involvement at this time. Contact with ACHP should wait until there is a better understanding of what action may be proposed, what the potential effects are under Section 106.

Swanzey, X-A000(713), 14195
Participants: Sean James, HTA (sjames@hoyletanner.com); Jim Marshall, NHDOT

This project was previously discussed at the 9/11/2008 and 2/5/2009 Cultural Resource Committee (CRC) Meetings. S. James provided an update on the Thompson Covered Bridge scour protection since the last committee meeting. Preliminary plans have been reviewed and approved by the NHDOT, and the project will now include installation of a deluge sprinkler within the bridge. This project and the dam removal projects are being combined and bid as one project. Preliminary plans

were emailed to Beth Muzzey at DHR, however they were not received due to limitations on DHR's email system. Paper copies of the preliminary plans for the scour protection project and sprinkler design were submitted for review. The project now includes ARRA funding.

There was some discussion regarding the National Society for the Preservation of Covered Bridges (NSPCB). This group has been notified in writing on several occasions regarding the dam removal and no formal response has been received. B. Muzzey indicated that they had recently requested to be a consulting party to the project. After some discussion, it was agreed that the preliminary plans would be sent to NSPCB for comment, however due to the advanced state of the project they would not be a consulting party. S. James requested a copy of the NSPCB letter so that plans could be forwarded to the correct address.

There was some discussion on the timing of the scour countermeasures relative to the dam removal. It was agreed that the Memorandum of Affect would include language indicating that the scour protection of the bridge would take place prior to or concurrent with the dam removal project. It was also noted that a plate would need to be added to one of the sleeper beams. S. James will forward the effects form to B. Muzzey. As this project includes stimulus funding, B. Muzzey indicated that they would expedite the review. B. Muzzey stated that the project appears to have a 'No Adverse Effect,' however will check with J. Garvin

Bath, X-A000(901), 14439
Participants: Sean James, HTA (sjames@hoyletanner.com)

This project was previously discussed at the 9/11/2008 and 2/5/2009 Cultural Resource Committee Meetings. S. James provided a handout with a project background of key dates and future milestones. Preliminary plans were submitted and approved by NHDOT. Preliminary plans were also submitted to Jim Garvin at NHDHR on February 25th; however no review comments were provided to Hoyle, Tanner. The Town's goal is to bid the project in the fall of 2009 with construction to start in the spring of 2010. A spreadsheet was also provided to the committee indicating the need for removal of all truss members identified as either for inadequate strength or poor condition. It had been agreed that recently added purlins could be removed to reduce the weight of the bridge.

The National Society for the Preservation of Covered Bridges (NSPCB) has not been contacted to date regarding the project, however J. Garvin of NHDHR has made them aware of it. S. James indicated that we wished to receive preliminary plan comments prior to contacting the NSPCB and that they would be contacted after this meeting to see if they are interested in being a consulting party. B. Muzzey also requested that the Town of Bath Historical Society and Heritage Commission be contacted. (4/10/09 Meeting follow-up: The Town of Bath has a Historical Society but does not have a Heritage Commission).

There was a great deal of discussion regarding whether the committee had sufficient information to review the project and if the scope of work had been well defined previous to this meeting. Two items were specifically mentioned: 1) a photo of each member that is proposed to be replaced and 2) an evaluation of the bridge by an architectural historian to determine the age and condition of each piece of the bridge. J. Garvin has indicated that the sheathing/siding on the upstream or downstream truss could potentially be original. S. James indicated that Hoyle, Tanner could provide photographs and agreed that many portions of the bridge date to 1832. He asked why these requests had not been

made at the previous two meetings for the project. He also disagreed that the scope of the project was not previously known. The scope of work for the project, including replacement quantities, had been included in the Engineering Study previously submitted to NHDHR (on July 29, 2008). The Engineering Study included a listing of key dates in the bridge's history, which was compiled from state and town records. S. James indicated that a HAER report documenting the history of the bridge has also been completed. At the conclusion of the discussion, B. Muzzey indicated that NHDHR would prepare a written request for information for this project that explicitly describes the additional information being requested. [Note: J. Garvin indicated the additional information that DHR would need to review the project on May 6, 2009.]

New Boston, X-A000(563), 14835
Participants: Thomas Levins, Holden Engineering (hes@holdenengineering.com); Randy Parker, Bill Morrissey, New Boston Foot Traffic & Road Safety Committee; Tom Jameson, NHDOT.

Tom Levins opened the meeting with a brief summary of the bridge site and project scope. The project involves constructing a prefabricated steel truss footbridge over the South Branch of the Piscataquog River along with a boardwalk that will span a wetland area leading to the bridge. The footbridge will be the link connecting an existing nature path (Millpond Conservation Trail) along the east side of the South Branch Piscataquog River to a pedestrian trail that will continue along the west side of the river to the south village of New Boston. The nature trail is currently somewhat rough; and an upgrade will be constructed in future.

Bridge abutments for the steel truss bridge will be constructed to a depth of 4 to 5 feet. Supports for the boardwalk are expected to be 8" diameter or square columns, spaced to avoid any sensitive areas. The reconstructed path will have a maximum depth of disturbance of 8 inches. The staging area will have surface disturbance.

The location of the proposed west abutment and a portion of the trail on the west side of the river will be on private property. The owner of the property has agreed to permanent easements that will be required to construct the proposed improvements and maintain and use the bridge and path.

The proposed location of the east abutment, boardwalk, and the trail on the east side of the river are on Town owned land.

E. Feighner did ask that a Phase IA/IB Archaeological Survey be conducted. An initial field assessment would also determine where and how many 50 cm square pits would be required. After a brief discussion of the depth and surrounding impact area for the bridge construction, E. Feighner asked about the staging area needed for construction and any footpaths. As the footpaths are out of the scope of Holden's direct project responsibilities Bill Morrissey and Randy Parker discussed the width and depth of the path yet to be designed and/or funded. Both assessments would be accomplished simultaneously to lower project costs. Qualified archaeologist are listed on the NHDHR's website. NHDHR will check the database to see if any sensitivity assessments exist for this downtown area. R. Parker asked if we could have that information if it exists as the public has limited access for security reasons. E. Feighner stated that a map with areas of high sensitivity could be distributed, however specific site locations could not be presented.

Conclusions include the need for a Phase IA/IB Archaeological Assessment. There are no historical architectural or landscape features that would be impact by the project.

Boscawen, X-A000(342), 14402
Participants: David Foster, Underwood Engineers, Inc. (pmac@underwoodeng.com); Michael Wright, Town of Boscawen (603753-9188); Tom Jameson, NHDOT

This project was previously discussed at the Monthly Cultural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting of 3/13/08.

Information provided

- Environmental Review Documentation submitted in March 2009 and is presently under review.
- Design plans
- Photos
- Request for Project Review by NH Division of Historical Resources
- Programmatic Categorical Exclusion Checklist
- 4 Memorandums of Effect

Presentation
The need for sidewalks was reviewed.

The Town of Boscawen seeks a Categorical Exclusion for this project.

Since the last time we met on March 19, 2008, we received input from this group, the Natural Resource Agencies, the NH Department of Transportation, and the Town of Boscawen. We have selected a final route for the sidewalk that reflects all input. The selected Alternative, # 5, includes the following features:

- Extend the sidewalk from the south along the east side of US Route 3 to the school.
- Construct a crosswalk at the entrance to the school.
- Construct a sidewalk on the west side of US Route 3 from the school to a point opposite Depot Road.
- Construct a crosswalk at the junction of US Route 3/US Route 4/Depot Road.

There are no wetland impact,, and the design minimizes impacts to cultural resources.

Sidewalk construction is within the Right-of-Way. No impacts to private property are anticipated. There are no significant grade changes, and therefore property impacts are minimized. Minor grading, when required, is limited to lawn restoration, seeding, etc. Construction zones will be monitored during construction so that direct impacts to residents are avoided.

Purpose
The purpose of this meeting is to identify if any historical properties would be adversely affected by the project.

Discussion
Edna Feighner stated that no archaeological survey would be necessary. Beth Muzzey stated the project will not impact architectural properties and historic landscape features (stone walls, posts, mature trees, etc.) and have no adverse effects if plans do not change per April 2009 plans. NHDHR signed the Request for Project Review by NH Division of Historical Resources. The Memorandum of Effect will be signed by NHDHR and FHWA. Additional project commitments will be noted on the memorandum.
Once signed, the Cultural Resources Memorandum of Effect is to be included in the Environmental Document along with Meeting Notes. When Environmental Document is complete, all documentation is to be forwarded to Tom Jameson for approval.

Antrim, 14944 (no federal number)
Participants: Lisa Martin (lmartin@quantum-cc.com), Jim Bouchard, Quantum Construction Consultants.

This project was previously presented on November 6, 2008. This project is intended to replace bridge 130/149 that has been closed upon recommendation of NHDOT due to severe deterioration and scouring of abutments. The previous meeting determined that an Individual Inventory Form should be completed for the bridge structure. Should the Town elect to improve River Road along North Branch Road then a Phase IA Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment would be required for the roadway length.

The Individual Inventory Form was completed by the Preservation Company and submitted to NHDHR at the end of March. NHDHR acknowledged that they had not had the benefit of reviewing the form as of yet. QCC provided two additional copies of the form and summarized, for discussion, the findings of Preservation Company. The structure is not eligible for the National Register. The report states that the North Branch Village was devastated by fire in 1888 and was never rebuilt. A significant rebuilding due to the presence of the former Nathaniel Hawthorne College contributed to loss of foundations or readily apparent signature of previous buildings. The original bridge failed and was reconstructed in 1909 including raising and widening of the bridge. Additional rebuilding occurred in 1963 with the current superstructure.

QCC noted that the stone masonry box culvert with cast-in-place concrete slab top with the date 1913 inscribed on the south end was originally designated to be removed and replaced with culvert as detailed on the preliminary plans. Further inspection by QCC has shown that the stone masonry sidewalls and concrete slab top components are in good condition. QCC is proposing to leave the stone culvert as is and modify the work along River Road so as not to impact the stone culvert.

QCC presented detailed photographs of the area surrounding the bridge and of the existing bridge structure. Within the photographs of the abutments, divisional lines of different construction phases are evident based on stone type, characteristics and construction. QCC conjectured that portions of the downstream wing walls and abutments represent the original bridge that failed and that the upstream side of the abutments and wing walls represent construction when the bridge was rebuilt in 1909. QCC noted that a significant scour hole exists beneath the south downstream corner of the south abutment, which was one of the contributing causes for the NHDOT bridge closure recommendation.

QCC presented the preliminary engineering plans for discussion, noting that the existing stone masonry abutments are to be removed down to the water line. Although the bridge is not eligible for the National Register, discussions relative to age of structure and stonework employed in the original structure identified NHDHR's concerns about removing the stone abutments. The quarry marks were noted. Triangular markings typify pre-1830's stone cutting methodologies. The quarry marks are not detailed in photographs presented. QCC offered to undertake detailed photography of stone quarry marks to assist in the review.

NHDHR requested that the abutments and wing walls be preserved if possible and that QCC undertake evaluation of modifications to the bridge design that would permit retention of the existing bridge substructures. Sketches are to be presented to NHDHR for review and consideration. QCC noted that this project is eligible for ARRA funding and the timetable is compact. NHDHR requested the discussion be continued at the Cultural Resources Meeting of April 9, 2009. QCC will present sketches of possible alternatives, and NHDHR will then have evaluated the forms.

April 9, 2009

Brentwood, X-A000(826), 15619
Participants: Matt Urban, Wendy Johnson, Craig Green, NHDOT.

Matt Urban and Wendy Johnson presented the subject project. The project is located in the Town of Brentwood. Work proposed includes the addition of two turning lanes north and southbound off of NH Route 125 onto NH Route 111A. The proposed work also includes the installation of four mast arms to support and replace the existing flashing yellow signal with a set of lights at the intersection. Widening varies from 8 to 5 feet in some locations and guardrail will need to be replaced as a result of that.

Matt and Wendy presented photos along with a plan of the proposed work to best illustrate the existing conditions of this area.

Having reviewed the photos and proposed work, Beth Muzzey stated that she did not expect any adverse effect to historic properties nor did Edna Feighner expect there to be any effect to archeological resources. It was agreed that the project could proceed as proposed, and a No Historic Properties Effect Memo would be issued. The NHDOT will notify DHR if design plans change because of the addition of drainage.

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

This meeting was held to receive input from the NHDHR, FHWA, and NHDOT staff regarding proposed improvements along South Street and their associated potential to impact cultural resources (both historic and archaeological).

SOUTH STREET

M. Haley of CLD and L. Monroe of Preservation Company, presented the project on behalf of the Town of Milford 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 and the Oval to the southern end of the proposed project at the railroad crossing between Clinton Street and Lincoln Street. T. Jameson is the NHDOT Project Manager.

L. Monroe presented information concerning the individual properties along the project limits. This information was required as a result of last month's DHR meeting. The remaining information required as part of the Historic District Area Form, such as the boundaries of the district, will be compiled over the coming months. The completed District Area Form is due to DHR by January 2010.

M. Haley presented the potential impacts to each side of the street. The majority of the discussion focused on the back curb along the east side of South Street.

- Generally speaking, DHR wanted to know what the intentions were for the sidewalk and the back curb. DHR also wanted to know how CLD intended to protect the back curb, which is part of the historic landscape, during construction.
    - CLD and the town would prefer to avoid touching the back curb entirely. The potential financial impacts to the project and the town resulting from resetting the back curbs could be detrimental to the project's completion.
    - In order to achieve this, M. Haley presented the idea of saw cutting the sidewalk within the Town's right-of-way and leaving the existing curb in place, undisturbed.
- A long discussion concerning the specifics about the saw cut concept resulted.
    - M. Haley explained the idea to saw cut the existing sidewalk, approximately 6" from the right-of-way, or from the existing back curb. This would allow for the removal of the existing sidewalk without disturbing the back curb.
    - DHR asked what the material would be used for the new sidewalk.
        - M. Haley responded that between the Oval and High Street, the town wanted to have concrete sidewalk to match the existing sidewalks in the Oval area. From High Street to Clinton Street, the sidewalk was proposed to be bituminous asphalt.
        - DHR expressed concerns about using concrete. The concerns related to the joint line along the proposed concrete/existing pavement boundary. DHR wondered about the long-term impacts of the concrete such as heaving and movement due to ground shifting.
        - DHR also wondered about how the concrete would be placed against a weak joint/material such as the existing pavement. R. Roach expressed concern that the new sidewalk would have an uneven edge along the private property side if formwork were not used.
        - M. Haley responded that an expansion joint/sealant would be placed between the new concrete sidewalk and existing pavement sidewalk to account for small movements and to minimize water undermining the new sidewalk.
        - The idea of using bituminous asphalt was presented by DHR. Pavement would allow for small ground shifting, and would match the existing conditions better.

        - B. Parker said that the concrete had been proposed since South Street is an entryway into the Oval area, and the Oval already has concrete sidewalks. The town would prefer to use concrete in this area.

- The potential impacts to specific properties along the west side of South St. were discussed
    - At 123 South Street (Dahl Property), DHR asked about the impacts.
        - M. Haley responded that the proposed easement was a temporary construction easement. The existing area is paved, and the proposed/final condition would be paved as well. The reason for the large proposed easement was for grading purposes.
        - DHR asked how the sidewalk was going to be defined from the parking area.
        - M. Haley responded that existing conditions has no definition, so at this time, the proposed design would be similar to the existing conditions.
        - T. Jameson proposed the idea of using flush mounted granite curb to differentiate the sidewalk from the parking area.
    - At the church property, since it was determined to be noncontributing in the previous historic study, DHR had little comment. B. Muzzey did ask what the intention was for the front of the property.
        - M. Haley responded that the existing lawn/landscaped area would be temporarily disturbed during construction, and would be returned to lawn/landscape upon completion in the area that is not part of the widening.
    - DHR asked about the proposed easements along the remaining properties along the west side of South Street between High Street and the Oval.
        - M. Haley responded that the existing lawn/landscaped areas at TD Banknorth would be restored. The bank property was where a permanent easement had been proposed to accommodate underground utility equipment.
        - M. Haley explained that the remaining properties would be returned to existing conditions. The paved areas would remain paved in the proposed condition, and the landscaped areas would be returned to landscaped areas.
- A brief conversation about the existing curb between the sidewalk and the roadway took place.
    - M. Haley explained that the intention was to reset the existing curb.
    - DHR expressed concern that the curb could be reset poorly.
        - M. Haley explained that typically resetting curb is not a problem for contractors. Installation of reset curb would be done in a similar fashion as new granite curb.
    - DHR also expressed interest in making sure the curb was protected during construction.
        - A mention of broken curbing was made, and J. Sikora said the intention would most likely be to replace the broken piece in kind. M. Haley agreed, explaining that the intent of “in-kind” replacement would be to replace any broken curb with same type of curb of similar condition. Many times, on projects where curb is “upgraded,” the existing old curb is saved, and the intent would be to use curb of this type to replace broken pieces.
- A brief conversation about potential work around the existing canopy at 20 South Street (“The Amigo’s Building”) took place.

- M. Haley explained that the project limits had been better defined toward The Oval and the South Street Project would include sidewalk work around the existing canopy that covers the sidewalk.
- The Amigo's Building is part of the previously established Commercial District around The Oval.
- B. Muzzey asked how work was proposed to be completed in this area
  - M. Haley responded that the canopy was in poor condition and the preferred alternative is to avoid impacting the canopy entirely. Work in this area would most likely be done by hand, and machine work would be very limited.
- Due to time limitations, a full discussion about the impacts was not held. However, DHR did not express concerns with the proposed work in this area.

- M. Haley followed up with J. McKay by phone to receive input about potential work around the canopy area and explained the situation in more detail.
  - The town's right-of-way falls in the middle of the sidewalk. The existing sidewalk is approximately 10 feet wide.
  - To address DHR's concerns about a potential joint line in the middle of the sidewalk, the project would propose to reconstruct the entire width of the sidewalk as an ad-alternate if funding is available and abutter coordination is successful. Near the buildings, the saw cut method discussed at the meeting would be used to avoid impacting the structures in this area. Appropriate special provisions would be added to the construction specifications to address this work and protect the existing structures.
  - Due to the right-of-way falling in the middle of the sidewalk, easements would be required to complete this work.
    - J. McKay asked if the easements would be permanent because a permanent easement/taking would trigger *de minimis* 4(f).
  - M. Haley said the town would most likely make the easements permanent to take responsibility for the entire sidewalk width; however, further discussion with the town would be necessary to confirm this.
  - J. McKay generally thought the idea would work. She recommended contacting Charlie Hood and Kevin Nyhan (both of NHDOT) to get input on possibly completing a *de minimis* 4(f) evaluation. She believed this could be appropriate because while the takings would be permanent, the sidewalk already exists in this area, and the easements may be small enough to qualify.
    - CLD will follow up with the appropriate NHDOT staff to complete the necessary paperwork.

NHDHR DETERMINATIONS

- L. Wilson noted that Milford is known historically as a "Granite Town," similar to Concord. Milford had a number of quarries that provided high quality granite to local projects. She noted that many pieces of granite in Milford showed similar qualities as those found in Concord. L. Monroe was unaware of that fact, but appreciated the input, and agreed that the granite work she saw during her site visit was very high quality.

- DHR determined that the proposed project would have no adverse impacts to the surrounding historic properties. They agreed to begin work on generating a Memo of Effect (MOE), with some conditions:
  - CLD is to contact J. Cunningham to coordinate for the MOE preparation.
  - DHR wants to make sure specific provisions are added to the prosecution of work to make sure protective measures are specified. DHR wants to review the prosecution of work. DHR understands that time is of the essence due to potential ARRA funding, and agreed to a quick review. CLD will also provide a copy of the specifications to the NHDOT (T. Jameson).

T. Jameson confirmed with B. Muzzey and J. McKay that the project could proceed. NHDHR and NHDOT agreed, however if any changes were made to the project as it was approved at today's meeting, the project would have to go back to the committee for review.

Boscawen-Canterbury, 15281 (no federal number)
Participants: David Eckman (603-763-5200, j.vanstelten@eckmanengineering.com), Eckman Engineering and Michael Wright (603-753-9188), Town of Boscawen

Michael Wright provided background on the project and the Town of Boscawen's excellent track record with respect to historic preservation/restoration. He noted that unfortunately the deteriorated condition of this bridge has led the town and NHDOT to the belief that the structure must be removed. Michael went through the proposed removal sequence and reviewed the submitted DHR Request for Project Review (RPR) package. The 1909 bridge is a two-span, high Parker Truss designed by John Storrs.

Elizabeth Muzzy, SHPO, stated that NHDHR must fully understand the cultural resources value and requested the completion of an individual inventory form by a qualified architectural or engineering historian. A list of qualified architectural and engineering historians is available from NHDHR.

D. Eckman noted that he understood the inventory form was already completed and that it was included in the submitted NHDHR Request for Project Review (RPR) package. E. Muzzy stated that the inventory done in the 1980s that was referenced was not valid and in fact rejected by NHDHR and FHWA.

D. Eckman mentioned the "Level II-A" status identified for this structure, which meant that it could be removed on the condition that the original construction plans were located or new plans created detailing the structure (original plans were located in NHDOT Archives) and that historic recording with photographs were completed before removal. E. Muzzy and others noted that the rating system was invalid as well and reiterated that the inventory needed to be done again by an expert from the pre-qualified list.

E. Muzzy noted that if federal money is involved in the project, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) requires consideration of historic preservation. ("Federal agencies must consider the effects of their actions on historic properties and provide Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) an opportunity to comment on federal projects prior to implementation." The US Army Corps of Engineers (US ACOE) has been designated the lead federal agency for this undertaking. (From research of Section 106).

Similarly, E. Muzzy noted that if Federal Highway funds are involved in the project Section 4(f) must be adhered to. “Section 4(f), Final Rule published by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in the Federal Register is the statute that protects public and private historic sites from use by proposed transportation projects (in addition, it protects public parks, recreation areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges). It is one of the most stringent environmental laws related to transportation. Its requirements involve judgments that elude easy explanation and are often difficult to interpret with a great deal of confidence. As a result, Section 4(f) has become the most frequently litigated environmental statute in the Federal Highway Program aside from the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). It is also the most frequent cause of court injunctions delaying highway projects.” From research of Section 4(f)).

M. Wright noted that the Municipal bridge program’s matching money will expire at the end of this year and that the towns of Boscawen and Canterbury have put aside money for the past few years in order to make the removal project possible. [Note: A conversation with Nancy Mayville indicated that these funds were not set to expire in September. jm]

Linda Wilson stated that it is not NHDHR’s fault the deadlines were set as they are and need to follow the proper process for this type of project. E. Muzzy handed a copy of “AASHTO’s Guidelines for Historic Bridge Rehabilitation and Replacement” to D. Eckman for future reference.

D. Eckman noted the bridge is in poor condition and may fail in the not so distant future. Referring to photographs in the NHDHR RPR application he noted that the Boscawen span has twisted, distorting the lower chord members due to differential settlement in the pier area and that the Canterbury span has extreme deterioration in the floor beams that connect the two trusses, also referring to photographs in the NHDHR Request for Project Review (RPR) package.

L. Wilson noted that there are discussion pages with information about restoration of historic trusses on-line for our information. D. Eckman noted that significant time has been spent researching historic trusses of this era on-line and in archives. His opinion is that the structure has deteriorated beyond reasonable or realistic in place repair. Included in the NHDHR Request for Project Review (RPR) package is a discussion of the alternatives: doing nothing, full rehabilitation, and removal.

Doing nothing is not an acceptable option as kids are jumping from the structure and there may be liability for the towns in addition to the danger to the kids. Three jumpers died on the former Hannah Dustin Bridge before it was removed. The fact that the bridge is deteriorated to the point that it may fail in the not so distant future also supports the argument that doing nothing at this time is not reasonable. Restoration would be expensive given the extreme deterioration and may result in more of a modern reproduction, due to the volume of replacement members.

The removal process proposed and discussed by Michael Wright removes the structure in a way that minimizes the possibility of damage to the historic structure and surrounding landscape, and keeps preservation options involving re-use at other locations viable.

L. Wilson stated that there are far fewer steel truss bridges than covered bridges in NH and preservation of these structures has recently become a priority.

M. Wright asked what the Town could do to help expedite the process and keep the project moving forward? D. Eckman asked if the town could advertise the structure for sale or begin the historic

recordation process? E. Muzzy requested the project report for a 30-day review from 4/9, a listing of public meetings and public responses at the meetings, and the completion of an individual form. She did not know at this time what the process would be.

Antrim-Deering, 14237 (no federal number)
Participants: Scott Newnan (scott.newnan@seacon.com), Wade Brown, S E A Consultants; Craig Ohlson, Town of Deering; Rich Roach, ACOE; Nancy Mayville, NHDOT

Wade Brown, P.E. gave a brief overview and update on the project advertisement schedule which begins July 1, 2009 and stated that the goal of this meeting was to discuss and finalize outstanding items of the MOA and Marketing Plan. The following was discussed.

Advertisement & Bidding Process during the 2-Year Storage Period:
At previous Cultural Resource Meetings, all parties agreed that the bridge would be advertised every 6 months during the storage period. During Beth Muzzey's review of the draft marketing plan, the following questions were posed: "Will the first bid that meets the criteria be chosen? Or would it be better to have review bids every six months?"

S E A explained that the intention was to advertise for a period of time, 60 days was agreed upon by all parties at this meeting. The first bidder to come forward that meets the selection criteria would be awarded the bridge at the close of the 60-day period. S E A stated that if we held bids and only reviewed them every six months, the town risks losing a potential bidder. All parties agreed that the bridge would be advertised for a period 60 days, every six months until a successful bidder is identified or until the 2-year storage period expires. Scott Newnan will contact Phil Miles (NHDOT ROW) to make sure this is acceptable. He will notify NHDHR of changes, if required.

Determination of Salvageable Beams & Stringer:
During Beth Muzzey's review of the draft marketing plan, the following question was posed: "How will 'salvageable' be determined?" Wade Brown and Scott Newnan explained that S E A would make that determination during disassembly of the bridge, based on visual observation and engineering judgment. SHPO advised that preservation and reuse of this bridge might not be for heavier vehicle loading and to keep this in mind during the process of disassembly. It was agreed that determination would be made based on the members being suitable for lighter loads.

Historical Documentation:
It was noted that a "Preliminary Draft" was received by S E A from their sub-consultant, Rich Casella of Historic Document Company (HDC). S E A informed the committee that HDC was having a difficult time identifying the origin of the existing bridge and planned to visit the NHDOT archives next week to find more information. It is believed that the bridge was moved to its current location in 1953. Linda Wilson suggested that HDC look at available records of the Peterborough Transcript. S E A will notify HDC of such.

Craig Ohlson stated that during a conversation with HDC he learned that the trusses could be disassembled into pieces at existing splice connections within the truss. He asked the committee if that would be acceptable for ease of moving the bridge. The committee would prefer the contractor avoid this process, but would be amenable to this in the future if it was truly needed.

Demolition Funding Availability:
SEA explained that if a successful bidder were not identified before the project begins construction, the Town's contractor would disassemble and relocate the bridge to the storage site. The funds offered during the advertisement of the bridge as part of the mitigation efforts would be used to pay the Town's contractor for this work, making it unavailable after its removal to storage. Jamison Sikora from FHA concurred. All parties agreed that demolition funds would not be available during the 2-year storage period.

Relocation of Structure after Storage Period:
S E A explained that once the 2-year storage period expires, the Town might not have any money to participate in relocating the structure to a proposed historic bridge storage yard. S E A asked what the committee would be looking for from the town for participation. With the historic bridge storage yard scenario and uncertainty, all agreed that this will be addressed in the future and that the committee realizes that all parties may not be able to participate at that time.

ARRA Funding:
Nancy Mayville indicated that the final list of eligible projects would be announced next week (week of 04-13-2009).

Note: Rich Roach of USACE and Nancy Mayville of NHDOT joined the meeting near the end.

Andover, X-A000(697) 15335 &15335A
Participants: Jim Spaulding, HL Turner (jspaulding@hlturner.com)

The project owner is the Andover School District, which is a part of SAU #46. James Spaulding delivered two copies of the "Request for Project Review" including required supporting material, and presented the project on behalf of SAU #46. The project is to construct a sidewalk along the westerly side of School St from the existing sidewalk on Routes 4 & 11 to the sidewalk at the Andover Elementary/Middle School. All work is within the NHDOT right-of-way or on school property. J. Spaulding presented a conceptual site plan showing the sidewalk and a series of photographs of the project area. He described the two buildings in the vicinity of the project, one being the town hall and the other being the house know as The Hamp House, named after a former owner. Both of these buildings are located on school district property. J. Spaulding stated that he had reviewed files at DHR and copies of that research were contained in the Request for Project Review form. The entire project area is within the Andover Center Historic District, which is eligible for the National Register. After a short discussion it was determined that the project will not impact historic properties. Beth Muzzey signed the second page of the Request for Project Review, checked the box entitled "No Historic Properties Affected" and made the following comment: "Although this project is within the Andover Center Historic District, it will not present any effects to historic properties."

Antrim, 14944 (no federal number)
Participants: Lisa Martin, Jim Bouchard, Quantum Construction Consultants

This project was initially presented on November 6, 2008 with a subsequent presentation on April 2, 2009. It is intended to replace the Old North Branch Road Bridge (130/149) that has been closed upon recommendation of NHDOT due to severe deterioration of the superstructure and scouring of

abutments. The previous meetings determined that an Individual Inventory Form (IIR) should be completed for the bridge structure, which has been completed with submission to New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources (NHDHR).

As requested at the April 2, 2009 presentation, QCC undertook further photographic documentation of the quarry marks from stone splitting to assist with determination of probable construction dates of different sections of the abutments. NHDHR had previously noted that triangular markings would indicate pre-1830's techniques, whereas rectangular would be more indicative of post-1830's quarrying. QCC undertook detailed close-up photography of a number of quarry marks from the top of the exposed face and directly onto the face. In all cases, the evident marks represented cylindrical borings that represented plug and feather method of quarry post-dating 1830.

NHDHR noted that at the April 8, 2009 DOE meeting, the existing bridge structure was considered not eligible for listing, with the exception of a possible listing under Criterion D. With additional investigations, the area could be deemed archaeological sensitive if sufficient evidence remains of the North Branch Village buildings razed by fire. If such remnants remain, then the existing abutments and wing walls could contribute to the determination of archaeological sensitivity for the area. NHDHR requested that the project undertake a Phase IA archaeological survey for the area. QCC noted that this project is considered eligible for ARRA funding and is continuing with design so as to meet the original milestones for advertising. As such, QCC inquired if the Phase IA could be conducted in conjunction with the ongoing work. NHDHR concurred that the archaeological survey and reporting could be done concurrently so as not to impact project schedules.

Per the April 2, 2009 NHDHR request, QCC presented two alternative plans for construction of the bridge predicated on maintaining the current bridge replacement design while preserving portions of the north and south stone abutments. The first option moves the bridge northward so that most of the north abutment and associated wing walls are preserved at the sacrifice of the south abutment and wing walls. This option was based on the north abutment appearing to be the more historically significant of the two abutments at the previous meeting.

The second alternative repositions the bridge slightly south, enabling preservation of both the south and north abutments and portions (10-16 feet) of associated wing walls. This latter option requires reinforced excavation to preserve the wing walls and abutments at a significant added cost to the project. Additionally, the tops of the existing abutments and wing walls must be lowered to accommodate new bridge construction. The tops of the remaining substructures would be capped with concrete to stabilize the substructure and prevent scour of the surface should floodwaters flow overtop the remaining structure. NHDHR's preference is implementation of this latter option.

NHDHR requested that any of the cut stone removed from the abutments remain on site. QCC noted intent is consistent with QCC's previous design, which included incorporation of stone into the project.

QCC noted that preservation of the abutments would affect the hydraulics of the bridge design. This information is supportive to the NH Department of Environmental Services, Wetlands Bureau Standard Dredge and Fill application that is currently under review by Wetlands. NHDHR noted that under Section 106, Wetlands is required to discuss historical issues with NHDHR and that they will address the need. QCC noted that preservation of the existing substructure would not mitigate the high flow velocities currently present. These velocities caused significant scour beneath the south

abutment at the east wing wall. NHDOT bridge reports have identified scour hole extending seven (7) feet under the abutment/wing wall. QCC will attempt stabilization through grouting of the void but cannot guarantee longevity.

The existing bride is supported at mid span by steel struts founded on concrete piers at the centerline of the existing abutments. The struts will be removed during construction with the concrete foundations remaining.

FHWA noted the need to undertake a Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation of the bridge before the project is permitted to advertised. QCC acknowledged the need and has undertaken 4(f) evaluation in past.

Although the bridge is not eligible for the National Register, the meeting conclusion is that the project does have an adverse effect, which is being mitigated by an archaeological Phase IA documentation and through partial retention of the existing bridge abutments and wing walls.

Economic Stimulus Contracts, Historical Mitigation Updates
Participants: Joyce Mckay, Jill Cunningham, NHDOT; Beth Muzzey, Edna Feighner, Linda Wilson, NHDHR; Jamie Sikora, FHWA

Beth Muzzey asked that the committee meet to discuss any outstanding mitigation for ARRA funded projects that are currently listed on the NHDOT ARRA project list (http://www.nh.gov/recovery/contracts/index.htm). Jamie Sikora has been tracking these projects for their NEPA and 106 completion and believes the only projects with outstanding mitigation are Lebanon-Hartford, 14957 and Conway Bypass 11339B. [Note that the Conway Bypass is no longer being funded under ARRA]. Charles Hood agrees that these two projects continue to have outstanding mitigation, however the Conway mitigation has been listed in the Environmental Commitments, and mitigation cannot be determined for the Lebanon project until it is known which alternative is selected.

Sanbornton (no project numbers)
Participants: Paul Fluet, Fluet Engineering (paul@fluetengineering.com); Bob Valosky, Sanbornton Town Administrator; John Thayer, Sanbornton DPW.

Paul Fluet from Fluet Engineering presented the project, which replaces the steel I-beam bridge with concrete and stone abutments on Shute Hill road over Emerson Brook. The current bridge was constructed within the last 30 years and is not considered historic. A temporary bridge adjacent to the existing will be a culvert pipe, and is needed while the old bridge is removed and a new pre-cast concrete bridge is constructed in the same location. E. Feighner asked about excavation in the area. Aside from the demolition of the existing bridge, the placement of the footings for the proposed bridge, and the placement of the temporary bridge, there will be very little excavation. The proposed plan would raise the roadway, which would introduce a layer of fill to the project area. John Thayer, from Sanbornton's DPW informed the committee that the fill brought in for the temporary bridge structure will most likely be reused for the proposed bridge, eliminating waste, and reducing the amount of traffic to the site.

It was agreed by the committee that there were no historic properties aboveground. E. Feighner would like to look through the DHR database to determine archaeological sensitivity in the area.

Note: On 4/27/09, E. Feighner responded to J. McKay's inquiry regarding archaeological concerns in the area, and stated that there were no sites in the area of concern and no survey would be required. J. McKay contacted P. Fluet to inform him of this decision, and noted that should this project receive NHDOT funding, a Memorandum of Effect would need to be filled out and sent to NHDOT for proper agency signatures.

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

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

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