BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT
CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting
DATE OF CONFERENCES: April 21, 2016
LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building
ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT
Joe Adams
Chris Carucci
Sheila Charles
Victoria Chase
Ron Crickard
Michael Dugas
Jill Edelmann
Jon Evans
Marc Laurin
Nancy Mayville
Jennifer Reczek
Jason Tremblay
C.R. Willeke

Federal Highway Administration
Jamie Sikora

NHDHR
Laura Black
Edna Feighner

McFarland Johnson
Christine Perron

Stantec
David McNamara

City of Concord
Ed Roberge
Rob Mack

City of Lebanon
Christina Hall

Town of Enfield
Steve Schneider
Meredith Smith

VTrans (on phone)
Jeannine Russell
Kyle Obenauer

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

Lebanon 14552 (no federal number) 1
Concord Exit 16/Mountain Rd (no federal number) 2
Enfield, 12967B, X-A001(087) 4
Ossipee 14749, X-A000(490) 5
Lancaster-Guildhall 16155, A001(159) 7

April 21, 2016

Lebanon 14552 (no federal number)
Participants: Dave McNamara, Stantec; Christina Hall, City of Lebanon; C.R. Willeke, NHDOT

Continued consultation to discuss the Mascoma Street Bridge Rehabilitation project. The meeting's goal was to gain consensus to move the project forward as a stand-alone project, separate from the larger Mechanic Street project.

Stantec provided an overview of the Mascoma Street Bridge project. The bridge was originally constructed in 1954 and there have been no major changes to it since it was constructed. There is deterioration to the beams largely due to infiltration through the joints. The proposed action is to replace the existing steel girders, bridge deck, and railings, while leaving the existing substructure in place. There will be minor changes to the profile, and crash tested bridge rail is proposed, otherwise the bridge width, lane and sidewalk configurations are proposed to match existing conditions.

The project is State and locally funded and is being managed through the State Aid Bridge program. The project does not require any federal permits.

The discussion focused on the potential connection between this project and the adjacent Mechanic Street corridor improvements project. As a part of the NEPA process related to that project, a project area form was completed. That project area form recommended that the Mascoma Street Bridge is not an eligible resource; however they also noted that it likely contributes to a potential historic district. Due to funding availability and timing of other projects, the City would like to move forward with the bridge project, while the NEPA process for Mechanic Street is going to take longer to complete.

NHDHR stated that a recommendation regarding potential for National Register eligibility without evidence of fieldview or research is not acceptable. They reiterated two scenarios to move forward:

- Complete the Project Area form and then move forward with the potential historic district documentation. The planning document would then be available when discussing potential impacts for both projects.

- Provide an individual inventory form for the bridge. This would be the standard method of resource identification to allow the bridge project to move separately, without the benefit of the planning document. The Department noted this was a considerable expense for the City when a recommendation had been previously made by a knowledgeable historian.

As of March 2015, the NHDHR has encouraged the use of the project area form to help determine what survey would be needed for both of these Lebanon projects (which the City had indicated in early communications were overlapping). The DHR still encourages its use in this manner, if the team addresses critical comments. Stantec asked if a more detailed response to an earlier RFI regarding the eligibility of the bridge would suffice, in lieu of completing an inventory form. NHDHR questioned if enough information was available to satisfy the original question, but if so, would consider it. The meeting concluded with the City, Department, and Stantec agreeing to discuss options and get back to NHDHR with a plan to move forward.

Concord Exit 16/Mountain Rd (no federal number)
Participants: Ed Roberge, Rob Mack, City of Concord; Nancy Mayville, Ron Crickard, Jill Edelmann, Sheila Charles, NHDOT; Jamie Sikora, FHWA; Laura Black, Edna Feighner, NHDHR.

Initial consultation to discuss the proposed intersection of I-93 Exit 16 (West Portsmouth Street)/Mountain Road/Shawmut Street roundabout project. Nancy Mayville introduced the project including prior NHDOT involvement in the project area. The current intersection configuration was designed in the mid 1990's and constructed in 2001 by NHDOT with City participation. NHDOT reconstructed the Exit 16 interchange and the I-93 bridge approach roadway up to but not including Mountain Road. The reconstruction of the Mountain Road/East Side Drive/Shawmut Street and East Side Drive/Eastman Street intersections was included in the NHDOT project but funded by the City of Concord. As Federal funding was included in the NHDOT portions of the project, the maintenance agreement between the NHDOT and the City provides that the NHDOT has review authority over any future changes that the city might propose at the intersection. Such is now the case as the intersection was originally designed with multiple traffic lanes to be compatible with future traffic signalization, whereas the current project would reconfigure the intersection into a roundabout.

Ed Roberge noted that by the early 2000's traffic and crashes at the intersection had increased to the level that installation of traffic signals was warranted. The City held two public hearings by 2007 on the scope of intersection improvements and a roundabout option was the clear preference by the public due to its traffic calming features, speed reduction, context-sensitivity to the East Concord neighborhood and potential 'gateway' feature. City Council approved the roundabout option in 2007 as a city-funded project and placed in on the City's CIP. Project design began in 2015 and construction is anticipated later this summer. In March 2016, the City hosted informational meetings with the direct project abutters as well as a neighborhood public information meeting which included over 60 attendees, City Councilors and staff. The project continues to have substantial public support. Attendees at the public meeting were invited to participate in the final design of the roundabout project. A small working group of local residents was established to review project landscaping as the design progresses; the first stakeholder meeting was held in mid-April. Ed presented a preliminary design plan of the roundabout and indicated that the design reflected multiple iterations to develop its shape and location that optimizes safety and multi-modal traffic operation while minimizing and balancing impacts to adjacent properties. Property impacts were minor and generally consisted of minor strip takings for sidewalk and curb improvements.

Laura Black summarized NHDHR comments on the RPR. While there are no archaeological concerns, it was noted that it has been over 20 years since the last historic evaluation of area resources as were documented in the referenced 1996 Programmatic 4(f) Evaluation done for the original NHDOT interchange project. The 1996 evaluation of the potential East Concord Historic District was never completed to the extent of formally designating the District as eligible. Also, there might be properties now over 50 years old that were not so when evaluated 20 years ago such as the Mobil Station. Best practices require that cultural resource/environmental studies and analysis 20 years old should be assessed and brought up to date, as necessary, under current field and evaluative conditions. Section 106 requirements dictate that the evaluations should be updated at this point. Also referenced was the NH survey policy (available on the NHDHR website at http://www.nh.gov/nhdhr/programs/documents/archhistsurveypolicy.pdf;) which points to updating the evaluations.

Jill Edelmann questioned if Section 106 requirements were even applicable to the current City project if no Federal funds are involved. Nancy Mayville confirmed that no Federal funds were used in the original NHDOT project beyond the interchange approach roadway west of Mountain Road. Jamie Sikora (FHWA) concurred and confirmed that no Federal funding was involved, and thus a Section 106 requirement is not applicable to the current project.

Edna Feigner noted that NHDHR's comment on the RPR (regarding updating the evaluations) were appropriate in terms of documenting NHDHR's review. However, NHDOT needs to determine if Section 106 is applicable to the current request; if not, there is no federal requirement for the City to apply NHDHR's comments.

Jill Edelmann suggested that Nancy Mayville make a formal determination that Section 106 requirements are not applicable to this project. If so, the City should send a letter back to NHDHR stating that no further project review by NHDHR is needed under Section 106. RSA 227C:9 should be addressed and therefore, Laura Black requested that the city provide a copy of meeting notes and attendee lists related to the previously-noted stakeholder meetings hosted by the city.

Enfield, 12967B, X-A001(087)
Participants: Victoria Chase, Chris Carucci, Jon Evans, NHDOT; Consulting parties: Steve Schneider, Enfield Town Manager; Meredith Smith, Selectwoman/Enfield Heritage and Historic District Commission, Chair

Continued consultation regarding the Main Street/Northern Rail Trail Crossing to discuss the project status and an alternative design proposal.

Jon Evans began by giving a brief overview of the project. This project involves pedestrian improvements and pavement rehabilitation along Main Street and in Enfield, NH. The project begins approximately 25 feet north of the Main Street/Bridge Street intersection and proceeds north/northeast approximately 1,000 feet to a point approximately 250 feet to the northeast of the Main Street/Sargent Street intersection.

The Northern Rail Trail (formerly the Northern Railroad) passes over Main Street within the project area via a narrow, low clearance bridge. For several years the Department has been working to address various concerns associated with this crossing. In 2010 when the Shaker Bridge was closed due to structural concerns and in advance of the replacement effort, the Department was forced to construct a temporary bypass road around the Northern Rail Trail Bridge in order to allow emergency vehicles, delivery trucks and school buses to access the neighborhood between Mascoma Lake and the rail trail.

Upon completion of the newly constructed Shaker Bridge, the Department began investigating various alternatives which would address vehicle and pedestrian passage issues within the project limits. Among varous alternatives that were reviewed were several alternatives which would have eliminated the Northern Rail Trail Bridge over Main Street through the creation of an at-grade Main Street crossing. These alternatives were met with opposition and concern over an at-grade crossing. As a result the Town of Enfield developed a plan which would leave the existing Northern Rail Trail Bridge over Main Street intact, would enhance pedestrian access through the project area and would allow for the creation of a multi-use recreational area on the former motel property between the rail trail and Mascoma Lake. The former motel property is owned by the NH Department of Transportation and the Town of Enfield holds an access agreement allowing it to use the property for recreational purposes.

Chris Carrucci explained the details of the proposed improvements along Main Street within the project area. The intent of this effort is to connect the sidewalks on either side of the project area to allow for continuous pedestrian access between Enfield Village and Mascoma Lake. This will be achieved by constructing a sidewalk across the former motel property between the Northern Rail Trail and Mascoma Lake to the east of the Northern Rail Trail Bridge. A portion of the pavement along the bypass road will be removed to offset the additional pavement/impervious surface area necessary to construct the new sidewalk and make the bypass road less likely to be used by unauthorized traffic. Gates will also be installed to prevent vehicles from accessing the northern rail trail. The main street pavement surface within the project area will be rehabilitated to gain several additional inches of clearance beneath the Northern Rail Trail Bridge. The parking area on the former motel property will be enhanced as necessary and landscaping features such a boulders or blocks will be installed between the lake and the parking area. C. Carrucci noted that the Department was aware of an archaeologically sensitive site to the northeast of the existing bypass road; however the site is at least approximately 150’ from any of the proposed efforts.

Both Meredith Smith and Steve Schneider expressed enthusiastic support for the proposed effort as it would enhance the recreational opportunities available to visitors to Mascoma Lake as well as connect the sidewalk between the Village of Enfield and the Lake and provide direct access to the Northern Rail Trail.

Based upon the project proposal, Jill Edelmann suggested a section 106 determination of No Historic Properties Affected. Laura Black and Edna Feighner agreed and indicated that they did not have any concerns with a No Historic Properties Affected determination. Jamie Sikora indicated that the FHWA could agree with a No Historic Properties Affected determination. J. Edelmann indicated that she would prepare a No Historic Properties Affected Memorandum for signature by FHWA, NHDOT and NHDHR.

Ossipee 14749, X-A000(490)
Participants: Christine Perron, McFarland Johnson; Victoria Chase, Mike Dugas, Jennifer Reczek, Jason Tremblay, NHDOT

Continuing consultation to discuss the current status of the project and alternatives analysis. Jill Edelmann introduced the project, noting that the consultation was initiated in 2011 and inventory forms have been completed on three bridges and a property located at the corner of one bridge. Of these four resources, it has been determined that two bridges are eligible for the National Register.

Mike Dugas provided an overview of the project. The purpose of the project is to remove three bridges from the Red List and rehabilitate 3.2 miles of NH Route 16, beginning approximately 300' south of Captain Lovewell Lane and ending just south of the NH Route 25 (West Ossipee) intersection. Roadway work will involve pavement reclaim, which will increase the roadway elevation by 1 foot. No widening is proposed. Guardrail will be replaced and existing drainage will be addressed. The condition of all drainage structures, which are currently 50 to 60 years old, still needs to be assessed and the limits of slope work still need to be finalized. The Department will continue to consult with DHR if any drainage structures are found to be potentially historic or if there will be work outside the right-of-way on properties of concern.

Jennifer Reczek provided an overview of bridge design alternatives. The Lovell River Bridge, which is not eligible for the National Register, is a steel I-beam bridge with a concrete deck. The deck is in poor condition and needs to be replaced. Since the roadway just south of the bridge floods just above the 10-year flood elevation, the bridge will be replaced in order to reduce the frequency of flooding to just below the Q100 elevation. A temporary bridge will be installed to the west of the existing bridge to maintain traffic during construction.

The Bearcamp River Bridge and Bearcamp Relief Bridge are both eligible for the National Register. Both bridges were constructed in 1955 and added to the Red List in 2004. The substructure of each bridge is rated a 5 out of 9 (fair). The deck and superstructure is rated a 4 out of 9 (poor) on the Bearcamp River Bridge and a 3 out of 9 (serious) on the Bearcamp Relief Bridge. Some of the design details that make these bridges unique are the features that have led to their deterioration. The open grid shoulder and sidewalk allow salt and water through the bridge deck. This has contributed to substantial section loss and deterioration, particularly on the exterior girder and metal coping. There is also deterioration of the piles.

Rehabilitation of the Bearcamp River and Bearcamp Relief bridges would entail the following:

- Remove concrete deck, steel grates and supporting members and guardrail and replace with concrete deck and crash tested rail;
- Replace exterior girders and install new cross frames in exterior bays;
- Repair and paint interior girders and cross frames;
- Replace bearings;
- Repair concrete pile caps and abutments;
- Jacket piles with FRP wrap to counteract section loss (fiber-reinforced polymer).

The existing bridges are not wide enough to accommodate alternating one-way traffic during rehabilitation. Therefore, a temporary detour bridge would need to be constructed to the west of the existing bridges. Due to the length of time the temporary detour would be in place, FEMA requires that the detour be constructed to meet the 100-year flood elevation. The cost of the diversion alone would be approximately $4 million. The bridge rehabilitation alternative would total approximately $7.7 million.

A number of different replacement alternatives have also been considered, with the slide-in bridge alternative the preferred replacement option. With this option, the new substructure is constructed while maintaining alternating one-way traffic. The superstructure is constructed on temporary supports adjacent to the final bridge location. The road is then closed for a 60-hour period to allow time to remove the existing bridge and move the new superstructure into place. Bridge slide technology has been done elsewhere in the country but has never been done in New Hampshire. This alternative would cost approximately $6.5 million. In addition to the lower cost, this alternative would also result in less impact to natural resources such as the river, floodplain, and adjacent wetlands.

Christine Perron noted that letters were sent to town officials and the local historical society in 2011 to ask for input on potential concerns regarding natural and cultural resources. A Public Informational Meeting was held in January 2013, at which time the consulting party process was described. To date, no concerns regarding historic resources have been raised and there are no consulting parties. Another Public Informational Meeting will be held later this spring.

Laura Black stated that it's clear that the existing bridges have substantial deterioration, and the rehabilitation would be substantial. Obviously rehabilitation would be the best option from a historic perspective but if the bridges are past the point where rehab is prudent, and replacement is selected, then the project would result in an adverse effect.

L. Black asked if other detour options were explored in lieu of a temporary bridge. J. Reczek replied that NH Route 16 is the only National Highway System route that runs north-south on the east side of NH. There are no good options for detours using state routes for the one or more construction seasons needed for the rehabilitation. Two detour routes have been identified for the two weekend closures required for the bridge slide option, NH Route 153 to the east of the project and a westerly detour using NH Routes 28,171, 109 and 25. These roads provide a lower level-of-service than NH Route 16 and are rather lengthy; therefore they would not be suitable for use during the rehabilitation.

Jamie Sikora noted that bridge replacement would qualify as a Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation.

C. Perron said that the project would be discussed at a future Cultural Resource meeting following the Public Informational Meeting. Mitigation options could be discussed at that time.

Lancaster-Guildhall 16155, A001(159)
Participants: Joe Adams, Marc Laurin, NHDOT; Jeannine Russell, Kyle Obenauer, VTrans (on phone)

Continuing consultation to discuss mitigation measures associated with the determined Adverse Effect, and steps to move forward with the Section 106 process.

Jeannine Russell stated that the Phase II archaeological report completed by IAC was very good and does not require any revisions. She provided an update on the status of the remaining investigations to be completed in Vermont. VTrans is in the process of hiring Dr. John Crock, UVM Consulting Archaeology Program, to complete the Phase III investigation starting in late May. Joe Adams indicated that HTA coordinated with the landowner on the previous investigations and Jeannine should contact Ed Weingartner for the landowner's contact information.

Jill Edelmann started the discussion on the mitigation measures due to the Adverse Effect from the proposed demolition of the US 2 bridge over the Connecticut River (Roger's Rangers Bridge). NHDOT is suggesting standard mitigation measures such as documentation of the bridge, interpretive signage and marketing of the bridge. Kyle Obenauer agreed that these correspond to Vermont's standard measures #1, 2 and 9. He inquired whether an overlook (measure #17) was appropriate. It was decided that as the proposed 10-foot sidewalk is designed mainly for snowmobile use and the fact that there are no walking trails on either side of the bridge, that an overlook would not be appropriate. Kyle asked for consideration of measure #19, that the design of the new bridge be compatible with the surrounding historic and natural environment and appropriate to the massing and feel of the existing bridge. Joe Adams stated that the design of the bridge is at 30% and the design is for a standard two span concrete deck with steel girders. There will be one piers, as presently exist, with each span to be 200 feet in length. Plans of the design will be forwarded to Jeannine and Kyle for them to provide input on the design. Laura Black agreed with the mitigation options to be considered.

Jeannine thought that depending on the results of the archeological investigations there may need to be a Native American component to the signage. Laura also thought that there may be other broader education options that may be appropriate if the information is too much to place on a panel and further discussion is needed on determining the most appropriate place to erect the signage.

A discussion ensued on how best to complete the Adverse Effects Memo due to the different processes between Vtrans and NHDOT. Jeannine and Kyle stated that Vermont's Programmatic Agreement with FHWA has specifics guidelines on information that must be included in the Memo. Jill will provide the DRAFT Memo to Jeannine and Kyle for them to review and add in their appropriate language.

Jamie Sikora stated that the impacts to the bridge will result in a Programmatic 4(f). He inquired if the archaeology will also require 4(f) documentation. Jeannine stated that she did not think the archaeology will rise to the level that would require a 4(f) evaluation. Jamie stated that NH FHWA will be the lead on the 4(f)evaluation and that both FHWA divisions will sign off on the Section 106 Memo. A copy of the 4(f) will be made available to VT FHWA for their review.

Submitted by: Sheila Charles and Jill Edelmann, Cultural Resources

New Hampshire Department of Transportation
Cultural Resources Agency Coordination Meeting

Date April 21, 2016

Please initial next to your name. Guests: Please use reverse side to sign in.

Initial	Name	Agency	Email Address
LB	Laura Black	NH Division of Historical Resources	laura.black@dcr.nh.gov
	Richard Boisvert	NH Division of Historical Resources	Richard.Boisvert@dcr.nh.gov
SC	Sheila Charles	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	scharles@dot.state.nh.us
VC	Victoria Chase	NHDOT – Highway Design	vchase@dot.state.nh.us
RC	Ronald Crickard	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	rchrickard@dot.state.nh.us
	Michael Dugas	NHDOT – Highway Design	mdugas@dot.state.nh.us
JE	Jill Edelmann	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	jedelmann@dot.state.nh.us
EMF	Edna Feighner	NH Division of Historical Resources	Edna.feighner@dcr.nh.gov
	Ron Grandmaison	NHDOT – Highway Design	rgrandmaison@dot.state.nh.us
	Bob Landry	NHDOT – Bridge Design	rlandry@dot.state.nh.us
	Marc Laurin	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	mlaurin@dot.state.nh.us
	Leigh Levine	Federal Highway Administration	Leigh.Levine@dot.gov
	Stephen Liakos	NHDOT – Community Planning	scliakos@dot.state.nh.us
	Don Lyford	NHDOT – Highway Design	dlyford@dot.state.nh.us
	Beth Muzzey	NH Division of Historical Resources	elizabeth.muzzey@dcr.nh.gov
	Kevin Nyhan	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	knyhan@dot.state.nh.us
JS	Jamie Sikora	Federal Highway Administration	jamie.sikora@fhwa.dot.gov
	Pete Stamnas	NHDOT – Highway Design	pstamnas@dot.state.nh.us
	Cindy Vigue	Federal Highway Administration	Cindy.Vigue@dot.gov
	CR Willeke	NHDOT – Planning	cwilleke@dot.state.nh.us

Please fill in all of the requested information. April 21, 2016

Name	Agency	Phone #	Email Address
✓ David McNamara	Stantec	603-250-6416	david.mcnamara@Stantec.com
✓ Christina B. Hall	City of Lebanon	603.448.3112	Christina.Hall@lebanonnh.com
✓ C.R. Willcox	NHDOT	603 271 6472	cwillcox@
✓ NANCY MAYVILLE	NHDOT	271-1609	Nmayville@dot.state.nh.us
✓ Rob Mack	City of Concord	225-8520	rmack@concordnh.gov
✓ ED ROBERGE	CITY OF CONCORD	(603) 225-8520	eroberge@concordnh.gov
✓ MEREDITH SMITH	ENFIELD	603 632-4093	meredithsmith22@comcast.net
✓ STEVE Schneider	ENFIELD	?	
✓ Christine Perron	M J	225-2978	cperron@mjinc.com
✓ Jennifer Reczek	NHDOT	271-2731	jreczek@dot.state.nh.us
✓ MICHAEL DUGAS	NHDOT	271-2604	mdugas@dot.state.nh.us
✓ Jason Tremblay	NHDOT	271-2731	jtremblay@dot.state.nh.us
✓ Joe Adams	NHDOT	271-2731	JAdams@dot.state.nh.us