BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT
CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting
DATE OF CONFERENCES: May 5 and 12, 2011
LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building
ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT
Jill Edelmann
Jon Evans
Rick Faul
Samantha Fifield
Ron Grandmaison
Joyce McKay
Kirk Mudgett
Carol Niewola
Kevin Nyhan
Christine Perron
Alex Vogt
Tony Weatherbee

NHDHR
Laura Black
Edna Feighner
Jim Garvin

DRED
Jennifer Codispoti
Chris Gamache
Bill Gegas

CLD
Karen O'Rourke

Gale Associates
Erik Strand

HTA
Sean James

NAA
Royce Rankin

Stantec
Jerry Fortin
Michael Leach

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

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

May 5, 2011 1
Recreation Trails Program 1
Bow-Concord, 13742B (no federal number) 2
May 12, 2011 2
Andover 14679A (no federal number) 2
Stewartstown (no project number) 3
Lebanon, NH - Hartford, VT, A000(627), 14957 4
Campton (no project number) 5
Wolfeboro, X-A001(116), 16070 6
Lebanon, X-A000(906), 15717 7
Swanzey 14196 (no federal number) 7
Claremont, X-A000(418), 14494 7
Nashua Municipal Airport (Boire Field) 8

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

May 5, 2011

Recreation Trails Program
Participants: Jennifer Codispoti, Chris Gamache, Bill Gegas, DRED

The yearly review of the grant applications for the recreation trails program took place. There were six grant applications that NHDHR/NHDOT had questions or comments on. All other projects not listed below were cleared of any cultural resource concerns.

11-004 – Please remind the Town of Goffstown to avoid any stone culverts along the existing rail trail.
11-016 – It is asked that if the Friends of the Northern Rail trail are proposing any additional improvements along the line (including mile marker painting), that they present these improvements to the Cultural Resources committee, as the Northern Railroad is an eligible resource. The grading and rolling proposed in the grant application was acceptable as they are avoiding the culverts and bridges along the line.
11-027 – It was asked that the Cohos Trail Association check on the age of the stone stairs they are proposing to rebuild. It was pointed out that the stairs could be a CCC effort.

[Note: After the meeting, the Cohas Trail Association confirmed that the stone stairs on Mt. Sanguinary were originally put in by the North Country Trailmasters (high school) student program in 2000, and therefore do not possess any cultural or historic concerns.]

11-034 – The Town of Hudson is proposing a new trail be constructed at Benson's Park. The grant application mentioned that an archaeologist would be consulted. NHDHR asked that the archaeologist note all the features in the area, and that construction avoid any and all current park features.
11-042 – There were no issues with the stream bank stabilization, however NHDHR requested that the Whitefield Snow Kings forward pictures of the trestle bridge to their office.
11-048 – The City of Lebanon is proposing to remove 650 feet of rail near the downtown area. It was asked that this project be presented to the Cultural Resources committee with additional pictures of the work proposed on the bridge, and if any additional resources will be impacted. [See June 2, 2011 minutes for follow-up).

Bow-Concord, 13742B (no federal number)
Participants: Joyce McKay, Kevin Nyhan, NHDOT; Edna Feighner, Linda Wilson and Laura Black, NHDHR

Joyce McKay, Edna Feighner, Linda Wilson and Laura Black visited the site to determine the limits of ground disturbance at the State Hospital grounds. Based on that review, the soils around the Bow Brook channel in the vicinity of the old golf course were determined to be disturbed. As such, no additional archaeological investigation is required. No further survey work is needed and the existing memo is sufficient.

May 12, 2011

Andover 14679A (no federal number)
Participants: Jon Evans, Samantha Fifield, and Ron Grandmaison, NHDOT

Jon Evans and Samantha Fifield began by giving a brief overview of the proposed project. This project involves replacing the existing 48" corrugated metal culvert that carries Mitchell Brook beneath NH Route 11/ US Route 4. This culvert is undersized and during periods of heavy flow, the waters of Mitchell Brook overtop the roadway causing damage and a temporary road closure. During events such as this one, the roadway floods not only at the subject culvert, but also along many of the nearby alternative routes. This essentially cuts off portions of the town and requires

traffic (including emergency response vehicles) to be detoured all the way down to Concord or up to Canaan to get from one side of town to the other.

The Department proposes to replace the existing structure with a 14' wide by 8' tall concrete box culvert. The invert elevation of the proposed culvert will be depressed 2-feet below the streambed elevation to provide for a natural bottom within the culvert. Scour holes at the inlet and the outlet of the existing pipe will be filled in with natural material to match the surrounding streambed elevations and provide for a more naturalized stream channel. The culvert has been designed to pass a Q50 and will also pass a Q100, assuming that floodwaters from the Blackwater River do not rise enough to cause a backwater condition, resulting in water backing up into and through the culvert. These backwater conditions occur with the existing culvert and will continue to occur under the proposed culvert design due to the flooding dynamics of the surrounding area.

The project will require a drainage easement at both the inlet and outlet of the structure. These drainage easements will require minor property impacts to parcels 1, 2, 4 and 5. The project will also require a slope easement, which will impact parcels 5 and 6.

J. Evans indicated that of the properties, which will be impacted by the project, only parcel 2 contains any building structures. Pictures of the project area were presented including pictures of the house located on parcel 2. S. Fifield indicated that there were several large trees located between the road and the house on parcel 2 and that the department has no plans to impact this vegetative screen. All impacts to parcel two will be located directly adjacent to the proposed structure.

J. Evans and Joyce McKay indicated that the Mitchell Brook Culvert is located outside the boundaries of the Andover Historic District as defined by a previous study.

Edna Feighner indicated that the project could proceed as proposed without concern for archaeology. Laura Black indicated that the project did not appear to impact any area historic resources and therefore a no historic properties affected determination could be made. J. McKay indicated that she would prepare a No Historic Properties Effected Memo for signature at the next meeting.

Stewartstown (no project number)
Participants: Christine Perron

Christine Perron gave an overview of the project. District 1 has been asked to address a landowner complaint about poor drainage on the Rosa Marshall property on US Route 3 in Stewartstown. The District has proposed to install a new catch basin on Route 3 at the west end of the Marshall property; a new drop inlet in an existing drainage ditch along the rail corridor on the east end of the Marshall property; and a 15" pipe connecting the two along the south side of the property. Excavation at the deepest point will be approximately 7 feet.

While the 1914 map does not, the 1925 Sanborn map shows the house and barn on the Marshall property with a small attached structure off the south side of the barn (where the current property line is now located). This previously attached structure is no longer standing and excavation for

the drainage pipe will occur in this location. For these reasons, Edna Feighner asked that an archaeological monitor be present on site during construction. As the drainage pipe will be constructed along the edge of the property in a manner that will return the yard to existing visual conditions, except for a small grate at either pipe end, Laura Black indicated that preparation of an individual inventory form for the Marshall property would not be necessary. However, if construction will impact the barn (or other structures) on the property then the project should return to the Cultural Resources committee meeting.

C. Perron will ask District 1 about the anticipated date of construction. Once the date is known, Joyce McKay will provide an estimate for the archaeological monitor.

Lebanon, NH - Hartford, VT, A000(627), 14957
Participants: Jillian Edelmann, Christine Perron, and Alex Vogt, NHDOT; Jim Garvin, NHDHR

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the possible creation of a historic bridge website. Jill Edelmann explained that, in lieu of updating the Connecticut River Joint Commissions website and the installation of an interpretative panel for mitigation, the Department was proposing to instead create a historic bridge website. This is something that DOT Web Services or Rich Casella could create. A state historic marker will still be installed in NH and VT as part of the Lebanon-Hartford project. Rich Casella had suggested that a small plaque could be attached to the historic marker that directed readers to the bridge website for more information. A bridge website could serve as a receptacle for files such as monographs and HAER documents. It would include an introductory page on the history of bridges and transportation, more detailed pages for each historic bridge in the state, and a detailed page on the history of bridges over the Connecticut River. Additions and updates to this website could serve as potential mitigation for future projects.

Laura Black said that DHR had started a bridge website that wasn't yet available to the public. After discussions in her office, she felt that it might be good to house a bridge website at DHR since that would be where people would be more likely to look for such information. Alex Vogt and Edna Feighner both commented that it should depend on who would be populating the website. J. Edelmann also added that the website would likely provide positive publicity for the DOT. She did not intend for the website to look like the existing DOT site. DHR and others could link to the site.

Jim Garvin commented that the future of such a website would depend on continuity and commitment. He added that there was potential for a lot of different types of information to be included on the site. L. Black stated that she didn't want the website to be just a repository for lost bridges. It should instead be a website on all historic bridges written from a historian's perspective. J. Garvin added that it should include a general history of bridge building and transportation; it should convey the state's engineering legacy.

L. Black suggested that there would be a lot to discuss about the website and a separate meeting should be scheduled. Joyce McKay said that the idea needed to be discussed with the DOT Commissioner's Office before proceeding any further.

L. Black commented that the proposed interpretative panel for the Lebanon-Hartford bridge would have a very different audience than a website would. She asked how that audience would be reached without the panel. J. Garvin asked if the Department had an issue with the cost of the panel or if people were thinking the website was just a better way to go about this. A. Vogt responded that he felt the website was just a better way to provide more information. There was also the issue of the park where the panel would be placed. It is still not known where the panel would be installed or when the park would even be constructed. J. McKay summarized the concerns with an interpretative panel: 1) As has been the case with Newfield-Stratham, it is difficult to fund the creation and installation of a panel following the completion of construction; 2) the Department does not know when the park in Lebanon will be constructed; 3) once a panel is installed, who maintains it could be an issue, especially when considering potential vandalism; and 4) a panel has a finite lifespan. She added that the panel in Bristol was never installed because the town was concerned about vandalism. The Town placed the content of the panel on its website.

L. Black asked that the Department get feedback from the City of Lebanon on this issue. She also suggested that another option may be to create a brochure, for example a tri-fold brochure, instead of a panel, and the City could place the brochures at the park once it has been constructed. A. Vogt agreed to discuss this with the City.

Regarding potential rail systems for the proposed bridge, L. Black stated that the information that Scott Newman sent was reviewed, and it was DHR's preference to have a short concrete parapet with a metal railing on top of it that would be similar to the railing on the existing bridge. A. Vogt stated that Bridge Design is still evaluating rail systems and that rail and lighting options still needed to be discussed with Lebanon and Hartford officials. This will be discussed at a future meeting.

Campton (no project number)
BRPI funding
Participants: Tony Weatherbee, NHDOT

This was the initial review of proposed repairs to a 1934 concrete arch on Route 175 over the Beebe River (144/092). The proposed work includes repairs to the arch spandrel wall and replacing one of the concrete rails. It is unknown what caused one rail to deterioration at a much higher rate that the other. Bridge Maintenance is proposing to replace the degraded rail and to leave the rail that is in good shape in place. The proposed design of the new rail would mimic the current concrete arch design with shadow lines and depressions, along with an overhanging concrete coping. It is unlikely the new rail would have open arches, as it needs to meet current safety standards.

Laura Black asked that an individual inventory form be completed on the bridge, and thought it would most likely be an eligible resource. It was listed in the 1988 bridge survey as an excellent example of its type with a noteworthy span, and received a high score. It was recognized that the plan to repair the bridge does minimize the impacts. Joyce McKay noted that the other option was to place W-beam in front of the current rail. Although the w-beam is reversible, there would still be a visual impact to the bridge, the historic bridge rail would continue to deteriorate, and it would be less likely that a similar minimization option would be available if repair work was postponed.

For those reasons, L. Black stated that the proposed project, while resulting in an Adverse Effect, appears to be the most beneficial option for the resource.

Steve Johnson will get the project schedule to J. McKay, who can then provide an estimate for the documentation to bridge maintenance. E. Feighner asked that M. Urban complete the RPR form and submit to NHDHR. Thus, the project as presented would create an adverse effect and require a MOA since there would be federal involvement.

Wolfeboro, X-A001(116), 16070
Participants: Gerard Fortin and Michael Leach (michael.leach@stantec.com), Stantec

Michael Leach opened the meeting with a presentation of the overall plan for the sidewalk project with an explanation of the color coding used with the plan showing the existing sidewalk to be reconstructed, areas of new sidewalk, reconstructed driveways, pavement removal to become grass areas, and areas along the frontage of properties which will be re-landscaped with grass upon completion of the proposed improvements. The ages of building within the project area as discussed were noted with photographs provided to the Committee for locations where improvements would be adjacent to or upon lots with buildings greater than 50 years old. Specifically, 46 School St, 39 Union St, 40 Union St, 29 School St., 25 School St., 19 School St., 20 School St., 34/36 Glendon St, 42 Glendon St., 50 Glendon St., 54/56 Glendon St., 62 Glendon St., 51 Glendon St., 59/61 Glendon St., 9 Lehner St., 15 Lehner St., 4 Lehner St., and 79 Glendon St. were presented and the proposed improvements at each location were discussed in detail.

At 39, Union Street, a fence would be moved back on the property. A tree would be removed from the right of way in front of 61 Glendon. The Committee discussed locations 9 Lehner St., 15 Lehner St. and 4 Lehner St., where proposed small retaining walls would be constructed to address the grade changes. The Committee asked what type of wall would be constructed and if there was a detail available to review. J. Fortin indicated a design for the wall was not completed at this time, but the wall would likely be a modular block wall that would use a form liner to create a look similar to a cobble type face. The Committee seemed agreeable to this type of design. The Committee asked if the Owner's were agreeable to the wall. J. Fortin indicated that certificate of right-way-way is needed for the project, and that the Town would need to get agreements under the project. The Committee recommended a detail of the proposed wall be provided and a copy of documentation be provided acknowledging that each property Owner is agreeable to the proposed wall design. The Committee noted the proposed project through a consensus determination of eligibility as a historic district, would have, as it is now defined, a no adverse effect with a de minimis impact, meaning that the impact are so limited that there would be no 4(f).

It was agreed that Stantec would provide the following to the Committee to complete the review for the project:

A detail of the proposed wall and supporting information (in a letter or memo from the Town) acknowledging that the property owners at 9 Lehner St., 15 Lehner St. and 4 Lehner St. are agreeable with the proposed retaining wall design at their properties.

Lebanon, X-A000(906), 15717
Participants: Rick Faul, Kirk Mudgett, and Kevin Nyhan, NHDOT

Kevin Nyhan, Kirk Mudgett and Rick Faul discussed this project, which would replace the concrete box culvert that carries the outlet channel of Boston Lot Lake under NH Route 10 in Lebanon. Work would involve removal of the existing culvert and installation of a new culvert adjacent to it. An easement for construction and maintenance would be required from an adjacent property that is not 50 years old or older. After discussion about the archaeological sensitivity of this area, which is close to the Connecticut River, it was agreed that if work can be contained within the impact area depicted on the plans as of the date of the meeting, no archaeological survey would be required. Under these conditions, the project would receive a no historic property affected memo. If additional impact/disturbance area were needed, archaeological survey would be required.

Swanzey 14196 (no federal number)
Participants: Sean James, Hoyle Tanner (sjames@hoyletanner.com)

Sean James from Hoyle, Tanner presented the project, which includes installation of a deluge sprinkler system within the Cresson Covered Bridge, a lattice structure. Funding is being provided by Town and NHDOT Bridge Aid funds. The sprinkler will be feed from either end of the bridge from a fire department connection, approximately 40’ to 70’ away from the bridge. The feed pipe will be installed underground, go through the existing backwall and up the south face of the bridge. The outside pipe diameter of the feed pipe is 5” and therefore a bump out in the siding will be required to hide the pipe on the outside of the bridge. Inside the bridge, the pipe will be hidden to the greatest extent possible and painted brown to blend into the bridge better. There will be three sprinkler lines. No existing bridge members, other than 2 pieces of siding will be cut, removed or altered as part of this work. NHDHR asked if the paint could be supplied in a matte finish. S. James will check paint finish availability. It was the consensus of the committee that the Effect Memo could be signed, as “There will be No Adverse Effect on Historic or Archaeological Properties”.

Claremont, X-A000(418), 14494
Participants: Karen O’Rourke, CLD (kareno@cldengineers.com)

Karen O'Rourke, PE of CLD Consulting Engineers, attended the meeting to request that the Categorical Exclusion Document be amended to remove the commitment to provide black bridge rail at the Maple Avenue box culvert. Ms. O'Rourke presented a letter from the City of Claremont supporting the request, a plan showing the original design and the current design, and photos of the subject and the surrounding areas. Changes to the original design for the culvert replacement resulted in the elimination of the bridge rail and the use of standard galvanized W-beam guard rail. It was noted that only one side of the roadway was to have bridge rail and the other side would have standard W-beam in the original proposal. Since the current proposal includes standard galvanized guardrail on both sides (which is consistent with the galvanized rail present there today), and a gentle slope will replace a drop-off at the culvert alleviating concerns for pedestrian

safety and comfort, it was agreed that the commitment for black bridge rail could be removed from the affect memo.

Nashua Municipal Airport (Boire Field)
Participants: Eric Strand, Gale Associates (EWS@GAINC.com; 471-1887); Royce Rankin, Nashua Airport Authority; and Carol Niewola, NHDOT

Eric Strand explained that every Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) funded project is required to carry out the Intergovernmental Review Process (E.O. 12372) that includes coordination with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) on matters relative to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. This project recently submitted E.O. 12372 documents to NHDHR via their Request for Project Review (RPR) form. E. Strand briefly reviewed the content of the identified construction phase of this multi-year project. E. Strand noted that this project will be the construction phase resulting from previously funded planning studies, an environmental assessment, and design and permit efforts.

Laura Black summarized her review of the submitted RPR for this project that indicated that it was "new" project, which for NHDHR means that there were no previous phases that had received NHDHR comments. She explained that she had gone back into the files and found that the airport was started in the 1930s, a 1992 "Form B" (Area Form) had been submitted recommending that the entire airport be considered eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (Register) but that the "Board" (State Historical Resources Council) had denied the recommendation. L. Black did find RPR comments on previous phases of this project and NHDHR's comments on the Environmental Assessment that concluded that no additional efforts with regard to Section 106 were required.

L. Black said that the NHDHR's policies for acting on submitted RPR forms have changed since the previous comments were filed. L. Black is now required to start her review from the beginning and require reviews of all resources that are older than 50 years. Based on her review, she feels that there are resources at the airport that need protection (e.g., 1930's vintage brick hangar, airfield pavement configuration, and airfield pavement to airport building relationships). What she would like to have happen is (1) understand what is at the airport now; (2) wants concurrence from NHDOT, FAA, and airport on Form B because the airport might be eligible for listing on the Register, and (3) wants mitigation for the adverse impact caused by the removal of the old Runway 14-32 when the new one is constructed.

Joyce McKay offered the suggestion that an Affect Memo and Memorandum of Agreement could be prepared, executed, and submitted to NHDHR to address item #2 above. Carol Niewola asked the question who has determined that the airport is eligible for listing on the Register. L. Black said that it would be by a consensus of the attendees of this meeting. C. Niewola objected and stated that she didn't have any information to make this determination and that it is the NHDHR's Board/Council who appears to have that responsibility, and that any action to provide agreements on this would be premature. Additionally, C. Niewola said that because of the history of RPR comments that no additional efforts are required, to require new efforts at this late phase of this project are not justified.

L. Black reiterated that there needs to be more documentation in the NHDHR files to be able to properly evaluate the new projects as they are presented. C. Niewola proposed a compromise. Since the SHPO has the opportunity to provide comments during the Intergovernmental Review Process via the submitted RPR form, C. Niewola suggested that the SHPO acknowledge the previous Section 106 project coordination efforts, but include a new requirement that the airport complete Form B with the next federally funded project at the airport so that the Board/Council can make a determination regarding the eligibility of the airport (or portion thereof) for listing on the Register. Then if an Affect Memo and MOA need to be prepared they can be scoped into that project. J. McKay felt that this compromise would put the review process back in the right order. J. Black was agreeable to that but recognized that once this current project is completed, the existing runway configuration will gone, so she will also ask for an aerial photographic history of the development of the airport prior to demolition of the existing runway. All attendees concurred with this process.

> ***Notes on submitted minutes**:* Laura Black apologized, indicating that DHR had overlooked the fact that it had not reviewed the historical and architectural components of the project when Edna Feighner originally commented indicating that no further archaeological investigations were necessary. Because an inventory form on the airport was last completed in 1992, more than 10 years ago, NHDHR now requires that the form be evaluated to determine if additional/updated survey is needed. It is DHR's recommendation that a Historic District Area Form be completed as a large percentage of the airport's resources are 50 years or older, and some of those resources (such as the brick hanger) are rare resources on airfields. The DHR was willing to make a consensus determination for the purposes of this project, and then recommend preparation of the historic district area form as mitigation for the adverse impact caused by the removal of the old runway 14-32 when the new one is constructed.
>
> The NHDOT suggested that an effect memo could be prepared and submitted, if needed, to address the requested Historic District Area Form. It was never suggested that a Memorandum of Agreement be prepared and signed.
>
> It was determined that this runway project would not have an effect on the airport, however the historic district area form would be completed as mitigation with the next federally funded project at the airport, c. 2013. No memo or MOA would be needed. However, as part of this project, to address the loss of runway 14-32, NHDHR requested that an aerial photographic history of the development of the airport be completed, prior to the demolition of the existing runway. This should include aerial photos of the existing runway configuration, and photos depicting the relationship of the existing runway configuration to the airport's historic buildings/structures.

****Memos/MOA's**: Claremont, X-A000(418), 14494 *updated*; Dover

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