

# BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT CONFERENCE REPORT

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

**DATE OF CONFERENCES:** June 7, 2012

**LOCATION OF CONFERENCE:** John O. Morton Building

**ATTENDED BY:**

**NHDOT**

John Butler  
Dean Eastman  
Jill Edelmann  
Jon Evans  
Cathy Goodmen  
Jon Hebert  
Don Lyford  
Kevin Nyhan  
Christine Perron  
Bill Saffian  
Alex Vogt

**Federal Highway  
Administration**

Jamie Sikora

**NHDHR**

Laura Black  
Edna Feighner  
Peter Michaud  
Beth Muzzey

**VTRANS**

Scott Newman  
Katelyn O’Shea

**City of Dover**  
Doug Steele

**HEB**  
Jason Ross

**Historic  
Documentation Co.**  
Rich Casella

**McFarland-  
Johnson**

Gene McCarthy

**Preservation  
Consultant**  
Elizabeth Hengen

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

**PROJECTS/PRESENTATIONS REVIEWED THIS MONTH:**

*(minutes on subsequent pages)*

<i>June 7, 2012</i> .....	1
Dover, T-3993 .....	1
Carroll, X-A002(196), 21431 .....	3
Lebanon-Hartford, A000(627), 14957.....	4
Enfield, X-A001(087), 12967B.....	6
Pembroke, X-A000(414), 14477A .....	8
Stark, X-A002(371), 20224.....	9
Meredith, STP-F-X-0241(014), 10430.....	11

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

June 7, 2012

**Dover, T-3993**

**Participants:** Doug Steele, City of Dover ([d.steele@dover.nh.gov](mailto:d.steele@dover.nh.gov)); Beth Muzzey, NHDHR

The City of Dover is looking to remove the bypassed Watson Road Bridge between Country Farm Road and Tolend Road, south of the Cocheco River. The 1925 steel, riveted, double intersection Warren Truss was set aside ca. 1985. This bridge was inventoried and found eligible for the National Register of Historic Places in 1985, and because of that finding, the it was agreed that the bridge would be set aside to seek alternate preservation methods. This setting aside of the bridge, and repainting and repairing the bridge on new temporary abutments, resulting in a finding of No Adverse Effect with the NHDOT.

In the letter that outlines the No Adverse Effect finding from NHHPO, dated March 5, 1985, the following stipulations were included: 1) The bridge was to be relocated as part of the project to a state parcel adjacent to its original location, thereby leaving it in its existing setting; 2) The bridge was to be placed on abutments, repaired for non-vehicle use, re-decked, and repainted; and 3) The bridge was to be maintained by the City of Dover for a minimum of ten years.

These three stipulations were discussed in more detail:

1. The bridge was relocated adjacent to its original location. (*Stipulation completed*)
2. The bridge was placed on temporary concrete abutments. The project contract information and shows that the contractor was tasked with cleaning and painting the truss structure and hand rail, along with making the necessary repairs to broken members, redecking, and bracing the truss for its move, and future preservation. The engineering audit sheet, dated March 1986, detailing the contractor payouts notes that the “removal and rehabilitation of the existing bridge structure” was completed. (*Stipulation completed*)
3. The bridge has been maintained, vegetation cleared and graffiti cleaned since it was moved 1985. (*Stipulation completed*)

Also in the March 1985 memo from SHPO, it states that the documentation and archival photographs on of the bridge have been completed. Laura Black noted that the NHDHR does not have a copy of those archival photographs.

Beth Muzzey asked if the city would be willing to advertise the bridge for sale, in an attempt to find a willing buyer. Previously, the Boscawen Painters Union had expressed interest in the bridge, and the ability to use it as a teaching tool. It was agreed that the city would market the bridge once with a historic easement, and then once without. B. Muzzey asked that the advertising schedule be longer than normal, suggesting 6 months to actively market the bridge before it is sold to the highest bidder. A paragraph describing the bridge and its historic nature and significance will be provided to the city for use in their marketing efforts by NHDHR. (Information for advertising the bridge was provided by the DHR on June 29, 2012.)

It was asked if the NHDHR would be willing to look into easement conditions, and possibly cap the number of years the easement pertains to the bridge. This may entice potential buyers as there are no funds available from FHWA, NHDOT, NHDHR or the city to help move the bridge. (The NHDHR determined that use of a 10-year term easement was agreeable.)

NHDHR and the city will look into the archival photograph locations. (The NHDHR has looked again through in-house files and archived files, and inquired of former employees including Jim Garvin and Linda Wilson for any recollection of the Documentation’s completion and submittal, and inquired of Chris Closs, the preservation consultant contracted to do the photography, for any recollection of paperwork indicating the status of the work. Chris Closs remembers completing the photography and believes all materials were sent directly to the National Park Service and then transferred to the Library of Congress. Apparently no copies or prints were retained in New Hampshire. He will look for the HAER number so they can be tracked down as they don’t appear in online searches.)

**Carroll, X-A002(196), 21431****Participants: Dean Eastman, Jon Hebert, Christine Perron, NHDOT; Peter Michaud and Beth Muzzey, NHDHR**

Jon Hebert provided an update on the project. The project consists of the reconstruction and expansion of the existing Mount Washington Hotel Scenic Overlook on the westbound side of US Route 302, as well as the construction of a new scenic overlook on the eastbound side of US Route 302 opposite from the existing overlook. The location of the new overlook is on a hillside. Recently completed geotechnical borings have revealed that the site is very wet and ledge is present on the site. These factors led to design changes. The newest layout is in approximately the same location as the layout originally presented and has the same amount of parking. The biggest change is the increased wall size at the front of the overlook adjacent to US Route 302. The wall will be 10-15 feet tall and will be MSE construction, which is essentially a block wall. There will still be a retaining wall at the back of the overlook. The latest design also incorporates a berm and ditch along the back of the overlook in order to collect water from the hillside and keep it separate from the water coming off the parking area.

Christine Perron provided an update on issues and concerns that were raised at the previous meeting. Regarding the Mount Washington Hotel, Peter Michaud confirmed that the boundary of the National Historic Landmark does not extend across Route 302. The existing overlook is located within the Route 302 right-of-way.

Regarding the railroad, the line is the Mountain Division of the Maine Central Railroad is eligible for the National Register. According to information on file at the NHDOT, the line “opened the White Mountains to tourism on a scale that transformed local communities from rural farm villages to busy luxurious resorts”. It’s also significant for its construction and engineering, passing through rough terrain such as Crawford Notch. The Department feels that the view of the Hotel and surrounding mountains that will be created from the clearing required for the new scenic overlook is consistent with why the rail line is eligible for the National Register. The Conway Scenic Railroad, which operates on this line, sent a letter to the Department in support of the new overlook and the removal of trees as proposed.

There was a question at the previous meeting regarding the date of construction of the Lodge at Bretton Woods, which is located adjacent to the proposed overlook. The lodge was built in the early 1970s.

There was also a question at the previous meeting about the Scenic Byway as a resource under any pertinent CRM laws. According to the FHWA Section 4(f) Policy Paper, the designation of a road as a scenic byway is not intended to create a park or recreation area. The improvement of a publicly-owned scenic byway would not come under the purview of Section 4(f).

Finally, at the request of the DHR, an archaeological assessment will be completed this summer within the project area.

Laura Black asked how the Scenic Byway relates to Section 106. She noted that there were certain reasons why this route became a scenic byway and asked if any of these reasons make it a historic resource. Jamie Sikora stated that he would need to look into this.

Beth Muzzey asked for more information on physical impacts to the railroad. J. Hebert explained that there would be slope work within the 20' right-of-way of the rail line; however there would be no impacts to the ballast and tracks. The slope line would be staying within the tree line. B. Muzzey asked if there were any drainage culverts under the railroad within the project area. C. Perron said that she walked the area and saw only metal pipes. J. Hebert added that there are box culverts in the vicinity of the project but they are located outside the project limits and would not be impacted. The project would not be addressing any railroad drainage. B. Muzzey asked if impacting the railroad would be a 4(f) use. J. Sikora responded that the permanent impacts proposed in the railroad right-of-way would be a *de minimis* 4(f) use.

B. Muzzey asked if an example was available for the type of wall being proposed. J. Hebert replied that there were many options such as granite like blocks or MRM. B. Muzzey stated that something natural in appearance would seem most appropriate for the setting. She said that the wall was the only thing with potential to impact the National Historic Landmark and something too modern looking would change the viewshed. It was agreed that photographs of potential wall types would be sent to DHR and the Mount Washington Hotel for comment. The letter from the Conway Scenic Railroad would also be sent to DHR.

P. Michaud commented that the project seemed acceptable from the point of view of the National Historic Landmark, and just asked that there be more coordination regarding the wall. He also asked if the Hotel should be asked to comment on the project. Dean Eastman stated that the Hotel would continue to be included in discussions about the project.

J. Sikora asked if the Scenic Byways group had been asked to comment on the project. D. Eastman said that the group is familiar with the project and had no concerns. The North Country Council has written a letter in support of the project.

### **Lebanon-Hartford, A000(627), 14957**

**Participants: Christine Perron, Bill Saffian, Alex Vogt, NHDOT; Katelyn O'Shea, Scott Newman, VTrans; Beth Muzzey, NHDHR**

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the proposed bridge rail as well as other outstanding stipulations of the MOA. Bill Saffian provided an overview of the project. The project involves the replacement of the US Route 4 bridge over the Connecticut River. The existing bridge was closed to traffic in 2009 and temporary detour bridge was installed. The proposed replacement bridge is a 440' long multi-girder bridge.

At the request of the City of Lebanon, the proposed bridge rail is black anodized 3-bar aluminum rail with balusters. The City also requested concrete light post pedestals that will intermittently break the rail. Photographs of this type of rail system used in Enfield were shown. DOT will be providing conduit to the pedestals and the City will install lights at a later date. An illustration of

what the City is currently considering was shown. The lights will be full cut off LED and the posts would be arched at the top.

Scott Newman asked how tall the lights would be. Alex Vogt said that those details had not been determined yet. The pedestals would be 4 feet tall. B. Saffian said that the DOT will give the City a minimum clearance required for sidewalk use and winter maintenance, but the actual style of lighting would be up to the City. The lighting was more for aesthetic purposes rather than for safety. Lights would be placed at the piers and just behind each abutment for a total of 8 lights.

S. Newman asked about the connection between the bridge rail and pedestals. B. Saffian said that a splice bar would be bolted to a faceplate anchored into the concrete pedestal. Beth Muzzey asked how the concrete pedestals hold up to snow removal. B. Saffian said that the pedestal would be even with the face of the rail.

S. Newman asked about the design on the pedestals. B. Saffian explained that the exact pattern seen in the Enfield photos would be used.

S. Newman stated that he is generally not a big fan of aluminum 3-bar bridge rail but he did like what was being proposed because of the interruptions in the rail from the concrete pedestals. He felt that sometimes this rail can look out of character in a historic area but the pedestals greatly improve the look. He also commented that he is not crazy about the lights that the City is considering and would prefer posts that are not arched at the top. B. Muzzey commented that the choice of lighting was always considered more of a local choice. Laura Black asked if a rendering of the lighting could be shared once the City determined dimensions and style.

B. Muzzey asked if the concrete would be colored. B. Saffian said that it would not be colored.

S. Newman asked if the Town of Hartford had any input in the rail design. A. Vogt said that town officials have stated that they support what the City of Lebanon wants. S. Newman then asked if the end walls could incorporate a plate or inscription that included that bridge number, town/city, date of construction, and town seal on both sides of the road and both ends of the bridge. There was some discussion about what this would look like but in general it was agreed that this could be done. Christine Perron stated that the Department would discuss some options then send to S. Newman and others for review and comment.

S. Newman asked how much approach rail there would be in Vermont. B. Saffian replied that there is only a nominal amount in Vermont. It will turn away from traffic and will be black like the bridge rail.

C. Perron provided an update on additional stipulations of the MOA. State Historic Markers would be placed at both ends of the bridge. The City of Lebanon would also like an interpretive panel that they could incorporate into the kiosk they have planned for the future park. The City has also expressed an interest incorporating the granite blocks from the bridge piers into the park; the blocks will be stockpiled for the City's later use. The Department still needs to complete the documentation of the apartment building at 17 Maple Street, and excavation and documentation of

the Toll house adjacent to the apartment building. It is preferred that this work be done once the building is vacant; however, it is not known when this will be.

The City also asked that form liners be used on the new bridge piers to replicate the granite block look. S. Newman asked if the abutments would get the same treatment. B. Saffian replied that the City didn't see the need to use the form liners on the abutments and felt that smooth concrete would be acceptable. The wing walls would be U-back with the exception of one flared wing. Much of the abutments and wing walls would not be visible. There was discussion about the use of form liners on the abutments and wing walls and it was generally agreed that they should match the piers. A. Vogt stated that the form liner could be used on the NH abutment and wing walls but there may not be enough room on the Vermont abutment to use the form liner.

B. Muzzey asked about the status of the Phase I Historic Bridge Inventory. She noted that the deadlines written in the MOA had come and gone and asked how this effort could get back on track before funding from the project expired. It was agreed that a separate meeting was required to discuss funding and status. Jill Edelmans would organize the meeting.

C. Perron confirmed that the final details of the design would be sent via email. S. Newman asked for final plans and commented that he could email his concurrence. L. Black asked about the status of a website. C. Perron noted that information on the history of Connecticut River bridges would be placed on the Connecticut River Joint Commissions website. J. Edelmans added that Rich Casella is working on this effort.

### **Enfield, X-A001(087), 12967B**

**Participants: Jon Evans, Alex Vogt, NHDOT; Alex Bernhard, FNRT; Beth Muzzey, NHDHR**

Jill Edelmans began by indicating that the Department sent Laura Black a letter on May 31, 2012 containing additional information for review prior to this meeting. Jon Evans noted that in the package of information sent to L. Black there was a sheet showing the latest revisions to the project's Purpose, Need and Secondary Goals and Objectives statements. He indicated that a preliminary version of these statements were discussed at the October 13, 2011 Cultural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting. Since the October meeting, these statements were reviewed with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and several changes were made as a result of FHWA's review.

J. Evans asked if there were any questions, comments or concerns regarding the project's Purpose, Need and Secondary Goals and Objectives statements that were previously provided. Beth Muzzey indicated that she had concerns with the two bullets found in the Secondary Goals and Objectives statement that reference minimizing impacts to historic resources and preserving the continuity of the rail-trail. B. Muzzey indicated that she felt that these bullets directly relate to regulations, which require the avoidance and/or minimization of impacts to historic resources. J. Evans indicated that he did not feel that these bullets really belong in the project purpose or need statements, as they do not directly relate to the transportation purpose and need of this project. B. Muzzey agreed that these items did not necessarily have to go into the project's purpose and/or need statements though it minimizes the regulatory process by putting them in the same category as "nice things to do." Alex Vogt asked if B. Muzzey had any suggestions as to better incorporate

these two bullets and address this concern. B. Muzzey indicated that she would think about some suggestions and would get back to the Department once she had given it some thought.

J. Evans indicated that the Department is finishing up the final touches on the Draft Environmental Study/Categorical Exclusion & Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation and as such would like to include a Section 106 Memorandum of Effects for the preferred alternative. He indicated that the Department has identified Alternative 2A as the preferred alternative and as a result prepared a draft Adverse Effect Memo which was provided in advance of this meeting. He indicated that this memorandum simply verifies the adverse effect determination made for Alternative 2A at the August 4, 2011 Cultural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting. J. Evans asked if there were any questions or comments regarding the prepared memo.

Alex Bernhard expressed concern that Alternative 2A was identified as the preferred alternative over some of the other alternatives when it results in what he believes to be greater impacts to the Northern Rail Trail. He asked how the Department came to identifying alternative 2A as the preferred alternative. J. Evans indicated that reasons behind the Department's identification of Alternative 2A are extensive and have been detailed in the forthcoming Draft Environmental Study. He indicated that given the complexity of this decision, it would be best to wait until the study is released and everyone has had a chance to review its contents prior to discussing A. Bernhard's concerns with the preferred alternative.

A. Bernhard indicated that he was concerned with the removal of an additional at-grade crossing and its effect on the Northern Railroad Corridor's eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. He requested that a 3<sup>rd</sup> party investigate the effect the removal of this grade separated railroad crossing will have on the corridor of the Northern Railroad. He also requested the inclusion of the following paragraph within the effects memo:

“An additional adverse effect on the corridor will result from the fact that this will be the 12<sup>th</sup> bridge removal and the 5<sup>th</sup> loss of grade separation (with resulting at grade crossing) since the corridor was acquired by the NHDOT. If the Memorandum of Agreement referred to below is prepared, it will address this effect as well as any other.”

Jill Edelmann suggested that the preparation of an updated District Area Form for the Northern Railroad Corridor could be included as an additional form of mitigation for the proposed project. Jamie Sikora indicated that the FHWA would consider A. Bernhard's request for inclusion of the above noted language in the effects memo as well as his request for an additional study of the corridor.

J. Evans reiterated that the Department typically includes the memorandum of effect in the Draft Environmental Study and as such was simply requesting a confirmation of the effects determination made for Alternative 2A for inclusion in the document. Edna Feighner indicated that although NHDHR still agrees that Alternative 2A would result in an adverse effect on the corridor of the Northern Railroad, as was determined at the August 4, 2011 meeting, NHDHR was not in a position to sign the Adverse Effect Memo at this time.

J. Sikora indicated that he would discuss with others at FHWA to determine whether or not the Draft Environmental Study/Categorical Exclusion & Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation would be finalized without a Section 106 Memorandum of Effects. It was agreed that the project would be reviewed again at the Monthly Cultural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting once NHDHR and the consulting parties have had an opportunity to review the information contained within the Draft Environmental Study/Categorical Exclusion & Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation.

**Pembroke, X-A000(414), 14477A**

**Participants: John Butler, Cathy Goodmen, Don Lyford, NHDOT**

This project is to improve the intersection of US Route 3, Pembroke Hill Road and Bow Lane. C. Goodmen reviewed the project history, as L. Black had not been involved since its last cultural resources review in April of 2006. J. Butler continued describing the current project plans. The project originally was going to construct a roundabout at this intersection due to accidents, including one fatality, but the design was not supported at the public hearing. The Town has since asked NHDOT to consider adding a center left turn lane, a sidewalk on the west side of US Route 3, improving the side walk on the north side of Pembroke Hill Road and installing signals at the intersection. Part of this project would include re-aligning Bow Lane to enter the intersection opposite Pembroke Hill Road, allowing a four-way signal.

A public meeting was held on May 14, 2012 where the signaled intersection was supported by most in attendance. A public hearing is tentatively scheduled for August 8, 2012.

During the investigations for the original roundabout, individual inventory forms were prepared for properties located within the area of potential effect. Three of these properties were found eligible for the National Register of Historic places, The Captain William Fife house on parcel 15, the Aaron Whittemore Homestead, on parcel 18 and the Pembroke Street Cemetery. The Cemetery will not be impacted by this project. The only historic impact with the roundabout design was a drainage easement on a small part of the Fife property and the Whittemore property to access the header for a culvert that carries Meetinghouse Brook under Bow Lane. The drainage easement for this culvert will still be needed for the new project.

For the original roundabout project NHDOT received a memo of 'No Historic Properties Affected with de minimis 4(f) impacts' for the drainage easement needed on the Fife and the Whittemore properties.

The new signaled intersection project will add some different impacts.

Along the Route 3 frontage for parcels 15 and 18, the widening for the center turn lane will be only to the west side of US Route 3 and work will be limited to within the NHDOT right-of-way, except for a slope easement near the white wooden fence on the Whittemore property, needed to work on a guardrail. This work will include removing part of the fence rails, adding some soil to the area near the guardrail and replacing the wooden fence to previous conditions. Currently the Fife House has front yard landscaping that is located within the NHDOT right-of-way. Approximately 5-6 feet of this landscaping will need to be impacted to accommodate the roadway widening.

[11] Temporary driveway easements are also required to match into the existing driveways.

C. Goodmen showed photos of the surrounding houses on US Route 3, all of which were determined ineligible for the National Register of Historic Places in 2007. Following the meeting, L. Black and J. Edelman reviewed the inventory forms submitted and DOE'd in 2007.

The improvements to Pembroke Hill Road will consist of widening the sidewalk to 5 feet and repaving the entire width. D. Lyford noted that when Right-of-Way researched the properties, they discovered that the Town had constructed the sidewalks on Pembroke Hill Road partially on the abutters' properties, not on Town property. The new sidewalk will require the NHDOT to acquire a narrow strip of additional right-of-way from six properties; parcels 12, 12-1, 12-2, 12-3 and 12-7. The houses on parcels 12- 1 and 12-2 are not on the 1957 USGS Topo map, but the house on parcel 12-3 appears to be on the 1921 and 1957 USGS map, and it was noted to have a brick foundation.

E. Feighner noted that the previous gas station area was disturbed and if there are no new deep excavations for drainage catch basins or water detention areas, there are no additional archaeological concerns. John Butler noted that if any water treatment areas are proposed they would be located on the former gas station property.

L. Black asked if any major trees would be impacted. J. Butler noted that hedges and trees are generally set back from the road and sidewalk and aside from trimming and maintenance will not be impacted. There will be no impacts to the stonewall on parcel 12, along US Route 3.

L. Black noted that there are no concerns with the impacts on Pembroke Hill Road due to sidewalk widening. The only impacts would be to narrow strips of lawn on the properties, which would essentially look the same once the sidewalks are completed.

NHDOT will wait to hear from DHR regarding the Fife and Whittemore properties once they have had a chance to review the inventory forms and reassess any impacts with the new project limits.

Note: After the meeting, L. Black and J. Edelman reviewed the documentation that was completed for the project area. It was agreed that the documentation sufficiently covered the area, and the only impacts to eligible properties were the drainage easements on the Whittemore and Fife properties, along with the slope easement on the Whittemore property to relocate the fence. It was suggested by NHDHR that the finding remain "No Historic Properties Affected" for the above reasons, FHWA agreed adding that there would be no 4(f), as there is no permanent usage from the easements being acquired.

### **Stark, X-A002(371), 20224**

**Participants: Jason Ross, HEB; Rich Casella, Historic Documentation Co.**

Jason Ross of H.E. Bergeron Engineers presented the project on behalf of the Town of Stark. This is the second meeting with the Cultural Resources Committee.

Rich Casella presented a brief history of the bridge and handed out a Table of Contents, sketches, and a sample Bridge Feature Inventory sheet that will be included in the Historic Structures Report.

Jason presented the results of the site investigation. There have been several rehabilitations of the bridge in the past and much of the original fabric of the bridge has been replaced. The diagonals of the truss were reconfigured into a single span in the 1890's. Many of the structural members show signs of rot, deterioration, and insect damage.

HEB held a Public Input Session was held on 2/29/12. There was a good turnout and had a lot of positive feedback about the project. Jason presented the items that were discussed at the meeting. A second Public Input session will be scheduled soon.

HEB met with Tim Andrews & David Wright from the Covered Bridge Society to discuss the rehab options. Jason reviewed the items that were discussed with Tim. Jason presented the 3 rehabilitation alternates:

Alternate 1 – Rehab what is currently there. Remove existing roofing and purlins, reinforce existing rafters, install solid plank roof sheathing, install new cedar shake roofing, remove existing roadway and sidewalk decking, replace two steel stringers and recoat two steel stringers, rehabilitate the existing concrete pier and concrete bridge seats, rehabilitate and reconfigure the trusses into a two span configuration, install transverse timber deck and sidewalk beams, install longitudinal timber decking with 14' clear roadway, install new vertical ship-lapped siding, install partially grouted rip-rap around the pier and in front of the abutments, apply No-Char treatment to all exposed timbers, install dry hydrants and sprinkler system, and perform electrical and lighting upgrades.

Alternate 2 – Reconfigure trusses to be a 2-span structure as they were originally. Remove existing roofing and purlins, reinforce existing rafters, install solid plank roof sheathing, install new cedar shake roofing, remove existing roadway and sidewalk decking, remove the existing steel stringers, rehabilitate the existing concrete pier and concrete bridge seats, rehabilitate and reconfigure the trusses into a two span configuration, install two-span laminated timber arches with steel hanger rods and new timber needle beams, install transverse timber deck and sidewalk beams, install longitudinal timber decking with 14' clear roadway, install partially grouted rip-rap around the pier and in front of the abutments, apply No-Char treatment to all exposed timbers, install dry hydrants and sprinkler system, and perform electrical and lighting upgrades.

Alternate 3 – Wouldn't have to reconfigure diagonals; less modification to what's there. Remove existing roofing and purlins, reinforce existing rafters, install solid plank roof sheathing, install new cedar shake roofing, remove existing roadway and sidewalk decking, remove the existing steel stringers and concrete pier, rehabilitate the existing concrete bridge seats, rehabilitate the trusses in the current single span configuration, install single span laminated timber arches with steel hanger rods and new timber needle beams, install transverse timber deck and sidewalk beams, install longitudinal timber decking with 14' clear roadway, install partially grouted rip-rap around the pier and in front of the abutments, apply No-Char treatment to all exposed timbers, install dry hydrants and sprinkler system, and perform electrical and lighting upgrades.

Since so much information was provided at this meeting, the committee could not comment on which alternate they thought would be the best. The committee asked HEB to return to a future meeting once the Engineering Study and Historic Structures Report have been complete. These

documents should be submitted in advance of the meeting so that they can be reviewed and discussed at the meeting.

**Meredith, STP-F-X-0241(014), 10430**

**Participants: Gene McCarthy, McFarland-Johnson; Liz Hengen, Preservation Consultant; Cathy Goodmen, Don Lyford, NHDOT**

This project is to improve safety and traffic flow on NH Route 25 and US Route 3 through the Town of Meredith, especially at the intersection of NH Route 25 and US Route 3.

This has previously been presented on 5/12/2005 and 1/8/2009

This project has been going through a Context Sensitive Solution (CSS) review with a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) since 2006. The current meeting was to update SHPO with the current status of the project.

Gene McCarthy of McFarland-Johnson, Inc. (MJ), the consultant for this project, gave a brief statement of the project history up until the present. In Phase A of the CSS review, which ended in Spring of 2009, the CAC developed a list of possible options that included work from the intersection of US Route 3 and NH Route 104, northeast on NH Route 25 to the town line with Center Harbor. MJ developed a scope of work for Phase B (which would bring parts of the project through the initial National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review) to include reviewing all the options and selecting the best alternative for the problem spots in the project area. Due to a reduction in the funding, NHDOT and MJ decided to limit Phase B to just selecting the best alternatives for the Meredith Village Core area and bringing only a limited section through the NEPA process. It was decided that the intersection of US Route 3 and NH Route 25 needed the most improvements.

L. Hengen noted that the Meredith US3/NH25 Improvements Transportation Planning Study she previously prepared in 2007 recommended survey of several buildings to determine eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. The new focus will include some areas that were previously not reviewed and also some properties that were not 50 years old at the time, but are now. This will require some more fieldwork.

G. McCarthy noted that the Phase A study eliminated most of the alternatives suggested and concentrated on several intersections that have problems, thus limiting possible impacts.

L. Black noted that there are no different levels of forms now (no "form fronts"). It will be up to the consultant to determine the amount of information to include in the inventory forms necessary for them to make an eligibility recommendation and justification. Due to the passage of time, current NHDHR survey policy, and changes in the project area she requested that the consultant prepare inventory forms for any properties in the current project area that are now older than 50 years, update any inventory forms older than 10 years, and update the Historic District Area Form as appropriate; all following the current survey policy.

G. McCarthy said it should take 18-24 months to get the preferred alternative to the NEPA stage. D. Lyford and G. McCarthy said that the CAC meetings should start again this autumn and when the selected alternative is chosen we will present this again.

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

Submitted by: Jill Edelman, Cultural Resources

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