BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT
CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting
DATE OF CONFERENCE: July 9, 2009 and July 30, 2009
LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building
ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT
Tim Boodey
Jill Cunningham
Cathy Goodmen
Doug Gosling
Larry Keniston
Laurel Kenna
Jim Marshall
Nancy Mayville
Joyce McKay
Matt Urban
Alex Vogt

Federal Highway Administration
Jamie Sikora

NHDHR
Edna Feighner
Jim Garvin
Beth Muzzey
Linda Wilson

CHA Inc.
Don Scott

CLD Engineers
John Byatt
Dorna Hamer
Dan Hudson

CMA Engineers
Josh Bouchard
Roch Larochelle

DuBois & King
Mark Goodrich

FNRT
Alex Bernhard

Town of Gilford
Scott Isabelle
Dustin Muzzey

Hansen Construction
Michael Hansen

City of Keene
Jim Donison

Town of Milford
William Parker

City of Nashua
Donnalee Lozeau
Leon Kennison

Nashua RPC
Tim Roache

SEA Consultants
Thomas Marshall

VHB
Frank O'Callaghan
Pete Walker
Rita Walsh

Town of Washington
Edward Thayer

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

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

Keene, 14441 (no federal number) 2
Merrimack-Nashua, 13964 (no federal number) 2
Gilford, 14825, X-A000(553) 3
Hollis, 13488, X-A000(430) 4
Lebanon (no project numbers) 6
Washington, 14346 (no federal number) 6
Hooksett, 12537A 7
Milton, LS-1828 (8) SP-P2282-E 7
Portsmouth, 14376, X-A000(337) 8
Columbia-Lemington, 13815, X-A000(915) 8
Madbury, 15773 (no federal number) 9
Albany, 15771, X-A000(952) 9
Rochester (no project numbers) 10
Historic Bridge Inventory and Plan 11
Nashua, NRDB-5315(021), 10040A 11

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

July 9, 2009

Keene, 14441 (no federal number)
Participants: Don Scott, CHA Companies (dscott@chacompanies.com); Jim Donison, City of Keene Engineering Dept (jdonison@ci.keene.nh.us)

This project involves the replacement of the Spring Street Bridge over Beaver Brook (140/078). Discussion Topics:

1. Intro/Roles & Responsibilities
    a. Jim Donison will be the point person on this project on behalf of the City
    b. Don Scott will be serving as CHA's lead on environmental issues.

2. Project Overview
    a. Limits of work are currently within the limits described in CHA's scope of work. They are within the current road right-of-way. However, the City may want to expand the limits to include more reconstruction of Spring Street.
    b. The design intention will not be to increase the water surface elevation in the proposed condition. An initial concept has been developed that will slide a precast box culvert between the existing abutments, and will rebuild in-kind the granite block walls for a length of 10 feet up stream of the bridge.
    c. Neighborhood Standards – As part of the project, CHA will work with the City to develop Neighborhood Standards for Bridge Replacements. CHA will review previous projects to better understand what has worked and what doesn't work as far as aesthetics for project settings. CHA will contact Keene Heritage Commission for advice and research regarding the design of the parapet walls.

3. The primary concerns for SHPO will be the impacts to the walls and the reconstruction of the granite block walls upstream of the bridge.

4. We were asked to provide a map showing eligible properties and districts in the neighborhoods in the area and to show the relationship of this bridge site with the city-wide survey. The Keene Heritage Commission should be consulted.

5. It was indicated that there were no known archaeological findings within our project area.

6. We were asked to return in September to the Cultural Resources Meeting, once we have prepared preliminary plans and a preferred design of the bridge parapet walls.

Merrimack-Nashua, 13964 (no federal number)
Participants: John Byatt, CLD (johnb@cldengineers.com)

John Byatt presented the project to the group. Handouts included the Request for Historic Review by NHDHR. The Town of Merrimack and City of Nashua would like to replace the existing Manchester St. Bridge over the Pennichuck Reservoir. The existing bridge is a 22 foot single span

bridge consisting of a concrete deck on steel I-beams. The substructure consists of tall dry laid stone abutments and wing walls. An approximately 400-foot long fill causeway through the reservoir form the approaches the bridge. There is a 25' high granite wall on one side of the channel.

The proposed bridge structure is a 120-foot long 3-span bridge. Short concrete abutments and short wing walls supported on drilled shafts are also proposed. The bridge would be built over and behind the existing stone substructures. The existing superstructure would be removed in its entirety. The existing stone abutments and wing walls would be left in place except for approximately the top 4.5 feet. The existing top several feet of wing wall have slid outwards and need to be removed to allow access under the bridge.

NHDHR noted that the area is considered archaeologically sensitive and areas impacted through construction (including staging areas) need archaeological assessment. A Phase IA assessment with Phase 1B testing, if needed, was requested.

NHDHR noted that a historical review of the area was done as part of the Nashua Circumferential Highway project. They suggested that CLD review the files in their office to find if the granite wall was noted in the survey. It is likely that the project area is in a historic district associated with the Pennichuck Water Works. If the project is in the district, they felt the bridge and the granite walls may contribute to the district.

NHDHR asked if removing the top several feet of wall could be avoided or reduced. John explained that completely avoiding impacts would require that the road be raised approximately 4.5 more feet. This would increase wetland impacts and roadway impacts as the area is relatively flat. John said they would evaluate the project area to determine if the granite walls could be avoided. NHDHR asked that if the tops of the walls were removed could the removed stones by used as revetment on top of the grade under the bridge. John replied that the stones could be used in this way.

It was agreed that another meeting was needed after the impacts were evaluated and the historic records reviewed.

Gilford, 14825, X-A000(553)
Participants: Mark Goodrich, Dubois and King (mgoodrich@dubois-king.com); Scott Isabelle, Gilford School District; Dustin Muzzey, Town of Gilford

Mark Goodrich of DuBois & King met on July 9th, 2009 to discuss the proposed sidewalk project along the Alvah-Wilson Road in the Town of Gilford, NH.

M. Goodrich presented a brief overview of the project: Project involves the construction of a new bituminous concrete sidewalk with granite curbing (5' wide by approximately ¼ mile long). The sidewalk will be located on the north side of Alvah-Wilson Road, extending west from the intersection with Belknap Mountain Road to approximately the intersection with Sprucewood Avenue. The sidewalk will be located approximately 5' from the edge of the travel way, and will be located within the existing right-of-way.

Construction of the sidewalk will minimally impact the existing storm water runoff. The current storm water runoff is intercepted by swales along the south side of Alvah-Wilson Road. As such, the only storm water runoff that will be affected will be the runoff between the centerline of the road and the new sidewalk. No new subsurface drainage will be required. Instead, storm water will be directed to low points along the route, and allowed to flow through breaks in the sidewalk. Construction will require minor excavation to a depth of approximately 2' in order to place the base and subbase materials.

Construction will not impact existing historical structures, including homes, stone walls and boundary markers. Alvah-Wilson Road and all property abutting the project are owned by the Town of Gilford. Additionally, the construction will not require the removal of existing vegetation or impact wetlands.

E. Feighner indicated that the project area would probably not require archaeological investigation. She will examine the inventory before making a final determination. [E. Feighner subsequently did not request archaeological survey of the area].

M. Goodrich directed to locate a book on the history of Gilford, authored by Adaire Mulliigan and Kathy Francke, which contains historical maps of Gilford. Cultural Resources is interested in whether or not the maps identified locations of historical significance within the project limits.

M. Goodrich located the document and several maps, including a map identifying 100 areas of interest. Per this map, the two sites located closest to the proposed project are #52 The Meadowbrook Farm - 72 Meadowbrook Lane, and #53 Yacht Club Vista (33-39 Weirs Road). However, it appears that both sites are sufficiently far enough away from the project so as not to be affected by the proposed construction (see attached documents).

It was agreed that the project would not affect historical resources.

Hollis, 13488, X-A000(430)
Participants: Roch Larochelle, CMA Engineers (rlarochelle@cmaengineers.com); Josh Bouchard, CMA Engineers (jbouchard@cmaengineers.com)

This Municipally-Managed project involves the construction of a new sidewalk along NH Route 130 (Ash Street) from the intersection with Silver Lake Road ("Four Corners") easterly approximately 1,800 feet to Broad Street, terminating at the US Post Office. The project falls entirely within the Historic District, which had been previously established by the Town and is eligible for nomination to the National Register. This meeting was a follow up to an initial scoping meeting that was held on May 7, 2009 at which time it was concluded that no archaeological or historical reviews would be needed as part of this project.

Roch Larochelle, PE, presented the project using an enlarged color roll plan of the preliminary design and several photos of the area buildings and structures. It was reiterated that the Town has identified the Ash Street Sidewalk project as a high priority project to improve pedestrian access and safety along the 1,800-foot project corridor. The group was also reminded that this project is

one of several sidewalk improvement initiatives. The Town is planning to close a sidewalk loop along Main Street and Ash Street to Silver Lake State Park.

It was explained that the proposed sidewalk route runs along the northerly edge of Ash Street, crossing a number of business drives and two un-signalized intersections (Market Place and Glenice Drive). The proposed sidewalk will be constructed using concrete and granite curbing, similar to nearby completed projects along Main Street. The sidewalk is to be 5-feet in width except along the Remax property where it will narrow to a 3-foot width for approximately 130-feet (Sta 1+60 to 2+90) to minimize property impacts. The proposed curb line will be set at a constant offset of 4-feet from the existing travel-way and is to include a 3-foot grass strip between the proposed curb and sidewalk from Sta 0+40 to 16+00, which will accommodate the relocation of several mailboxes for the driving postal route. Back-curb has been introduced along the Cook & Stiles property (Sta 7+05 to 8+10) to minimize impacts to within the public right of way. With the introduction of a new curb line, it will be necessary to include new drainage structures/catch basins to collect gutter flow from rainfall runoff, which would be tied into existing collection system at Sta 8+50, LT. and existing swale along the western side of Glenice Drive.

Contact letters have been sent to the various resource agencies and Town committees and coordination meetings have been held with Public Works, Police and Fire Department officials to discuss project concerns. One specific concern that was expressed by safety officials was the location of the informal pedestrian crossing of Ash Street to “Hilda’s Walk”, a publicly maintained walkway just east of the intersection with Glenice Drive (Sta 14+75). It was noted that this informal crossing coupled with the limited intersection sight distance at Glenice Drive contributes to safety concerns, particularly as emergency vehicles are exiting Glenice Drive, which is the entrance/exit for the Hollis Fire Department. Officials also asked that a formal crosswalk be considered for this location to provide better protection and advanced notice for pedestrians using Hilda’s Walk, which links Ash Street to sidewalks on Broad Street. Upon review, it was concluded that the existing crossing location has marginal available sight distance (approximately 200-feet) for westbound traffic due to a crest vertical curve just east of the intersection (Sta 16+00), and that by shifting the pedestrian crossing to Sta 14+00, this could be improved to approximately 300-feet for westbound traffic, which would exceed design requirements for either a 30 mph or 35 mph posted speed. Eastbound sight distance is estimated at 435-feet.

Relative to the sight distance issue discussed above, it was recommended that the existing brush growth be cleared to the limit of the existing right of way at the northeast quadrant of the intersection. It was also noted that an existing, 22” maple east of the intersection (Sta 15+40) would need to be removed since it is in the path of the new sidewalk. It was further added that public officials supported the removal of the tree, that the tree is in poor health (photos provided), is within the public right of way, and that its removal would improve sight distance to the intersection with Glenice Drive.

A preliminary public information meeting was held on June 8, 2009 and a follow up public meeting is scheduled for July 27, 2009 after which the Environmental Study will be submitted to NHDOT for review and approval. All permanent work is to be completed within the existing right of way, however there will be a need for several temporary construction easements to complete the project. A Memorandum of no adverse effect with a de minimus finding was signed by FHWA and NHDHR.

Lebanon (no project numbers)
Participants: Alex Vogt, Larry Keniston, NHDOT; Alex Bernhard, Friends of the Northern Rail Trail,Consulting Party (aabernhard@comcast.net)

Alex Vogt of NHDOT and Alex Bernhard of Friends of the Northern Rail Trail (FNRT) presented this project to the committee to examine different options associated with the possible removal of Northern Railroad Bridge (108/113). The bridge is a 1928 concrete slab that carries the rail over Slayton Hill Road. A. Vogt stated that this project was in a planning phase and wanted the committee's input on the project. The reasons for replacing the bridge would be to allow pedestrian and bus access to the hospital. At present, buses are too tall to pass under the bridge, and the roadway is too narrow to accommodate pedestrians safely. A. Vogt presented multiple options for improving the area, including removing the bridge, raising the bridge, replacement, and keeping the bridge in place.

Beth Muzzey stated that the corridor is eligible for the National Register and that the bridge is a contributing element. A Bernhard asked if the roadway could be lowered to keep the bridge in its current location and accommodate bus traffic. FNRT would like to keep the rail at grade, if possible. Their ultimate goal is to tie this section of rail into their other recreation trails, keeping the rail at grade. B. Muzzey agreed that keeping the grade is a significant feature of this rail line, and others throughout in NH. A. Bernhard also asked about pedestrian access from the rail to the roadway. A. Vogt said that the road might lowered, however he is not sure of the depth due to utilities. Additionally, he was unsure if a reduced grade could accommodate buses. Linda Wilson inquired if the city had looked into van transit, and suggested they contact Mickey McIver of Danbury to examine how their transit issues could be addressed. A. Vogt asked if a pedestrian tunnel would have impacts on the integrity of the corridor, and B. Muzzey suggested that they look into the creation of the pedestrian walkway where the stone box culvert was near the bridge. A. Vogt thanked the committee for their suggestions and insight and will come back before the committee when more information becomes available.

Washington, 14346 (no federal number)
Participants: Mike Hansen, Hansen Construction (hansenbridge@tds.net) and Tom Marshall, SEA (Thomas.marshall@seacon.com); Edward Thayer, Town of Washington (highway@washingtonnh.org)

Mike Hansen presented the following project information in the meeting:

The Town of Washington is replacing the existing one lane Halfmoon Pond Road Bridge (Bridge No. 181/083) over Halfmoon Pond Outlet. A temporary bridge would be utilized to maintain traffic safely during construction of the new bridge. The installation of the temporary bridge required a short form Phase 1A completed by Robert Goodby, Ph.D. of Monadnock Archaeological Consulting, LLC. Mr. Goodbye determined the project area was not archaeologically sensitive.

The following paraphrased questions, comments, and discussions ensued as a result of the presented information.

- E. Feighner stated that Alexka Chan from Monadnock Archaeological Consulting, LLC. be on site during the removal of the roadway fill material and fabric placed for the temporary bridge detour approaches. She requested that A. Chan submit photographs of the monitoring including the removal of the fabric and an end of field report for the monitoring.
- E. Feighner agreed to allow the temporary detour to be constructed and the original project stipulations were amended.

Mike Hansen of Hansen Construction agreed to the request for Alexka Chan from Monadnock Archaeological Consulting, LLC to be on site during the removal of the roadway fill material.

Hooksett, 12537A
Participants: Matt Urban, Don Lyford, NHDOT

Matt Urban along with Don Lyford presented an update to the Hooksett 12357A project. Originally, this widening/drainage project located along NH Route 3 began just north of the Benton Road intersection tapering to an end near the current CVS access drives. However, further persuasion from the front office has insisted that this project continue further just south of the Martins Ferry Road intersection.

M. Urban presented the three known potentially eligible historic structures to SHPO. Those structures included the PSNH building, which was determined to be not eligible. The stone-constructed residential property and the blue concrete-block hall were found eligible. There are no expected impacts to the concrete-block hall, however, the department does intend to widen towards the stone hall. NHDHR indicated that they would like to know the exact amount of land that would need to be acquired, and if the acquisitions required a temporary or permanent easement. D. Lyford agreed to determine the square footage of the impact area. J. McKay indicated that depending on impacts, the project might involve a 4(f) document. If the impacted area is limited, the project may be eligible for a de-minimus 4(f) impact. M. Urban and D. Lyford agreed to bring this project back to the committee for review once the square footage of the impacts to the stone property has been determined.

Milton, LS-1828 (8) SP-P2282-E
Participants: Laurel Kenna, NHDOT

Laurel Kenna presented the proposed sale of the NHDOT surplus property. This parcel's access point is located off NH Route 25, and falls between Route 25 and Route 16 in Milton. The property contains a NHDOT sand pit and has no evidence of building structures; the pit portion of the parcel has been disturbed and is therefore not archaeologically or historically sensitive. Since there was no evidence of building structures B. Muzzey indicated that there was no concern for architectural resources on the parcel. E. Feighner indicated that she would check the archaeological database to determine if archaeological resources exist in the area.

Note: After checking with NHDHR's database, E. Feighner concluded that this site has no archaeological sensitivity.

Portsmouth, 14376, X-A000(337)
Participants: Cathy Goodmen, NHDOT

This project was presented to review the painting of the New Hampshire approach bridges to the high bridge that carries I-95 over the Piscataqua River. The approach bridges go over two B & M RR tracks, Preble Way, and Ranger Way, several NHDOT lots that the City of Portsmouth uses for recreation, and several NHDOT Maintenance lots. There will only be temporary impacts to traffic on the roads and the RR to install the scaffolding under the bridge. The two roads and two RR lines will be open to traffic during the work. The project entails sand blasting the existing paint on the steel and repainting. All the work will be performed on scaffolding attached under the travel-way, and the work areas will be enclosed. All removed paint will be collected and disposed of in an approved lead paint facility. The enclosures will prevent leakage of removed paint and overspray of new paint. The recreational areas under the bridge will be closed during work directly above them. They will re-open when the work area is moved. Construction will take place through two construction seasons.

Portable sound walls will be installed around the blasting and painting compressors/generators to limit the noise impact to the Historic Atlantic Heights Neighborhood. The equipment will be located as far away from the neighborhood as possible and work hours will be limited to 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM.

With the inclusion of the sound walls and the statement that noise will only be during construction, it was determined that this project would have no adverse effect on the Atlantic Heights neighborhood or the Eastern Railroad corridor.

A Public Informational Meeting was held July 30, 2009. The attendees were satisfied that NHDOT is taking all mitigation steps possible to limit the noise levels.

Columbia-Lemington, 13815, X-A000(915)
Participants: Nancy Mayville, Tim Boodey, Doug Gosling, NHDOT; Jim Garvin, NHDHR

The bridge project is receiving ARRA-related funding. Because FHWA will fund all of the work, LCHIP funds will be unnecessary. Tim Boodey presented the elements that would require attention during the rehabilitation of the Howe Truss covered bridge. These repairs were identified through visual inspection. The cross members at each portal will require replacement. Rusted at the joints, the majority of the steel tension rods are deteriorated and would be replaced with galvanized rods painted black. T. Boodey plans to replace the compression bearing blocks with white oak. He indicated that a portion of the lower chord had deteriorated. One of three sections would be removed and replaced with dense select structural douglas fur. He noted the presence of cracked rafters, which would be replaced in-kind. J. Garvin requested that the pith of the new wood be excluded if possible. The rafters that were cracked without structural deterioration would be sistered. Additionally, eight to ten compression diagonals would be spliced or replaced; at least

four would need to be replaced in-kind. It was noted that some of the diagonals have been relatively recently replaced. Portions of the deck also need replacement. J. Garvin noted that all of the deck had been replaced in the 1980s. The bolster blocks would be reset.

As outlined, the work will not have an adverse effect on the eligible bridge because the original material would be replaced in-kind. Different wood species may be used if the original is not available. If there were substantially more work than outlined, Bridge Maintenance would review the work with NHDHR. J. Garvin indicated that he would not need to review the bridge in the field. The no adverse effect memo should include the specified work.

Madbury, 15773 (no federal number)
Participants: Nancy Mayville, Tim Boodey, Doug Gosling, NHDOT; Jim Garvin, NHDHR

The Perkins Road Bridge over the Western Division of the B&M is a timber bridge on concrete abutments that spans over the rail line. The rail line is owned and operated by the B&M, NHDOT will own the bridge until 2011. The abutments are currently failing. The bridge is closed, and the town has requested that the NHDOT remove it; the road is owned and maintained by the town. The town plans to discontinue the road. The project would occur under the State Aid Bridge Program, and the Department would like to remove it this summer. B. Muzzey indicated that the line is eligible, and requested an individual determination of eligibility for the subject bridge to determine if it is a contributing structure. She requested that the contractor identify whether the railroad or the town built the overpass and whether this bridge represents a grade separation project.

Albany, 15771, X-A000(952)
Participants: Nancy Mayville, Tim Boodey, Doug Gosling, NHDOT; Jim Garvin, NHDHR

Bridge Maintenance is planning to rehabilitate the Albany Covered Bridge on Dugout Rd., a Forest Highway, north of NH Route 112 and 6 miles west of Route 16. It was likely damaged by ice flows. The bridge is a paddleford truss. T. Boodey indicated that the decking needed to be replaced; the bridge bows downstream and required straightening; and the abutments needs to be pointed. He noted the gaps in the stone. Some of the stone had fallen to the base of the abutments. J. Garvin asked if the stone were originally dry-laid so that the abutments would self-drain, decreasing the hydraulic pressure behind the walls. T. Boodey noted that mortar had already been applied to the stone. J. Garvin agreed that addition of mortar was acceptable if already present and expressed concern about the hardness of the mortar.

Most of the work, the decking and realignment, would be completed after the adjacent campground is closed. The bridge would be realigned by pulling it back after loosening the members. The best time to realign the bridge is when the decking is removed. Bridge Maintenance will likely be able to remove only part of the bow, which is about 6". They would also replace some of the rods and tighten others. Replacement of the 6" and 5½" decking is not considered an adverse effect; it will be replaced with 12" wide boards of the same thickness.

Bridge Maintenance would like to point the stone late in the summer. J. Garvin would like to review and negotiate the mortar composition, to make sure there is sufficient lime content. In part given the level of alteration at the bridge, it was agreed that the project would have a no adverse effect on the bridge.

Rochester (no project numbers)
Participants: Dan Hudson (danh@cldengineers.com), Dorna Hamer (dornah@cldengineers.com), CLD

Daniel Hudson, PE of CLD Consulting Engineers gave an overview of the planned Washington Street Reconstruction project, which includes reconstruction of Washington Street including roadway reconstruction, sidewalks on both sides, and drainage, water, and sewer utility replacements, between Haig Street and Madison Avenue. The project also includes water, sewer, and drainage utility replacements, as well as roadway replacement in-kind (same widths / no sidewalks) on Cleveland Street and Sylvain Streets. Water and sewer replacements will extend northeast, beyond the roadway reconstruction limits, to connect to existing utilities in Strafford Square, the intersection of Washington Street, North Main Street, and Walnut Street.

Dan explained that an Area Form and a Phase 1A Archeological Sensitivity Assessment had been prepared previously, as part of review of the Strafford Square project (X-A000(320), 14350), which included the Washington Street work. However, the Washington Street work is now being advanced, due to the recent receipt of ARRA funds for sewer, drainage, and water elements. Section 106 documentation for the now separate Washington Street project is being completed by NHDES. Therefore, revisions will eventually be required to the Draft Categorical Exclusion Document for the Strafford Square project, in order to remove the Washington Street work, which will be constructed in 2009-2010. The construction of a roundabout at Strafford Square is planned for 2015 +/-. Previous commitments associated with the Strafford Square roundabout work will be met at a later date, including: completion of the remaining phases of archeological investigations in the yards of properties to be acquired and razed, as well as execution of a Memorandum of Agreement. However, what is currently requested is approval of the current Washington Street Reconstruction work as a stand-alone project.

In response to an inquiry, it was noted that the intent is to complete the anticipated water and sewer work at Strafford Square, such that none would be required as part of the future project. It was explained that work within Strafford Square would need to be done at night, given the high traffic volumes and disruption that daytime construction would create.

Determination

It was determined that the Washington Street Reconstruction project would have no-adverse affect on historic properties within the project limits, nor on the Strafford Square Historic District. However, archeological monitoring is required during water and sewer construction within the center of the Strafford Square intersection, given the possibility of encountering intact artifacts and deposits related to Native American and Euro-American occupation, as noted in the Phase 1A assessment. NHDHR will issue a letter to NHDES, summarizing the findings, with an attached

graphic outlining the area within which archeological monitoring will be required during construction.

Historic Bridge Inventory and Plan
Participant: Jim Garvin

Relative to the Historic Highway Bridge Plan, the committee discussed predetermining the Section 106 eligibility for the National Register. Although done in the past, the current trend is to avoid such determinations. However, the plan would offer the information in a matrix form. As a comparative study within each bridge type, it would be able to make recommendations for future treatment based on significance; integrity; structural and functions considerations including such issues as structural condition, hydraulic factors, load carrying capacity, geometry, and safety; and environmental considerations.

J. McKay noted that the $150,000 set aside for Phase I would probably not fund the entire survey for that phase, but would be a good start. B. Muzzey asked if funding could be added to the amount stated in the letter of intent. [T. Jameson subsequently indicated to J. McKay that the amount could be increased.]

Individuals who might form a committee to review and reach consensus concerning the highway bridge plans would include representatives from NHDOT, FHWA, NHDHR, planning agencies, consulting engineers, and state and municipal government representation. Suggested participants include: Mark Richardson, Dave Powelson, Bill Cass, Joyce McKay, and Jillian Cunningham NHDOT; Dave Hall and Jamie Sikora, FHWA; Beth Muzzey and Jim Garvin, NHDHR; Sharon Watson, Central Planning Commission; a representative from the Municipal Planning Association; Sally Gunn, VHB; and a representative from Martha Clark's office.

July 30, 2009

This meeting took place outside of the normal Cultural Resources Committee meetings, however it was determined by the committee members that the meeting minutes would be recorded with the rest of the July Cultural Resources minutes.

Nashua, NRDB-5315(021), 10040A
Participants: Donnalee Lozeau, Mayor of Nashua; Leon Kennison, City of Nashua; Tim Roache, NRPC; Elizabeth Muzzey, Edna Feighner, Linda Wilson, NHDHR; Jamie Sikora, FHWA; Joyce McKay, Jim Marshall, Jill Cunningham, NHDOT; Frank O'Callaghan, Pete Walker, Rita Walsh, VHB

Introductions
Tim Roache opened the meeting by distributing an agenda (attached) and offering an overview of the roles of the Nashua Regional Planning Commission (NRPC) and VHB. Tim briefly reviewed the agenda and explained that the City had hired NRPC to conduct the written re-evaluation of the Broad Street Parkway project. VHB is working as a subconsultant to the NRPC. Tim is managing

the project on behalf of NRPC and Frank O'Callaghan is managing the project for VHB. After introductions, Tim turned the meeting to the Mayor.

Mayor's Opening Remarks
Nashua Mayor Lozeau opened the meeting by providing a brief history of the original project and its alternatives as well as a review of recent City actions to advance the project. The successful completion of the project as it is currently envisioned is among the Mayor's top priorities. Mayor Lozeau discussed the meeting's purpose, which is to seek guidance and comment on the cultural resources scope of work and to determine if the DHR representatives saw any particular impediments or constraints with either of the two Options now being considered. Time is of the essence; Nashua citizens will have little patience for further delay of the long awaited project. Therefore, Mayor Lozeau emphasized that the City needs NHDHR to be direct and candid in their review of the project. In short, the City needs to know immediately if there is a problem – a "fatal flaw" with Option 2.

Project Review
Frank O'Callaghan of VHB explained the project has been substantially scaled back relative to the project discussed in the 1997 Final Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision. Specifically, the parkway will be only two lanes in width rather than the four lanes described in the FEIS.

Two options are currently being considered. Option 2 (similar to original project "Alt 4C" in the 1997 FEIS) has the proposed parkway on the current alignment of the Pine Street extension through the center of the millyard, while Option 1 (similar to the Selected Alternative in the 1997 ROD, also known as "Alt 4C Modified") runs west of the existing buildings in the Nashua Mfg. Co. complex. Both options would require a new bridge to span the Nashua River, but only Option 1 would require a new bridge to cross the mill canal on the eastern boundary of the Millyard district.

Both options call for removal of the Nimco Building; in addition, the Boiler House would be removed under Option 2. Two other buildings within the project area of both options, 12-14 Baldwin Street and 40 Pine Street, are proposed for demolition. Option 2 also requires the relocation of the Waste House and impacts Storehouse #2 in the Millyard. To the north of the Nashua River, the proposed parkway parallels the Pan Am RR line and passes under Fairmount St and Baldwin St before intersecting with Broad St.

Mayor Lozeau stressed that the City wants to keep the project moving and will do the heavy lifting required to maximize DHR's time and expedite project review to the extent possible. She does not want the project to fail, to be delayed, or exceed the budget. The project has been the subject of numerous public meetings and the latest plans and information on posted on the City's website. She also stressed the current road system within the mill complex (which is considered a prime economic development area) is inadequate and that the parkway's installation here would help solve the issue.

Environmental Process
Peter Walker of VHB explained that VHB's role, besides the refined design of the new parkway, is to compare the impacts of Option 2 to the FEIS Selected Alternative. This is required under

FHWA's NEPA regulations because more than three years have elapsed since the last major federal action on this project and because the City wishes to change the parkway alignment in the Millyard. This process is known as a "written re-evaluation" and is essentially seeking to determine whether there are any new significant environmental impacts associated with the project that were not discussed in the FEIS and ROD. If not, then the 1997 ROD will stand as valid. If so, then a further formal NEPA document would be required.

VHB is also preparing a new Section 4(f) Evaluation, which will include a comparison of Option 1, Option 2, and the FEIS Selected Alternative, as well as any other reasonable alternatives. Peter referenced the fact that the FEIS process eliminated Alternative 4C (similar to the current proposed Option 2 route) due to concerns about historical resources. However, the City wishes to pursue this formerly rejected alignment. It was suggested that Option 2 may be acceptable due to the fact that the roadway is now only two lanes which would not have the same effect as the original parkway design (four lanes, median separated). Because of the potential significance of this issue, VHB is prioritizing the Section 4(f) above other resource analyses, rather than completing the 4(f) near the end of the project which is often the case.

Review of Cultural Resources Work Scope

Rita Walsh of VHB introduced the proposed cultural resources scope of work, which entails preparation of a Project Area Form, two individual inventory forms, and a re-evaluation of the integrity and contributing significance of buildings and structures within the National Register-listed Nashua Manufacturing Co. complex. Rita had distributed a copy of the written work scope prior to the meeting to enable NHDHR to review it.

Rita explained that the Nashua Manufacturing District work item is required due to the fact that the area was listed over 20 years ago and has undoubtedly changed in appearance and due to several demolitions within the complex. The two individual inventory forms were intended for the two buildings proposed for demolition outside of the Nashua Mfg. Co. complex, if they are over 50 years old. In addition, Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) reports for the complex and individual buildings proposed for demolition were not completed in the previous studies; the cultural resources scope includes completing work on buildings that are impacted under both Option 1 and Option 2.

Beth Muzzey explained that the original Section 106 project review in the 1990s used different methods of survey and documentation; it was stressed that the current practices of survey and documentation need to be followed in this alternatives re-examination. Comments on the proposed cultural resources scope of work included a discussion of the recently prepared and submitted Project Area Form for French Village – the neighborhood in the south end of the Project Area. The form, submitted to DHR in 2008, was reviewed by DHR, but found to be incomplete and recorded incorrectly as a Project Area Form, rather than a Historic District Area Form, which has different documentation requirements. DHR believes the area is eligible for the National Register, but needs the form to be revised. The City stressed that the reduced footprint of the Project and landscaping would benefit this neighborhood. Linda Wilson cautioned about confusing landscape design with mitigation for cultural resource impacts.

DHR also commented that the information in the draft HAER reports would need to be transferred to NH State Property Documentation reports, as the standards for which properties' reports are sent to the Library of Congress has changed. These reports would go to local and state recipients.

There was also a brief discussion of the required components of the Project Area Form, which documents the areas within the Project Area boundaries, but contains recommendations on further survey work. Beth noted that work on the Project Area Form should be initiated immediately since there are many unknowns at this time.

Documentation of the existing integrity of the buildings and structures within the Nashua Manufacturing Co. was also discussed; the format for presenting this information was referred to a discussion with Mary Kate Ryan, State Survey Coordinator with DHR. A granite wall flanking the Nashua River was brought up as a feature that was not documented in the National Register nomination, nor was it explored in an archaeological study in the millyard (1997 study by Kathy Wheeler; no further archaeological investigations required in millyard was the recommendation). It appears that the proposed bridge common to both Options 1 and 2 would cross over the granite wall and it is unclear how it might be impacted. Walsh noted that the wall would be located and photographed in the field to document its location with reference to the proposed bridge.

It was explained that the two individual inventory forms specified in the scope of work were either for the two buildings proposed for demolition (if they were over 50 years old) or as placeholders for as yet unknown buildings that would require such documentation. It was pointed out the building at 12-14 Baldwin Street, one of the two buildings proposed for demolition, may be in an older neighborhood and that the area should be explored as a possible historic district.

Regarding any archaeology work, Edna Feighner of DHR noted that she needed to review the previous efforts and outcomes in order to make a recommendation.

Walsh noted that the site file search for previously inventoried and listed properties within the entirety of the Project Area was just starting and that more information would be known by the August 6 NHDOT/NHDHR cultural resources agencies coordination meeting in which the cultural resources scope would be discussed in more detail.

FHWA's role in the alternatives re-examination (DOT funding is involved, which results in the requirement of going through Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act review) was discussed. Jamie Sikora will prepare a letter notifying the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation about the re-examination. A list of possible consulting parties, including neighborhood organizations, will be compiled; it was suggested that the City additionally post a notice on their website to see if anyone is interested in being a consulting party. The Society for Industrial Archaeology was also suggested. It was noted that Jamie Sikora determines who is allowed to be a consulting party in the Section 106 process.

Beth Muzzey of DHR was asked if there were any "non-starters" or '"fatal flaws" in the proposed Option 2, which is the City's preferred alternative. The City requested knowing this sooner rather than later. She asked about ways to avoid demolition of buildings in Option 2 (waste house, north end of the storage building, Nimco Building) and that DHR needs more specific information on the design and that a field visit may be helpful. She also suggested additional meetings to review the

design. She noted that NHDHR believes that the design of the roadway could be developed in a way that would minimize impact to the Millyard.

The timing of DHR's review of the project was also discussed. Muzzey noted that ARRA projects have first priority, but that they will give the Broad St Parkway project the best possible priority. She noted that it is always most helpful for DHR to receive as much information as possible and as soon as possible. The more thorough the information provided, the timelier the review will be.

Project Schedule

Pete Walker of VHB presented the project schedule, which commenced in July 2009. Five meetings with NHDOT/NHDHR are called for, one each month over the next 5 months. The meeting topics would include discussion of cultural resources scope, effects, and mitigation – the possibility of submitting cultural resources information in phases was suggested, if there was too much information to discuss in one meeting. Joyce McKay requested that the meetings be held as part of the regularly scheduled cultural resources agencies coordination meetings. To stay on track, VHB intends to complete a draft Section 4(f) by November. The overall goal is to have the written re-evaluation completed by next Spring. This is obviously a very aggressive schedule, and will require good communication and timely responses on behalf of both the City and NHDHR. Beth Muzzey explained how important it is to have complete information submitted to NHDHR for review. Incomplete information will cause delays.

Next Steps

Next steps were discussed. These steps are a field reconnaissance with NHDOT to document the granite wall on the Nashua River and review the other areas within the Project (August 4, 2009). Most of the members present at this meeting will re-convene at the regularly scheduled cultural resources agencies coordination meeting on August 6 to discuss the proposed scope in more detail.

****Memos/MOA's: Strafford 15502A; Farmington 15677; Nottingham 15720**

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

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