BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT
CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting
DATE OF CONFERENCES: August 11, 2016
LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building
ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT	Rebecca Martin	Jamie Sikora	Christine Perron
Gerard Bedard	Jennifer Reczek		
Sheila Charles		**HTA**	**VHB**
Ron Crickard	**NHDHR**	Stephen Haas	Steven Hodgdon
Keith Cota	Laura Black	Matt Low	
Jill Edelmann	Edna Feighner		**Town of Plaistow**
Wendy Johnson			Sean Fitzgerald
Marc Laurin	**FHWA**	**MJ**	Greg Jones

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

Plaistow, X-A004(363), 40312 1
Ossipee, X-A000(490), 14749 3
Newington-Dover, NHS-0271(037), 11238 4
Salem-Manchester, IM-IR-0931(174), 10418C 6

August 11, 2016

Plaistow, X-A004(363), 40312
Participants: Stephen Haas, Matt Low, HTA; S. Fitzgerald, Greg Jones, Town of Plaistow;

Initial consultation for the Main Street SRTS at Pollard Elementary project to determine the effect status.

Stephen Haas provided an overview of the project which is part of the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) funding program administered by NHDOT through the Local Public Agency (LPA) program. The focus of the project is the area in and around the intersection of Main Street (NH12A) and Elm Street at the center of Plaistow Village adjacent to the Pollard Elementary School and the Plaistow Town Hall. Both Main and Elm Street are NHDOT owned roadways which carry significant volumes of traffic (including a high percentage of large trucks) and serve as a cut through to NH 125. The heavy volumes and high speeds have resulted in safety concerns for pedestrians and bicyclist looking to connect to the school and other properties in the village. The existing pedestrian network consists of several crosswalks with long crossings (due to wide shoulders) and low pedestrian visibility, narrow (36" in many locations) & missing sidewalk segments, ADA ramp concerns, a missing crosswalk on Elm St at Main, and some pedestrian sight distance concerns. A right turn slip lane from northbound Main Street onto Elm street adds conflict points and invokes higher speed turning maneuvers which has reduced pedestrian safety.

The slip lane has been closed using temporary traffic barrels since 2012 in coordination with NHDOT. This configuration has been well received by citizens and the Board of Selectman for its perceived safety benefits. The Town has been seeking funding to implement permanent measures to formalize the slip lane closure for several years.

Hoyle, Tanner performed on-site file research at NHDHR in late 2014 and follow-up correspondence in July 2016. There are 18 structures that abut the project area. The Plaistow Town Hall is the only structure that has been inventoried and is eligible for the Historic Register. Through coordination with NHDHR as part of the RPR process, there are no known archeological concerns. There are also no known natural resources concerns, as there are no wetland or other water resources within the project area and the project anticipates to reduce impervious surfaces within the previously disturbed footprint.

Through a number of studies and conceptual designs over the past several years a roundabout and realigned intersection geometry (to reduce skew angle) have been investigated and dismissed. The design that is currently being proposed, which has been developed through several public meetings as part of the LPA process, takes into account many previously identified pedestrian improvements but does not propose substantial intersection reconfigurations. The current design proposes to construct new 5' ADA compliant sidewalks along both sides of Main Street and the south side of Elm Street, upgraded crosswalks with "bumpouts" that reduce crossing widths and increase pedestrian visibility, vertical granite curbing adjacent to existing sidewalks to introduce grade separation, and closure of the right turn slip lane. The closure of the slip lane will include new granite curbing, a landscaped area with plantings that will not affect sight distance, and a new sidewalk which will follow the former path of the slip lane as a reminder of its former use and to formalize the separation between the landscaped area and the abutting properties. Right of way impacts are not anticipated.

J. Sikora asked if Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFB) had been considered for the crosswalks? S. Fitzgerald noted that they had been considered but that the Board of Selectman and Highway Committee are not in favor of them in this location in town.

J. Edelmann had concerns over the removal of elm tree on the slip lane island. S. Fitzgerald noted that the original historic elm on this corner had been removed many years ago and this tree was a much younger replacement. S. Haas confirmed that this tree would require removal to improve pedestrian sight distance.

L. Black suggested getting an architectural historian on-board to study the slip lane configuration and elm tree so that the committee has a better understanding of what could potentially be lost. S. Fitzgerald noted that the Town is deeply concerned with its history and is currently seeking grants to help fund a tribute to the Town's brick making history. S. Fitzgerald stated that he understands the importance of the process and wants to be able to get to the "bricks and mortar" portions of the work and put the road on a "diet" so that it can be a place for pedestrians as much as cars.

J. Edelmann noted that she feels the sidewalk location keeps the ROW feel of the slip lane area and asked if it could be enhanced to further maintain the slip lane feel, perhaps through widening? L.

Black suggested getting a historian on-board to help with design elements to add historical feel which could include a wider sidewalk, stamped concrete, or elements of the former rail.

J. Edelmann noted that she is looking for information to help support a Cultural Resources Effect Memo. L. Black confirmed that the project needs to go through the typical identification/effect/finding process. It was agreed that the Town should consult with it local Historical Commission to develop historical elements that may be included in the design or other commitments that the Commission may like to see. With a letter or documentation from the Historical Commission, the Town will then look to seek the Cultural Resources Effect Memo.

Ossipee, X-A000(490), 14749
Participants: Christine Perron, McFarland-Johnson; Rebecca Martin, Jennifer Reczek, Gerry Bedard, NHDOT

Continued consultation to provide an update on the July 19, 2016 open house and to discuss potential mitigation for the adverse effect resulting from the replacement of the Bearcamp River and Bearcamp Relief bridges on NH Route 16.

Rebecca Martin started the meeting by describing the NHDOT Open House held in Ossipee on July 19, 2016. Overall, the event went very well. There were three stations set up in the room (one station for each of the proposed Ossipee projects), plus a welcome station where attendees signed in and were told about the format of the event. People were generally positive about the projects, with concerns largely about property impacts and access to the Bearcamp River. No concerns were expressed about historic resources in the Ossipee 14749 project. People were generally not aware that the two Bearcamp bridges are historic, although most seemed to be aware that they are in poor condition. Throughout the Open House, a video was playing to show an example of slide-in bridge construction and the method seemed to be well-received by those who watched the video. The video and all handouts from the Open House are available on the NHDOT project website. Some people who have called the Project Manager about the project have visited the project website, so the materials are being accessed.

As discussed at previous meetings, the project will involve replacement of the two Bearcamp bridges, resulting in an Adverse Effect. Comment sheets, comment cards, the NHDOT Section 106 brochure, and the Ossipee 14749 Section 106 handout were distributed at the Open House and the Section 106 handout is also on the project website. An invitation to the Open House, along with the Section 106 handout, was emailed directly to the Ossipee Historical Society. To date, no one has expressed interest in becoming a consulting party and no comments have been received on potential mitigation.

Jennifer Reczek noted that the proposed closure of NH Route 16 for 2 weekends during construction was described at the Open House. Attendees seemed to be generally positive about the proposed construction method and appreciated how NHDOT was planning to schedule the closures during off-season, low-volume times. It was also noted that an additional meeting with local business owners was planned prior to construction.

Christine Perron described the proposed mitigation for the project. As previously discussed, this project will be the first time the slide-in bridge construction method is used in NH; therefore, DOT wants to reach out to the public to help construction go as smoothly as possible and help alleviate any concerns with the short-term closures of NH Route 16 that will be necessary. With this in mind, the NHDOT is working with McFarland Johnson to develop an educational video and interactive webpage as the project progresses. Given the adverse effect on the bridges, the NHDOT proposes to expand the purpose of the video and webpage to memorialize the historic bridges. These materials could be developed to highlight the historic elements of the Bearcamp bridges and what it is that makes them unique. There are similarities in the history of the existing bridges and the proposed replacement bridges in the way that both have been designed using innovative technology to reduce construction costs and duration. The thought is that the video and webpage could highlight the history of the existing bridges as well as history in the making. The interactive webpage would consist of photos of the bridges and surrounding landscape. Certain elements of the bridges and landscape could be clicked on to view a pop-up box describing historical significance and/or proposed construction. The webpage could also contain a link to the video, as well as documents such as the bridge inventory forms.

Edna Feighner suggested that photographs showing construction of the existing bridges could be included on the webpage.

Laura Black, E. Feighner, and Jamie Sikora were agreeable to using the proposed video and webpage as mitigation of the adverse effect. L. Black asked if there is existing archival documentation of this bridge type. Jill Edelmann said that the inventory forms have been completed but not archival documentation. L. Black suggested that abbreviated archival documentation be completed for the bridges, and this documentation would contain useful information to incorporate into the video and website. It was agreed that a single abbreviated document could be prepared for the two bridges.

The Adverse Effect Memo and MOA will be prepared for review and signature in the near future.

Newington-Dover, NHS-0271(037), 11238
Participants: Keith Cota, Marc Laurin, NHDOT; Steve Hodgdon, VHB

Continued consultation to review the alternatives analysis that was been completed on the General Sullivan Bridge.

Steve Hodgdon presented a summary of the Type, Span & Length Study(TS&L) of the General Sullivan Bridge (GSB) completed by VHB and HDR as they relate to the Newington-Dover MOA stipulations, and to the project goals of maintaining the GSB to provide fishing, pedestrian and bicycle access. Four alternatives were evaluated:

- Alternative 1 – Rehabilitation of the GSB, with the repairing and strengthening of the trusses, and including a new floor system, deck and railing. The width of the deck would be narrowed from 32 to 21 feet, exposing the floor beams in the middle span and preventing fishing from the side. A 9 foot bump out for fishing access would be constructed on the Newington side on the approach to the middle span. Most, if not all, of

the bracing would need to be replaced. An access door into the vault of the Newington abutment would be installed for the purpose of maintenance inspections.

- Alternative 2 – Three options were evaluated with the complete superstructure replacement on the existing piers. Option 2A with steel girders, Option 2B with concrete girders, and Option 2C with metalized trusses. No bump out would be required.
- Alternative 3 (basically a combination of #1 and 2C) – Rehabilitation of the middle spans trusses (4 through 6) to maintain the character-defining three-part continuous truss of the GSB. The approach spans, spans 1 through 3 and 7 through 9, would be replaced with a simple span with metalized trusses and;
- Alternative 4 – Complete replacement of the bridge was assessed for cost comparison. Would consist of concrete deck with steel girders on circular shafts (similar to the recently constructed Little Bay Bridge). Would require the complete demolition of the superstructure and substructure.

These Alternatives were evaluated considering Capital Cost, a 75-year Life Cycle Cost/Maintenance, Constructability, and Historic Resource Impacts. A comparison table of the costs was reviewed and range from $49.4M to $34.7M. Alternative 1 has the highest Life Cycle Costs while Alternative 2C has the lowest. The TSL concluded that the practicable alternatives that will be further discussed are Alternative 1 (consistent with the MOA), Alternative 2C (least cost, both capital and life-cycle) and Alternative 3 (would maintain the character-defining three-part continuous trust).

Keith Cota stated that these three alternatives do have varying degrees of cost and adherence to the commitment, versus rehabilitation and replacement of the trusses. These practicable alternatives will be presented and discussed at an upcoming public informational meeting, likely scheduled in September. There would be a large commitment in maintaining the old structure. Jamie Sikora pointed out that FHWA has agreed with the rehabilitation of the bridge. Edna Feighner expressed general concern that there have been examples of other projects with commitments in MOAs that come down to not being able to be afforded. These projects have been so long in coming to fruition that the DOT determines that the commitments cannot be met due to the costs. E. Feighner asked how many MOAs have been altered after they have been agreed to, and that there may as well not be commitments made if they are not implemented. Edna asked DOT to compile a list of MOAs and commitments that haven't been met to continue this conversation with Central Office about this situation. K. Cota replied that there was limited evaluation of the bridge structure when the MOA was agreed to and understands the frustration. The public, and the legislative and senate transportation committees have had two basic comments on the GSB: that the funds to be spent will only accommodate pedestrian and bicycling access, and; they question the necessity of fixing the bridge at all. DOT is trying to find a balance.

Laura Black stated that the GSB is a nationally significant bridge and there have been recent losses of other significant bridges, such as the Memorial Bridge and GSB's sister Lake Champlain Bridge. [Two similar bridges in Massachusetts have also recently been demolished and replaced further solidifying GSB's national significance for its type.] The rehabilitation of the trusses with Alternative 1, would be the preferred option for DHR. J. Sikora mentioned that sustainability is a big issue that FHWA takes into account in meeting the Section 106 commitments. S. Hodgson inquired about Alternative 3. K. Cota explained that the arch does have service life, but the

approach spans are quite problematic, and this would be a compromise that would balance historic preservation with better life-cycle maintenance costs. L. Black stated that this would be a compromise of a compromise, and that rehabilitation of all the trusses would be better than replacement with new ones. She opined that this brings up the importance that critical and real thought needs to be provided in the NH Bridge Management Plan that is being developed. K. Cota agreed for the need to reach the right decision process for bridges in NH. He will ensure that DHR is made aware of the public informational meeting date and time.

Salem-Manchester, IM-IR-0931(174), 10418C
Participants: Wendy Johnson, Marc Laurin, NHDOT;

Continued consultation regarding the MOA stipulation updates.

Jill Edelmann reviewed the latest revisions to the MOA that state the careful removal and storage of the Robert Prowse bridge for a period of 10 years, that included a reevaluated estimated cost for the removal and relocation, and that will include the development of a marketing plan by the end of 2016. J. Edelmann stressed that there is a looming deadlines as FHWA requires that the MOA be signed prior to the construction of the next I-93 widening contract, scheduled for advertising in September 2016. Jamie Sikora stated that FHWA would provide conditional approval allowing the contract to be advertised if the MOA was in the process of being finalized, but the bids could not be opened until the MOA is signed.

Wendy Johnson stated that the storage area for the bridge is anticipated to be located within the ROW along the west side of I-93 a mile or so south of the bridge location, and that discussions on the interpretive exhibit being located at the Hooksett Rest Area have been initiated with Alex Ray, though the exhibit would also be able to be located at the Salem Welcome Center. She asked if there was a concern with stating an exact dollar figure in the MOA for the costs of the removal and storage. J. Sikora stated that FHWA will make funds available not to exceed the bid estimate. If the actual costs of the removal and storage exceed the bid amount, there is a standard process for the contractor to justify and petition to NHDOT/FHWA the extra costs. It was agreed that the MOA language would not include a dollar amount.

Laura Black agreed that the MOA should refer to the development of a marketing plan to be developed by the end of the year and that Jim Garvin's information should be used in its development. J. Edelmann agreed and pointed out that the MOA will be modified to take into account the low-bid criteria constraints by requiring the applicants interested in the bridge demonstrate how the will meet the Secretary of Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings. J. Sikora stated that adaptive reuses could also meet the Standards. J. Edelmann will revise the MOA and send out to all for one last review prior to finalizing the MOA for signatures.

Submitted by: Sheila Charles and Jill Edelmann, Cultural Resources

New Hampshire Department of Transportation
Cultural Resources Agency Coordination Meeting

Date August 11, 2016

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

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

Please fill in all of the requested information. May 12, 2016

Name	Agency	Phone #	Email Address
MATT LOW	HOYLE, TANNER	603.669.5555	MLOW@HOYLETANNER.COM
STEVE HAAS	" "	" "	SHAAS@ " " "
SEAN FITZGERALD	TOWN of PLAISTOW	6033825200	Sfitzgerald@plaistow.com
Greg Jones	Town of Plaistow	603 382 7371	GJones@plaistow.com
Christine Perron	MJ	225-2978	cperron@myinc.com
Jennifer Reczek	NHDOT	271-2731	jreczek@dot.state.nh.us
Gerard Bedard	NHDOT		gbedard@dot.state.nh.us
Rebecca Martin	NHDOT		
STEVEN HODGDON	VHB	391-3920	shodgdon@vhb.com
Keith Costa	NHDOT	271-1615	Kcosta@dot.state.nh.us
Wendy Johnson	NHDOT	271-3909	Wjohnson@dot.state.nh.us