

## BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT

### CONFERENCE REPORT

**DATE OF CONFERENCES:** November 6 and 13, 2008

**LOCATION OF CONFERENCES:** J.O. Morton Building

**ATTENDED BY:** Kevin Nyhan, Cathy Goodmen, Marc Laurin, Pete Salo, Tom Jamison, Bob Landry, Bob Juliano, and Nancy Mayville, NHDOT; Dina Boles and Michelle Juliano, Public Works; Edna Feighner, Linda Wilson, Jim Garvin, and Beth Muzzey, NHDHR; Jamie Sikora, FHWA; Rick Stewart, Louis Berger; Glenn Smith, Northfield Town Administrator; David Pierce, Board, Friends of the Goffstown Rail Trail; Steve Griffin, Town of Goffstown Planning Coordinator; Lisa Martin, Quantum Construction; Mark Goodrich, Dubois and King; Roch Larochelle, CMA Engineering; and Richard Candee, Portsmouth Historical Society.

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

Northfield, X-A000(091), 13890  
Salisbury, 14626A (no federal #)  
Antrim, 14944 (no federal #)  
Andover, X-A000(219), 14169  
Nashua 13716 and Bedford 13527 (no federal #)  
New Ipswich, X-A000(15334), 15334  
Portsmouth, X-A000(357), 14417  
Alton, X-A000(510), 14121A  
Laconia 15492 (no federal #)  
Nashua 13716 and Bedford 13527 (no federal #)  
Salem-Manchester, IM-IR-0931(174), 10418C  
Merrimack 12105 (no federal #)  
Portsmouth-Kittery, BHF-T-0101-(015), 13678  
Hopkinton, STP-TE-X-000S(450), 13483A

Thursday, November 6, 2008

**Northfield, X-A000(091), 13890. Participants: Tom Jamison; Rick Stewart, Louis Berger ([rstewart@louisberger.com](mailto:rstewart@louisberger.com)); Glenn Smith, Northfield Town Administrator; and Rick Silverberg, Winnepesaukee River Trail Committee**

Rick Stewart presented the overall WRT 2 trail layout on an aerial photograph, which showed the 2-mile trail starting from Park Street in Northfield and extending to Route 140 in Tilton. The first 4200 ft from Park Street to Knapp Road is a "Share the Road" section, which means the trail utilizes the existing streets and sidewalks as they now exist. No disturbance will take place in this

section. The trail's typical section for the next 5300 ft from Knapp Road to Route 140 in Tilton is an 8-foot wide stone dust trail that will be built parallel to the existing railroad tracks for most of the way. The edge of the trail closest to the track will be 15 ft from the track centerline. A majority of the trail will be built over an existing sewer (42" and 48" in size), which is located 16 ft from the track centerline. R. Stewart presented plans that showed the trail, sewer and railroad locations, as well as, several typical sections from the sewer construction plans. R. Stewart noted the sewer construction trench was 8-ft wide, and that the sewer's typical sections showed that gravel material (and in some instances stone fill) was placed over the sewer to build up the slope where the sewer was installed along the river embankment. A majority of the trail will be constructed level with the existing ground using 6-inches of crushed gravel and 4-inches of stone dust. A 200-ft portion of the trail will have a drainage ditch built on the south side (opposite side from the tracks) of the trail. An existing 4-ft wide box culvert will be extended so that the trail will cross over. Approximately 480 ft of segmental block retaining walls will be needed along the trail.

E. Feighner requested that a Phase IA and IB Archaeological study be done to confirm that the area along the proposed trail has been disturbed. Soil cores should be taken along the entire 5300 ft with special attention to the 200 ft ditch area and the box culvert extension. Following Standard Phase 1 Procedures, test pits may be warranted at certain locations. The DHR Request for Review Form, the Short Form and an end-of-field letter should be completed if nothing is found. If resources were located, then a Phase IA/IB report would be required. DHR also requested that the future trail Phase 3 alignment along the north side of the railroad from Knapp Road, the bridge crossing over the river, to Granite Street be investigated at this time.

E. Muzzey noted that for the Project Area Form (PAF) for the railroad line, the rail corridor must be considered as a Transportation Historic District. This discussion needs to be added to the PAF. She also noted that the design for the box culvert extension must be submitted to DHR for review. R. Stewart brought the January 10, 2008 version of the PAF to the November 6, 2008 meeting. It should be noted that a revised PAF dated April 8, 2008 was submitted to the DHR. There are still outstanding issues as noted in an April 26, 2008 letter from DHR. J. McKay requested that a copy of the PAF be sent directly to her once it has been completed.

Once DHR has received and approved the Phase 1 and the PAF, a determination will be made for the project, which will be submitted by the consultant in a Cultural Resource Memorandum of Effect document. This will be included in the Categorical Exclusion Document.

**Salisbury 14626A (no federal #). Participants: Dave Powelson and Nancy Mayville; Dave Pierce ([davepierce@verizon.net](mailto:davepierce@verizon.net)), Board, Friends of the Goffstown Rail Trail; and Steve Griffin, Town Planning Coordinator.**

Dave Pierce and Steve Griffin had earlier expressed interest in moving the Pingree Bridge from Salisbury to the Rail Trail in Goffstown to carry a pedestrian loading. The time frame in which this process might happen was not an issue for the Town of Goffstown. They directed a series of questions to the committee concerning the process of relocating a historic bridge and installing the bridge at a new location.

Q1: What will the Salisbury bridge replacement contract cover in the way of adaptive reuse of the bridge? D. Pierce was looking for information dealing with the following issues: Temporary storage of the bridge would occur at Salisbury for how long? What would be the

transportation costs, such as cranes at loading and unloading sites, trucking convoy, and permitting? Will they be covered or would the town have to bear the cost? If disassembly is needed for transportation, would reassembly at the installation site be provided by another party?

ANS: The MOA detailing the exact actions related to the preservation of the Salisbury or Pingree Bridge has not been written. One option still under consideration is its preservation on-site so the engineering firm with oversight for the bridge rehab or replacement may have addressed the reuse of the bridge at another location. Meanwhile J. McKay will provide copies of two other MOAs so Goffstown may see what has been defined for previous projects. [The MOA's were provided]. L. Wilson pointed out that some funding assistance might be available from Moose Plate and Certified Local Government grants. Goffstown is a CLG.

Q2: It appears technically feasible to reuse the present bridge seats, which DOT constructed in 1990. Each bridge seat is 16' long x 5' deep x 4' high and weighs about 9 tons. Their re-use would simplify the new abutment design and would save a considerable amount in the installation costs. Would the bridge transportation also include transport of the two bridge seats?

ANS: DHR does not have a mandate to preserve structures as young as the bridge seats. However, if the reuse of the bridge at another location were significantly more feasible or likely if the bridge seats were also reused, then the bridge seat issue would be reviewed for possible inclusion in the Salisbury MOA.

Q3: The new bridge abutments at Goffstown would be designed by a commercial firm. Would either DHR or NHDOT need to have oversight of the final plans?

ANS: Yes, but only to ensure sufficient steps have been taken to preserve the structure. The type of design and structural capacity would be the town's responsibility. If the bridge were left on the NHDOT bridge inventory, the DOT may be able to periodically provide a brief inspection.

Q4: One scenario might have a funding article presented to the Goffstown voters in the March 2010 election to cover some portion of the installation costs. Assuming the design of new abutments, site surveys, abutment construction, and lifting of the bridge onto its new seats might cost \$100,000. What state resources might be available for offsetting all or most of the installation cost?

ANS: Only those grant and funding sources already advertised on the DHR web site.

Q5: The scenario to have the bridge transported in 2009 and installed in 2010 is contingent upon a very favorable sequence of events. In any event, we are anticipating temporary storage of the structure, on blocks, at a site just 200 yards from its installation site. Will there be any limitations on the length of time for such storage before installation is undertaken?

ANS: No such deadlines on the receiving town have been part of other preservation efforts; however, both DOT and DHR would monitor the progress towards reuse.

Q6: What covenants would DHR place on the bridge at its new site?

ANS: Peter Michaud will research and provide an answer.

Q7: We accept the fact that NHDOT has an interest in periodic bridge inspections since we've been told the bridge would remain on its inventory for a span of time yet to be determined.

However, we have no interest in maintaining a 10-ton capacity, which is its current rating. The Goffstown Rail Trail could place fixed bollards at either end of the bridge, thus preventing vehicle access. Emergency vehicle access to the trail is not an issue as the approaches to the bridge from either end, are less than 0.2 miles from a public road. Does NHDOT have inspection guidelines which might find the condition of the bridge suitable to a lower capacity, such as 2-tons?

ANS: NHDOT does not have load capacity inspection criteria specifically designed for rating non-vehicular bridges. The NHDOT inspection could be something as simple as recording the fact the bridge is still where it was installed. The structural condition of the bridge (for its pedestrian use) could be a responsibility of the town engineer.

Q8: We accept the fact that the Pingree Bridge does have lead paint. While the installation of the bridge will be expensive by itself, we certainly do not want to put the Goffstown tax payer on the front line of footing an even more expensive bill for elimination of the lead paint risk if such action were mandated after-the-fact by a state or federal agency. What technical advice can DHR, or some state agency, provide us such indicating that the current paint condition would be an acceptable public risk? Thus, complete paint removal would not be necessary.

ANS: Lead paint laws are related to day care centers, tenant units, and worker safety. The town may want to research information related to environmental risk (chips on the ground and possible threat to ground water). Other than the conditions discussed, there is nothing mandating bridge-type structures be absolutely lead-free. D. Powelson cautioned the town to not loosely interchange “repainting” actions with “abatement” actions as there are specific and more stringent criteria meant by abatement.

Q9: Could the adaptive reuse portion of the Salisbury replacement bridge contract include all, or some level of, lead paint removal?

ANS: No

Q10: What are the plans to announce the reuse of the Pingree Bridge? Would a RFP be issued and by whom? What would be the time frame for such a process?

ANS: See answer to Q1. As background, Goffstown pointed out that during an earlier meeting with NHDOT Planning and Community Assistance, Nancy Mayville said an RFP could be one course of action since such action would reach a wide audience and since, in theory, some organization might want to pay to have rights to the bridge. On the other hand, Goffstown pointed out the VHB Inc. project manager indicated another course of action would be a perspective recipient’s letter of intent submitted to VHB would allow VHB to present preservation recommendations to DHR.

Q11: Are there any other issues we need to review or information you would like?

ANS: There was discussion about who actually would control the amount of funds set aside for bridge demolition – the town of Salisbury (who is contracting the bridge work) or the recipient organization. If it is the recipient organization, then there may be more freedom to define the nature of the preservation action paid for by the funds. However, The cost of demolition for the Salisbury bridge may not be that much (relative to more modern or more massive bridges)

therefore any assumption (at the current time) as to the amount of the preservation funds is premature.

**Antrim 14944 (no federal #). Participants: James Bouchard ([jbouchard@quantum-cc.com](mailto:jbouchard@quantum-cc.com)) and Lisa Martin, Quantum Construction.**

Quantum Construction Consultants, LLC (QCC) was contracted by the Town of Antrim for the design of a replacement bridge structure for Old North Branch Road Bridge over North Branch River (130/149). According to the NHDOT bridge report, the existing bridge was built in 1910 and the superstructure was replaced in 1955. The stone abutments and corrugated steel and concrete deck are severely deteriorated and are in need of replacement. The bridge was closed on September 12, 2008, due to its critical deficiencies. In addition to replacing the bridge, the Town asked QCC to evaluate upgrading River Road, adjacent to the North Branch River, in lieu of replacing the bridge.

QCC presented each of the alternatives being considered. For Alternative I, QCC presented a site plan, elevation and section showing the proposed 32-foot wide replacement bridge. There will be some minimal changes to the roadway alignment to accommodate the new bridge, but the work will be concentrated in the right-of-way.

For Alternatives IIA and IIB, QCC discussed the proposed roadway alignments for River Road. Both alternatives will require raising the roadway above the 100-year flood elevation where it crosses the North Branch River floodplain. The limits of work for alternative IIA extend from NH Route 9 to the intersection with Old North Branch Road. This alternative would widen River Road and require the construction of extensive retaining walls in an embankment that is located partially on the Flint Estate, a property listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Alternative IIB would widen River Road to the west side of the North Branch River floodplain. From this point, the current alignment of River Road would be abandoned and a new roadway would be constructed to connect into the proposed roadway alignment for the Maharishi Academy of Total Knowledge, on the site of the former Nathaniel Hawthorn College.

NHDHR representatives determined that an Individual Inventory Form should be completed for any work involving replacement or removal of the bridge. This would include all alternatives. In particular, they requested that the abutments be dated. The representatives also indicated that a Phase 1A Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment would be required for both Alternative IIA and Alternative IIB outside the road box. It was determined that no further surveys are required to take place on adjacent properties, as they will not be adversely affected by the project.

QCC will hire an architectural history consultant to review the history of the structure and complete the required Individual Inventory Form. Should the Town decide to pursue Alternatives IIA or IIB, QCC will also hire an archaeological consultant to complete the Phase 1A Archaeological Assessment. Once the required work has been completed, QCC will follow up with the Cultural Resource Committee.

Thursday, November 13, 2008:

**Andover, X-A000(219), 14169. Participant: Kevin Nyhan.**

B. Muzzey noted that the listing of Potter Place should be noted in the MOA and that it be noted that the buildings adjacent to the railroad station are potentially eligible for the National Register. The changes were made, and the MOA was signed for the project.

**Nashua 13716 (no federal #) and Bedford 13527. Participant: Cathy Goodmen.**

Bedford 13527 (no federal #)

This project was previously presented March 8 and November 8, 2007. A RPR form was presented to DHR. This project is intended to replace bridge 189/121 that carries US Route 3 over the F.E. Everett Tpk in the town of Bedford. Previous meetings determined the bridge would only be eligible as a contributing resource in a district that encompasses the F.E. Everett Tpk. A project area form was requested and is currently being produced. A public hearing will be held in January 2009, and the NHDOT requested the signature of an effect memo by DHR for inclusion in its environmental document. After a short discussion of the previous meeting comments, it was agreed that a memo should state that if the bridge is a contributing element to the district, then there would be an adverse effect to the district. Mitigation for this adverse effect would be the production of the area form. If the F.E. Everett Tpk is not eligible for the National Register, then there would be no historic properties affected. Since there is the need to treat storm water for this project, the area will be reviewed for Native American archaeological sensitivity in a phase IA-IB survey.

Nashua 13716 (no federal #)

This requirement was presented for the first time, and a RPR form was provided. This project rehabilitates bridge 137/076 that carries the southbound lane of the D.W. Highway over the northbound on ramp to the F.E. Everett Tpk, just south of the city of Nashua. Work will include replacing the bridge rail and guardrail, replacing the deck, and painting the steel. This project is within the F.E. Everett Tpk corridor that is currently being reviewed to determine its eligibility for the National Register. It was determined that if the corridor is eligible, this rehabilitation will have no adverse effect. Depending on the safety requirements, the NHDOT will investigate the replacement of the bridge rail with a similar rail. If the F.E. Everett Tpk were not eligible for the National Register, then there would be no historic properties affected. The project area is not archaeologically sensitive.

Effect memos will be presented for both projects at the next meeting.

**New Ipswich, X-A000(695), 15334. Participants: Mark Goodrich, Dubois and King ([mgoodrich@dubois-king.com](mailto:mgoodrich@dubois-king.com)).**

Mark Goodrich presented a brief overview of the project, A Safe Route to School Project. The project involves the construction of a new bituminous concrete sidewalk with granite curbing (5' wide by approximately 1,000' long). The sidewalk will be located on the south side of Route 124 (Turnpike Road) and extend from the TD Banknorth property to the intersection of Tricnit Road, Turnpike Road, and King Road. The sidewalk will be located approximately 15' south of Route 124's centerline, and will be located within the existing right-of-way. Construction of the sidewalk will impact the existing storm water runoff. As such, three new catch basins will be located within the roadway to collect runoff and direct it to the existing drainage system. Construction will require minor excavation to a depth of approximately 2' in order to place the base and subbase materials. The catch basins will require excavation to a depth of approximately 10'. All excavation will be within the existing right-of-way.

Construction will not impact existing historical structures, including homes, stone walls and boundary markers, nor will construction require the removal of existing vegetation.

M. Goodrich received conditional archaeological approval from Division of Historical Resources by Edna Feighner.

M. Goodrich shall provide a plan that identifies the limits of the New Ipswich Center Village District. He was directed to contact Tanya Kress of DHR on Pillsbury St, Concord, NH. Ms. Kress is responsible for the oversight of the database, which would include New Ipswich's Center Village District. With this information, a No Adverse Effect Memo can likely be signed. There would be no 4(f).

**Portsmouth X-A000 (357), 14417. Participant Roch D. Laroche, PE, CMA Engineers ([rlaroche@cmaengineers.com](mailto:rlaroche@cmaengineers.com))**

This Municipally Managed project is sponsored by the Pease Development Authority (PDA) and involves the construction of a dedicated bike/pedestrian path. The project begins at the intersection of Grafton Drive and New Hampshire Way and continues southerly along Grafton Drive to the intersection with NH Route 33. The proposed path continues along NH Route 33 southwesterly to the intersection with Portsmouth Avenue and continues along Portsmouth Avenue to the Greenland Town Line. The total length of the project is estimated at approximately 1.5 miles and is intended to provide improved access at the southern Tradeport entrance as part of the "Great Bay Bicycle Loop".

CMA Engineers, Inc. has been retained by the PDA to design the project and is now in the beginning phases of the Engineering Study seeking input on area resources. Roch D. Laroche, PE of CMA Engineers, presented the project using a USGS map of the subject area along with a set of photos and large scale colored plan depicting the existing conditions and pertinent features of the site.

The proposed project will likely involve construction of an 8- to 10-foot wide paved multi-use path that is intended to be situated along the western side of the stated roads with 8 to 10-feet of horizontal separation from the existing roadways where possible. Construction will involve excavation along Grafton Drive and Portsmouth Avenue to approximate depths of 18-24 inches for the path as well as the possible installation of drainage catch basins. Work along the western side of NH Route 33 may involve the filling of wetlands adjacent to the Public Golf Course.

Edna Feighner stated that she would review their files for sensitive sites and would advise if any archaeological investigations were necessary. [Edna later notified CMA Engineers that from her review of NHDHR's database, there is a Native American site approximately 2,000 feet from the project area and an historic site identified within the golf course. She indicated that a combined Phase 1A/1B archaeological investigation would need to be completed to support the project]. Based on this information, CMA Engineers intends to contract with IAC to complete this work.

**Alton, X-A000(510), 14121A. Participant: Kevin Nyhan.**

The project involves the NH Routes 11 and 28 intersection. Kevin Nyhan presented a memo for signature. A majority of the project is within the right-of-way. Because of a driveway match and sidewalk placement as well as potential impact to a tree, B. Muzzey requested a photograph of the property at the west end of the project. K. Nyhan will bring the photograph to the next meeting.

**Laconia 15492 (no federal #). Participant: Joyce McKay.**

J. McKay reviewed the stone railroad culvert on the Boston, Concord, and Montreal line with B. Muzzey. The culvert outlets drainage into Lake Waukewan near Cotton Hill Road in Laconia. Bryan Lombard had indicated that, since the line was eligible for the National Register, repair rather than replacement was feasible. Repair would involve armoring both ends with rubble stone and filling in the pool formed by the flooding to limit erosion around the culvert. B. Muzzey agreed to this approach and request documentation as a continuation sheet to the existing area form. Identify the continuation sheets as page A, etc. The documentation would include black and white photographs, location map, description, and any further identification that is available from the Bureau of Rail's records.

**Andover, X-A000(219), 14169. Participants: Alex Bernhard and Ed Hiller, consulting parties; and Kevin Nyhan.**

The parties signed the MOA for the project.

**Nashua 13716 (no federal #) and Bedford 13527. Participant: Cathy Goodmen.**

The two affect memos for two bridges along the Everett Turnpike were signed. The effect produced by these two projects will depend on whether the FE Everett Turnpike is eligible for the National Register.

**Salem-Manchester, IM-IR-0931(174), 10418C. Participants: Marc Laurin and Pete Salo.**

P. Salo provided a brief description of the work associated with the Exit 5 contract (14633E) in Londonderry. To improve safety, Independence Drive, at its intersection with Auburn Road, will be relocated to the south to align it opposite Verani Drive. This shifts Independence Drive onto the Manchester-Lawrence rail corridor and impacts an existing 2.5-foot wide stone box culvert. The north end of the stone box culvert is connected to a basin, which drains to the east under Independence Drive via a 3-foot concrete pipe. If the culvert is to be retained, the required minimum cover of the new Independence Drive roadbed with the existing stone box culvert cannot be provided. The intent is to replace the stone box culvert with an 18-inch pipe.

J. McKay stated that L. Mausolf is in the process of finishing the M & L rail corridor area form and has determined that this section of the line is most likely not eligible. E. Muzzey inquired as to the possibilities of avoiding the culvert. P. Salo pointed out that if the culvert were to remain, inadequate cover would likely to produce in frost heaving under the relocated Independence Drive. Also, there is the potential for conflicts with water and sewer lines if the pipe were to be placed in a new location. He stated that the culvert could remain if the new pipe was placed through the existing culvert and the culvert filled in with flowable fill. E. Muzzey asked that this option be further evaluated from a cost and engineering perspective to see if it is appropriate. L. Wilson agreed that this option would protect the actual stone construction characteristics of the resource.

E. Muzzey stated that currently she cannot determine the eligibility of the culvert, but can assume the culvert is individually eligible. Because the culvert would be covered whether or not removed, documentation including examination of the quarry marks and any stone carvers marks that may be present would be required to obtain a better understanding of the resource. J. McKay inquired about the level of documentation required for this effect. E. Muzzey stated that a brief NH Historic Property Documentation Form for the culvert would be appropriate, including large format photography, sketches of the culvert, and a narrative with information on the stone work and quarry marks if they are present. The documentation should also provide reference to the area form, as appropriate, for more information. A future determination of eligibility will be based on this and information from the area form. A discussion on the quarry marks ensued. DHR will provide DOT with the information that they have available. [This information was provided. Inspection of the culvert did not locate the referenced marks. DOT agreed to monitor the culvert for such marks as it was being removed, assuming that the engineering study could not find an alternative solution.]

**Merrimack 12105 (no federal #). Participant: Marc Laurin.**

J. McKay presented the Amended MOA for review. The Amendment was the result of changes that will occur due to the value engineering and includes new mitigation. The old stipulations were left in and some minor clarification was made. The amendments were handled in the “whereas” clauses and in the two new stipulations. The Amended MOA was signed. M. Laurin will forward it to the ACOE for signature. J. McKay inquired as to the type of progress report stipulated in the mitigation section. E. Muzzey stated that a letter report would be appropriate. The additional mitigation would cover the consideration of the in-lieu fee for adverse effects to

historic bridges to fund historic bridge rehabilitation and the development of a bridge yard. An additional element of mitigation was the development of a white paper on Robert Prowse and loading it to a DHR website.

**Portsmouth, BHF-T-0101(015), 13678. Participants: Kevin Nyhan, Bob Juliano, and Bob Landry and Consulting Parties: Richard Candee.**

Bob Landry discussed this project, which involves the rehabilitation of the Memorial Bridge. Bids for the project came in \$15M over the engineering estimate, which has necessitated a review of new options, including replacement. The State of ME will not participate in the current project since bids are so high. The issue of prudence with regard to 4(f) was discussed. Maine was most concerned with the operational costs. The Department of Transportation will be meeting with its Maine counterparts, and with NH and ME FHWA to plot out a course of action.

There was considerable discussion about the direction to proceed with regard to cultural resources as all parties previously agreed to an Adverse Effect with mitigation as outlined in a Memorandum of Agreement. B. Muzzey indicated that she felt that DHR could reach no other conclusion regarding the Memorial Bridge than what has already been agreed to with regard to the choice of alternatives. The Memorial Bridge is a gateway to the City of Portsmouth. B. Landry indicated that the additional cost needs for historic mitigation needs to be considered in any alternative selection.

Next steps include reviewing the regional transportation needs of all three Portsmouth-Maine bridges, looking at the potential elimination of one crossing and engaging all parties. Inspection of the current span will occur next spring. B. Muzzey indicated that historical agencies should be engaged sooner rather than later, especially referencing the Maine Historical Commission. In addition, the signatories to the MOA all need to sit down and discuss the future project. The State of Maine needs to take a more active role in the next steps of the project. Jamie Sikora indicated that he would touch bases with Dave Gamble of FHWA concerning the future of the project, including the issues of feasibility and prudence and how to incorporate such issues of maintenance into the 4f consideration.

In addition, discussions included the use of historic preservation funds to make up the difference in the estimated funding to the actual cost, obtaining better engineering estimates, and “passing the hat,” to secure additional funds.

The project will be reviewed again at a later date. Additional questions included whether the project needed to go to the Council.

**Hopkinton, STP-TE-X-000S(450), 13483A. Participants: Jim Garvin, DHR; Dina Boles, Public Works; Jamie Sikora, FHWA; and Kevin Nyhan.**

J. Garvin and Dina Boles discussed the fireproofing and lighting improvements for the Contoocook covered railroad bridge in Hopkinton, a FHWA TE project. L. Wilson had noted that the contract should reference such standards as the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Sections 106 and 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Other than those standards, J. Garvin noted that he would need to verify any additional standards needed in the contract with Beth Muzzey. J. Garvin did note that the contract would probably not be subjected to the Davis

Bacon Act. D. Boles indicated that the contract should be ready for FHWA's review within a week.

Line items in the contract would include the design/build specifications and shop drawings for the fireproofing and for the installation of lighting. D. Boles asked about the amount of the contingency fee for these items, stating that it could be negotiated given the limited budget for the contract.

D. Boles described the options for lighting. It was noted that the lighting is intended primarily to provide security. Rather than relying on solar power, it may be easier to tap electricity from the pole, given its need for the fire alarm system. The use of LED lighting and motion detectors to trigger the lights when pedestrians are on the bridge would reduce the amount of power necessary for the lighting. Since three fixtures would be required, the solar panels needed to run the lights would need to measure 5'X2'. Placement would have to be on the south and more visible side. The use of power metered off the pole now appears to be the preferred option. The lighting has a 5-10 year warranty.

D. Boles asked about the specifications for the construction trailer and chemical toilet. The contractor would need room to store piping for the alarm system, which can run considerable length. J. Garvin suggested leaving this section open, since there may be storage opportunities nearby. Gating the bridge to serve this purpose was also suggested.

D. Boles also inquired about the need for a project sign, indicating the project name, sources of funding, and other details. J. Garvin wasn't certain whether they were mandatory, but depending on the budget, it seemed like an appropriate form of public notification about the project. He will ask Tom Jamison about the need for such a sign recognizing the use of TE funding.

D. Boles plans to advertise the project on December 9, 2008. K. Nyhan noted that the Categorical Exclusion would need to be completed with a signed effect memo before the advertising date so that FHWA could authorize the funds. If the contract for the design/build does not include the performance standards, can they be referenced in the memo? The memo can also state that DHR would review and approve all documents produced by the contractor.

**\*\*Memos/MOA's:** Andover X-A000 (219), 14169 (MOA); Merrimack 12105 (MOA); Alton, X-A000(510), 14121A (memo); Barnstead 15264 (memo); Bedford 13527 and Nashua 13716 (memos).

Submitted by Joyce McKay, Cultural Resources Manager

<http://www.nh.gov/dot/bureaus/environment/CulturalResourcesMeeting.htm>

S:\MEETINGS\SHPO\08 minutes\11-6-13.doc