

# BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT

## CONFERENCE REPORT

**DATE OF CONFERENCES:** May 5 and 12, 2005

**LOCATION OF CONFERENCES:** JO Morton Building

**ATTENDED BY:** Jon Evans, Kevin Nyhan, Mark Hemmerlein, Marc Laurin, Alex Vogt, Charles Hood, Bill Hauser, Chris Waszczuk, NHDOT; Jim Garvin, Linda Wilson, and Edna Feighner, NHDHR; Harry Kinter and Ed Woolford, FHWA; Peter Helm, OSP; Tom French and Joseph Bittler, HTA; Chris Gamache, DRED; Lynne Monroe, Preservation Company; and Cynthia May, CLD.

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

### NOTES ON CONFERENCE

*Thursday, May 5, 2005*

**Whitefield, HP-STP-F-X-0351(008), P2953. Participants: Marc Laurin and Alex Vogt and Pete Helm and Steve Walker, OEP.**

Alex Vogt recapped the proposed limits of the 400 by 2000-foot scenic easement and the modifications to the limits of the easements that were discussed at last month's meeting. He noted that NHDOT's total take on LCIP land was 4 acres. He reminded all that these easements rely on consent of landowners. If this cannot be done, the alternative option would be to put an easement on the Bean property off Colby Road, which abuts the existing LCIP land.

P. Helm stated that the Bean property has higher natural resources value, but it would be preferable that the compensation package for the LCIP impact focus on protecting scenic views since this is what would be impacted. S. Walker added that it would increase the value for the easement to follow existing woods line boundaries rather than proposing a line 400 feet from the highway ROW. This approach would create a shorter and deeper easement. It would also provide better value since this would preserve an iconic northern New Hampshire farm scene. L. Wilson agreed that the property is an emblematic northern New Hampshire farm scene, which would need to be managed to remain in its current agricultural setting. A. Vogt speculated that since the land drops off sharply the views might well be preserved within this 400-foot area without going all the way to the woods line.

P. Helm stated that an affirmative right to allow the state to mow, rather than making it mandatory on the owners, would be an option for the easement, which would better protect the scenic views. Also, he reiterated that ideally all the backfield areas should be in the easement. If the back is developed, a driveway could split the front tract and cause mowing concerns as it may not be economical for the owner to mow these smaller areas. L. Wilson said that a stewardship

fund could be set up to provide for mowing, and could be used to reimburse the owner or go to the DOT. P. Helm thought that fund might be the money received from DOT to acquire the LCIP property for the road widening and might be both used to acquire the new easements and/or set up a maintenance endowment. H. Kinter asked that OEP to provide its preferred solution for the limits of the proposed easement. P. Helm will, in the near future, get permission from the owners to walk their properties, GPS some points, and sense of the landscape to understand what makes sense for the easement. H. Kinter stated that it is a good idea to get a realistic look at whether any potential development in the backfield will be seen from Route 3. P. Helm will inform DOT of the date he is going up to assess the area.

**Nashua 11057. Participants: Cynthia May, CLD, Don Lyford, and Joyce McKay.**

J. McKay presented the preliminary mapping of industrial sites located by Timelines or John Milner Associates (JMA) at the proposed Rotary Park. The current map illustrates the considerable density of foundations. In the requested form, JMA will also overlay buildings shown on the Sanborn Maps covering this site. L. Wilson noted that the International Paper Box Company, which last occupied the site, was linked to the Lombombards, an important family with existing ties to the city.

C. May indicated that CLD was just getting started in the design of the park and that the City of Nashua was enthusiastic about the prospect of creating an interpretive park, using the information presented in the form. The city intends to hold a series of charrettes to assist in its design.

E. Feighner was concerned about the preservation of the building remains and associated machinery. She indicated that the site could be buried completely or filled so that the foundation outlines just showed at the surface of the ground. This approach would protect the site and reduce liability. She also stated that the park should not include tree plantings since the excavation of holes and the roots themselves would disturb the site. Surface flowerbeds planted in added fill would work. Similarly, the pedestrian paths should be additive rather than excavating to create a base.

J. McKay asked Don Lyford if NHDOT was currently concerned about the foundations immediately adjacent to the river. He indicated that since they were fenced, he was not. The treatment of these foundations has not yet been determined. They would need to be stabilized.

The next step includes integrating the historic and hazard material information into the park planning. It was noted that the report should be arriving by late May.

Notes from Cynthia May, CLD:

**1. Meeting Overview**

The meeting attendants were interested in what the City of Nashua proposed for the design of the park. They appeared pleased to learn that this was the pre-design stage and that a great deal of public participation would take place to formulate that vision. They were also assured that the archeological and HAZMAT reports would provide the design process with necessary guidance regarding what kind of park it would be and how it would be developed. There was a question regarding whether or not historic interpretation would be part of the program, and based on the input received from the City of Nashua, I indicated that interpretation was considered an important design element.

NHDOT does not plan to do any work on the site at this time. The condition of walls, floors, fences, and debris was discussed. It seemed that the fences currently offer an adequate level of safety. It was also mentioned that the State does not own the dam. It is owned by Pennichuck, who should be contacted for any necessary repairs.

The proximity of Elm Street Junior High was noted, first in terms of the desire line created by students traversing the site, and second to note that the Nashua students will be an excellent resource in the design process, because they have been exposed to historical treasures in Nashua through other programs, and have shown an interest in this site.

## 2. Site History/Archeology

- The archeological survey will most likely show that there is minimal area on the site that has not been impacted by industrial structures. There is a building foundation at the top of the site, adjacent to Bridle Path, and may still contain old machinery.
- When the final map is produced, it will overlay a Sanborn Map\*.
- The archeological report is expected to be complete within the next few weeks.
- The archeology and history of the site covers a range of time and industrial activities, probably dating from the 1820's or earlier. It most likely began as a sawmill or gristmill on the brook, and has seen foundry work, edge tools, and most recently was occupied by the International Paper Box Company.
- The final archeological report may include title history (not deed research) as well as an accounting of early history.
- Although the hazmat report has not been submitted to date, the initial indications were that no serious problems appeared to show up on this site. There was an isolated oil spill in one location, and a deposit of slag material behind a foundation wall on the south side of the brook.
- The archeologists will identify the period for each of the structures on the site.
- The concrete foundation walls and slabs may date back to the 1920's when there was a proliferation of concrete use in building construction.

## 3. Historical Interpretation

- It will be important to address the historic significance of this industrial site in the park design.
- There are two interpretive options:
- a. Bury the historic features completely to preserve them and develop a design on top of the features. The construction of walkways may be problematic if they are near structures and require ground disturbance to provide base material. interpretive program on the new ground surface. One option might be to superimpose the structure foundations on the new surface.

- b. Leave historic features just barely visible (first course) on the ground surface and develop the park to incorporate these structures along with an associated interpretive piece.
- Strawberry Banke in Portsmouth would be a good place to visit as an example of desirable preservation/interpretation.

#### 4. Park Development

- All ground disturbance activities will be prohibited in the area around historic structures.
- No trees can be planted in or near foundation walls. Trees can be introduced in containers above the ground. (It was noted that trees were not typically an element of the industrial site, and that Rotary Common may become a good cultural legacy park given all that is still present above and below the ground.)

\*Jamie Paine provided this information:

Sanborn Maps are historic maps (I believe insurance maps) that were created for different towns or states that identify where buildings were etc. Consider them early USGS or DeLorme-type maps from the 1800's-early 1900's.

#### **Discussions of the Addition to Programmatic 4(f) and the Proposed Amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act at AASHTO. Participant: Bill Hauser**

The new programmatic 4(f) is intended to expedite the review of those transportation projects that currently result in a 4(f) because they utilize lands from National Register properties but have an overall beneficial effect to eligible properties. The programmatic would be applied to projects that have a relatively minor impact. The official with jurisdiction, here the Division of Historical Resources, and the Federal Highway Administration would agree that the project effects with the proposed mitigation have beneficial net effects before the programmatic could be used.

L. Wilson stated that this approach reflects the established philosophy of cooperation, the consensus decisions, for New Hampshire's transportation projects that NHDHR, FHWA, and NHDOT have displayed for many years.

A staffer was present at the AASHTO meeting to facilitate the discussion about the proposed amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act. B. Hauser leads the Standing Committee on Cultural Resources. Currently, AASHTO does not intend to issue statements about the amendments. Reflecting on the portions of the amendment relating to Section 106, participants did express grave concerns about changing the Determination of Eligibility process, which is now based on consensus determinations. This approach works. Although intended to involve only listed or previously determined eligibility, the proposed changes to the process states that all determinations must be sent to the Keeper. This approach would be a step backwards for the process and is very similar to the one followed in the 1980s. The slowness of this approach resulted in the current consensus approach. ASSHTO's current stance is to keep hands off the process. ASSHTO is planning to provide education to its members about why its members think the current process works, but has decided not to go on record either way.

A task group of the Cultural Resources Committee will conduct a survey about the eligibility process concerning the issues about the exponential growth of properties that appear to be eligible, the process by which each state determines eligibility, and the way in which the state involves the relevant communities in that process. The study will take into account the distinct rise in the number of buildings that are now fifty years old and must be addressed in the eligibility process. One example would be the ranch house. The findings of the committee will be synthesized to establish best practices.

It was noted that the House Interior subcommittee increased the budget by .5 million. The proposal keeps Save America Treasures and deletes the administration's Preserve America Program.

**Temple 14136 (no federal #). Participant: Tom French and Joseph Bittler, HTA ([tfrench@hta-nh.com](mailto:tfrench@hta-nh.com)).**

Mr. French began with a brief overview of the project explaining existing conditions of the project and the need for the proposed improvements. Highlights of the discussion included widening of West Road near the bridge from 20' to 24' wide. This project is unique from other projects in that the Town of Temple will build it. Photographs of the existing conditions were presented to the committee.

The committee discussed the bridge and its historic characteristics. The bridge is approximately a 9'-6" single span with a 13" inch thick concrete deck that is supported by steel railroad rails on mortared field stone abutments. It was concluded by the committee that the bridge has no unique or historic features.

A question was raised by J. Garvin regarding the wood rail. Mr. French discussed in detail the rail system that is crash tested by FHWA. The rail will have a steel plate on the back to stiffen the timber rail.

J. McKay asked if any of the houses within the vicinity of the project working limits were older than fifty (50) years. Mr. French said that no houses are within the project and they cannot be seen from the project. However, there is a house at the Blood Road intersection with West Road and its age is not known.

Mr. French also explained the proposed bridge type, which is a box culvert. The project was designed to limit the impacts to wetlands and impacts to stonewalls that define the prescriptive easement that the Town has. It was concluded by Mr. French that stonewalls will not be disturbed.

A Cultural Resources Memorandum of Affect was signed by the committee on which the "No Historic or Archeological Properties will be Affected" box was checked.

**Sandown 14260 (no federal #): Participant: Tom French and Joseph Bittler, HTA.**

Mr. French began with a brief overview of the project explaining the existing conditions of the project and the need for the proposed improvement. It was discussed that the existing bridge would be rehabilitated. The bridge substructure will have some minor repairs while the

superstructure would be completely replaced. The existing bridge was built in the late 1970s to early 1980's by town forces.

Proposed improvements for the project are: improve vertical alignment of the roadway to improve the visibility of traveling vehicles, fix scour holes at northeast wingwall, and fortify roadway slopes with stone fill to prevent the roadway embankment from eroding due to the river flow.

There is an old mill foundation at the west end of the project well outside the project working limits. Other than this there are no known historical or archaeological resources within the vicinity of the project. Age of the nearby house is unknown.

The committee had no concerns regarding this project. A Cultural Resources Memorandum of Affect was signed by the committee on which the "No Historic or Archeological Properties will be Affected" box was checked.

**DRED Projects. Participant: Chris Gamache, DRED ([cgamache@dred.state.nh.us](mailto:cgamache@dred.state.nh.us)).**

C. Gamache discussed the Pier Bridge, which is a covered railroad bridge in Newport owned by DRED. It was part of the Sugar River Rail Line, eventually a spur of the Clermont and Concord Railroad. The center column is being undermined by the Sugar River. DRED is proposing to pump concrete to underpin the bridge, minimizing the protrusion of concrete. The project is scheduled for low-flow, sometime in August or September. NHDHR agreed that it would be all right to proceed with the project.

*Thursday, May 12, 2005*

**Bridge Storage Yard. Participants: Bill Hauser, Den Danna, and Jim Moore.**

J. Garvin had inquired about the practicality of establishing a bridge storage yard for set-aside historic bridges, which would be placed in anticipation of reuse. It was noted that the Bristol-New Hampton project, which involves a 240' long bridge, has sparked this discussion between NHDHR, NHDOT, and FHWA. Another potential recipient might be the set-aside bridge in Bartlett. Issues under discussion included locations and the necessity of setting a time limit on their storage. In New Hampshire, set aside bridges might be used in its recreational trail system. Although perhaps not having locations on its campus to place historic bridge as has been done in Massachusetts, UNH has expressed interest in considering the refurbishing of historic bridges as part of its engineering program.

It was noted that Vermont maintains such a storage yard. It was requested that J. McKay contact the VTAOT to inquire about their storage locations for set-aside bridges and arrange a tour. Jim Garvin, J. McKay, Den Danna, and perhaps Jim McConaha and Harry Kinter would be interested in participating. In addition, Den Danna agreed to do a query with AASHTO about whether other states have such yards and how they handle their set-aside bridges.

If such a yard were established, it would make sense to place yards in the northern, southeastern, southwestern parts of the state and in Concord. Surplus lands and district maintenance areas may be potential locations. It was noted that the Franklin bridge maintenance yard did not have a lot

of room for such a function. Jim Moore agreed to send a memo to the districts inquiring about potential locations.

**Durham-Newmarket, STP-TE-X-5133(009), 13080. Participants: Kevin Nyhan and Chris Waszczuk.**

K. Nyhan began by discussing the proposed impacts to historic resources. Since the impacts have been minimized through design, and have not changed from those presented at the last meeting, a detailed description of impacts was not necessary. It was noted that there would be 755 square meters of drainage easements and 270 square meters of strip acquisition. H. Kinter and L. Wilson stated that since the impacts have not changed the project could be classified as No Adverse Effect and a programmatic 4(f).

J. Butler described the proposed formalization of Wildcat bus stops along the entire route. Buses currently pull off the roadway in informal areas, and the proposed project would merely formalize them with pavement and short tapers. He explained that the proposed pull-offs were roughly 100 feet long and noted their locations. No one objected to this proposal. It was noted that the NHDOT would go through all necessary phases of archaeology. A No Adverse Effect memo will be signed at the June 2, 2005 meeting.

**Bath-Lisbon, MGS-STP-NHS-F-T-0331(018), 10425: Participant: Charles Hood, Kevin Nyhan, Bob Landry, Bill Grace, and Lynne Monroe, Preservation Company.**

L. Monroe stated that, based on recent fieldwork, Preservation Company had revised its historic property table. Preservation Company has reached a final determination on most of the properties in the survey area. She will recommend limited changes for some of the district boundaries because of property alteration and the passing of the fifty-year old mark of other properties. Although there are changes to the original scope of work, the work can be done within the original budget. More survey forms than realized exist. However, Preservation Company will need to prepare more continuation sheets.

L. Monroe had the following questions. It was agreed that Preservation Company should leave all properties in the table. She will adjust the period of significance on the district forms as needed, in part to update the more recent end date reflecting the passage of time since the district area forms were originally prepared. L. Monroe noted that, in general, she was re-evaluating those properties that had undergone relatively significant alterations in the last ten years. Some historic districts will be shortened, and some properties near the edges of those districts will become individually eligible.

The format for the continuation sheets will include the old photos and new photos of the property and a comparative discussion/description of changes to the property that necessitate re-evaluation. The continuation sheets will be sufficiently complete to, for the most part, stand alone.

H. Kinter noted that he needed to send the Advisory Council notice of an adverse effect for the project, inviting them to become a consulting party. He requested a draft EA from Bill Grace, and he will need to know which properties are likely to be eligible and which are not.

**DRED Projects. Participant: Chris Gamache, DRED ([cgamache@dred.state.nh.us](mailto:cgamache@dred.state.nh.us)).**

C. Gamache reviewed the scope of 56 recreational trails projects that will be funded in fiscal year 2005 with FHWA TE monies. NHDHR indicated which projects required further review. C. Gamache will make arrangements with E. Feighner to examine them in the field.

**Rye, MGS-BRF-X-T-0221(010), 13269. Participant: Joyce McKay.**

Having recently examined the project area along Seavey Creek in the field at low tide, J. McKay noted the probable location of the former tidal mill. It appears to have been positioned on a flat, graveled area immediately adjacent northwest side of the bridge. Some timbers are embedded in the gravel, but may as likely be associated with the removal of the former bridge at that location. Because of the level of disturbance at the site and because the tidal mill would have likely stood on piers at this location, it was determined that this area would not provide a constraint to the project and further investigation was unnecessary.

**Meredith, STP-F-X-0241(014), 10430. Participants: Mark Hemmerlein and Charlie Hood.**

This project involves reconstruction of US Route 3 and NH Route 25 from NH Route 104 to the Center Harbor Town line. A review of the process being utilized to restart this project was presented. M. Hemmerlein explained that the project would be split into three phases: A) planning, b) NEPA Stage, and C) Final design phase. During the A phase of the project, the Department in coordination with the Town of Meredith would like to come up with some reasonable solutions to the traffic issues at the US Route 3 and NH Route 25 intersection while maintaining the character of Meredith Village. The downtown area was recently re-flown to provide us with an up-to-date base plan. The roadway north of the High School is being resurveyed. Most of the natural and cultural resource inventorying has been completed. McFarland Johnson will be reviewing the existing data and updating it as needed. The subs on the project include: 1. Projects for Public Spaces, Carl Johnson and Associates (Landscape Architects); 2. Resource Systems Group (Traffic Modelers); 3. Applied Economic Research (Grown Modelers); 4. Liz Hengen (Architectural Historian); and 5. Victoria Bunker (Archaeologist). Currently the Department is setting up the scope of work and fees. We hope to start with some traffic analysis this summer and begin meeting with the Advisory Task Force in the fall.

**\*\*Memos:** Manchester, X-A000(073), 13873; Troy, NHS-T-F-0131(035), 10434.

Submitted by Joyce McKay, Cultural Resources

Manager

c.c.	J. Brillhart	K. Cota	N. Mayville	Bill Cass
	C. Barleon, OSP	C. Waszczuk	D. Lyford	
	V. Chase	R. Roach, ACOE	H. Kinter, FHWA	