

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT

CONFERENCE REPORT

DATE OF CONFERENCES: June 1 and 8, 2006

LOCATION OF CONFERENCES: J.O. Morton Building

ATTENDED BY: Marc Laurin, Jon Evans, Kevin Nyhan, Cathy Goodmen, Russ St. Pierre, Charles Hood, Bill Hauser, Dennis Danna, Nancy Mayville, Mark Richardson, Dave Powelson, Ed Welch, Dave Powelson, Bob Landry, Robert Barry, Ram Maddali, and Bob Aubrey, NHDOT; Jim Garvin, Linda Wilson, Jim McConaha, and Edna Feighner, NHDHR; Harry Kinter, Bill O'Donnell, and Dave Hall, FHWA; Lynne Monroe and Carol Hooper, Preservation Co.; Mike Johnson, Maine Historical Commission (via phone); Addie Kim and John Watters, HNTB; Richard Candee, Portsmouth Historical Society; Matt Waitkins, Nashua Regional Planning Commission; Aaron La Chance, Vollmer Associates; Mike Hansen, VHB; Richard Verville, NHOEM; Pete Thomas, FEMA; Jamie Paine, CLD; Tim Sappington, architect for the Town of Gorham; Jack Mettee, Appledore Engineering; and David Hodges and Joe Landry, Town of Salisbury;

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

Thursday, June 1, 2006

Hill/Bristol 14278. Participant: Jim Garvin.

J. Garvin agreed that the Borough Road Bridge (130/165) is not eligible for the National Register. He noted that he would prefer if the bridge were left in the landscape, but agreed to its removal. However, he did request that black and white photographs of the bridge be submitted to the Division.

Wilton X-A000(107), 13906. Participants: Matt Waitkins, Nashua Regional Planning Commission and Charlie Hood.

The Nashua Regional Planning Commission (NRPC) is in the process of preparing the Environmental/Cultural/Historical documentation for the Wilton Downtown Sidewalk Improvement project. The objective of the project is to redesign and install a new downtown sidewalk system, including improvements to existing sidewalks, additional sidewalks to eliminate use of painted lines along street surfaces, clearly defined crosswalks, traffic calming devices including pedestrian controlled traffic light and traffic island, improved street & parking lot lighting, and access to a possible future river walk.

The project begins on Main Street near the Wilton Fire Department, proceeds northwesterly along Main Street and ends near the entrance to the Wilton Police Department parking lot near the intersection of Main Street, Burns Hill Road and NH 31. (Please see the attached maps).

1. Matt Waitkins distributed materials that included a text description of the project, a map of the project area, and a conceptual diagram of the potential improvements. M. Waitkins is a transportation planner at

Nashua Regional Planning Commission (NRPC), and he noted that NRPC has been contracted by the Town of Wilton to manage various administrative tasks for this project. One of the tasks that NRPC will manage is the environmental/historical resource permitting process.

2. M. Waitkins noted that this project has yet to be designed. The engineering/design firm (CLD Consulting Engineers of Manchester, NH) has been procured, and a contract between the Town of Wilton and CLD should be finalized in the near future. The design and engineering phase of this project is therefore expected to begin this summer.
3. The reason NRPC requested to attend this meeting was to develop an understanding of any potential issues that may arise regarding historical resources in the study area and address them early in the design phase.
4. The committee noted that if the project remains inside the current right-of-way, potential impacts to the architectural, archaeological and landscape (species of vegetation) resources would most likely be minimal.
5. The committee noted that Jamie Paine is responsible for environmental coordination for the consultant, CLD Consulting Engineers. They suggested that M. Waitkins coordinate with him during the design/engineer process.
6. M. Waitkin asked what the next steps regarding the permitting process should be. The committee responded that at some point NRPC would need to come before the committee so that it could have an opportunity to review the project design in relationship to cultural resources including landscaping, lighting, architecture, archaeology, and so on.

Hillsborough, X-A000(093), 13892: Participants: Bill Rollins, Vollmer Associates, and Charles Hood.

Bill Rollins opened the meeting with a brief description of the project, including the project limits and a description of how the project has been broken into phases. He described the limits of the current phase of the project within the downtown area. The proposed landscape plan was described. The buildings within the project limits eligible for the National Register were identified and their location described with respect to the proposed improvements.

The general design plan maintains existing grade at the face of the existing structures and work outward was explained since, in most locations within the project limits, the sidewalk extends to the building face. This design philosophy will minimize impact to buildings. Some of the wooden stairs to the buildings will have to be removed and reset to accommodate the proposed improvements.

H. Kinter noted that it appeared that most of the improvements were within the ROW. B. Rollins explained that Vollmer did not perform a ROW determination, but based on the information obtained from Town tax maps that was correct. B. Rollins did discuss the need to remove and reset some wooden stairs at the building faces to permit the removal of the existing bituminous sidewalk and the installation of the brick. Mr. Rollins explained this would be completed by obtaining temporary construction easements, most or all of which had already been obtained by Matt Taylor, Town of Hillsborough Planner.

H. Kinter asked about the type of light proposed. B. Rollins explained that a fixture matching the type of light used in the recent Butler park renovation was specified, though these lights would be on shorter poles and serve only to light the sidewalk at night, not as streetlights. Additionally, the proposed drainage improvements were explained, including the addition of structures to collect storm water at problematic locations (as field observed).

A consensus was reached that the project does will not have an adverse effect on historic or archaeological properties. The Cultural Resource Memorandum of Effect was filled out stating this and signed by relevant

parties. It was also decided that if the work stays within the existing ROW and all easements were temporary, as is expected, there would be no 4(f) involvement.

Jaffrey, STP-TE-X-000S(432), 13490. Participants: Greg Bakos, VHB; Charles Hood, and Ram Maddali.

Greg Bakos gave a description of the project to the cultural resources committee. The following points were made about the proposed improvements:

- The project mainly consists of replacing existing bituminous sidewalks with new cement concrete sidewalks along Main Street through the core downtown area.
- Pedestrian safety and accessibility will be improved through the installation of accessible wheelchair ramps according to the latest NHDOT standards.
- The painted crosswalks will be reconfigured to eliminate diagonal crosswalks. This will require minor traffic signal equipment alterations.
- No work is proposed on the existing river crossing.
- Several street lighting fixtures will be replaced to match the majority of the period lighting fixtures currently in the downtown.
- None of the work is proposed outside of the existing right-of-way.

G. Bakos acknowledged that the downtown is a historic district, but suggested that no adverse impacts are anticipated to existing structures or visual resources as a result of this project.

Following brief discussions, the Committee determined that there would be No Adverse Effect on historic or archaeological properties, and a no adverse effect municipal memo was signed.

Franklin SP-P1984, UGI-219(15). Participant: Joyce McKay.

E. Feighner did not find the surplus land between the railroad corridor and US Route 3 archaeologically sensitive. No survey was requested for its sale.

Alstead, X-A000(425), 14540M. Participants: Jim McConaha, NHDHR; Richard Verville, FEMA; Robert Landry and Kevin Nyhan.

It was noted that the New Hampshire chapter of the American Institute of Architectures has offered to assist in the recovery from the October 2005 flooding. This offer included architects Chris Williams and John Merkle. It was agreed that they could be most helpful assessing the structural stability of eligible properties, for example the dwelling at 15 Forest Road. This building has been determined to be potentially eligible, and a full form will be completed. If the building is to be moved, J. McKay will have a structural survey completed and prepare preservation covenants.

B. Landry noted that there were five properties in Alstead Center outside the NHDOT project area (14540M) that are verified or potential buyouts. They should also be evaluated for the National Register significance. Photographs were reviewed. Of the five, L. Wilson requested that three be evaluated. Subsequently, one

dropped out of the buyout program, leaving 139 River Road and a store near the rigid frame bridge. A full form will be completed for the dwelling, and a front form will be prepared for the store.

NHDOT with NHDHR submitted a proposal for a sum of \$30,000 to survey historic stone culverts. These structures were affected by the flooding of October 2005 and May 2006. Without this survey, NHDHR is finding all intact stone culverts eligible for the National Register. R. Verville reported that the proposal is being considered under the EMPG program. It was noted that this study would document the different types of stone culverts in the project area, establish criterion for eligibility determination for each type, and provide appropriate approaches to repair eligible culverts that would satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for rehabilitation.

Hinsdale, X-A000(426), 14540N. Participants: Jon Evans and Bob Aubrey.

This project consists of the bypass of a collapsed section of NH Route 63 in the town of Hinsdale, NH. J. McKay discussed a concrete slab bridge located at the northern edge of the project area, and it was determined that this structure is not eligible for the National Register. A plan detailing design changes to date was presented detailing possible impacts to the Smith property directly adjacent to the current temporary detour. It was mentioned that the ranch house to the north of the Smith property might also be impacted. Jon Evans pointed out that this foundation of this house appeared to be of recent concrete construction and that it likely was set on or just above the underlying bedrock. Jon also indicated that there appeared to be either an old retaining wall or foundation between the garage and house. J. McKay indicated that she would examine this location further the next time she was in the area if it was impacted.

Grantham 13221 (no federal number). Participant: Russ St. Pierre.

R. St. Pierre stated that the Department was seeking to place a 38-space park and ride at Exit 13 off of Interstate 89. The lands in the area of the park and ride have been recently disturbed, and no historical resources exist in the area. Therefore, it was agreed that no historic properties would be affected.

Thursday, June 8, 2006

Derry-Londonderry 13065 Exit 4A. Participant: Jamie Paine, CLD.

Jamie Paine of CLD Consulting Engineer, Inc. explained that it was not noticed until recently that the footprint of the Northern Interchange alternative for the Exit 4A project extends beyond the I-93 widening improvements. This additional area of impact is located on a parcel of land, part of the Reed Paige Clark homestead property, which was previously determined eligible for the National Register for the I-93 (10418C) project.

DETERMINATION:

NHDHR determined that the northern interchange alternatives (Alternatives C and D) would have an adverse impact to the Reed Paige Clark homestead property, specifically the associated former potato field located immediately west of the I-93 corridor and south of Stonehenge Road. The adverse effect on the property would be for both the need to acquire land to build the northern interchange and also the visual impact a major raised interchange would have on the Reed Paige Clark building located on the north side of Stonehenge Road. H.

Kinter and M. Laurin determined that though the impacts are adverse, the 4(f) documentation required for the impacts could be completed in the programmatic format.

Concord, X-A000(386), 14442. Participants: Joyce McKay and Charles Hood.

This project is part of the Concord 20/20 program and seeking TE funding. It involves the renovation of an urban park built in 1976 to support revitalization for downtown Concord and to celebration the nation's bicentennial. Bicentennial Square is located behind businesses lining Main Street and Warren Street. The Square was originally used for lunch meetings and rest and relaxation for downtown shoppers and workers, and it supported many outdoor theater and musical performances. Over time, the use and dynamics of the park changed, and the physical environment and certain elements of the park deteriorated so that it experienced decline in use. Through a series of public meetings and questionnaires, abutting and adjacent offices, retail merchants, and residents expressed their desire to see revitalization of the square as an active, public space for the downtown. Participants responded that they wished for better lighting, an increased in seating areas, improved landscaping, and more contemporary space for outdoor entertainment, recreation, and learning for people of all ages. In 2004, Groundwork Concord produced a design concept for a "redevelopment" project that included all of these elements, plus: removal of an unsightly 1970's-era plastic shelter, a new public art installation, new chess tables, a Concord history trail, additional trees and shrubs, archways at two entrances to the square, and increased safety mitigation between pedestrians and vehicles loading and unloading to businesses on the square. Also included in the redevelopment concept was moving most of the dumpsters located on the square to a single location out of public sight and harm. Those participating in the public review and comment sessions in 2005 approved the overall redevelopment plan. The design concept was further developed as a formal design with specifications in preparation for contractor bids in 2006. The City and Groundwork Concord are jointly overseeing this project and intend to have all construction and installations completed in the fall of 2006. There is minimal displacement of existing brick pavement and soil, and no alterations to buildings or other major elements of the existing park, except for the removal of the plastic shelter that has no historical or structural significance. The addition of a concrete river trail and history tiles developed by local elementary school students will greatly increase the value of the park to Concord's downtown. All other improvements including electrical, lighting, and landscaping, are standard to necessary park maintenance and improvements and meet the City's requirements for the site. The light matches the City's standard for historic areas. The archways are black, steel, lightweight structures, which may not be erected at the entrances to Warren and Main at this time. A letter from the City supports the improvement of the park under the requirements of 6(f).

It was agreed that the project would not have an adverse effect on the downtown historic district. However, it was noted that NHDHR wanted the opportunity to review construction drawings and the content of the interpretive materials used for the history trail prior to construction. H. Kinter noted that NHDOT is to advise the City of Concord that the lateness of submissions for environmental review will no longer be countenanced.

Bridge Maintenance Projects. Participants: Joyce McKay, Dave Powelson, and Ed Welch.

The committee discussed the eligibility of three bridges: Acworth jack arch bridge (113/064), a concrete rigid frame bridge (167/095) in Effingham, which are identified for Maintenance or Project Development projects, and an abandoned double, concrete arch bridge over the Taylor River in Hampton (086/123).

The Town of Hampton wishes to rehabilitate the concrete arch bridge for use as a pedestrian crossing, and had contacted the NHDHR to determine the need for review of its eligibility for the National Register. The

structure appears to pre-date 1930, which is the date provided in the bridge inventory. D. Powelson noted that the structure appeared to be composed of two shallow arches and a concrete slab. The tops of the arches resemble a pyramid shape. The parapet was composed of poured concrete since the juncture between the form's boards is visible in the concrete. It was determined that the structure could not be scored since it is rated as a culvert rather than a bridge for which the scoring system was established. Thus, it would be up to the town to provide the information on an individual full form to determine eligibility.

A rigid frame bridge in Effingham (167/095) was also considered for scoring. According to the bridge inventory, it was constructed in 1924. J. Garvin wondered if the bridge actually qualified as a rigid frame since there did not appear to be evidence of the moments being carried from the top slab to the abutments. The bridge has partially fixed ends which butt up against former stone abutments. Because it appears to be a concrete slab structure, it was agreed that the bridge was not eligible for the National Register, and it was not scored. It was also noted that the bridge had already been widened. A stone dam is located upstream from the bridge. It appears that a mill structure may have sat between the bridge and the dam. E. Feighner requested a Phase IA/IB, which would map the aboveground features in relation to the bridge, conduct a literature search to identify and better define the site, and undertake testing along the margin of the bridge in the vicinity of the structure.

Finally, the 1915 jack-arch bridge in Acworth (113/064) was considered. The corrugated metal form used to construct the arch remains. In this instance, the bottom flanges of the I-beams are exposed, leading to the considerable corrosion that is currently visible. The October 2005 floods damaged opposing corners, which left the structure unstable. J. Garvin noted that as an individual structure the bridge was not eligible, since its integrity has been affected by the recent flood events. However, it does contribute to the potential district defined by the limits of the South Acworth hamlet. If a major project occurs here to replace the bridge, then a district area form should be completed and would include photographs and a description of the bridge. If it becomes a bridge maintenance project, then the current information should be submitted on an individual form.

Gorham, X-A000(347), 14407. Participants: Cathy Goodmen, Ram Maddali, and Tim Sappington, architect for the Town of Gorham.

This project is to renovate and convert a 1949 B&M railroad diesel engine to a tourist attraction and museum. This project has been presented previously, and there was concern that it might be eligible for the National Register. It was determined that the diesel engine had been removed from the car before the Town of Gorham acquired the engine. Cathy Goodmen, Tim Sappington, architect for project; and Don Provencher, a Gorham Historical Society member, presented an overview of the renovation. Since the car is no longer eligible for the National Register, the project was determined to have no impacts. E. Feighner noted that NHDHR would like copies of the text for the displays before they are installed, to check accuracy. D. Provencher said that the historic society would send that information to NHDHR after it was developed.

Belmont, X-A000(398) 14462. Participant: Cathy Goodmen.

The presentation provided an update on the NH Route 106 project, which includes pavement overlay, drainage improvement, guardrail upgrades, and reconstruction of the intersection with NH 106 and NH 140. There is limited work on NH Route 140 that includes drainage from Main Street into the Tioga River at the edge of the eligible district. C. Goodmen presented the plan of the proposed drainage outfall on the bank of the Tioga River. This is in the northernmost edge of the historic district of the Village of Belmont and may impact the

canal that was constructed for the mill in the village of Belmont. Also, NHDOT will be widening a short part of NH 140 near its intersection with NH 106, and will need a drainage easement onto the historic Moody/Hunkins House. H. Kinter determined that both of these impacts to the district and to the dwelling are to be taken individually and will qualify as de minimis. E. Feighner requested testing in the area of the outfall of the drainage from Main Street into the Tioga River to determine what is below the surface in this area and to have monitoring of the area during excavation.

Concord STP-TE-X-5099(034), 13481. Participants: Cathy Goodmen, Charlie Hood, and Mike Hansen, VHB.

This is a municipal project to complete a pedestrian connection from the Conference Center to the multi-modal transportation center in downtown by creating new sidewalks and improving existing ones. Cathy Goodmen, Chris Carucci, and Mike Hansen, VHB, presented the project. It will be advertised with the NHDOT project 13184 that adds drainage along North Main Street and down Horseshoe Pond Road for storm water overflow. The city's portion would replace the sidewalks within the project limits. Currently, NHDOT is negotiating with a landowner to secure an easement to put the drainage along Horseshoe Pond Road. C. Carucci noted that the contract has an item to protect the historic trees along North Main Street. NHDHR expressed concern about the Sycamores and Maples. NHDHR determined that the sidewalk work would have no adverse impacts. If NHDOT receives approval to do the work, J. McKay will arrange the contract to complete the archaeological testing along Horseshoe Pond Road, prior to the beginning of work.

Subsequent to this meeting, various groups of interested parties met and determined that the drainage project requires additional study to document the existing drainage pattern along Horseshoe Pond and the city streets. Currently, the drainage portion of the project is on hold. It was also later noted by Jim McConaha that the project would need to be reviewed and accepted by the Heritage /Historic District Commission. J. McKay contacted the city engineer of Concord who will make this contact and receive the necessary permission.

Railroad Culvert, Seabrook. Participant: Jack M. Mettee, Appledore Engineering (Deb Loiselle).

The culvert with a distinctive Gothic Arch under the Eastern Railroad in Seabrook is both eligible as part of an eligible district and as an individual structure. J. Mettee noted that Appledore Engineering was preparing a watershed study for Cains Brook. A fish ladder around the dam adjacent to the culvert rather than dam removal is being proposed. He has observed slumping along the corridor adjacent to the culvert's wing walls and noted that the railroad bed is contaminated with an arsenic defoliant. This condition may raise a concern with DES. However, the contamination is only within the top two feet of the soil in the rail bed. Some of the slumping activity is caused by the use of dirt bikes along the trail. J. Mettee had also noted recent graffiti on the walls of the culvert. Recent subdivisions have been established nearby. The Bureau of Rails has noted that it would be up to the Town of Seabrook to block such use since the Department does not have a project in that vicinity. There are no funds to halt the erosion. H. Kinter noted that if the line became a rail trail, then TE funds could be used to remove the graffiti and rehabilitate the culvert. However, TE funds have been programmed for a considerable period into the future. If it became part of the recreational trail system, then up to 10,000 dollars might be available to convert a section of the corridor and a portion could be applied to the culvert and bank erosion.

Portsmouth, BHF-X-T-0101(015), 13678. Participants: Kevin Nyhan, Bill Hauser, Charles Hood, Steve Liakos, Mark Richardson, and Nancy Mayville; Addie Kim and John Watters, HNTB; Mike Johnson, Maine Historic Commission (mike.d.johnson@maine.gov); Richard Candee, Consulting Party, Portsmouth Historical Society; Jim McConaha, NHDHR; Lynne Monroe and Carol Hooper, Preservation Company.

The purpose of the meeting was to review the preferred alternative and alternatives considered for the Memorial Bridge (U.S. Route 1) rehabilitation. John Watters distributed a handout that included an alternatives evaluation matrix that summarizes the primary alternatives under consideration as part of the Section 106/Section 4(f) assessments, secondary alternatives that were considered but dismissed from further consideration, and Scott Avenue Bridge alternatives. The four primary alternatives under discussion for purposes of Section 4(f)/Section 106 review include: (1) lift span rehabilitation; (2) lift span replacement; (3) replacement in-kind of the existing lift span; and (4) preservation of the upper portion of the lift span by floating off-site and replacing the lift span structure below deck. The handout included graphics of primary alternatives, lift span rehabilitation/replacement, and the Scott Avenue Bridge alternatives. It addressed prudence/feasibility, construction/maintenance costs, and traffic. John Watters explained that long-term maintenance costs were estimated over 54 years using a 4% inflation factor. He inquired about comments or inputs on the evaluation matrix.

Jim Garvin stated that it was the position of NHDHR that the preferred alternative under Section 4(f) and Section 106 is rehabilitation of the lift span rather than the replacement of the lift span. He assumed that it also represented the position of MHPC. Rehabilitation would remain their preferred alternative unless this alternative is proven to not be feasible or prudent under 4(f).

Nancy Mayville stated that NHDOT has identified the replacement of the lift span as the preferred alternative and that it is clear that this is more prudent, when costs and future maintenance are considered, as well as traffic (which has an intangible cost). Mark Richardson indicated that he also had concerns regarding perpetuating the existing condition, where corrosion is sandwiched on panel points, given the poor condition of the bridge. Jim Garvin acknowledged that this is an important point.

Jim Garvin stated that, when examining the initial cost, the rehabilitation appears to be the best option until maintenance costs are factored in. He stated that two-thirds of the 1922 original structure would remain, and only the lift span would be replaced. He inquired whether maintenance costs include maintenance of flanking spans. John Watters indicated that the projected costs include maintenance of the entire bridge and the Kittery approach span.

Harry Kinter inquired what percentage of the cost is applicable to the lift span. He indicated that a narrative rationalization, in addition to presenting maintenance costs, is needed to justify why the preferred alternative satisfies prudence and feasibility over the SHPO's preference for lift span rehabilitation or replacement in kind or below deck. Harry Kinter stated that the Section 4(f) document is needed, stating why the preferred alternative satisfies prudence/feasibility and that this document must undergo the FHWA legal sufficiency test. As to the question of prudence, he stated that he didn't know if there was a court case that used long-term maintenance as a prudence argument. Judges have historically allowed large costs to be incurred before throwing historic preservation out as an alternative. He stated that \$28 million additional in maintenance costs over 54 years translates to \$500,000 per year, and he indicated that he did not know whether this would be considered cost-prohibitive and whether this constituted a valid prudence argument for long-term maintenance. He stated that Section 4(f) issues have to be resolved upfront, before the Section 106 process can be concluded. It was discussed that, typically, effects are determined under Section 106 and this information is included into

the Section 4(f) document. Harry Kinter indicated that the Section 4(f) document needs to be prepared for FHWA Section 4(f) legal sufficiency review ahead of the conclusion of the Section 106 process in this case.

Bill O'Donnell stated that he thought that this represented a valid argument as a prudency issue. Harry Kinter stated that he did not think this was as simple as stating that the cost was too high. Richard Candee commented that two-thirds of the cost has to be spent anyway for rehabilitation of the flanking spans. John Watters stated that possibly 50% or more of the total maintenance cost is associated with the lift span maintenance.

Jim Garvin stated that he would like to get a sense of the percentage of steel/weight of the lift span, since more than two-thirds of the bridge will remain. Except for the panel points, he stated that he didn't understand why the lift span costs were higher.

Nancy Mayville stated that the costs associated with rehabilitation of the flanking span are the same for each alternative, so the difference in cost has to be attributed to the lift span.

Harry Kinter asked whether mobilization for the painting accounts for a large part of the maintenance cost. John Watters stated that, since the lift span moves, this is a large encumbrance on the work, and work stops when the lift opens. The painting is very slow, since the lift span opens 4,000 times a year. Enclosures on the lift span are an encumbrance on the operations of its painting and maintenance contractor since they have a wind sail effect. The work is more challenging, difficult, and costly and should approach 50% of the entire maintenance cost. Jim McConaha inquired whether the paint tarp could be left on until the work is completed. John Watters replied that the lift span is roughly 300 feet long. The contractor might be able to tarp 30 to 60 feet at a time, and the paint hoses have to accommodate bridge lifts that are 150 feet in height. The grit connections and painting systems have to be disconnected when the bridge lifts, and the lines are re-primed. Nancy Mayville commented that the lift span is also sensitive to weight. Mark Richardson stated that a new lift span would have fewer steel surface areas to work on and would be quicker and easier to paint.

Jim Garvin acknowledged that the option for removing the lift span appears to be less expensive and may be more cost-effective than the lift span rehabilitation. Jim Garvin inquired about the length of time it would take to complete the Scott Avenue approach under the various options. John Watters indicated that construction of Scott Avenue happens at the same time as the lift span work. The four- to five-month Memorial Bridge closure corresponds to the work on the Scott Avenue approach.

Jim Garvin commented that the difference in construction closure for the float-out, float-in option would be two months and inquired whether this is acceptable. Nancy Mayville stated that there is an economical issue on both sides of the bridge. The local businesses agreed to the 5-month closure and are willing to live with this. The comment was made that this issue can be used in the prudency arguments.

Jim Garvin raised the issue of the availability of the Navy Yard dry dock. John Watters indicated that the dry dock is booked through 2011. Jim McConaha questioned whether reserving it now would allow this to be ready for construction. John Watters indicated that reserving the dry dock for a particular month may be risky, if the project is scheduled to go to construction before or after this date. The dry dock reservation could be lost if it is required by another entity. Nancy Mayville stated that the goal is to try to advertise by November 2007 and start construction by January 2008. Harry Kinter stated that, because the SHPOs and consulting parties favor Option 4, the burden of the long-term costs would have to undergo FHWA legal sufficiency review. It will be several months before a determination will be made. He stated that the FHWA Washington office might not consider the 54-year maintenance cost justification for the prudency discussion. Bill Hauser suggested engaging the FHWA legal sufficiency staff earlier than normal by submitting preliminary information, rather than second guessing the process. He indicated that he is on a Task Force addressing Section 4(f) legal

sufficiency reviews that advises that states engage legal counsel early, to determine whether actions are likely to be approved. It was decided that the matrix distributed at the meeting would be used for the preliminary information to be submitted to FHWA for a preliminary determination on Section 4(f). After this, a Section 4(f) document would be submitted to FHWA for the formal Section 4(f) legal sufficiency review.

Jim McConaha indicated that the additional down time of two months for the float-out, float-in alternative should be weighed against the historic character of the structure. Addie Kim indicated that the matrix could be updated to reflect the economic impacts associated with extending the construction outages. A number of businesses that were surveyed indicated concerns regarding potential impacts associated with extending the construction closures through the peak tourist season (March through October), and several commented that this could affect their viability. A number of people that live in Kittery also use the bridge to walk to work in Portsmouth and have no other means of getting to work. Someone mentioned that traffic detours would be in place; Addie Kim mentioned that the businesses most concerned about viability are close to the end of the bridge and would be affected by a traffic detour.

John Watters stated that there are three types of risks in comparing the alternatives. The first is cost risk, and the least cost risk would be associated with replacing the lift span. With the lift span rehabilitation, the costs and construction durations could go up because of the uncertain nature of rehabilitation projects. The “hybrid” option of merging the older upper portion of the lift span with a newer bottom structure does not appear to have been done before, and there could be a significant risk in this estimated cost if the contracting community is unsure how to perform this work. John Watters indicated that HNTB has worked on bridges in many cities over the last 80 years. He checked with the HNTB bridge service leader, who had never heard of this being done before. Harry Kinter indicated that this should be part of the prudence discussion.

John Watters stated that the second type of risk relates to the structural stability of the bridge. If the rehabilitated structure’s painting system is not fully maintained, the lower chord of the bridge could continue to deteriorate. Since the rehabilitation options do not replace the lower chord, the existing deterioration would still be present and any additional deterioration would be critical to stability of the bridge. The lift span replacement options would have a new lower chord and thus less risk of future deterioration. The merged span option would have future stability risk associated with the connections between the old and new portions of the truss. This is a unique situation, and the risks are not fully understood.

John Watters stated that the third risk relates to traffic, and the risk of expanding construction durations. The two lift span replacements have the same, lower risk. With the lift span rehabilitation, the construction duration could creep out due to the nature of rehabilitation projects. Floating the lift span to a dry dock location has inherent risks associated with the two pieces not fitting together and causing schedule delays. There are a lot of uncertainties pertaining to finding a place to work with sufficient lay-down areas. If a working dry dock (or land based facility) were not close to the existing bridge, the transportation durations would increase.

Harry Kinter stated that these risks should be addressed as part of the prudence discussion. John Watters stated that continued maintenance of the existing bridge would also mean that monies are not available to build other projects across the state. Richard Candee commented that the further that this involved effects away from the impacted community, the less relevant this discussion seems. He indicated that he thought the Navy Yard should be reserved for 2011.

Joyce McKay asked whether these risks should be added to the alternatives evaluation matrix. It was agreed that the risks need to be part of the Section 4(f) discussion for purposes of the FHWA legal review. Harry Kinter indicated that a summary of the meeting should be sent to the MHPC.

Jim Garvin suggested that if the officials in charge of the Navy Yard were contacted with a written statement, there might be a possibility that they would try to expedite availability for use on the project. He indicated that the bridge construction might affect a significant work force and asked if a ferry service was being addressed. Nancy Mayville replied that either a shuttle or ferry would be used to provide a means of transporting people across the river. Richard Candee stated that the Sarah Long Bridge only accommodates cars, and there is a huge contingent that walks over the bridge.

Richard Candee stated that this might be a good time to reserve the Navy Yard for use, so that the project will not be delayed. John Watters stated that the condition of the trunnions, ropes, and sheaves is serious, and warranted inspection on a six-month schedule. He suggested that this situation might warrant construction prior to availability of the Navy Yard in 2011.

Harry Kinter indicated that a meeting should be scheduled with Bill Hauser and Bill O'Donnell to review the alternatives evaluation matrix and strategy for submitting preliminary information to FHWA for preliminary determination on Section 4(f). It was agreed that this meeting would be scheduled for the last week of June.

Linda Wilson inquired whether there were any risk factors for the lift span replacement option.

Mike Johnson joined the meeting by teleconference and indicated that they are reviewing the alternatives evaluation matrix. Joyce McKay briefly recapped the decision to send this information to FHWA in Washington, D.C. for an early determination on Section 4(f). J. McKay requested that he send comments on this matrix. Mike Johnson indicated that he had passed this along to the assistant director, and there are no comments at this time. John Watters stated that the matrix would be revised as discussed and forwarded for review over the next week or two.

Richard Candee inquired whether the Bath Iron Works in Maine had gone out of business or would be available for such work. Mike Johnson indicated that he could check into this. John Watters indicated that the dimensions would have to be large enough to accommodate the bridge. Jim McConaha commented that this facility was used to build destroyers and is probably big enough. Richard Candee indicated that he could check with the City of Portland. Nancy Mayville stated that she could contact staff at the Maine DOT urban bridge program and also check with Jim Wentworth.

John Watters stated that HNTB would revise and send the matrix. Harry Kinter indicated that he would forward this to the FHWA legal staff to get preliminary feedback on Section 4(f) legal sufficiency. Bill Hauser commented that the FHWA staff was not in Washington, but in the resource center in Baltimore. Harry Kinter indicated that he thought that Dave Gamble and Bob Black would be reviewing this information.

Salisbury, Pingree Bridge, Mountain Road (095/135). Participants: David Hodges and Joe Landry, Town of Salisbury and Dave Powelson and Robert Barry.

The Pingree Bridge is an 1893, pin-connected low Pratt truss bridge now posted at 3 tons. This bridge provides the only access to a small number of houses. In 1988, the NHDOT replaced the deck and stingers in the center span and painted the bridge, but retained the original stringers. This work placed the bridge at a 10-ton capacity. The state passed legislation allowing the 10-ton bridge to remain in service after repairs. Generally, bridges need to be brought up to a 15-ton capacity.

D. Powelson confirmed that the deck of the Pingree Bridge had been replaced and was in good condition. However, the deteriorated connection with holes through the steel between the bottom chord and floor beam just above the bridge seat is causing the down posting of the weight limit. This connection requires reinforcement. Several options have been considered. Adding an additional support beam across the bridge would reduce the bridge's width to about 10 feet, which would not be sufficient for the current traffic over the bridge. Bridge Maintenance has proposed welding plates to the deteriorated connection, which would bring the weight limit up to 10 tons. This weight limit would be sufficient for the loads taken over the bridge by David Hodges.

In the long term, the town has proposed replacing the bridge. The proposed fix should extend the useful life for the bridge for about 8-10 years. NHDHR supported the repairs as the most appropriate fix, and asked if the bridge could be moved to an alternative site or used in place when the new bridge was constructed. It was noted that it would be important to wash the sand and salt off the bridge as part of the town's yearly maintenance.

Flooding in Central New Hampshire. Participant: Peter Thomas, FEMA.

A formal letter for the disaster was issued on May 31 since the preliminary damaged assessment has reached the level necessary for a declaration. The incident period is between May 13 and May 23. FEMA has issued an environmental handbook that provides some information on the disaster. FEMA offices are being established in Portsmouth to serve both New Hampshire and Maine. Public Assistance deals with the infrastructure. There are four additional offices in New Hampshire that will deal with homeowners. Project operatives are currently reviewing the damage and preparing work sheets. P. Thomas noted that the stone culvert report was being examined by the HMGP program for the October event, and funding appeared likely. It was agreed that FEMA/DOT projects could be reviewed at the Cultural Resources Meeting on July 13.

Town of Kensington, X-A000(109), 13908. Participants: Lynne Monroe, Preservation Co.; Ram Maddali; Glenn Greenwood, Regional Planning Commission; Lynne Monroe, Preservation Company

For this transportation enhancement project, the Town of Kensington has created plans for improvements to a parking lot, which is currently not landscaped and unpaved, and located in the center of the town, opposite the Town Hall. They have received promise of an enhancement grant from FHWA and have proceeded into the bid process.

Last December, the plans for the project were reviewed by the agencies for archaeological impact and Joyce McKay, Linda Wilson, and Edna Feigner conducted an inspection of a trench, discovered evidence of a house foundation, and made a recommendation that the height of the fill be increased to protect the site. The town changed its plans accordingly. Because of this approval, the town assumed that they had fulfilled their Section 106 requirements. However, the design for the lot, which includes a large stone wall along the length of the frontage, had never been specifically reviewed by the committee. Therefore, Glen Greenwood presented the plans for the design including paved parking, landscaping, and a wall. He showed three photographs of a fieldstone wall similar to the one proposed for the project. The proposed wall was a recent change as the original plans had included a cut granite wall.

James Garvin commented that while the wall was attractive, formal walls were usually reserved for cemeteries or pounds, and perhaps no wall at all would be a preferable solution. He suggested creating a grassy area where

townspeople might gather, and perhaps planting significant shade trees such as Liberty Elms, the new blight resistant strain. Linda Ray Wilson suggested rolling gravel into the pavement to soften the impact of so much asphalt and eliminating striping. All suggestions were considered to create a less formal solution more in keeping with the rural agricultural character of Kensington. Edna Feigner suggested that since there was evidence of a stone wall on one end of the area, perhaps creating a "deconstructed" wall involving a single row of stones might be appropriate. Jim Garvin felt that this might be creating a false sense of history, however. There was also discussion about the use of split granite posts, either as fencing with a chain, or as gate posts to mark entrances and paths. Ultimately, the town was told to consider three possibilities: no wall at all, split granite posts, or a fieldstone wall.

****Memos:**

Other projects may also be reviewed.

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	

S:\MEETINGS\SHPO\06minutes\6-1-8.doc