BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT
CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting
DATE OF CONFERENCES: January 7 and 14, 2010
LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building
ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT
Mike Dugas
Jill Edelmann
Jon Evans
Jon Hebert
Larry Keniston
Marc Laurin
Don Lyford
Jim Marshall
Joyce McKay
Kit Morgan
Kevin Nyhan
David Scott
Matt Urban
Tony Weatherbee
Alex Vogt

Federal Highway Administration
Jamie Sikora

NHDHR
Dick Boisvert
Edna Feighner
Beth Muzzey
Linda Wilson
Christine Varnold

City of Berlin
Pamela Laflamme
Pat McQueen

CMA Engineers
Jeffrey Murray

FNRT
Alex Bernhard
Dick McKay

KVP, LLC
Ray Korber
Bob Rook

Town of Littleton
Chuck Connell

Town of Milford
William Parker

Town of New Castle
Brad Meade

VHB
Gorden Edington
Sally Gunn

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

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

Laconia, X-A000(884), 15691 1
New Castle, X-A000(555), 14827 (ARRA funded) 2
Moultonborough, X-A000(932), 15710 3
Westmoreland 5
Alton, X-A000(500), 14121A 6
Winchester, DPR-BRF-X-0111(005), 12906 6
Littleton, X-A000(298), 14307 7
New Ipswich, X-A000(403), 14465 9
Enfield, BRO-X-T-0145(003), 12967 10
Berlin, X-A000(052), 12958B 11

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

January 7, 2010

Laconia, X-A000(884), 15691
Participants: Jon Evans and Mike Dugas

Joyce McKay began by reviewing the project, which involves the reconstruction of the US Route 3 and NH Route 11B intersection in Laconia. The proposed alternative involves the construction of a roundabout at the subject intersection.

J. McKay indicated that at the December meeting it was determined that given the level of potential archaeological sensitivity in this area, soil borings would be used to determine the extent of subsurface fill and disturbances associated with the construction of the roadway. The results of these borings and any potential disturbances associated with the subject project will be presented at a future meeting to determine if any further archaeological investigations are necessary. The locations of the soil borings were reviewed with Dick Boisvert who indicated that they were acceptable. He also indicated that just to the north and northwest of the project area were several known extensive archaeological sites. He indicated that depending on the results of the soil borings, there is a high potential that extensive archeological investigation(s) will be necessary. He was particularly concerned with the area to the northeast of the bridge where a water quality treatment structure may be proposed. Jon Evans indicated that the results of the soil borings and more details on the water quality treatment and soil disturbances would be presented at a future meeting.

J. McKay and J. Evans indicated that in mid December they performed a field review of the project area. Locations and pictures of any potentially historic structures were reviewed with Linda Wilson. L. Wilson indicated that there did not appear to be a district area, and therefore a District Area Form would not be necessary. She indicated that she felt four (4) individual forms would be necessary for parcels 4, 10 and two structures on parcel 8. L. Wilson felt that given the proposed impacts to the stone arch bridge were limited to the roadway surface and minimal excavation of the bridge approach, a form for the bridge would not be necessary. (Note: J. McKay researched the bridge, and it was previously determined eligible, with 16 points, in the 1988 Historic Bridge survey as a concrete arch.)

J. Evans indicated that given that this project is part of the Highway Safety Improvement Program the budget is extremely tight particularly if extensive archaeological monitoring is found necessary. He noted that property impacts are expected to be limited to very minor strip easements or acquisitions immediately adjacent to the existing roadway. For parcels 4 and 10, it is very unlikely that any property impacts (other than temporary construction easements) would be necessary. He asked if it could be assumed that the structures on parcels 4, 8 and 10 were eligible and that any of the potential strip easements/acquisitions would in reality result in at most a “No Adverse Effect” determination. For the purposes of section 4(f) this would result in a de minimis finding and the subject forms would not be necessary.

L. Wilson indicated that the forms should still be prepared to ensure that should the project expand at a later date the Department would not have to scramble to prepare the necessary forms to determine the project’s effect on the above noted potentially historic resources. She indicated resistance to this approach and felt preparing the forms on the buildings that would have property impacts was necessary. [Currently, potential property impacts are limited to parcel 6, which requires two individual forms]. Based on these comments, it was agreed that up to the four previously mentioned forms would be prepared and reviewed at a later meeting.

New Castle, X-A000(555), 14827 (ARRA funded)
Participants: Jeffrey Murray, CMA Engineers (jmurray@cmaengineers.com), Brad Meade, Town of New Castle

Jeff Murray described that the Town has been working toward the completion of the sidewalks for several years and has received funding from the TE program for the completion of the work. The project includes two sidewalk segments, one along Route 1B (Wentworth Road) between the Wentworth by the Sea property and the Town Library, and the other between Ritzon Street and the elementary school

(Portsmouth Ave). Sidewalks are proposed to be minimum 3-feet wide and comply with ADA accessibility and other requirements. Construction will disturb to a depth of 18 to 20 inches.

J. Murray reviewed the location of the sidewalks and also photographs of the proposed sidewalk locations. It was discussed that Route 1B is a two rod road and that the right of way is close to the existing pavement limits, therefore easements will be required from the private property owners. There are potentially eligible properties along one side of the road, and 1970's-1980's vintage houses on the other. The proposed route is along the road on properties of the potentially eligible properties.

The proposed location along Wentworth Road and Portsmouth Avenue will meander from the roadway alignment to avoid disruption of existing ledge outcrops, a stone wall, mature trees, and a cemetery. A minimum 6-foot buffer will be maintained between the edge of pavement and the paved sidewalk. Due to the location of the existing culvert discharge and wetlands, a wetland permit will likely be required to construct the sidewalk. CMA will review whether use of a curb and shifting the sidewalk toward the road would avoid wetland impacts.

J. Murray indicated that they have had several design iterations based on conversations with the property owners on whose land the sidewalk will be relocated. The property owner prefers to keep the existing natural features in place and still wants to maintain a balance with the location of the path and retaining some privacy for their residence.

The location of the sidewalk for access to the elementary school was also discussed with the Committee. J. Murray indicated that the sidewalk could be located adjacent to Portsmouth Ave. with a curb, or could potentially lead directly onto the school property from Ritzon Street. Brad Meade stated that it would be his preference to not have it located directly along Portsmouth Ave. The proposed location will soon be reviewed with the school principal and the Chief of Police.

It was clarified that both projects are in potentially archaeological sensitive areas and that a survey is required. J. Murray stated that he has spoken with IAC about completing the work. At this time, historical architectural assessment should not be required because of the proximity of the affected property's buildings to the project.

The Committee indicated that the meandering footpath approach to the Wentworth Road sidewalk should be considered a model project where it will minimize disturbance of the existing natural features and provide a safe route for pedestrians. Constructing a curbed sidewalk along the entire length of Wentworth Road would not be desirable from their perspective.

Action Items:
Contract with firm (likely IAC) to complete investigation of archaeological sensitive areas and present their findings to Committee. Test pit investigations, if required, would likely need to wait until spring to be completed. L. Wilson noted that the sidewalk has limited visibility to the potentially eligible buildings, and the town has coordinated closely with property owners. Therefore, she did not request determinations of eligibility for these properties.

Moultonborough, X-A000(932), 15710
Participants: Ray Korber (rkorber@kvpllc.com) and Bob Rook, KV Partners, LLC

R. Korber presented the project to committee members. In summary the items discussed included:

***Project Location*:** The project is located in the Town of Moultonborough and includes a segment of NH Route 25 (approximately 1,500 feet) and adjoining segment of Fox Hollow Road (approximately 120 feet). This "T" intersection is located approximately 1.25 miles east of the signalized intersection of Moultonborough Neck Road. The area is dominated by residential properties.

***Existing Conditions*:** NH Route 25 is a state owned and maintained two-lane road traversing the north side of Lake Winnipesaukee. Fox Hollow Road is a town owned and maintained road (approximately 500 feet) intersecting NH Route 25. Fox Hollow Road provides the sole public access and egress for approximately 75 homes along Fox Hollow Road, Gilman Point Road, Acorn Lane, Moose Walk, and other roads. Most of the development in this neighborhood consists of single family homes located along the waterfront of Lake Winnipesaukee and Lee's Pond. Several larger, interior parcels remain undeveloped at this time.

The intersection of NH Route 25/Fox Hollow Road is a "T"-intersection controlled by a stop sign on Fox Hollow Road northbound. In the area of the intersection, the posted speed limit on NH Route 25 is 45 miles per hour. At the intersection, NH Route 25 is 26 feet wide both east and west of Fox Hollow Road with a soft shoulder on the north side and a gravel swale on the south side. Combination curve/intersection ahead signs are located on both the eastbound and westbound approaches of NH Route 25 approximately 450-500 feet in advance of the intersection.

Fox Hollow Road intersects NH Route 25 just west of a horizontal curve and just east of the crest of a vertical curve. Fox Hollow Road is narrow, only 17-18 feet wide at a point just 30 feet south of the edge of the NH Route 25 travel way. NH Route 25 is in a cut section with earthen embankments close to both sides of NH Route 25 in the vicinity of the intersection. Both sides of Fox Hollow Road are heavily wooded.

***Need for Project*:** The Town of Moultonborough is seeking to complete roadway improvements on NH Route 25 at the intersection with Fox Hollow Road to address safety issues created by the impaired visibility due to limited sight distances in the vicinity of the intersection and the difficult turning movements into and out of Fox Hollow Road. Key issues include:

- The Fox Hollow Road intersection is located approximately 315' west of the crest of a vertical curve on NH Route 25. The existing posted speed limit on NH Route 25 at this location is 45 miles per hour. Left turn movements from Fox Hollow Road onto westbound NH Route 25 are problematic due to the limited intersection sight distance caused by the vertical curve and speed of westbound NH Route 25 vehicles. Vehicles entering from Fox Hollow Road do not have adequate time to determine if they can safely enter onto NH Route 25. This problem is exacerbated by the fact that some vehicles "bottom-out" at the paved drainage swale located at the intersection with NH Route 25 as they move from Fox Hollow to NH Route 25, thereby slowing their progression onto NH Route 25.
- Vehicles heading westbound on NH Route 25 have limited sight distance around the combination horizontal and vertical curve as they approach the Fox Hollow Road intersection. Vehicles queued for a left turn movement onto Fox Hollow Road are obstructed from oncoming westbound vehicles and are highly susceptible to rear end collisions.
- Due to the tight turning radius, vehicles traveling eastbound on NH Route 25 and making right turn movements onto Fox Hollow Road must slow down considerably to complete the turn to navigate the narrow entrance to Fox Hollow Road. This is particularly problematic if there is another vehicle standing at the stop condition on Fox Hollow Road waiting to turn on

to NH Route 25. Deceleration in NH Route 25 eastbound from this movement causes vehicles to queue on NH Route 25 and leaves the turning vehicle susceptible to a rear end collision. Eastbound NH Route 25 vehicles cannot safely maneuver around a right-turning vehicle entering Fox Hollow Road due to the limited sight distance created by the combination horizontal and vertical curves.

Proposed Project: An evaluation was completed on appropriate improvements at the current 45 MPH design speed. At this design speed, the existing vertical profile meets the 45 MPH criteria and can be maintained. A left westbound turn lane and right turn taper at Fox Hollow Road are proposed to address the safety issues noted above. The typical section at the Fox Hollow Road intersection would include (2) 11-foot travel ways, (1) 12-foot left turn lane, and 4-foot wide shoulders for a total pavement footprint of 42 feet. The existing pavement footprint is 26 feet. This will require the reconstruction of approximately 1500 feet of roadway to facilitate the proper taper from the new widened section to the existing roadway width at the project limits. It is important to note that the horizontal curvature of NH Route 25, existing earthen embankments and residential buildings on the north side of NH Route 25 prevent the attainment of the required stopping sight distance without significant impacts to abutting properties.

Major items of construction will include: clearing, grubbing and removal of trees; installation of temporary bypass lane; excavation of side slope areas to accommodate the widening; installation of aggregate base course materials; reconstruction of side slopes through the cut section; re-grading private drives; relocation of utility poles, signs, etc.; removal of existing drainage structures and installation of new drainage system; placement of pavement and pavement markings; and site restoration. Improvements at Fox Hollow road will include a widening to accommodate the eastbound right turn taper and to open the entrance to NH Route 25 to improve sight distance.

There was discussion regarding additional information requested by committee members. The information includes:

- Complete a Phase 1A archaeological review. KVPartners will confer with the Town regarding retaining a consultant to complete this work. E. Feighner noted the list of qualified historical archaeologists on its website.
- Submit photographs of the buildings along the roadway. There are no impacts to the buildings themselves but they are potential impacts to the front section of the properties within the project limits. KVPartners will submit the requested clear photographs.

Westmoreland
Participants: Larry Keniston

Larry Keniston presented the ca. 1848 East Westmoreland large stone arch culvert, along the now abandoned Cheshire railroad corridor. This project was reviewed by NHDHR in October 2008 after flood damage had caused the outlet end to collapse. More damage was suffered in 2009. L. Keniston provided photographic documentation of this damage to the committee members. A large hole was formed where a tree had fallen through the arch. After consulting with Bridge Maintenance, the Rails Bureau found the best plan of action to save this arch culvert was to remove approximately 40’ of the arch structure at the outlet end, and lower the grade above the culvert approximately 20’. They would pour a new concrete wing wall at the outlet end. It was also proposed that the area would be stripped of any vegetation to make sure that roots do not disrupt the culvert in the future. L. Wilson noted that the

proposed changes would be an adverse effect on the resource, however she asked that she present the project at DHR's next staff meeting on 1/11/10, and their discussions/conclusions will be presented to NHDOT. [DHR subsequently requested that the Bureau of Rails hire a qualified stone mason to examine the arch and make recommendations for rebuilding the arch. DHR suggested John Wastrum.]

January 14, 2010

Alton, X-A000(500), 14121A
Participants: Kevin Nyhan, Don Lyford, Jim Kirouac, Chris Girard, NHDOT

Kevin Nyhan reviewed this project, following up from the last meeting. K. Nyhan detailed that there are several trees along the south side of the road that will be impacted by construction. Two trees in front of parcel 222, within the right-of-way, would be pruned. This was determined not to be a problem. One tree in front of parcel 223, within the right-of-way, would be removed. If this tree were to be greater than 50 years old, it may contribute to the historic property. However, Chris Girard, a certified arborist, indicated that the tree was no older than 40 years. This was determined to be not a problem. In addition to these trees, an additional two trees were identified for removal for improving drainage in front of parcel 226, within the right-of-way, across the road. In Chris' opinion, these trees, which are mature silver maples, are older than 50 years old. As the associated property is potentially historic, the property will need to be evaluated. Two additional trees on this property were also noted to having possible impacts depending on the root system, however it was unknown if these trees would be impacted until construction started.

Looking at an aerial map, K. Nyhan and J. McKay indicated that the project area is likely on the outskirts of a large historic district in Alton. K. Nyhan indicated that the original project area form did not extend as far as the project goes today, and if the project area form were being done today, it would have. However, the project is late in design and K. Nyhan suggested that in order to comply with Section 106, parcel 226 be evaluated with an individual inventory form. The form would determine the individual eligibility of the property and how it would contribute to an overall district, without determining if there is a formal district. The Department utilized this approach for the Durham-Newmarket, 13080 and Derry, 13249 projects. This request came as a result of the project not needing any permanent easements or acquisitions from properties in the project area.

Everyone agreed to this approach. The project was determined to have no adverse effect and no 4(f), and there would be no Section 4(f) uses. The former, no historic properties affected memo would be modified. Additionally, the Department agreed to save the potentially impacted trees on parcel 226 if possible. Its ability to save them would not be known until after construction. If this effort does not work, the Department would confer with the property owner and replace them with reasonably substantial trees of a similar species. They would be planted to avoid utility lines.

Winchester, DPR-BRF-X-0111(005), 12906
Participants: Mike Dugas, Don Lyford, and David Scott NHDOT

Mike Dugas started the presentation with a review of the different project alternatives for the replacement/rehabilitation of the ca. 1935 3-span continuous girder bridge with parabolic haunches. This project went through the CSS process. It was determined by the community that alternative 9 was

the preferred option, which replaces the bridge off line, and improved sight distance along the corridor. At a recent public meeting, citizens were asked about the possibility of saving the bridge, continuing to use the off-line approach for non-vehicular use, and the residents expressed no support.

A proposed parking lot with dry hydrant was discussed which is still in the development phase. It was noted that if the parking lot were to be implemented, all appropriate phases of archaeology would be conducted. B. Muzzey noted that the only above ground concerns were that of the bridge. Alternative 9 does not impact any of the older houses along Route 10. D. Scott noted that the cost to rehabilitate the bridge would be immense because of the costs associated with the installation of a temporary bridge, adding shoulders along the roadway, widening the existing structure, and repairing/replacing existing concrete rails. Although not all, these are the main efforts involved with rehabilitating the structure. NHDHR asked about other options, including keeping the bridge in place. D. Scott explained that improving the sight distance south of the existing bridge would require lowering the grade at the rail trail crossing, which would cause substantial impacts to the rail trail and the abutting residential and commercial properties. As sight distance was one of the most important aspects of this project to the residents in the area, again, it was determined that it would not be prudent to maintain the existing bridge.

B. Muzzey stated that the removal of the bridge would be an adverse effect on the resource. As far as types of mitigation are concerned, it was asked if the girders could be re-used elsewhere. L. Wilson asked J. McKay if she could contact DRED to see if they are interested in the re-use of the girders. Other types of mitigation that were brainstormed included documentation, public outreach, bridge survey and preservation plans for a subset of I-beam structures, and a monograph on G.R. Whittum, which would look at the importance of the rolled beam with haunches technology. B. Muzzey also suggested that a compatible bridge rail study for replacement of rails on historic bridges would be helpful to present to municipalities, because bridge rail has always been a contentious issue when dealing with historic bridges or bridges in historic areas. It was noted that in this case where the bridge is being replaced, replication of the rail was not warranted.

Mitigation for impacting the bridge will be further investigated to determine appropriate mitigation for this project.

Littleton, X-A000(298), 14307
Participants: Sally Gunn and (sgunn@vhb.com); Chuck Connell, Town of Littleton; Jim Marshall, NHDOT

Sally Gunn discussed events and subsequent communications, which occurred since the last Cultural Resource Coordination Meeting. She met with the Littleton Select Board, two state representatives, and some Town citizens on December 8, 2009. After much discussion and a vote by the Select Board, the unanimous decision was to contribute $5,000 toward mitigation measures. This $5,000 represents the Town's 20% share of $25,000 of mitigation measures.

Mitigation Measures Cost Saving Opportunities
Linda Wilson presented some ideas to reduce the cost of some of the currently proposed mitigation measures. Since the research on the bridge to-date has been so thorough, large format photo documentation will be acceptable; since there are already several historic plaques in Littleton and the 1927 flood has been recognized, placement of a simple and much less expensive marker on or near the

new bridge as proposed by the selectmen to commemorate the former Apthorp Bridge would be acceptable. The cost savings from these two measures could be used to commission a scholarly annotated bibliography with introduction rather than a full monograph of Harold Langley. There are already citations of Harold Langley in publications by Richard Casella and others, which can be further researched. L. Wilson shared a copy of a less detailed monograph, which was completed for the Currier Gallery of Art on Edward Lippincott Tilton, which cost much less than the Prowse monograph.

Metal Truss Bridge Preservation Plan
Jamie Sikora asked if the money to be put towards the Metal Truss Bridge Preservation Plan could be whatever was "left over" after the rest of the mitigation measures had been completed. Joyce McKay said she would rather have a set amount for the Metal Truss Bridge Preservation Plan as this is a very high priority; L. Wilson concurred.

Commemorative Marker
Sally Gunn noted that the Town of Littleton would like a commemorative plaque to recognize the existing bridge. Chuck Connell confirmed this, but also noted that the top priority for the Town is getting the bridge replacement project completed. Linda Wilson said she could forward some example markers to Chuck Connell. L. Wilson also said the commemorative marker doesn't have to be placed on or near the new bridge. The marker could be placed anywhere in town and the Town of Littleton could select the location.

Large Format Photography
Joyce McKay noted that the large format photography is the only mitigation measure that must be completed before construction of the new bridge can begin. Once the Memorandum of Effect and Memorandum of Agreement are completed and signed, and the large format photography is completed, removal of the existing bridge and construction of the new bridge may begin. Joyce said that the large format photography would be completed under a NHDOT on-call contract with the support of Joyce McKay and Jill Edelmann. J. McKay will manage these efforts.

Annotated Bibliography
Joyce McKay and Linda Wilson agreed that a scholarly annotated bibliography of Harold Langley would be acceptable in place of a full monograph. This annotated bibliography will contain an introduction to Harold Langley and reference research that has already been completed. L. Wilson hopes that this will serve as the backbone for future research and documentation of Harold Langley. J. McKay said that the annotated bibliography will be completed under a NHDOT on-call contract.

Final Mitigation Measures
Joyce McKay recapped the proposed final mitigation measures: They will be a commemorative marker for approximately $500, large format photography and minimal associated documentation (photo key and description) for approximately $2,000, a scholarly annotated bibliography for approximately $7,500, and a contribution to the High Pratt inventory and bridge preservation plan of approximately $15,000. Chuck Connell agreed to these measures as long as the Town's share (20%) does not exceed $5,000.

Draft Memorandum of Effect and Memorandum of Agreement
Sally Gunn presented drafts of the Cultural Resource Memorandum of Effect and Memorandum of Agreement to the group. J. McKay agreed with the general layout of the documents but would like the language to be closer to the Memorandum of Agreement for the Newington-Dover project (11238,

NHS-027-1(037). J. McKay also requested that costs for the individual measures not be included. A line stating the maximum cost of the mitigation measures will not exceed $25,000 may be included. Sally Gunn said that VHB would prepare revised drafts of the Memorandum of Effect and Memorandum of Agreement and email them for comments so that the final Memorandum of Effect and Memorandum of Agreement can be signed at the next NHDOT/NHDHR coordination meeting. It will not be necessary for VHB or the Town to attend that meeting.

New Ipswich, X-A000(403), 14465
Participants: Matt Urban, Dave Scott, Mike Dugas, Jon Hebert and Don Lyford, NHDOT

This project is located at the junction of NH Route 123 and NH Route 124. The proposed project will replace the ca. 1950's I-beam structure that sits a top an older stone arch bridge, along High Bridge. The circa 1817 lower stone arch will be left in place. The new structure will be a single span bridge and will not put any stress on the arch. In addition, minor adjustments to the approaches would be made.

The Preliminary Design team informed SHPO that this project is going through the CSS process and that many design alternatives have been reviewed and discussed. Implementing the CSS process, the Design Team has been gaining input from the Town, local historians, police chief, fire chief, the schools, and local citizens who are interested parties. As such, the plans as proposed are the preferred alternative.

This preferred alternative requires that a temporary detour be constructed bypassing the High Bridge, sending traffic to Mill Street. The preferred detour will place regulated traffic behind the Mill Building. A temporary detour bridge will be placed over the existing closed jack arch bridge. Minor improvements to Ypya Drive and Cutter Road will improve the approaches for the temporary detour. The benefit of the preferred alternative will allow the work to be completed in one construction season.

Understanding that much of this area has previously been documented as a historic district (the High Bridge Area Form, Greenville-New Ipswich, completed Fall 2001), L. Wilson requested that inventory forms be completed on the stone arch bridge and the I-beam structure and the jack arch bridge at Mill Street. L. Wilson indicated that if DOT did not impact the Jack Arch, it did not need to be surveyed. However, the DOT would likely impact its wings.

Edna Feighner requested that Phase 1A archaeological surveys be completed to determine if there would be any archaeological sensitivity in affected parcels. While the whole area should be examined at the Phase IA level, specific areas to be considered include the area of the jack arch bridge on Mill Street, the former store location, any NE quadrant impacts, and the penstock/mill area. The penstock is fed by a pond about one mile upstream. The DOT may need to drill through the penstock to establish its new abutments. Documentation during the Phase IA would be sufficient mitigation for this impact, given that it is no longer used.

D. Scott noted that the stone arch bridge was constructed of granite, schist, and gneiss stone. Some of these stones appear crumbly and deteriorated. He inquired whether it would be wise to inject a polymer into the vault that would penetrate voids in a small area along the vault to strengthen the structure. The DOT is examining the effectiveness of such products. He also inquired about potential contractors that might do such work. Thus, the design team is looking into the best possible ways to preserve the lower stone arch structure without compromising its historic integrity. D. Scott noted that the top 1'-2' of the

stone arch structure was disturbed when the I-beam bridge was built on top of the arch. The DOT may need to disturb and possibly remove this section again for the construction of the new bridge.

Once the results of the surveys are completed this project will return to the committee to determine if further action is required.

Enfield, BRO-X-T-0145(003), 12967
Participants: Alex Vogt, Jon Evans, NHDOT; Alex Bernhard and Dick McKay, Friends of the Northern Rail Trail

Alex Vogt began by giving a brief overview of the project, which involves the reconstruction of Main Street and NH Route 4A in Enfield, NH. This effort will include replacing the Main Street, Shaker Bridge over Mascoma Lake and addressing structural and safety concerns associated with the Northern Railroad Bridge over Main Street.
A. Vogt indicated that through much of preliminary and final design, this project included removing and replacing the existing Northern Railroad Bridge over Main Street with a longer and taller pedestrian bridge. The existing bridge only has 9.5 feet of vertical clearance and one lane under with alternating traffic on Main Street. The Northern Railroad is currently a rail-trail recreational facility, owned by the State of New Hampshire and operated and maintained in part by the Friends of the Northern Rail Trail. Main Street has a relatively low traffic volume of approximately 2,000 vehicles per day.

A. Vogt indicated that recently the Town of Enfield (including the Enfield Heritage Commission) requested that the Department incorporate an at-grade-crossing of Main Street rather than constructing a new structure in place of the existing one. A. Vogt indicated that the Department had originally looked at this as an alternative during preliminary design. At that time, however, the Town requested a grade-separated crossing. As a result, a grade separated crossing was proposed until the more recent request was made.

A. Vogt noted that the revised proposal includes removing the existing structure and constructing the railroad approaches with a 5% grade to match up with the elevation of Main Street. He indicated that there was a strong possibility that the Department would be able to leave the western granite abutment in place to minimize impacts. He also noted that there is an at-grade crossing in Enfield to the east of this location.

Alex Bernhard expressed concern with the new proposal as it would eliminate the grade separated crossing that was originally proposed. He indicated that he felt this negatively impacts the Northern Railroad by eliminating the continuity of the existing facility grade separated facility. A. Bernhard felt that as the proposed at-grade crossing was not evaluated as the preferred alternative during the environmental documentation and Section 106 process, he felt the effect of this proposal on the Northern Railroad Corridor should be re-evaluated.

L. Wilson stated that NHDHR had assumed that when it signed the MOA that the continuity of the railroad would continue. Linda Wilson indicated that she agreed with Mr. Bernhard and felt that the continuity of the grade separated railroad corridor would be compromised under the at-grade proposal. She also indicated that she felt this was a substantial enough deviation from the original proposal that the Section 106 effects determination and any subsequent mitigation should be re-evaluated.

Jamie Sikora indicated that he disagreed with A. Bernhard and L. Wilson as he felt that even if the effects of the new proposal were re-evaluated, the end result would still be the same. He noted that the new proposal would at most result in an adverse effect determination, which was already the outcome of the previous grade-separated alternative. He also felt that even if the effects of the at-grade proposal were re-evaluated it was unlikely that any additional mitigation measures would be discovered beyond those that have already been included in the existing Memorandum of Agreement.

J. Sikora indicated that he would discuss this with some of his Federal Highway counterparts and if necessary contact the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to see what their thoughts are on the proposed changes. Beth Muzzey indicated that NHDHR would prepare a letter to J. Sikora indicating all of their concerns with the proposed changes for use when consulting these entities.

Berlin, X-A000(052), 12958B
Participants: Don Lyford and Marc Laurin, NHDOT; Pamela Laflamme and Pat McQueen, City of Berlin

J. McKay briefly reviewed the mitigation components that have been agreed to so far. The proposal submitted by Christine LaTulip of the NH Preservation Alliance on the Public Forums and Workshops mitigation aspect was handed out and briefly discussed. All agreed on the Documentation, Public Forum and Workshop, Historically Compatible Landscaping, Public Outreach and Archaeology mitigation. Discussion of the remaining outstanding mitigation component ensued with discussion on whether the best option would be to provide Relocation of Historic Properties or to Purchase and Resale of Dwellings (within the District) with Covenants. Consensus was reached that the Relocation of Historic Properties option would <u>not</u> be pursued.

Further discussion of the details of the Purchase and Resale of Dwellings component occurred. Jamie Sikora stated that the FHWA feels that the Uniform Relocation Act requirements would not be applicable. The city would need the building to be habitable, so that it could receive a Certificate of Occupancy. Jill Edelmann described her research into properties listed for sale within the District. There are about 30 presently listed. Pam Laflamme expressed concerns with respect to starting the construction of the project if a property did not sell, and with the time frame for the purchase and sale of the properties. She also asked the following: If the DOT cannot sell it, then who owns the property. Beth Muzzey stated that contingencies on what would occur if a property did not sell would be outlined in the MOA and as long as there is a clear agreement of the time frame specified for the start and anticipated completion of the mitigation, construction could occur prior to the finalization of this mitigation. The MOA would need to specify the nature of the marketing effort, and include an example of a covenant applicable to the exterior of the building. She also stated that the bidders would need to have a plan to maintain the property, understand the covenants that would be placed on the property, and be willing to work with the covenant holders.

J. McKay stated that the properties that would be considered for Purchase and Resale would be identified by conducting an inspection of seven or eight vacant properties that are currently listed for sale within the District. The inspection would involve DOT (Joyce and Jill) and the City (Pam, the Building Inspector, and Victoria Chase) to review these properties and make recommendations on which ones to purchase. B. Muzzey stated that this inspection would be used to achieve a consensus among SHPO/DHR, FHWA, DOT and the City on four (4) contributing properties that possess good integrity on their exterior and are preferably representation of a type. The focus of the selections of the properties

would be to mitigate the impacts to the District. D. Lyford suggested that purchase of these properties should be done after the properties directly impacted by the project have been negotiated. J. McKay will draft the MOA that will outline the specific mitigation components. J. Edelmann will review the real estate listings and choose several properties suitable for the initial inspection and walk-through by DOT and the City that have good exterior integrity, are preferably vacant, and are in reasonable interior condition.

****Memos/MOA's**: Lincoln-Franconia, A000(808), 15603; Claremont, X-A000(418), 14494

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

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