BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT
CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting
DATE OF CONFERENCE: October 1 and 8, 2009
LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building
ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT
Jill Edelmann
Jon Evans
Cathy Goodmen
Doug Gosling
Bob Landry
Marc Laurin
Eric Lewtas
Don Lyford
Jim Marshall
Joyce McKay
Christine Perron
William Rose
Trent Zanes

NH Bureau of Public Works
Dina Pinnell

Federal Highway Administration
Jamie Sikora

NHDHR
Beth Muzzey
Edna Feighner
Linda Wilson
Jim Garvin

City of Berlin
Pam Laflamme
Pat McQueen

City of Claremont
Kurt Beek

City of Keene
Jim Donison

City of Nashua
Leon Kenison

CLD Engineers
Daniel Hudson

DuBois & King
Jeff Adler
Scott Bourcier
Bob Durfee

HSI
John Vancor

Meridian Land Services
Chad Branon

Nashua RPC
Tim Roache

Town of Hancock
Kurt Grassett
David Drasba
Mike Fallon

Town of Salisbury
Kathleen Doyle
Ren Ross-Raymond
Margaret Warren

Town of Windham
John Mangan
Mark Samsel

VHB
Sally Gunn
Frank O'Callaghan
Pete Walker
Rita Walsh

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

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

Hopkinton, STP-TE-X-000S(450), 13483A (80428R) 2
Wentworth 14517A 2
Berlin, X-A000(052), 12958B 3
Claremont, X-A000(418), 14494 4
Windham, X-A000(558), 14830 (ARRA-Related) 5
Keene, X-A000(586), 14891 6
Hancock, X-A000(929), 15685 6
Nashua, NRBD-5315(021), 10040A 7
Salisbury 14626A (no federal number) 9

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

Hopkinton, STP-TE-X-000S(450), 13483A (80428R)
Participants: Jim Garvin, NHDHR and Dina Boles, Public Works

The purpose of the meeting was to review submittals and schematic plans for the proposed sprinkler system, submitted by Iron Works Fire Protection of Bow, N. H., and stamped by fire protection engineer Nicholas J. Cricenti, Jr. Speaking for the Division of Historical Resources, James Garvin approved the submittals but raised two principal issues for clarification. The first issue concerned the placement of the Storz fire department connection 2'-6" above grade, as shown on submitted plans. Garvin approved the location of the connection but asked that the elevation above grade be approved by the Hopkinton Fire Department, given the usual wintertime accumulation of plowed snow at the edge of the adjacent parking lot. The second issue concerned the gradient of the sprinkler piping. This piping is indicated at a uniform elevation of 18'-2" or 18.167' above the floor of the bridge. Garvin asked whether the piping should not be pitched toward the supply standpipe; Ms. Boles confirmed that it should. Garvin pointed out that the floor of the bridge cannot be presumed to be level, and asked that the elevation of the piping be established by laser level rather than by measurement from the bridge floor. Garvin will draft a letter of conditional approval to the Bureau of Public Works, with copies to TE coordinator Thomas Jameson, the State Fire Marshal, and the Federal Highway Administration.

Wentworth 14517A
Participants: Bob Durfee, Dubois and King (rdurfee@dubois-king.com)

Bob Durfee gave a brief overview of new impacts to Phase II of the Saunders Hill Road Truss Bridge over the Baker River (Bridge No. 142/096). Drainage improvements and new drainage ditches will extend beyond the current Right-of-Way in the vicinity of the existing bridge abutments and wing walls. Impact areas are small in nature. As-built drawings provided by B. Durfee indicate that the area of disturbance for ditching was most likely disturbed during original construction of the bridge and abutments. The Town will seek construction and maintained easements for these areas.

The committee had no issues with these new impacts. The no adverse effect memo previously issued for Phase II of this project will remain in effect.

Gilford 15626
Participant: Bob Durfee, Dubois and King (rdurfee@dubois-king.com)

The application of 4(f) to the Gunstock bridge project was briefly discussed with Bob Durfee. The adverse effect was created by the removal of an eligible bridge. FHWA is contributing funding to the project. It was determined that the district area form for Gunstock would be completed as mitigation after the environmental documentation had been completed and accepted. Because of the sequence of events and its use as mitigation, the eligibility of Gunstock would not create a 4(f) for this project.

Berlin, X-A000(052), 12958B
Participants: Marc Laurin, Don Lyford, Trent Zanes, NHDOT; Pamela Laflamme (Plaflamme@berlinnh.gov) and Pat McQueen, City of Berlin

The proposed cultural resource mitigation discussion points were reviewed and discussed point-by-point by the attendees as follows:

- **Documentation – 1.A**. Concerns were expressed by P. Laflamme that no resources were identified in the Draft EA to be individually eligible, with the general benefit of documentation to the City and community and that documentation should focus on the overall district. In response, J. McKay clarified that although no formal determination of individual eligibility was done, several properties would likely qualify. To make that determination, interior inspection would be needed. As buildings are purchased, each building with be inspected for interior integrity. Documentation would be for those impacted that best represent examples of type. L. Wilson explained that the information gathered could be of great use in boosting the sense of pride and spirit of the community. B. Muzzey stated that the proposal is a lesser degree of documentation than usual, but will provide the basic foundation and will be a value in any future purpose. She is comfortable with the compromise.
- **Documentation – 1.B.** P. Laflamme inquired if the on-going aerial photography proposed by DOT would be adequate. Based on a discussion with Glenn Davidson, T. Zanes stated that they will provide 1 foot per pixel resolution and that the fly-over should occur in April 2010. All agreed that these would be appropriate documentation.
- **Public Forum and Workshops – 2. A.** J. McKay clarified that the focus of the workshops could be on energy improvement, porches, general maintenance, owner-tenant empowerment. P. Laflamme stated that Jeff Taylor, with whom the City has been coordinating the proposal for the charrette (point 2.B below), is not comfortable presenting these concepts. The White Mountain Community College has in the past done energy efficiency workshops in the City. B. Muzzey stated that partnering with them and/or other organizations, such as the Preservation Alliance and DHR, would make sense as long as the preservation component of the workshop remains. J. McKay will coordinate with the Preservation Alliance.
- **Public Forum and Workshops - 2.B.** DHR has spoken with J. Taylor. The charrette would focus on planning on the use of the space that would be vacated by the project to prepare a guide to better use the area as well as landscaping in the district adjacent to the project area including Third Avenue. P. Laflamme anticipated that some of the plans that would be produced by the charrette could be incorporated into the long-term planning goals of the City. J. McKay will add J. Taylor's proposal to the MOA.
- **Historically Compatible Landscaping – 3**. Historically Compatible landscaping could be one outcome of the charrette. B. Muzzey thought it would be better to wait until the visual impacts of the project have occurred. D. Lyford stated that some of the land would be vacant prior to start of construction in 2011. B. Muzzey will discuss the charrette schedule with J. Taylor.
- **Relocation of Historic Properties – 4**. J. McKay stated that there have been no responses from any house movers contacted by the Department on estimated costs of relocation. Based on a move done by the Department in Lancaster, she estimates a cost of $80,000 to $100,00. It will be critical to time the moves based on the construction schedule. Coordinating the moves during construction could reduce the utility concerns to some degree. J. Sikora thought that the MOA could be reworded to "evaluate" the relocation as a commitment as there are still a lot of

unknowns. P. Laflamme and P. McQueen expressed concerns about the potential vacancy of the relocated houses for years, not recouping the cost of the house if it sells, the vagueness of the renovating restrictions, and the added costs of documentation of these relocated properties. B. Muzzey made the following comments. She stated that there is an enormous effect to the District, the largest effect in NH in 30 years and that this is mitigation and that recovering the costs should not be a factor. The renovation would be based the Secretary of the Interior's standards for rehabilitation to protect the historic nature of the property. Also, if the property is relocated so that it remains intact, the documentation could possibly be reduced to Level III (would be about $15,000 less per J. McKay). J. Sikora suggested that the property could be marketed based on the costs of demolition. D. Lyford will make sure that mitigation is programmed into the PE and ROW cost estimates. J. McKay will further explore the costs of relocation.

The option of purchasing a similar house that is for sale within the District, renovating it as necessary, and selling it with easements rather than relocating a house, was proposed by D. Lyford and discussed. J. Sikora thought that this could be part of the charrette/workshop, would get community input. B. Muzzey thought that there are some uncertainties with this option and that more information on how the process could work would be needed. E. Feighner stated that the cost effectiveness of the option would need to be assessed and that documentation of the impacted house that would not be relocated, would need to be retained. J. Sikora will look further into this option from a FHWA national perspective.

- **Public Outreach – 5.** There were no further discussion or concerns with the point as presented
- **Archaeology – 6.** There were no further discussions or concerns with the point as presented.

Claremont, X-A000(418), 14494
Participants: Dan Hudson, CLD Engineers (danh@cldengineers.com); Kurt Beek, City of Claremont

Daniel Hudson, PE of CLD Consulting Engineers presented proposed impacts to the two properties within the project limits that have been determined to be eligible for the National Register. Photographs, a large project plan, and two smaller plans detailing the impact areas were reviewed.

Officer-Kirn House (1 Charlestown Road)

Determination of Eligibility (DOE) Committee finding: This house is a contributing property in the potential district in the area of Charlestown Road.

Proposed Impacts: Right-of-way impacts on this 1.50-acre parcel include an approximately 2,000 square-foot acquisition with an additional approximately 500 square-foot temporary construction easement at the southeast corner adjacent to the intersection. The acquisition and easement are needed to construct a sidewalk, slip ramp, and traffic island for turning vehicles and pedestrians. The proposed modifications are similar to the existing features at this location. The existing aluminum fence (looks wrought iron, but is modern) will be reset to the proposed right-of-way at the back of sidewalk. The area to be disturbed is currently lawn and approximately 280' from the

existing residence. A large tree located within the Maple Avenue right-of-way adjacent to the parcel is to be removed to accommodate roadway widening.

NHDHR Finding: There will be No Adverse Effect on the property or the potential district as a result of the proposed work. However, if the property owner objects to the proposed changes, further review will be required.

Young House (83 West Pleasant Street)

DOE finding: This house is eligible as a well-preserved example of a mid-nineteenth century worker's house.

Proposed Impacts: It was explained that right-of-way impacts on this 2.22-acre parcel include an approximately 1,000 square-foot acquisition along the property's frontage, an approx. 1,100 square-foot permanent drainage easement, and an additional approx. 4,000 square-foot temporary construction easement. The acquisition and easements are needed to accommodate roadway widening and sidewalk replacement, as well as to reconstruct or replace the large culvert crossing and drainage outlet on West Pleasant Street. The proposed roadway/sidewalk modifications are similar to the existing features at this location, however the back of sidewalk will encroach approximately 5 to 7' towards the residence. Stone fill will be added at the culvert outlet to protect against erosion. Temporary impacts will include clearing of trees in the work area and areas needed to access the site.

NHDHR Finding: There will be No Adverse Effect on the property as a result of the proposed work. However, the following mitigation measures should be included in the final list of environmental commitments:

- Where trees are removed, they should be replaced with fast growing species to quickly reestablish vegetative buffers.
- If replaced, the wooden guardrail abutting the north side of West Pleasant Street shall be constructed of wood posts and rails.
- The proposed bridge-type guardrail to be replaced at the Maple Avenue box culvert shall be colored black.

October 8, 2009

Windham, X-A000(558), 14830 (ARRA-Related)
Participants: Scott Bourchier, Dubois and King (sbourchier@dubois-king.com); Mark Samsel and Dave Sullivan, Town of Windham; and William Rose, NHDOT

The Windham Administrator, Depot Advisory Committee Members and DuBois & King met on October 8, 2009 to discuss the Windham Depot Rehabilitation and Enhancement Project located in Windham, NH. The primary purpose of the meeting was to obtain sign-off from NHDHR and discuss in more detail the requirements of an historical and archaeological consultant during construction activities to provide guidance.

Scott Bourcier presented the meeting minutes held on September 30, 2009 where DuBois & King, NHDOT Cultural Resources and NHDHR met, discussed and agreed to review comments that would be required to be addressed for NHDHR's sign-off of the project. Although the minutes were reviewed and accepted, J. McKay expressed her concern regarding the open cellar of the Stickney's General Store. She explained that typically cellars are filled to protect the integrity of the artifact. Mark Samsel and John Mangan indicating that filling the cellar would minimize the historical value for visiting observers. After much discussion, it was agreed that NHDHR would sign-off on the Cultural Resources Memorandum of Effect but place a contingency that the Town and State make a site visit to review and implement appropriate protection treatment of the cellar hole. [The site visit was completed, and the historical society agreed to explore placing plantings in front of the series of cellar holes, especially along the roadside of that location.]

Jeff Adler inquired from the group the anticipated expectations of historical oversight during construction. J. McKay indicated that DHR and DOT had agreed to the following approach. The town would hire a preservation consultant with expertise in the rehabilitation of historical buildings to oversee each phase of the rehabilitation to ensure repairs are performed appropriately and to the highest extent possible. It was agreed that for continuity the project would inquire the services of Preservation Company to assist with architectural and civil/site oversight. The historical archaeologist with Monadnock Archaeological Consulting would be hired to do limited testing and monitoring in specified areas. The town agreed to place signs along the hilltop adjacent to the flume to keep visitors from damaging the site.

It was also agreed that although the historical consultant's directions would be recommendations, in the event there was a conflict, NHDHR would be contacted to resolve any/all disputes.

Keene, X-A000(586), 14891
Participants: James Donison, City of Keene Engineer (352-6550) (James.Donison@keenenh.gov); Bob Landry, NHDOT

Jim Donison of the City of Keene reviewed with the resource agency the alternatives for the North Bridge multi-use trail that will span Routes 9/10/12. J. Donison and Bob Landry commented that the three span pre-fabricated truss was the preferred alternative, and will be presented to the City. This truss was compared to the Schnell Bridge in Massachusetts. The committee agreed that an Effect Memo was ready to be signed with the No Adverse Effect box checked. J. Donison will email the completed memo to J. McKay when filled out so the resource agency can sign.

Hancock, X-A000(929), 15685
Participants: Chad Branon, Meridian Land Services, Inc. (CEBranon@MeridianLandServices.com); Kurt Grassett, David Drasba, Mike Fallon, Town of Hancock; and Jim Marshall, NHDOT

Chad Branon from Meridian Land Services, Inc. presented updated plans with drainage. There were questions from the resource agency pertaining to the status of existing walkways and whether they would be impacted as part of this project. NHDHR also questioned where there was excavation proposed for the installation of the new drainage system. Chad Branon explained the

limits of excavation for the drainage shown on the plans, and Kurt Grassett commented on the existing utilities that currently exist through the Main Street Corridor. It also questioned whether the common area was going to be impacted with any realignments of Main Street. Chad Branon explained that this project will not involve the realignment of Main Street through the common area and that the proposed alignment is very close to the existing alignment with minor variations to address drainage and sight-distance problems. The agency was in favor of the project but wanted Edna Feighner to review the plans for archaeological sensitivity. The meeting was adjourned after a brief discussion of the potential requirements for construction monitoring if Edna Feighner has any concerns. They also requested that Meridian submit their final set of plans to DHR for review.

Nashua, NRBD-5315(021), 10040A
Participants: Pete Walker (pwalker@vhb.com), Frank O'Callaghan, and Rita Walsh (rwalsh@vhb.com), VHB; Tim Roache, Nashua Planning Commission; Leon Kenison, City of Nashua Engineer; John Vancor (jvancor@hayner-swanson.com), HSI

The major purpose of this monthly meeting with the cultural resources personnel of NHDOT, NHDHR and FHWA was to discuss impacts to buildings and structures, especially within the Nashua Manufacturing Co. Historic District, which was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1986. Pete Walker of VHB explained that five options (the 2 FEIS options – Alternative 4C Modified with Revisions and Alternative 4C and new Options 1, 2 and 2A) were examined. Figures representing the routes and their associated impacts were prepared as were tables delineating which buildings and/or structures would be impacted through either whole or partial demolition. (See attached documents.)

	FEIS Selected	FEIS Alt 4C	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
# Millyard Full Demolitions	3	2	1	2	2
# Millyard Partial Demolitions	2	2	2	3	2
# French Village Demolitions	5	1	2	1	1
Total ROW Acquired in Millyard	6.5 ac	2.6 ac			

Pete Walker noted that in all options, the granite wall bordering the Nashua River would be impacted. Although this wall was not specifically mentioned in the National Register nomination, it was mentioned in the MOA, according to Joyce McKay. In every option except Option 2A, there would be some impact to the canal, which is presumed to be City-owned. Although not all options would require a take and removal of the boiler house in Nashua Mfg. Co. Historic District, the building is considered be in poor condition due to hazardous materials and structural status and is located in an area where additional parking is needed; it will likely be removed in any event. A major difference between Options 2 and 2A is which building on either side of Pine Street Extension is partially taken. Option 2 would take the north end of Storehouse #2, while Option 2A would take the west end of the Repair Shop & Cloth Room building. Pete Walker also noted that some of the demolitions in the FEIS selected alternative and Option 1 (which is similar to the selected alternative) have already been carried out.
A discussion ensued about possible changes to an access road in the vicinity of the NIMCO building and Technology Way in the northwest part of the mill yard district. As currently proposed

in Options 2 and 2A, this access road would take the west sections of the NIMCO building. These sections appear to be more recent, but additional research is being conducted to verify dates of construction. The area has some grade issues to the north of the NIMCO building, which will be more closely studied to see if the access road can be moved further north, although the electric substation and loading docks here present difficulties. There was also limited discussion about moving it to the south to run between buildings, but there are issues with required road widths and the presence of operating loading docks. Linda Wilson and Beth Muzzey explained that they would prefer that the plan use existing driveways rather than constructing new roadways if possible. Frank O'Callaghan agreed that VHB would review this as a possible modification to the plan.

The mill yard's 1896 Waste House would be removed in Option 2 (and FEIS Alt 4C), although the City is looking into moving the building elsewhere on the site. The interior of the building was viewed recently to begin a determination of its structural condition. John Vancor showed images, which show brick piers in the basement, basically a crawl space of approximately 4 feet in height. The piers appear to be more recent, or at least have more recent pointing work. The basement has brick walls, which go down to the stone foundation, but the wood beams are above, making it difficult to lift the brick walls off for the move. The possible locations would target an area west of the canal within the mill yard.

He also reported that no plans for the Waste House were found with the business association for the mill yard, although they do have plans for most of the buildings. Suggestions for other possible venues were the American Textile Museum in Lowell, MA or at the City. Plans would help understand how the building was originally constructed and how best to move it. Is the current floor placed on fill? The original function of the building as a Waste House was also discussed. A painting company most recently used it. If its original purpose was merely to store cotton waste (used in secondary markets), whether wet or dry, prior to loading onto railroad cars stationed in the railroad siding just east of the building or whether it also functioned in some manner for flood control due to its location next to the canal. Historically, waste house referred to buildings of this function.

Elizabeth Muzzey commented that the number of buildings or structures being impacted in the various options was not the only measure of impact. She referred to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's position in the 1990s during the original EIS that a qualitative assessment, which reduced the amount of new roadway within the complex, was also needed. She also noted that smaller buildings within the mill yard complex are as important as the larger, more prominent buildings, despite the fact that they served more mundane purposes; it is these buildings that help tell the entire story of how the complex operated. If they can be reused for storage or other ancillary purposes in a new development, then the outcome is a good one.

Pete Walker asked if NHDHR were willing to give the City its opinion on which option is most feasible and if any are definitely not feasible for Section 106 purposes. He explained that the City favors Option 2 or Option 2A over Option 1. However, the City understands that the alignment of Option 2 & 2A are similar to the alignment of the FEIS Alternative 4-C, which was rejected due to concerns over cultural resource impacts. The current plan is substantially different than the plan presented in the FEIS, however. P. Walker also asked DHR if they had any strong preferences for any particular option.

Elizabeth Muzzey replied that Option 2 would be preferred over Option 2A because impacts to Storehouse #2 would be more readily mitigated as the blind north elevation could be more easily rebuilt; by contrast, the Repair Shop and Cloth Room building has windows and doors on the west elevation that would need to be replicated. DHR asked if the canal could be bridged at the north end; the reply was that it would need to be filled. Determining the date of the current penstock at this northern end of the canal would be helpful. John Vancor noted that both buildings have operating loading docks that are an issue as well. Jamie Sikora of the FHWA does not think that any of the options present deal breakers and that the impacts are fairly equal, although different, in the impacts. DHR agreed that Option 2 is fair to pursue.

A brief discussion followed about the status of documentation on various areas and individual buildings within the Project Area. Two modified historic district forms - for French Village and the Baldwin/Prescott Streets area – are just beginning to be prepared. Individual inventory forms will be prepared for the two overhead railroad bridges on Baldwin and Fairmount Streets (over the Pan Am Railway line), despite some contradictory information about the wood trestles' dates of construction. Kit Morgan and Lou Barker of NHDOT were suggested as possible sources of additional information on this question. Individual forms will also be prepared for individual buildings that will be removed in any of the options; a form for 12-14 Baldwin Street has already been submitted, while a form for 40 Pine Street will be completed in a few days. Once National Register eligibility has been determined for all affected buildings, structures, and areas that are over 50 years of age, the next step will be to see if individual impacts to them can be avoided, minimized or mitigated.

VHB has ROW information for the project area north of the river, so can be sure which buildings will be affected. A survey of Broad Street is still needed. It was noted that the top half of the yellow sheet (effects/mitigation sheet) is VHB's responsibility to complete; Joyce McKay will provide the form to Rita Walsh.

It was suggested that Joyce McKay and Rita Walsh visit the Waste House to view the basement to see if there is more recent fill. Digging down to the foundation may provide information about structure too. It was further suggested that questioning the owner (ownership of the building is in a complicated situation right now) about the building might assist, as well as seeing if building permits or company records for both the Nashua Mfg. Co. and the Nashua New Hampshire Foundation might help.

The next meeting will include more discussion about options for the access road, impacts on eligibility properties, additional information about the feasibility of moving the Waste House, and Section 4(f) impacts.

Salisbury 14626A (no federal number)
Participants: Rita Walsh and Sally Gunn, VHB; Margaret Warren, Assistant Town Administrator, Town of Salisbury and Ken Ross Raymond, Kathleen Doyle, Town of Salisbury; Doug Gosling, NHDOT

The purpose of the meeting was to present further resolution of the proposed design of the new bridge and to present a draft effects memo and draft Memorandum of Agreement for the proposed replacement of the Pingree Bridge.

Douglas Gosling, Principal Engineer, Bureau of Bridge Maintenance for NHDOT announced that he had been contacted by Jeff Brillhart, NHDOT Assistant Commissioner, to see if the Pingree Bridge could be temporarily stored at a NHDOT facility. The Town of Salisbury had sent a letter to the assistant commissioner on 9-17-09, which asked NHDOT for assistance in storing the bridge. Doug Gosling said the bridge can be stored, if necessary (if an approved buyer is not available to move it when the bridge needs to be removed to begin construction of the temporary bridge), at the Bailey Bridge Yard. The address is 38 Salisbury Road, Franklin, NH, and is adjacent to the Highway Maintenance patrol shed #211. In this location, however, the bridge would not be available to public view. He cautioned that the bridge should only be moved once, that is, try not to have it stored at the NHDOT facility if at all possible. He also noted that the bridge cannot be moved in one piece, but must instead be cut into four sections. The wood floor system cannot be reused. The bridge, which Mr. Gosling believes is both iron and steel, would be unbolted and taken apart on the ground near its current location.

Sally Gunn then presented an update on buyers interested in taking and moving the bridge. The Town of Salisbury has compiled a list, which currently contains 9 to 10 individuals or groups; two interested groups are especially persistent and both proposed a public use of the bridge in a new location. In a letter from their lawyer, the Kensington group expressed their intent to keep and restore the bridge in perpetuity. Both groups said they could come with a flat bed truck on the day the bridge was scheduled to be removed. Sally was advised to adapt the marketing plan for the pony truss bridge in Antrim-Deering, NH. It specifies what bidders need to put in their plans, resulting in an even playing field from which the Town could choose a bidder for the bridge. If the Town puts out a RFP, it should include the criteria for making the decision on who is awarded the bridge. DHR will review the ad. Sally also spoke with Phil Miles of NHDOT ROW office and received sample ads from him. A covenant between DHR and the buyer will also be required, which should be referenced and available with the RFP or ad. Peter Michaud of NHDHR will review the language of a draft covenant, which will be prepared by VHB using a sample supplied by Joyce McKay of NHDOT.

Mitigation measures were then discussed. Sally Gunn presented the most recent information she had obtained on previously suggested railing types for the new bridge. Most states have done away with weathering steel railings, due to the accelerated rusting that continues to occur as moisture enters, breaking down the material. Timber railings have issues with checking, cracking, and insects; additionally snowplows are especially hard on such railings. Galvanized metal railings will provide the lowest level of maintenance for the Town overall. She also noted that its finish would dull over time. The T-4 metal railing has been tested and is very safe, but is more costly ($50,000 more) than a T-101 railing with a snow fence ($2,000 more for a black or brown finish on the snow fence). The later is what the Town would like to use. Elizabeth Muzzey indicated that she would check with others in her office and get back to them on this choice. Linda Wilson suggested that the Town look at the bridge at Langley Parkway off of Center St. going east to I-89, which has a timber guardrail.

In response to the Town's question about DHR's involvement in how the new bridge would look, Elizabeth Muzzey provided a brief overview of the requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act's Section 106. For this project, Section 106 is triggered by the wetlands permit that needs to be approved by the USACOE. She also explained that DHR's comments on the preferred railing types are guided by their professional judgment.

The draft effects memo was circulated and discussed; two versions were produced to follow two samples provided by NHDOT; either can be used for the final version. One of the mitigation measures has been started: The bridge was tested for lead paint, but the results have not yet come back (update: there is lead paint on the bridge, but no asbestos). Reuse of the stone abutments needs to attempt to put the stones in the new bridge's headwalls or as stone fill around the abutments. Sally Gunn will review to see if stones can be reused in the bridge. The language in the memo regarding the single stone wide stone wall in the vicinity of the temporary bridge will read "any portions impacted by the construction of the temporary bridge will be photographed and then re-built back to that appearance."

The mitigation measures noted in the draft effects memo also need to include preparation of a NH Historic Property Documentation form for the 1893 Pingree Bridge. The large format photos (preferably taken when the snow fence is off the bridge) and a draft narrative that includes the items requested by NHDHR need to be submitted and approved *before* the bridge can be removed from its original location. Mary Kate Ryan of NHDHR can provide further guidance on the requested items in this report. Additionally, the full-sized plans from the 1990s rehabilitation of the bridge need to be photographed with a large format camera. A PDF of the inventory forms (bridge individual inventory form and West Salisbury Historic District area form) need to be sent to the Salisbury Historical Society, Salisbury Heritage Commission and NHDHR. The NH Historic Property Documentation form needs to be sent to the same organizations. NHDHR will receive the large format negatives.

The effects memo will be sent to USACOE, followed by the completed and signed MOA. The draft MOA will be emailed to NHDOT and NHDHR for review prior to signature by required parties. Both agencies will also review the covenant, marketing plan, and ad.

There was a brief discussion about the cost of demolishing the bridge and how that cost can be used by a new buyer. The storage/marketing period for the bridge would preferably be five years. Elizabeth Muzzey stated that the T-101 railing colored snow fence in either black or brown was approved and should be stated as a mitigation measure in the effects memo and in the MOA. Finally, it was agreed that no additional meetings with NHDHR and NHDOT need to take place to finalize the various documents.

****Memos/MOA's**: Brookline, X-A000(785), 15552; Columbia, NH-Lemington, VT, 13815; Danville, X-A000(916), 13535; Windham, X-A000(558), 14830; Gilford, X-A000(553), 14825; Brentwood, X-A000(918)

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

S:\MEETINGS\SHPO\2009 minutes\10-1-8.doc