BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT
CONFERENCE REPORT

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

NHDOT
Chris Carucci
Bill Cass
Jill Edelmann
Jon Evans
Cathy Goodmen
Charlie Hood
Laurel Kenna
Bob Landry
Marc Laurin
Don Lyford
Jim Marshall
Joyce McKay
Kevin Nyhan
Jason Tremblay

Federal Highway Administration
Mark Hasselmann
Jamie Sikora

NHDHR
Laura Black
Tanya Krajcik
Beth Muzzey
Linda Wilson

MaineDOT
Russ Charette

Albacore Park
Ken Herrick

City of Berlin
Pam Laflamme

Town of Boscawen
Lorrie Carey
Roger Sanborn
Michael Wright

Town of Canterbury
Roger Becker
Philip Stone

City of Concord
Ed Roberge

Consultant
Lisa Mausolf
Jeff Taylor

Eckman Eng.
David Eckman

FST
Paul Harrington
David McNamara

HEB
Josh McAllister
Chris Fournier

Hoyle Tanner
Matthew Low
Chris Mulleavey

Louis Berger
Tom Levins

McFarland-Johnson
Vicki Chase
Gene McCarthy

Town of Peterborough
Rodney Bartlett

Peterborough Heritage Comm.
Andrew Dunbar
Deborah Kaiser
Duffy Monahon

Town of Tamworth
Bob Abraham

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

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

October 7, 2010 2
Winchester, DPR-BRF-X-0111(005), 12906 2
Peterborough, X-A000(535), 14772A, 14933 2
Tamworth, X-A000(982), 15831 5
Randolph 16098 (no federal number) 5
Portsmouth, X-A000(417), 14493 6
Concord, BRF-X-5099(021), 12004 8
Boscawen 15281 (no federal number) 9
October 14, 2010 9
Portsmouth A-000(911), 13678F 10
Salem 15989 (no federal number) 12
Bethlehem 14228 (no federal number) 12
Madbury SP-P12922 13

Seabrook and Hampton, 15813 13
Stratford, X-A001(004), 15866 13
Berlin, X-A000(052), 12958B 14
Berlin, X-A000(052), 12958B 15
12269A, NHDHR's Request for Historic Bridges 15

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

October 7, 2010

Winchester, DPR-BRF-X-0111(005), 12906
Participants: Loey Kenna, Don Lyford. Jason Tremblay, NHDOT

This project was previously seen in January, March and April of 2010.

Jason Tremblay briefly explained the project. The DOT plans on replacing the bridge over NH Route 10 with a new downstream bridge that will span the river. In addition, a parking area and river access path will also be built. In the area where the river access path and parking area are located, several test pits were found to be archaeologically sensitive.

Jason then presented a map showing updated impacts to the area. One option would bring impacts approximately 10 ft from the sensitive area and add stone to the banks in areas that have not yet been tested. The other option would bring them approximately 20 of the sensitive area and would take the stone in the other direction underneath the new bridge. Laurel Kenna asked if more extensive testing would be required for these additional impacts. Joyce McKay stated that NHDOT has already conducted a Phase I in the area of the second option. However, the first option may need to conduct a Phase II in previously tested area and would need continued additional Phase I testing in the areas where the updated impacts are now anticipated. All in attendance agreed that this would be suitable. For option 1, Phase I testing would be expanded to include the new areas with anticipated impacts, and additional Phase II tests would be conducted in the locations that were done previously. This testing will be done in the spring of 2011.

Peterborough, X-A000(535), 14772A, 14933
Participants: Rodney Bartlett, Town of Peterborough (rbartlett@townofpeterborough.us); Christopher Mulleavey and Matt Low (mlow@hoyletanner.com), Hoyle Tanner; Jim Marshall, NHDOT. Consulting Parties: Duffy Monahon (duffy@monahonarch.com), Debby Kaiser, Andrew Dunbar, Peterborough Heritage Commission

The goal was to determine if there were any cultural resources that might interfere with the newly proposed option. The participants discussed whether there could be a temporary north bridge from Route 202 to Summer St and what the impact would be on Summer Street, Route 202, Concord Street, the Contoocook River, the Downtown and reviewed the design and period of construction of the proposed bridge to replace the existing bridge.

Rodney Bartlett, Peterborough's Public Work's Director, met with Jim Marshall, DOT Project Engineer, and Hoyle Tanner's engineers before the 9:30 meeting. They discussed the possibility of

a temporary north bridge, but did not discuss an exact location. He noted that the best location, where the Contoocook is narrow and the banks parallel, would be in the vicinity of the Strand Building on Route 202. He stressed that the town has neither land nor an easement for a bridge. R. Bartlett explained that the downtown merchants, in particular Peter Robinson the owner of Roy's Market, were eager to have their businesses impacted as little as possible. Peter thought that a temporary north bridge would mean that the downtown bridge could be totally removed and construction time could be shorter.

R. Bartlett and the Hoyle Tanner engineers agreed that construction for the new Main Street Bridge could be shorter and that the extra 15 feet of bridge widening for traffic during construction could be eliminated. This extra 15 feet was not to be part of the travel lanes when the bridge was completed. Without the flare out, the possibility of a narrower bridge would be more in keeping with the existing bridge and scale of the historic downtown. Jim Marshall, DOT Project manager, noted that demolishing the entire bridge for new construction would also allow a deck type construction that could, in the future, for example 50 years from now, allow the bridge to be widened.

There was discussion about straightening the bridge out. Duffy Monahon inquired as to why the bridge needed to be straightened. Matt Low from Hoyle Tanner stated that there could be the opportunity to straighten the bridge if phasing was not used. The narrower bridge would allow for some alignment tweaking if it were deemed an improvement in roadway design.

J. Marshall said that DOT would fund a temporary north bridge. Permitting a temporary bridge through DES, the Department of Environmental Science, should be possible. He stressed that permitting for a permanent bridge would be very difficult. DOT would not fund a permanent bridge as part of this project. Further, the cost for a permanent bridge would be prohibitive.

J. Marshall said that the permanent impact of a temporary bridge would be minimal. All contours and typical vegetation would be put back in place. Before construction, a mat would be laid down for the temporary road connections. First gravel would be placed over the mat and then the roadbed and road would be constructed. After the temporary bridge was removed, the temporary road would be taken up, and the site would be returned to its original landscape.

Debby Kaiser and Duffy Monahon represented the Peterborough Heritage Commission. The HC is in favor of the concept of a temporary bridge, knowing the details and the impacts that would be necessary to fully support it. Eliminating the extra 15-foot of Main Street Bridge is strongly supported. It was reported that the HC had met on Oct 6 to discuss the temporary bridge. The HC distributed the written findings of the HC's concerns and comments, which are attached to the minutes.

In particular, the HC is concerned with the historic in-town residential neighborhood and the impact on the Unitarian Church at the corner of Summer and Main Streets. Residential neighborhoods are key to a vibrant downtown and must be preserved. And, a student of Bullfinch designed the Unitarian Church. What would be the impact of turning lanes and traffic at this intersection? Perhaps trucks might be excluded from the North Bridge. Signs could be posted for traffic only to the downtown. The most recent Master Plan noted that of the 50% of the traffic diverted through the Downtown, only 25% had the Downtown as a destination.

Joyce McKay asked D. Monahon and R. Bartlett to describe Summer Street and the area of interest on Route 202. D. Monahon noted that Summer Street might be viewed as being of three parts. The first third are the historic neighborhood and the Church. The next third primarily consists of houses built less than 50 years ago. There are a few older houses in this area. The last third consists of more natural landscape. The common path also runs along the railroad tracks in this area. Route 202 was described as being a newer commercial area in the vicinity of the Strand Building. Concord Street or Route 202 leading out north from the downtown meets the commercial area at Sandhill Road. Concord Street has many interesting historic houses and churches on it.

Linda Wilson of the Division of Historical Resources drew a map of the area on the board. As she drew, some attendees were amazed at the number of access points to downtown, including three bridges, as well as many alternative roads from every direction, leading to the downtown. J. Marshall inquired if Peterborough really needed a temporary bridge? R. Bartlett noted concern from the downtown merchants, who have been voicing that concern from the beginning of the project, over 21 months ago. J. Marshall said that DOT would support a temporary bridge if that were what the Town wants.

Andy Dunbar, a 37-year Peterborough resident of Summer Street and concerned citizen, spoke to the stability and family neighborhood of Summer Street. His house was built in 1840. He said everyone valued being able to walk to school and to the stores. He was worried about the increased traffic, the fear of the bridge becoming permanent, and making the neighborhood less attractive for families to live there. He noted how downtown businesses had changed recently. A big box grocery store and pharmacy had just been completed out on Route 101, drawing basic services out of the downtown, an impact greater than the traffic disruption that might occur due to bridge construction. He noted that Peterborough had become a destination for tourists, and was full of restaurants and antique stores now. It was more difficult to find a parking space on the weekend than during the week. He also noted that he travel extensively about New England for business, and that most towns during bridge construction had one lane open for both directions and regulated traffic with a temporary traffic light. Why could this not be true for Peterborough?

A. Dunbar noted that he had been the chairman of the Transportation Committee for the Master Plan. He thought that we should be looking at alternative transportation, vans and bikes. He also noted that although this was a state highway, fast moving traffic would not be feasible given that there are traffic back ups at Route 137, Old Street Road, and the Route 101 and 202 intersections.

J. McKay asked what would be needed to fulfill the Section 106 process for a temporary bridge to proceed. In summary, the historic Downtown Area, impacted by the bridge construction, which is currently being inventoried by Preservation Company, would have to be expanded to determine the impact of a north bridge. The inventory of historical, cultural and archaeological features would need to be expanded to include an area north on Summer Street, north on Concord Street passed Sandhill Road, and the commercial area passed the Strand Building. Linda Wilson also requested that the railroad corridor also receive survey.

Tamworth, X-A000(982), 15831
Participants: Josh McAllister, HEB Engineers (jmcallister@hebcivil.com); Bob Abraham, Town of Tamworth; Jim Marshall, NHDOT

Joshua McAllister, P.E., of HEB, presented a summary of the multi-phased Chorcorua Village Safety Improvements project. Phase I included reconstruction of Route 16 in the village core. The project is now at Phase II, which includes:

- Realignment of Runnells Hall Road and Chocorua Road intersection with Route 16.
- Pedestrian access improvements in the form of a bus stop and paved shoulders that include road widening in areas.
- Access improvements to GIII convenience store.
- Landscaping, gateway and lighting.

Joyce McKay voiced the archaeological concerns for the area. Concern was expressed for areas that had not previously been disturbed where the roadway is being widened. The originally proposed location for the dry hydrant had no archaeological concerns. However, if it is relocated, the new location may require reviewed by NHDOT and NHDHR. J. McKay also expressed concern about the construction of Chocorua Road and Runnells Hall Road improvements. She inquired as to how the road was built and the potential for archeological resources below previously disturbed area. She mentioned that construction of deep road sections or closed drainage might extend into undisturbed ground. Depending on the design, this area may need archaeological assessment.

The DHR asked that coordination be maintain when decided on the lighting and gateway features to ensure that the chosen look and materials match the historic district look and feel. Laura Black also asked that an updated file search be conducted prior to the next meeting. It was noted that DHR is currently working on the Determination of Eligibility (green) sheet for the Historic District Area Form, completed by Preservation Company.

Actions: Attend second Cultural Resources meeting during design development and conduct NHDHR file review prior to meeting.

Randolph 16098 (no federal number)
Participants: Josh McAllister, HEB Engineers (jmcallister@hebcivil.com); Ted Wier, Town of Randolph; Jim Marshall, NHDOT

Joshua McAllister. P.E., of HEB, presented a summary of the Randolph Hill Road Reconstruction project. This project intent is to reconstruct Randolph Hill Road from Route 2 to High Acres Road. The present roadway is in terrible condition because of cracks, exposed rocks, inadequate materials, and heaving. Improved roadway drainage would be provided by roadside ditching and reuse of existing outfall locations. Currently, the constraints within roadway include existing stonewalls lining the street and mature trees.

HEB is proposing an 18’ wide paved roadway with 2’ gravel shoulders and shallow ditches with under drain as a general design. It is believed this design will limit any widening and will maintain the rural character of the area.

The current right-of-way is not defined, however all work will be conducted within the prescriptive right of way. Construction will also be conducted to avoid damage to the stone walls in the area. It is proposed that the only impacts will be limited to property improvements, including driveway matches.

Actions: HEB will complete the Cultural Resources Effect memo, checked no adverse effect, noting that the stone walls and mature trees will not be impacted. DHR noted that there had been considerable public participation and wondered if HEB could send to them a summary of the public involvement.

Portsmouth, X-A000(417), 14493
Participants: David McNamara (dmcnamara@fstinc.com), Paul Harrington, FST; Jim Marshall, NHDOT

1.1 David McNamara of FST introduced the project, which involves the Sagamore Creek Bridge on Route 1A in Portsmouth, NH. The bridge is on the State's redlist. FST has recently submitted the Engineering Study for the project, which included a Project Area Form, and an Individual Inventory for the bridge, both done by the Preservation Company. A Phase 1A Archaeological Study was completed by Independent Archaeological Consultants (IAC). Both the Project Area Form and the Archaeological Study did not find significance resources within the project area other than the bridge. Many of the homes and buildings are newer, and the older structures that may have had some significance have undergone significant renovations. Due to the disturbance and alterations to the riverbank, from the construction of the existing bridge and original 1850 bridge, the Archaeological Study recommended no further study was needed. The Individual Inventory Form did find that the bridge itself was eligible for the National Register.

1.2 Paul Harrington of FST then described the existing bridge and its history, before presenting the options FST has studied for repairing or replacing the bridge. The existing bridge was constructed in 1940, slightly to the west of the original bridge. The existing bridge has an open steel grid deck, with two variable depth steel girders. The bridge is known to the area locals as the Whistling Bridge, due to the noise of the open grate decking. The bridge underwent significant repairs in 1984, replacing the majority of the floor beams, large sections of the open decking, and the rails. In 2005, the City completed some minor repairs to the structure that included additional bracing and securing loose member bracing elements. During the spring of 2010, an interim repair contract was completed, which included installation of redundant floor beams and additional repairs to the decking. The bridge is currently posted for a 6-ton weight limit.

1.3 The proposed bridge cross-section was described. The City is looking to construct 5' shoulders for bicyclists and one 5' sidewalk across the bridge. The area is very popular for pedestrians and bicyclists. In order to minimize impacts to natural resources in the area, the bridge widening to accommodate those features is proposed entirely to the east, which utilizes the previously disturbed ground from the original 1850 bridge footprint. It is desired that a solid deck replace the open deck grating, as the grating allows for runoff and stormwater to fall directly on the bridge's superstructure, speeding the deterioration of those elements. Additionally, the open grating poses a significant safety hazard for

bicyclists. The approach to the bridge from the north is down a long steep hill. The road is signed in advance of the bridge warning cyclists to walk their bikes, but some ignore the signs. The City has several incidents per year, where bicyclists fall and suffer injuries when they hit the steel grid decking.

1.4 A handout was provided, which showed pictures of the existing condition of the various bridge elements. Included were photos of the steel rails and walkway, steel grid decking, floor beams, girders, bracing, piers, and abutments.

2.0 Options - Superstructure

2.1 Rehabilitation – In a rehabilitation scenario, the only original bridge element that could be retained are the variable depth steel girders. The other elements are either too far deteriorated, or were replaced in the 1984 repairs. In order to use the existing girders, it is recommended that they be dismantled and shipped off site, where they would be de-leaded, rehabilitated, and sent back to the site. Vertical clearance is also a concern with the existing bridge. Many boaters and fisherman can only get under the bridge at low tide, and need to line up right in the center of the span, for maximum clearance. The rehabilitation option, combined with a solid deck would require the roadway profile to be raised in order to simply maintain the current vertical clearance. It would require a raise in profile of 2’-3’ in order to gain any clearance. These adjustments to the roadway profile could lead to property and additional wetland impacts.

2.2 Steel Girder alternatives – Two alternatives utilizing steel girders, a variable depth and a constant depth option, were considered. From a cost standpoint, there is very little difference. The variable depth option saves material, but has more fabrication costs. The constant depth girders are easier to fabricate, but require some additional steel. By utilizing new steel girders, the depth will be significantly less than the existing girders, allowing an increase in the bridge clearance, without changing the roadway profile.

2.3 Precast Concrete – The NHDOT encourages the use of precast girders in bridges over salt water, which the Sagamore Creek is. However, due to the span lengths, this option has cost and constructability concerns and was not recommended.

3.0 Options - Substructure

3.1 Drilled shafts are the preferred pier alternative. These can be drilled down to bedrock and extend up to the deck. This will limit the cofferdam and excavation required in the river. They could also be constructed behind the existing piers, allowing the channel to be opened up wider, and limit the amount of existing substructure that needs to be removed.

4.0 Preferred Alternative

4.1 FST would recommend to the City the new variable depth steel girder alternative. This option is cost effective, provides a design philosophy consistent with the original variable depth girder bridge, and provides the greatest vertical channel clearance, without impacting the roadway profile.

5.0 Discussion

5.1 DHR – Is there significant bike traffic across the bridge. FST – Yes, this is a heavily traveled bike route. This was evident while the bridge was closed in the spring for emergency repairs.
5.2 DHR - How long is the detour? FST – It is about a 3-mile trip, with traffic being diverted to Route 1.
5.3 DHR - Why the variable depth girders? FST – This design, which varies the girder depth to optimize the steel design is consistent with the current bridge. The design also provides the maximum vertical clearance without major impacts to the roadway profile.
5.4 DHR noted that in the Individual Report, this bridge was an example of an important transition to the variable depth steel girders.
5.5 DHR - How are the proposed piers different than existing? FST – The existing piers utilize concrete encased steel columns that are supported by spread footings on rock. The recommended piers are individual drilled shafts that are founded in rock and extend all the way up the pier cap without the need for a major cofferdam structure.
5.6 The DOT noted that another advantage of the preferred alternative is the ability to do much of the construction outside of the navigable channel.
5.7 DHR noted that they will need to consult with two members who were not at the meeting, and receive their feedback before making any determinations
5.8 FHWA said the rehabilitation option would need to be quantified.
5.9 If a full replacement is the option that moves forward, the existing bridge will need to marketed. This effort would be coordinated through the City. The DOT is currently marketing at least one other bridge. FHWA/City would pay the buyer the cost of the demolition.

6.0 Action Items

6.1 DHR will discuss the project with the members who were not at the meeting. FST left handout copies of the presentation.
6.2 FST will provide Joyce McKay with three (3) originals of each of the three reports, with the pictures printed on the appropriate paper.

Concord, BRF-X-5099(021), 12004
Participants: Catherine Goodmen, John Butler, Don Lyford, NHDOT; and Ed Roberge, City of Concord

This project has previously been presented May 25, 2000; December 7, 2000; March 13, 2003; January 12, 2006; November 12, 2009; April 1, 2010, May 6, 2010.

This project would replace/rehabilitate the bridge that carries Sewall's Falls Road over the Merrimack River.

The City of Concord has requested that the design for this project include a protected left turn lane into the Concord Monitor driveway from the southwesterly direction. This will require the widening of Sewall's Falls Road to the east of this driveway, impacting the railroad crossing of the Boston, Concord and Montreal Historic rail line.

This intersection was previously presented for another project, Concord 15935, a project to replace the signals at this crossing and upgrade the rails, ties, and the approaches. The project proposes to remove the old signal box and old crossing posts. Due to this crossing project, SHPO requested an Individual Inventory Form for this crossing. It had been previously determined that the corridor is eligible as a district, and the signals and signal box were contributing resources. The designers for this project stated that the new signals would have to be placed in the same location as existing, but the signal box could remain unaffected. SHPO agreed that this preservation of the signal box would provide mitigation for the loss of the signals and issued a finding of De Minimis impacts.

With the widening of Sewall's Falls Road, the signal box will have to be moved. Cathy Goodmen suggested that we preserve the signal box but move it back from the road, but out of the new roadway and slope work, essentially in the same location.

SHPO agreed that this would still be a No Adverse Effect, with J. Sikora's determination of De Minimis impact on the resource for the 15935 project.

Boscawen 15281 (no federal number)
Participants: David Eckman, Eckman Engineering; Michael Wright, Town Manager of Boscawen; Roger Sanborn, Lorrie Carey, Town of Boscawen; and Roger Becker, Philip Stone, Town of Canterbury

This project was previously reviewed on April 9, 2009 and December 12, 2009.

Michael Wright opened the meeting with a brief recap of the public meeting that was held to discuss the future of the Boscawen-Canterbury Bridge. It was determined from the meeting that the Division of Historical Resources wanted an assessment of the bridge's potential reuse. It was agreed that a final assessment would take place after the removal of the trusses from the abutments. Each span will be lifted from its abutments and placed on either side of the river where an assessment can take place. M. Wright stated that this process will be noted in a MOA, and that if the bridge can be re-used a separate MOA can be developed.

Linda Wilson suggested working closely with DRED for reuse options. Laura Black asked if any of the bridge plaques remain. M. Wright answered that there were plaques on both the Boscawen and Canterbury sides, however both had been removed and placed in storage. One of them may have been stolen since.

David Eckman spoke more on the process of removal and lack of natural resources permitting that would involve the Army Corps due to the delicate crane removal method.

M. Wright asked if there was any possibility to receive a consensus determination in order to go out to bid this December. L Wilson assured the towns that the NHDHR would be efficient in their review of the MOA language.

October 14, 2010

Portsmouth A-000(911), 13678F
Participants: Bill Cass, Bob Landry, John Butler, Kevin Nyhan, NHDOT; Laura Black, Elizabeth Muzzey, Linda Wilson, DHR; Russell Charette, Maine DOT; Jamie Sikora, Mark Hasselmann, FHWA; Vicki Chase, Gene McCarthy, McFarland-Johnson. Consulting Parties: Ken Herrick, Albacore Park; Roberta Lane, National Trust for Historic Preservation (via conference call)

Bob Landry indicated that this bridge replacement project was option MB2 from the Connection Study. It proposes to replace the Memorial Bridge with a skyline replica. The 28' width, rail-rail (11-3 typical, with a 6' sidewalk) will be replaced with a 32' rail-rail width (11-5 typical, with a 6' sidewalk). The project will also move the Bridge Tender House per HNTB recommendations in the original study for the Modified Replacement in-kind of the Memorial Bridge to provide the full 6-foot sidewalk without obstructions.

The project is anticipated to be design-build contract so consultation throughout that process with the SHPOs should be ongoing as well.

Jamie Sikora indicated that the meeting was not necessarily to kick off the Section 106 process since those discussions were ongoing during the Connection Study. Alternatives and resources were already identified.

There was discussion about terminating the MOA. Jamie Sikora believes the current MOA should be terminated as this is a new option. Beth Muzzey indicated that since this would be the first time a Section 106 MOA was terminated in New Hampshire, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) should be involved as soon as possible. The ACHP will have a 45-day review period if it is determined necessary to terminate the MOA. It was discussed that the ME SHPO also be involved from the beginning.

Jamie Sikora noted that the next meeting to discuss project effects (tentatively scheduled for 11/18/10) could either be a video conference or a webinar at FHWA NH headquarters. Finalization of the draft categorical exclusion/ 4(f) document should be complete by approx. 3/15/11.

A public meeting will hopefully be scheduled for late November. MOA discussions can then begin in December. Jamie Sikora asked that the conceptual design for the skyline replica be completed in order to clarify the design process in the MOA. Russ Charette noted that Maine DOT has completed MOA's with design build, and will forward those along to NHDOT and NH SHPO.

Essentially, the MOA needs to include the ability to review the design as the project goes forward to make sure that it follows the Secretary of Interior's *Standards* 9 and 10. Beth Muzzey indicated that she understood why we are here at this time, and despite that, the project needs to work within the context of NEPA/Section 106/ Section 4(f). To that end, SHPO must consider the rehabilitation options first until it is shown that they are not feasible and prudent. Discussion around these issues resulted in the desire for a meeting to discuss the options, already dismissed during the Connection Study, and the way in which they do not meet the purpose and need. Therefore, everyone would be able to proceed with Section 106 analysis in the appropriate stepwise process. Beth Muzzey noted that NH SHPO has only seen the draft version of the

Connection Study, and does not believe the Study was parallel with the Section 106 process. Jamie Sikora indicated that these options had been dismissed for other reasons. MEDOT agreed with the need to make sure NEPA/ Section 106/ Section 4(f) were honored in the decision making process.

McFarland Johnson will begin reviewing the screened alternatives and the effects at the same time as they move ahead with assisting the Department in the analysis of this project. Beth Muzzey asked that the Section 106 alternative analysis be laid out and agreed to by all parties in a draft stage, as opposed to waiting for the final study. L. Wilson noted that the Park Service will inquire if the study looked at a full range of alternatives. The potential alternative to be discussed included the no-build, rehabilitation, bike/ped., removal, and replacement with skyline replica.

Bill Cass asked if at the last public meeting, in May 2010, it was determined that the only feasible and prudent alternative was the replacement option. Beth Muzzey answered that the content of Section 106 was more important than dates. Kevin Nyhan attempted to clarify the above discussion stating that it was more document organization than further evaluation. B. Muzzey stated that for NH SHPO to look at the replacement option, it needs to be determined and documented early on why the elimination of the other options took place (hopefully this will be accomplished by Chapter 5 of the Study report).

Roberta Lane (via telephone) echoed the need to honor the respective environmental processes and have early reasons why the rehabilitation option could not be pursued further.

Joyce McKay stated that the next effects meeting will focus on the four options (no build, rehabilitation, bike/ped bridge, and replacement) for Memorial Bridge only and the effects associated with those options. Bob Landry pointed out that a separate NEPA and Section 106 process will be taken on by Maine for the Sarah Mildred Long Bridge, and should not be woven into discussion about the Memorial Bridge.

Beth Muzzey requested that dates for future meetings be set as early as possible. Will the effects be discussed at a regularly scheduled meeting?

McFarland Johnson will start their documentation, and Vicki Chase is planning on a draft version available in November. Alternatives can be reviewed at the same meeting as the effects are being determined. The December meeting will review the mitigation and start discussion about the MOA.

Actions:

- Jamie Sikora will set up a conference call with ACHP regarding termination of existing MOA.
- Joyce McKay and JS will work together to set up the next effects meeting, tentatively scheduled for November 18th at the NH FHWA headquarters, allowing video conference or a webinar access.

Dates will be set as early as possible for NH SHPO and consulting parties to mark calendars and enable participation.

Salem 15989 (no federal number)
Participants: Tom Levins, Louis Berger (tlevins@louisberger.com)

Tom Levins presented the plan and design information. The existing structure is a 1935 concrete slab bridge supported on cast-in-place concrete abutments. The existing bridge is approximately 27 feet wide with a roadway width of 25 feet. The overall structure length is 17 feet with a clear span of 14 feet. The condition of the existing structure is fair to poor with medium to heavy cracking and spalling of concrete members.

The proposed bridge will be an 18-foot by 8-foot, partially filled concrete rigid frame structure. The new bridge provides a larger hydraulic opening that will allow better flow characteristics and help alleviate the backwater conditions in high flow events. We are also proposing to excavate the sediment that has built up over the years to restore the original streambed conditions. The new bridge also includes a 5-foot sidewalk. Utility relocation work, along with drainage construction, is also included in the project.

There is one building located within the project limits along South Policy Street. It was constructed in 1930.

Edna Feighner was not present but L. Black stated that E. Feighner had reviewed the RPR submittal and did not find archaeological sensitivity. L. Wilson and L. Black felt that the bridge and the building each warranted having an abbreviated Individual Inventory Form (Front Form) prepared and submitted. She also asked them to discuss with the resources with the Heritage Commission to make sure that these properties were not locally valued.

Bethlehem 14228 (no federal number)
Participants: Chris Fournier, HE Bergeron Engineering (cfournier@hebcivil.com)

Chris Fournier presented the Prospect Street Bridge (NHDOT Bridge number 071/137) over the Ammonoosuc River. The original design drawings as well as an existing-features plan were reviewed. The bridge is a 1928 high Warren truss with a 108' span and was built by the American Bridge Company. The bridge is currently posted for one-lane, 15-ton weight limit, and 11’-9" vertical clearance. The bridge has a clear width of 19’-6", measured rail-to-rail. The primary goals of the rehabilitation are to replace the timber deck, improve safety, and repair the superstructure and substructure. Secondary goals include potentially widening the bridge to two legal lanes as well as increasing the load rating. Minimal approach roadwork may be included and will be determined during the engineering study phase of the project. C. Fournier discussed that apparently the bridge was rehabilitated in 1987 and will be reviewing the Bureau of Bridge Design files to determine the extent of any previous rehabilitations.

Action Items:
1. A Phase IA and IB archaeological survey will need to be performed for all areas that will be disturbed during construction, including the area around the abutment.
2. An Individual Inventory Form for the bridge should be completed.

Madbury SP-P12922
Participants: Joyce McKay

J. McKay reviewed the surplus land along NH Route 155 with Laura Black in the absence of Edna Feighner. The parcel includes one cemetery stone with the inscription identifying M. William Dam, 1758. A wire fence demarks the general area of the marker. There is a potential for additional cemetery stones. Later confirmed by Edna, for NHDOT to sell the parcel, the following potential items would need to be addressed: 1) notification of the descendants; 2) removal of the trash to allow access to the site to perform the necessary studies; 3) determination of the number of graves in the cemetery; and 4) relocation of the burial(s).

Seabrook and Hampton, 15813
Participants: Joyce McKay

J. McKay inquired about DHR's determination concerning the removal of the two Eastern Railroad bridges: the removal of the abutments at Guinea Road in Hampton and the removal of the bridge superstructure and abutments at Walton Road in Seabrook. To date, NHDOT has removed the bridge superstructure at Hampton, leaving the abutments and transferring the girders to DRED. DHR requested that NHDOT honor its original commitment to retaining the abutments at the Hampton crossing. DHR would agree to the same approach in Seabrook, removal of the bridge superstructure but not the stone abutments, large format photographic documentation of the bridge, and the reuse of the girders.

Stratford, X-A001(004), 15866
Participants: Kevin Nyhan and Chris Carucci, NHDOT

Kevin Nyhan and Chris Carucci presented this project, which involves maintenance-type work along a 2.0-mile section of US Route 3 beginning at Tetrault Road and proceeding north to the Columbia/ Stratford town line. Work involves pavement reclamation and 4" overlay, guardrail upgrade (cable to beam), and drainage repair/replacement. Some culverts will be replaced and others repaired, depending on condition. This section of roadway was constructed in 1958 (Tetrault Road, north 1.25 miles) and 1939 (from the 1958 section north 0.75 mile). All work will likely remain on state property (DOT right-of-way and/or State of NH railway)

C. Carucci presented the project in a stepwise fashion moving north through the project area.

1. In the vicinity of Tetrault Road, repair/replace drainage and extend and upgrade guardrail. Work within ROW. No concerns expressed
2. Drainage at Sta. 75+50: Chris showed a culvert with a makeshift crib at the outlet. District would like the project to replace this pipe. No concerns were expressed. it was noted that stone culverts did not exist along this corridor.
3. Work in the vicinity of a complex of buildings on the east side of the road (loop driveway) was cleared. No concern expressed.
4. Sta. 125+00 left there is a property that is listed in the National Register (Martin Farm). It was only after discussion and review of the National Register nomination that this was determined.

Originally, K. Nyhan and C. Carucci located the Martin Farm slightly further north and along the east side of the roadway. There is no work other than pavement rehabilitation at this location. The farm boundaries were discussed relative to the existing roadway. It was determined that the NR boundary includes the NHDOT right-of-way. No concerns expressed, however given the presence of the parcel, the project would result in a No Adverse Effect rather than a No Historic Properties Affected determination.

Laura Black indicated that work on the railroad property should be carefully reviewed to determine if additional survey might be required since the corridor might be a potential linear district. The work described at this meeting was determined not to have an adverse effect or 4(f) impact.

Following the meeting, Edna Feighner (not in attendance) indicated that if work were proposed outside of state property, the work would need to be reviewed to determine if archaeological investigations are needed.

Berlin, X-A000(052), 12958B
Participants: Pamela Laflamme, Berlin City Planner; Don Lyford, Charlie Hood, NHDOT

A modification to the MOA Stipulation IV: the purchase and resale of dwellings with covenants within the Berlin Heights District and outside the project area was discussed. Don Lyford suggested buying the value of the covenants from willing property owners rather than buying the property and reselling it with covenants. Thus, the transaction would be limited to a purchase of some property rights that relate to the preservation of the property. This purchase would be attached to the property deed. The covenants are to be on the exterior of the buildings. Covenants would be placed on properties that belong to the same building types as those demolished within the project area. The properties would then be residences, and owner-occupied, if possible.

Don Lyford indicated that the NHDOT appraisers might need some guidance on how to evaluate the monetary value of the covenants. Linda Wilson suggested that the Preservation Alliance might be able to offer some guidance and sample appraisals.

The length of the covenant was discussed. It was decided that 10 rather than 8 years might be preferable. It was noted that the building inspector would be able to assist in enforcing the covenants. Changes to the exterior of a building or building removal would require a building permit. NHDOT would work with the building inspector to educate the inspector about covenants, review such requests with him, and thus enforce the covenants. It was suggested that a session with Peter Michaud on preservation covenants and the yearly report could be presented at the workshops in the spring. NHDOT would assist homeowners with their report. The city would flag the covenants in the GIS system.

The scheduling of the workshop was briefly discussed. Pamela Laflamme suggested April or May. They should occur after the planning charrette because Jeff Taylor would use the workshops to report the results of the charrette.

Berlin, X-A000(052), 12958B
Participants: Pamela Laflamme, Berlin City Planner; Lisa Mausolf, Preservation Consultant; Jeff Taylor, Consultant in Community Planning; Don Lyford and Charlie Hood, NHDOT

Stipulation IIB, the planning Charrette, was also discussed. NHDOT had wondered if it would be wiser to wait until the buildings were removed prior to holding the Charrette. Don Lyford does not anticipate demolition of all the buildings until late next year. Jeff Taylor thought that their entire removal was not necessary to envision the space that would remain. He requested the insertion of grade stakes along the new route prior to the Charrette. It was agreed that the Charrette should occur in May of 2011 to provide as much benefit to design as possible. Jeff Taylor suggested that the Charrette be held in the Recreation Center. A Charrette typically lasts two days, with the documentation of the area by the team in the first morning, a review of the area with participants in the early afternoon, and listening sessions in the afternoon and evening. Saturday would be design day, based on public input. The results of the Charrette would be placed in a report and reviewed at the workshops.

12269A, NHDHR's Request for Historic Bridges:

1. DHR suggested the creation of a bridge wish list, that is, a listing of both available bridges for relocation and a list of those looking to use historic bridges.
2. As the plan for each bridge type is completed, DHR requested that the work envisioned in the plan be placed in the ten-year plan.
3. DHR observed that the rehabilitation option for historic bridges is often tabled early, and DHR requested more serious and continuing consideration of this option during the preliminary design of the historic bridge project.

****Memos/MOA's**: Rollinsford, NH-South Berwick, ME, X-A000(248), 14241; Alton X-A001(051), 14121D

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

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