

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT CONFERENCE REPORT

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

DATE OF CONFERENCES: October 10, 2013

LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building

ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT	Kevin Nyhan	NHDHR	Ed Roberge
Steven Babalis	Steve Liakos	Laura Black	
John Butler	Christine Perron	Edna Feighner	CHA
Sheila Charles	Bill Saffian		Rob Faulkner
Kathy Corliss		DRED	
Jill Edelmann	Federal Highway	Chris Gamache	Consulting Parties
Chris Girard	Administration	Seth Prescott	James Garvin
Cathy Goodmen	Jamie Sikora		Roy Schweiker
Tom Jameson		City of Concord	
Marc Laurin		Martha Drukker	
Don Lyford			

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

PROJECTS/PRESENTATIONS REVIEWED THIS MONTH:

(minutes on subsequent pages)

October 10, 2013	1
Concord 12004 BRF-X-5099(021)	1
Conway 14958, X-A000(626)	4
Roxbury-Sullivan 10439, F-X-0121(034)	5
Barnstead, 14121E, X-A001(174)	6
Randolph Pony Truss Bridge over Snyder Brook on Trail (DRED).....	7

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

October 10, 2013

Concord, 12004, BRF-X-5099(021)

Participants: Cathy Goodmen, Tom Jameson, Kevin Nyhan, Steve Liakos, NHDOT; Martha Drukker, Ed Roberge, City of Concord; Rob Faulkner, CHA; Consulting Parties: James Garvin, Roy Schweiker

Jill Edelmann stated that the Adverse Effect Memo had been signed.

Jamie Sikora added that the memo had been sent to the Advisory Council, most of which was on furlough. Jamie noted that he was not sure if Carol Legard was going to be able to participate in this meeting via conference call due to the government furlough / shutdown, but that the meeting should move forward regardless.

Ed Roberge stated that the next steps moving forward would be to finalize the Environmental Study with agreed to mitigation and that document, along with the Alternatives Analysis will be the final documentation to wrap up NEPA.

E. Roberge noted some mitigation ideas that have been discussed to date:

- HAER Documentation – done to standards;
- Interpretive signage;
- Marketing the bridge for re-use – terms and posting locations to be determined.

E. Roberge further noted that the City wants to do something that is meaningful and useful to the Concord community. Some good ideas were gleaned from a recent ACHP webinar, including:

- linking historic elements into the City's GIS system;
- use of QR code readers to provide residents with more readily available information.

Roy Schweiker responded that E. Roberge's discussion of options was inadequate in comparison to the level of mitigation that is typically required from wetland impacts. He also stated that the bridge's historic significance warrants more action, having been designed by a former Concord mayor.

R. Schweiker provided the following ideas:

- Put the span in a park, open to the public. Exeter did a similar thing with a lift span bridge;
- Use for a wetland crossing on a multi-use trail project in Concord;
- Use as a pier in downtown Concord to look out over the river;

Mr. Schweiker further noted that he would like to keep the bridge in the Concord area and ensure that the bridge is appropriately re-used.

E. Roberge acknowledged R. Schweiker's comments and added that a sustainable management and maintenance plan needs to be factored into any mitigation option that includes re-use of the bridge. He noted that while City Council recently accepted the master plan for the multi-use Merrimack River Greenway Trail (MRGT) project, there is no funding available nor committed.

E. Roberge continued, suggesting the option of taking a section of the bridge and placing it at the Fish & Game area as an interactive display making it part of the City's Heritage Trail. This would require some level of rehabilitation which would include re-painting and a new timber deck.

He then stated that the City has looked at locations for the historic span along the Merrimack River Greenway Trail and along the Heritage Trail, but have found no definitive user or organization to support it.

R. Schweiker asked if the Greenway swamp crossing near Terrill Park was still City property to which Mr. Roberge responded "yes".

E. Roberge further commented that their concern is the unique requirement to dismember the bridge and then how to cut out the portion to be used.

E. Roberge continued noting educational opportunities that the City has been discussing such as:

- Working with UNH and local high schools;
- Working with the Parks and Rec Department and the Community Center;
- Working with Liz Hengen at the Smile Building which has a “History of Main St. display”;
- Heritage Commission may also be interested in certain elements.

There was also a brief discussion regarding where the City would “store” material such as section of the bridge until a place or reuse could be determined.

It was acknowledged that these options were better than “file cabinet documentation” and that the City could work with a variety of organizations.

Jim Garvin agreed with R. Schweiker’s opinion that the project requires a higher level of mitigation, but that there needed to be a commitment for maintenance. He provided as a negative example the Bartlett Bridge Project which bypassed a historic bridge and a commitment was made to paint the bypassed historic bridge by DOT, but that never happened and the bridge was eventually removed.. He noted that the City needs to make a commitment as part of their budget so the bridge doesn’t become an eye sore - it should remain an asset, not become a problem.

J. Garvin continued saying the previous statewide historic bridge management plan developed as part of the mitigation for the West Lebanon Bridge Replacement included an advisory committee, inventory, and a management plan and it is to be completed by January 2014.

Jamie Sikora said that the draft has been completed. J. Edelman noted that NHDHR (SHPO) had substantive comments on the draft and DOT is now investigating how to revise the draft or move forward in another direction to create a plan.

J. Garvin said he was glad the maintenance plan is moving forward. He further noted that he did not like the “political intervention” in the Sewalls Falls 106 process. He suggested that as mitigation, in the future when a project is LPA and becomes municipally managed, the municipality should be more formally instructed on the process.

Tom Jameson and J. Sikora both responded that that process is already being implemented through the LPA program.

J. Garvin noted that he was glad to hear that a process was in place. He continued noting that the public participation for this project came too late in the municipally managed process and that the public process only appeared in the January 2013 Public Info Meeting and that overall, public participation was not handled well.

Laura Black raised the topic of marketing the bridge, saying that marketing should be viewed as a significant opportunity and not merely as a check box to mark off and be done with by listing only on the website and in local newspapers. It should be ensured the bridge is marketed to the appropriate audience to get a meaningful response. She continued noting that there should be a serious commitment and creation of a work plan with a time table and sustainable funding for. Another alternative might be to move the bridge to a recreational site. For example, working with NH Fish & Game to establish a “preservation easement” to preserve cultural and historic resources along the entire recreational trail (e.g., including the dam, power house, canals, and Native American resources).

J. Garvin noted the need to bring DRED and NH F&G into the discussion for a more broad-reaching mitigation that goes beyond the adverse effect of the bridge. Jim mentioned that the Sewalls Falls Dam Hydro-plant was turned into a museum / Industrial Heritage Park.

R. Schweiker added that there was another potential area being the railroad right-of-way to the west which could be used for a location if the conservation easement at the F&G property prohibits placement of the bridge.

J. Sikora stated that there needs to be assurances that any mitigation alternatives have community support (funding), and that a structured entity is viable and followed through on and that only viable options are committed to. E. Roberge commented that if the bridge is re-used it will stay in the community. He liked the idea of reuse at the boat launch area and has also spoken with F&G and City Council who indicate that a static monument has a higher probability of success than reuse.

Martha Drukker offered the possibility that the portal be re-used as an entrance to the Heights Community Center and that corridors within the Community Center could display a number of historic community elements.

J. Garvin reiterated the need for an entity to take responsibility of such an endeavor, an institutional commitment, since it will be costly and asked who was going to do it. E. Roberge asked if he knew of any examples. J. Garvin responded that Merrimack College, UMASS Amherst, and other academic institutions have bought bridges for structural analysis.

R. Schweiker noted that the historic bridge was preserved in Franconia as a static truss.

Steve Liakos said the bridge would need to be dismantled to be relocated. He emphasized the importance of thinking about how it will be moved before any commitment is made and further noted that adaptive re-use is a good idea. This would require a new floor and new bottom chord while preserving the trusses. He also stated that the pedestrian load is almost as high as the vehicular load (+/- 95%) and that appropriate codes needed to be followed. He also suggested that a physical barrier could be placed at the entrance of the bridge to ensure that no vehicles enter.

Following up on an earlier discussion, E. Roberge asked L. Black what the difference between a conservation easement and a preservation easement was. A conservation easement protects natural resources whereas a preservation easement protects cultural and historical resources.

T. Jameson said that the Sewalls Falls Bridge is a destination site and that he would like to encourage people to visit the site and asked if current funding is available for mitigation. Edna Feighner responded that offsite mitigation is eligible for funding, similar to wetland mitigation.

E. Roberge concluded that these thoughts on functional re-use can be further developed. At the next monthly meeting in November, a draft MOA can be discussed.

Conway 14958, X-A000(626)

Participants: Christine Perron, Bill Saffian, NHDOT

Bill Saffian provided an overview of the project. The project involves the rehabilitation of Bridge 170/071, which carries NH Route 16 over the Saco River. The bridge is a 3-span Deck Plate Girder constructed in 1945 and rehabilitated in 1978. The bridge is currently rated in decent condition (deck = 6, superstructure = 7, substructure = 6) and is not listed on the Department's red list. The area around the bridge is commercially developed and 11,000 vehicles cross the bridge daily. The town's water and sewer lines are located on the bridge. In addition, there are telephone lines carried across the bridge.

Proposed work would entail full and partial depth deck repairs; repair and repainting of bearings; painting of all structural steel; concrete repairs on the abutments; and guardrail replacement. The Department is trying to determine if the lights on the bridge are Town or State owned; if State owned, the maintenance district may ask that they be removed as part of this project. The Department is also waiting for feedback from the Town on the need for a sidewalk. Currently no sidewalks exist on the bridge and there are safety concerns when pedestrians use the bridge. If the Town's preference is for a sidewalk, then one sidewalk could be added by creating narrower travel lanes (12-1 typical instead of 12-2) and by utilizing the additional space created by the new rail. The addition of a sidewalk would require shifting the roadway centerline across the bridge and on the approaches. During construction, one lane would be maintained for southbound one-way traffic, with a 7.5 mile detour for northbound traffic. The project currently has an on-shelf date of October 14, 2014.

Laura Black asked if the proposed work would change any original features of the bridge. Bill Saffian responded that painting and abutment repairs would address original bridge components but no changes to 1945 components are proposed.

L. Black commented that, based on the work as proposed, an inventory form would not be necessary; however she suggested that the Department consider doing the form to determine if the bridge is an eligible resource in the event that additional work is added to the scope. Christine Perron asked B. Saffian if additional work was anticipated. B. Saffian responded that the scope was approximately 90% set at this time. The only potential for additional work would be for deck replacement if deck repairs were more widespread than anticipated; however this was unlikely. Jamie Sikora noted that a deck replacement would not be of concern.

L. Black suggested that it would be acceptable to take a chance by not doing an inventory form on the bridge. Edna Feighner added that the project would result in No Historic Properties Affected; however the effect memo should include language stating that the National Register eligibility status of the bridge was not evaluated as part of this project and is unknown.

Roxbury-Sullivan 10439, F-X-0121(034)

Participants: Don Lyford, John Butler, Steve Babalis, Marc Laurin, NHDOT.

As DHR was in attendance when the project alternatives were reviewed at the September 18, 2013 Natural Resource Meeting, the specific options had already been discussed and were not reviewed again. Laura Black discussed the RPR information, and the previous investigations done in 1996 and 2003. She confirmed that the Stoddard Country store was not eligible, due to loss of integrity, and that it is not part of the E. Sullivan District. The Wiswall House at 432 Valley Road is not eligible, but contributes to the District; the Higby house was evaluated in 1996 and the form needs to be updated; 526 Route 9 in Roxbury, though found not eligible in 2000, should be re-evaluated as it may actually be eligible; and the area form needs to be updated to include more information on the hardscape, infrastructures and landscape of the District. Jamison Sikora questioned that if the 529 Route 9 property impacts are to be minimal, whether it needed to be reviewed, but left it up to DOT to determine the extent of the evaluation. L. Black inquired about the stone retaining wall in Roxbury. John Butler described it as being composed of random boulders with no cut granite blocks. L. Black suggested that the wall will need to be described.

Regarding archeology, Edna Feighner agreed that the Goodnow Mill site is not eligible. Discussion ensued on the Locke Tannery site and the need for a Phase 2 evaluation. Sheila Charles argued that there is a lack of integrity and the site is very wet. J. Butler indicated that with the upstream relocation option the site would be in fill. E. Feigner stated that the area should be more accurately identified so the site as described in the report can be related to the proposed impacts. S. Charles and M. Laurin will go out to GPS the area to better identify the location of the site.

J. Butler inquired as to the historicity of the bridge. L. Black responded that it would also need to be part of the updated review effort. L. Black also questioned whether the impacts to NH 9 would be an effect on the E. Sullivan District. J. Sikora stated that unless the road shifts into the District, any reconstruction of NH 9 would likely not be considered Adverse.

Barnstead, 14121E, X-A001(174)

Participants: Chris Girard, Donald Lyford, Kevin Nyhan, NHDOT

Chris Girard presented the changes to the project since the public hearing last summer. The project was extended up White Oak Road approximately 500', the work along Lake Shore Drive was extended approximately 190', several driveway slope impacts have changed due to design profiles, Parcel 22 has been developed since the hearing. The purpose of the meeting was continuing consultation to provide project updates on the proposed intersection improvements along NH Route 28 at White Oak and Peacham roads, and further discussion regarding mitigation for the intersection impacts.

The following was discussed regarding mitigation:

1. Sheila has tried on 13 separate times to coordinate with the Town of Barnstead regarding mitigating the impacts to the White Oak School by posting information on the Town website. The last correspondence resulted in the Town asking if the project could proceed without their input. Laura asked that to wrap up this part of the mitigation that a brief annotated bibliography be prepared of information regarding school houses in Barnstead.

2. Completion of all necessary phases of archaeology: DOT is working on that now, with a Phase IB to begin in spring.
3. Archaeology monitoring in front of both cemeteries.
4. Landscaping on Parcel 15 to maintain the use and character of the property: The Department will work with the landowner on this, if the landowner desires it.
5. Working with the landowner at the White Oak School property to make sure the design is amenable to the owner. DOT will be doing this.
6. Regarding the extension of the project down Lake Shore Drive, the work will remain within the limits of existing roadway. There is a potential district in this area. The road is gravel. Laura asked that photographs be taken of the area to demonstrate a pre-construction condition of the area. Jill and Sheila agreed to take photographs.

It was agreed that the Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement could be developed for review and signature by NHDOT, FHWA and NHDHR.

Randolph Pony Truss Bridge over Snyder Brook on Trail (DRED)

Participants: Chris Gamache, Seth Prescott, DRED

This project was previously reviewed during the Cultural Resources Agency coordination meeting on July 11, 2013. Photographs and maps were presented. Megan DeNutte from DRED presented the photographs and maps. More information was requested on the strategies for the needed repairs on the truss structure.

Chris Gamache indicated the Pony Truss Bridge on the Berlin Branch Railroad is the last of this style on the grade and will be lost if not repaired in 2013. It is DRED owned and abuts (south of) the WMNF. Access to the bridge is provided by Route 2. Funds for repair are available from the Research Transportation Program (RTP) for abutment repairs and the Moose Plate Program for roof to truss repairs.

Jim Garvin indicated this wooden Howe truss (c.1918) is considered a covered bridge. The other NH pony truss bridge in Gorham was lost to arson about 9 years ago. There is widespread concern about the potential arson of the Randolph bridge, especially as it is in a fairly isolated location on the railroad line. One option would be to treat the existing bridge with a fire retardant as No Char. Garvin indicated the National Society for the Preservation of Covered Bridges (NSPCB) owns a Howe truss bridge from Berlin, and the American Engineering Company funded truss bridge research and moved the bridge temporarily for study to Case Western Reserve University, Ohio. Garvin affirmed the NSPCB is interested in donating No Char and helping with repairing the Randolph Bridge's siding.

Chris Gamache and Seth Prescott indicated the eastern granite abutment is seriously undermined by scouring and falling apart, subject to impact from the flow of the stream focused in part underneath the eastern abutments rather than along the centerline. There is significant worry about the necessity of closing the bridge and losing the bridge. The wood and steel truss siding also needs repair, plywood siding has been added as a temporary measure. The condition assessment of the bridge indicates it is not sitting properly, as it is twisted 3" off its eastern side and has settled 4 to 6" where it should lie flat, although the deck has already been shimmed on the east side to help

level it. The opposite western abutment is not subjected to the same pressure from the curve in the Brook.

Recommended strategies for repair include lifting the bridge off the abutments and moving it adjacent to the trail. Following repair or replacement with a concrete footing, the bridge could be lifted back onto the repaired footing. The problem with lifting and resetting is location choice. Moving it west would cut off trail access, and moving it east would block the access for abutment repair. The railroad bridge constitutes a major snowmobile corridor and facilitates pedestrian and sled dog access to the Appalachian trail. This process however has little funding and removing from the abutments may be beyond the project funds. Once removed, it is likely rot will be found on the timbers and other problematic structural issues may be encountered. The relocation project is likely to result in more catastrophic issues than those associated with the Pier Bridge.

Another preferred option would be to leave the bridge and granite abutments in place, and construct timber cribbing beneath it on both sides. . In addition, #5 rebar could be used to secure the framework. The granite abutment could be replaced with a concrete footing, laying 12" of concrete to the existing stones and supported with wing walls. The concrete might encourage better stream diversion. Gamache and Prescott recommend sacrificing this eastern abutment to save the resource in place.

Jamie Sikora asked if stone could be gathered and set against the abutment face to make it look similar. Seth Prescott indicated stone could be gathered from the center of the brook to armor the constructed wing walls, as well as the abutments. This would also assist in realigning the stream, and deterring the scouring. However Chris Gamache indicated the abutments are overgrown and hidden and there is little visibility from Route 2 by pedestrians. They cannot see the abutments from the trail, although it would be possible to clean up and expose more of the bridge

Strategies will continue to be reviewed, in cooperation with state and federal agencies. DES is waiting on the 106 determination.

Another repair issue is the roof, which has failed in several locations exposing trusses. Plywood roof and siding sections have been added as a temporary measure, however it is already rotting. Some of the tongue and groove boards have been lost. Chris Gamache however indicated the primary project focus is to stabilize the bridge, although Recreational Trail Funding (RTF) for example from the moose plates might be available to encompass some elements of roof repair. Chris Gamache also indicated the possibility of using pressure treated plywood to deter the water penetration,

Jim Garvin indicated that loss of the bridge abutment would be catastrophic. Pouring the concrete footing and using cemented masonry is affected by the weather. Can it be done before the winter with skilled laborers?

Chris Gamache indicated there is a small work window as it would require about a 6 week turnaround, but it could be done if initiated soon. They do require an emergency dredge and fill permit. Seth Prescott indicated polar sand could be added to the cement. He worried that if measures were not undertaken, it might be caved in or gone by the spring.

Laura Black asked about tinting the concrete. Seth Prescott indicated this will happen over time.

Jim Garvin reiterated this one of the last remaining Howe pony truss bridges in the US to carry a railroad. The bridge is a very rare example, as the Boston & Maine Engineer Jonathan Parker Snow continued using timber (spruce) instead of iron or steel into the early 20th century. Timber on a bridge in Gorham was coated with creosote. Seth Prescott affirmed this bridge also was coated. Jim Garvin indicated the intended weight load for carrying a locomotive and freight train was approximately 135,000 pounds. Another comparative bridge is the NR listed Wright's Bridge in Newport. Garvin indicated some documentation including photographs of the Randolph bridge is compiled in the BOSTON & MAINE RAILROAD, BERLIN BRANCH BRIDGE #143.06 (HAER NH-49) (Snyder Brook Bridge).

The discussion of effect ensued. Jill Edelman indicated, although this is not a NHDOT project as DOT no longer owns the property, this is an adverse effect if project involves entire replacement of the abutment and construction of wing walls. Edna Feighner concurred it will constitute an adverse effect and mitigation. Jamie Sikora indicated it will also be a Programmatic 4f issue and he will provide the necessary information for the process. Continued discussion with NSPCB is recommended.

****Memos/MOA's:**

Submitted by: Sheila Charles and Jill Edelman, Cultural Resources

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