

# BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT CONFERENCE REPORT

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

**DATE OF CONFERENCES:** December 3 and 10, 2009

**LOCATION OF CONFERENCE:** John O. Morton Building

**ATTENDED BY:**

<b>NHDOT</b>	<b>Federal Highway Administration</b>	Erin Clement	<b>McFarland-Johnson</b>
Mike Dugas	Marc Dixon	<b>Eckman Engineering</b>	Vicki Chase
Jill Edelmann	Jamie Sikora	David Eckman	Gene McCarthy
Jon Evans			Jed Merrow
Cathy Goodmen	<b>NHDHR</b>		
Tom Jameson	Linda Wilson	<b>HEB Engineers</b>	<b>City of Nashua</b>
Larry Keniston	Edna Feighner	Jason Ross	Leon Kenison
Laurel Kenna	Beth Muzzey		
Ron Kleiner		<b>HSI</b>	<b>Nashua RPC</b>
Marc Laurin	<b>Army Corps of Engineers</b>	John Vancor	Tim Roache
Don Lyford	Rich Roach		
Jim Marshall		<b>Louis Berger</b>	<b>VHB</b>
Nancy Mayville	<b>Town of Boscawen</b>	Jason Gallant	Sally Gunn
Joyce McKay	Michael Wright	Judy Huston	Frank O'Callaghan
Kurt Mudgett		Marty Bowers	Pete Walker
Kevin Nyhan	<b>CLD Engineers</b>		Rita Walsh
Christine Perron	Michael Haley		
Matt Urban			
Alex Vogt			

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

**PROJECTS/PRESENTATIONS REVIEWED THIS MONTH:**

*(minutes on subsequent pages)*

Bow-Concord, T-A000(018), 13742 .....	2
Lebanon Airport .....	2
Alton, X-A000(500), 14121A .....	3
Charlestown, A000(921), 13534 .....	3
Conway 15300 (no federal number).....	4
Grafton 13373A (no federal number).....	5
Grafton 14627 (no federal number).....	6
Laconia, X-A000(884), 15691 .....	6
Walpole-Charleston, X-A000(487), 14747 .....	7
Littleton X-A000(298), 14307 .....	8
Nashua, NRBD-5315(021), 10040A .....	10
Salem 14881 (no federal number) .....	12
Salem 15772 (no federal number) .....	13
Merrimack, X-A-000(353), 14413 .....	14
Hampstead-Atkinson, X-A000(859), 15663 .....	16
Derry, X-A000(897), 15690 .....	16
Epping, X-A000(886), 15693.....	17

Lee, X-A000(885), 15692 .....	18
Gorham, X-A000(891), 15699 .....	18
Lincoln-Franconia, A000(808), 15603.....	19
Hopkinton, X-A000(791), 15555 .....	21
Boscawen-Canterbury 15281 (no federal number) .....	21

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

October 1, 2009

### **Bow-Concord, T-A000(018), 13742**

**Participants: Jed Merrow ([jmerrow@mjinc.com](mailto:jmerrow@mjinc.com)) and Gene McCarthy, McFarland-Johnson, Inc.; Kevin Nyhan, Ron Kleiner, Don Lyford, NHDOT**

The project involves the replacement of two bridges carrying I-89 over I-93, including widening to three lanes and ramp relocation. The project will shift the road and shoulders to the west about 40 feet. The road will remain in the existing right-of-way.

The scope of the historic and archaeological work for the Bow Concord I-93 bridge project design was discussed. Vicky Bunker previously conducted a planning-level review of potentially archaeologically sensitive and previously disturbed areas. IAC will continue by conducting Phase 1B work on the sensitive areas, reviewing the APE while in the field, and adjusting the scope of work as needed. DHR agrees that IAC should identify possible additional Phase 1A areas, and do Phase 1B work on them, while in the field. They would not need to coordinate with DHR on any additional Phase 1A areas before proceeding with Phase 1B work on them.

IAC should examine the plans for former projects including the 1957 project plan for this location to understand the extent of disturbance. The consultant should also consider the possibility of deeply buried deposits, including using a backhoe if it seems appropriate. The consultant should also be alert to and photograph any potentially historic structures that may be within the APE, such as abandoned culverts, bridge abutments, RR structures, road beds, or the like. If they are located, they will need review.

An architectural historian will not be currently needed for survey. It was noted that this section of the I-93 Interstate is exempted from Section 106 consideration. However, if the above survey noted abandoned former road features, then such services may be needed.

### **Lebanon Airport**

Environmental Assessment for Airport Improvements

**Participants: Jed Merrow ([jmerrow@mjinc.com](mailto:jmerrow@mjinc.com)) and Gene McCarthy, McFarland-Johnson**

Jed Merrow described the Lebanon Airport Environmental Assessment project in general terms. Work may include shifting the runways and leveling a hill. The current scope of work for the historical architectural investigations do not call for preparing individual or area forms. Jed showed attendees photographs of the three buildings that are over 50 years old, which Hartgen Archeological Associates tentatively believes would not be National Register-eligible. After some discussion, DHR staff said that if the buildings will not be impacted, it would not be necessary to

provide detailed information on them. DHR staff did not want to specify what level of effort would be needed if the buildings might be affected.

(Rick Dymant, airport manager, later informed the consultant that the brick electrical building might be impacted by the north-south runway alternatives. Joyce McKay was consulted, and suggested preparing a Request for Project Review form, noting the building that would potentially be impact and including photographs of the resources. He will send it to Beth Muzzey for comment on the level of historic resource work required.)

### **Alton, X-A000(500), 14121A**

**Participants: Kevin Nyhan, Don Lyford, NHDOT**

Kevin Nyhan and Don Lyford discussed this project, which provides safety improvements at the traffic circle in Alton. Work extends up NH Route 11 and involves full box reconstruction and reconstructing the sidewalk along the cemetery on the south side of the roadway. K. Nyhan asked if an archaeological monitor were required for the work along the cemetery frontage and to reconstruct the driveway to the cemetery. E. Feighner indicated that one would be required for this work, but not for the work within the roadway box. D. Lyford indicated that this would go into the construction contract as early work.

The discussion then focused on removal and pruning of three trees along the south side of the roadway within the right of way, in front of two potentially historic properties. It was not known if the project area form completed for the project extended that far west into the Village of Alton on NH Route 11. B. Muzzey indicated that the trees may contribute to a larger district landscape, and the project area form may need to be extended and a district area form and individual forms completed on the subject properties. NHDOT would investigate the project needs and return with more information at the next meeting for a thorough discussion of the work and the properties. It was anticipated that there would be no 4(f) related issues since the trees are within the right of way. The larger right of way needs would also be evaluated. Jamie Sikora would need to be consulted to determine the appropriate course of action.

### **Charlestown, A000(921), 13534**

**Participants: Vicki Chase ([vchase@mjinc.com](mailto:vchase@mjinc.com)), McFarland-Johnson; Kevin Nyhan, NHDOT**

The purpose of this meeting was to revisit a previously approved bridge replacement project in Charlestown. Vicki Chase provided an overview of the project. The bridge, which crosses Clay Brook, is near a historic mill site, and there was a remnant wall of the mill that remained standing when the project was initially reviewed. A Phase 1A study was performed that found that the remnant mill wall was not within the Area of Potential Effect for the bridge replacement, and that recommended no additional studies. However, at the NHDOT cultural resource meeting on December 11, 2003, concerns were voiced that the vibrations from the bridge construction could cause the mill wall to collapse. Conditions on the Memorandum of No Affect signed on December 18, 2003, addressed ways to minimize the potential for vibration to affect the wall, including preconstruction meetings, vibration monitoring, and bracing the standing wall.

Subsequent to the town receiving all approvals, including a wetland permit for the bridge replacement, the project was put out to bid. The contractor bids were higher than the town had budgeted, and the bridge was not replaced. The town recently received ARRA funding to rebuild the bridge. Between 2003 and now, the wall has collapsed on its own, or through some other

means, perhaps erosion along the bank of the brook or vandalism. At the request of DHR, an archaeologist was retained to review the site to see what modifications, if any, should be made to the Memorandum of No Effect. The archaeologist found that there was only a small remnant of the wall remaining, that the masonry rubble at the base of the slope where the wall had collapsed lacked archaeological context, and that the site did not warrant further protection during this project.

Attendees of the meeting concurred that the extant archaeological resource does not warrant protection from vibration, and the Memorandum of No Effect was modified to reflect the change with the former memo appended to it.

### **Conway 15300 (no federal number)**

**Participants: Jason Ross ([jross@hebcivil.com](mailto:jross@hebcivil.com)), HEB Engineers**

Jason Ross, from HEB Engineers, presented a project concerning the Tasker Hill Road Bridge, NHDOT Bridge No. 182/066, over Page Randall Brook in Conway, NH. The existing bridge is located on Tasker Hill Road, approximately 700 feet south of the intersection with Route 153. The existing bridge is a 34-foot long metal pipe arch superstructure supported by a cast-in-place concrete substructure built in 1986. The clear span of the arch is 11'-7", the deck has a total width of 30 feet, and it supports two-lanes of traffic. It is currently listed on the NHDOT Red List of Bridges, and the project is currently scheduled for FY 2011 funding under the NHDOT Municipal Managed State Aid Bridge Program. On August 24, 2009, the New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NHDOT) recommended in a letter to the Town of Conway that the bridge be posted as "Bridge Closed" and barricaded at each end.

On October 27, 2009, a temporary bridge was constructed to span the top of the pipe arch. The existing temporary bridge has steel stringers and a steel plate deck superstructure supported by a pre-cast concrete block substructure. The entire temporary bridge is set into the existing road so that the bridge deck is flush with the existing road. The total length of the temporary single span, two-lane bridge is 30 feet. The maximum clear span is 28 feet. The deck width remains the same as the existing bridge at 30 feet. The existing bridge rails remain in use.

Tasker Hill Road is an existing two-lane paved road that has a width of approximately 24 feet. The horizontal and vertical alignment of the bridge and approaches are generally acceptable. The road has a 575'+/- radius horizontal curve just to the south of the existing bridge and a 325'+/- radius horizontal curve just to the north. The road dips slightly before each end of the bridge and transitions immediately to a level bridge deck surface. No critical horizontal or vertical sight distance problems exist.

HEB proposes to replace the bridge with a new structure in the location of the existing bridge. Minimal horizontal and vertical alignment modifications will be made to the approaches. The project is not expected to extend outside of the existing Right of Way. A temporary detour and bridge will be constructed to the east of the existing bridge to maintain traffic during construction. Fabric will be set down for the detour. The area disturbed by the detour will be restored once the replacement bridge is completed. This same area was previously used for a detour when the existing culvert was installed in 1986.

J. Ross provided the committee with a completed RPR form, a USGS map of the site, a proposed site plan, and a set of photographs of the bridge and roadway. Edna Feighner asked if HEB had photos and plans of the old bridge and the detour from 1986. HEB will send copies of these photos and plans to Edna. It was noted that the project would not impact the property of an adjacent granite building. E. Feighner will review the requested material to confirm the absence of impact. HEB will fill out a Cultural Resource Memorandum of Effect for Municipally Managed Projects, stating that there are “no historical or archaeological properties affected,” and forward it to the committee once E. Feighner had made her determination.

**Grafton 13373A (no federal number)**

**Participants: Jason Ross ([jross@hebcivil.com](mailto:jross@hebcivil.com)), HEB Engineers**

Jason Ross from HEB Engineers presented a project concerning the Mill Brook Road Bridge (NHDOT Bridge No. 162/139) over Mill Brook in Grafton, NH. The existing bridge is located on Mill Brook Road, approximately 1.8 miles north of Turnpike Road. The 1938 original Mill Brook Road Bridge was a single lane 30'-35' span steel beam bridge with a timber deck. The bridge was destroyed during Hurricane Floyd in 1999. Following the hurricane, a modular steel truss (Bailey-type) bridge was loaned to the Town from NHDOT. The bridge is 50-foot span and has a 14.6 foot-wide single lane. It is not currently listed on the NHDOT Red List of Bridges (bridges which are in severe condition and in need of replacement), but it is currently scheduled for FY 2011 funding under the NHDOT Municipally-Managed State Aid Bridge Program.

Mill Brook Road is an existing two-lane gravel road that has a width of approximately 18 feet. The horizontal and vertical alignment of the bridge and its approaches are generally acceptable. The road has a 200'+/- radius horizontal curve just to the south of the existing bridge and a 700'+/- radius horizontal curve just to the north. A slight horizontal sight distance problem exists. The horizontal alignment should be improved. Horizontal curves will be improved to meet AASHTO recommendations.

HEB proposes to replace the bridge with a new structure in the location of the existing bridge. The vertical alignment will generally remain the same. The horizontal alignment of the road will be modified to provide better sight distance. The road will be closed during construction. The project is not expected to extend outside of the existing Right of Way.

J. Ross provided the committee with a completed RPR form, a USGS map of the site, a proposed site plan, and a set of photographs of the bridge and roadway. He noted that flooding had destroyed the earlier bridge abutments. The resources committee did not find a potential for archaeological or aboveground resources in the project area. HEB will complete a Cultural Resource Memorandum of Effect for Municipally Managed Projects, stating “no historical or archaeological properties affected”, and forward to the committee.

**Grafton 14627 (no federal number)****Participants: Jason Ross ([jross@hebcivil.com](mailto:jross@hebcivil.com)), HEB Engineers**

Jason Ross, from HEB Engineers, presented a project concerning the Davis Road Bridge, NHDOT Bridge No. 123/104, over the Smith River in Grafton, NH. The existing bridge is located just downstream of the Kilton Pond Dam on Davis Road, approximately 125 feet west of Route 4. He indicated that the project was sufficiently removed from the dam that it would not impact the resource. It was originally built in 1936. The total length of the existing single-lane bridge is approximately 34 feet. The bridge is a steel, "I" beam bridge with a concrete deck. The Davis Road Bridge is suffering from severe deterioration and has a National Bridge Inventory (NBI) status of "Structurally Deficient." It is not currently listed on the NHDOT Red List of Bridges, but is currently scheduled for FY 2012 funding under the NHDOT Municipally-Managed State Aid Bridge Program.

Davis Road is an existing two-lane paved road that has a width of approximately 18 feet. The horizontal alignment of the bridge and approaches are generally acceptable. The road has a 300'+/- radius horizontal curve just to the west of the existing bridge and continues straight to the intersection with Route 4. The vertical alignment should be improved. The bridge is at the low point of the road with approximately 5% sloped approaches. This alignment causes sight distance issues at the intersection of Route 4.

HEB proposes to replace the bridge with a new structure in the location of the existing bridge. The horizontal alignment will generally stay the same. The bridge will be widened to 24 feet according to NHDOT standards. The approaches will taper the road width back to 18 feet. The vertical alignment of the road will be modified to provide better sight distance. The project is not expected to extend outside of the existing Right of Way. The road will be closed during construction.

J. Ross provided the committee with a completed RPR form, a USGS map of the site, a proposed site plan, and a set of photographs of the bridge and roadway. The committee did not find any potential archaeological or aboveground resources in the project area. Since the existing bridge is more than 50 years old, DHR requested a "Reconnaissance Level" inventory form for the bridge. Once this inventory is completed and accepted, HEB will fill out a Cultural Resource Memorandum of Effect (Municipally Managed Projects) stating "no historical or archaeological properties affected," and it will forward to the committee.

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

This project involves the reconstruction of the US Route 3 and NH Route 11B intersection in Laconia. Mike Dugas began by describing the existing intersection, which consists of several traffic islands and uncommon approaches. The intersection's abnormal layout makes it accident-prone, incapable of handling summer traffic demands and unable to adequately accommodate pedestrian passage.

M. Dugas indicated that the proposed project was identified as a candidate for safety improvements through the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). The City of Laconia

has also been pursuing improvements at this intersection for several years. The preferred alternative consists of constructing a roundabout, realigning the intersection approaches as well as expanding and updating the existing drainage system. He indicated that the existing stone arch bridge to the west of the subject intersection would not be impacted, with the exception of some minor resurfacing and re-grading of the eastern approach in order to tie it in with the proposed roundabout. He also indicated that some strip acquisitions or easements would likely be necessary along the southwestern and southeastern quadrants of the intersection. He also indicated that the drainage requirements still needed to be determined, however a potential outlet and treatment location was to the northwest of the intersection between the miniature golf business and the Lake Winnepesaukee channel.

Edna Feighner indicated that this area has a high potential for Native American archaeological deposits. She asked how much disturbance below the surface of the existing roadway was expected. M. Dugas indicated they were unsure at this point. Joyce McKay and Jon Evans indicated that the plan was to have the Department's Materials and Research Bureau conduct a soil-boring program to determine the extent of the underlying fill material. The results of this investigation along with a better indication of the proposed subsurface disturbances would be reviewed with NHDHR to determine the appropriate extent of archaeological investigation needed for the proposed project. E. Feighner indicated that this plan was acceptable as long as the borings were kept to the minimum diameter and depth limited to that necessary to determine the extent of the underlying roadway fill materials.

Pictures of some of the project area and surrounding properties were reviewed. Beth Muzzey indicated that she needed better pictures to determine if any architectural forms were necessary to determine the project's effect on any potentially historic properties. J. McKay indicated that she would take some additional photographs prior to the next meeting.

### **Walpole-Charleston, X-A000(487), 14747**

**Participants: Jon Evans, Don Lyford, NHDOT**

This Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) project involves the reconstruction and associated improvements to a 2.7-mile portion of NH Route 12 beginning at Main Street in North Walpole, continuing to NH Route 12A in Charlestown.

Jon Evans reviewed what had been presented at the November meeting. He indicated that the Public Advisory Committee (PAC) recently chose a preferred alternative. This alternative is known as alternative 3-2-3, which is a blend of two of the alternatives, which were examined during the CSS process (alternatives 2 and 3). He indicated that this alternative involves moving the railroad and roadway to the east away from the river in the southern and northern sections and slightly shifting the roadway to the west in the middle section.

J. Evans indicated that the Department would like to determine the project's effect on the cultural resources present within the project area. J. McKay and J. Evans indicated that based on previous discussions with NHDHR it was their understanding that the only property which was considered potentially eligible for the National Register was the New England Central Railroad. Joyce McKay and J. Evans noted that during the May 2007 Monthly Cultural Resource Agency

Coordination Meeting, a District Area Form of the New England Central Railroad (Sullivan County Railroad) was requested. At this time those properties adjacent to the project area were reviewed with NHDHR, and no additional forms or surveys determining potential eligibility were requested.

J. Evans indicated that no structures except for the New England Central Railroad would be directly impacted as a result of this project. He indicated that several properties, particularly in the Meany's Cove area, would probably be impacted as a result of strip acquisitions and easements. Beth Muzzy indicated that the effect could not be determined until forms for all properties containing potentially eligible structures were prepared. At the December 10, 2009 meeting, pictures of the properties containing structures, which would likely be impacted, were reviewed with NHDHR, and it was determined that four individual property forms would need to be prepared.

### **Littleton X-A000(298), 14307**

**Participants: Sally Gunn and Rita Walsh, VHB; Jim Marshall, NHDOT**

Sally Gunn presented mitigation options for the proposed replacement of the Redington St. Bridge (Apthorp Bridge). The removal of the existing bridge for replacement has been accepted by FHWA, NHDHR, and NHDOT as an adverse effect. She reported that the Town of Littleton has agreed to the following mitigation measures: 1) contribution of \$15,000 for the completion of the NH High Pratt Truss Bridge Inventory and Management Plan and 2) large format photography and preparation of a NH State Property Documentation report. NHDHR suggested in addition the following mitigation efforts: 1) monograph on Harold Langley, the bridge designer of the Redington St. bridge, and 2) marketing for the sale, and in the interim, storage of the bridge for 5 years.

Informing the Redington Street Bridge project, Sally Gunn updated the group on the efforts of the Town of Salisbury to market their bridge. Although there were at least nine interested parties, no formal bidders came forward. The Town of Salisbury will call all of the prospective bidders soon to find out which issues prevented them from bidding. N. Mayville thought that only about \$10,000 could be available for a prospective bidder. There would be no federal funds to provide the cost of demolition to the bidder. There was a brief discussion about calculating the cost of demolition as one prospective bidder thought this cost might be available to help in the rehab costs. NHDHR suggested that FHWA might have some guidance regarding this issue.

#### *Moving and Storage of the Bridge*

Sally Gunn then presented a brief explanation of the methods and costs of moving a truss bridge, actually two Pennsylvania trusses with a new bowstring truss in the center, in Vermont to provide some idea of costs to move the Redington St. Bridge and its retrofit for a Swanton footbridge. See: <http://www.localmotion.org/advocacy/close-the-gaps/783-first-mile-of-96-mile-trail-opens> and [http://www.waymarking.com/waymarks/WM6XA1\\_Swanton\\_Footbridge\\_Swanton\\_Vermont](http://www.waymarking.com/waymarks/WM6XA1_Swanton_Footbridge_Swanton_Vermont)

The costs were approximately \$1.5 million for completion the project. Approximately \$400,000 was spent to disassemble and store the two PA trusses.

NHDHR requested more specific information about comparable costs for disassembly and moving of the Redington St. Bridge. Suggested comparables are the Shelburne Bridge, which was picked up by a crane and set adjacent to its original location and a bridge in Carroll, which was moved to the side of the road adjacent to Rt. 3. Possible storage locations in the interim might include the currently unused railroad corridor, which still includes a track, adjacent to the bridge. The corridor is owned by the State of New Hampshire. Wade Brown of SEA and Jamie Payne of Tidewater were suggested as contacts for more information on disassembly and moving of bridges.

### *Bridge Marketing Plan*

B. Muzzey requested that the bridge be marketed every six months for five years. For bridges with federal funds, the bridge advertisement does offer the buyers the cost of demolition, a legal requirement. The figure for demolition does need to be determined. Regarding the bridge marketing plan, it was noted that the past ones have been unsuccessful in finding successful bidders, and a better plan is desired to make the relocation a success. It was noted that the Town of Littleton is liable for the structure while it is stored and for the disposal costs (if not sold) after the 5-year period ends. It is possible that a NHDOT storage or maintenance yard could store the bridge for free, but the cost of moving the bridge is still the responsibility of the Town. The floor system and deck of the truss could not be salvaged, due to poor condition.

### *Metal Truss Bridge Preservation Plan*

The outcome of the previous discussions regarding the high costs, methods, storage, and marketing in the attempt to save the bridge at a new location was that perhaps funds can be productively spent addressing the completion of a model inventory and management plan for High Pratt Truss Bridges. This model would then be used in the completion of the statewide Historic Highway Bridge Inventory and Management Plan for 291 bridges, which are both municipal and state-owned. It was agreed that the Town of Littleton could contribute to this fund as a mitigation measure.

### *Harold Langley Monograph*

NHDHR suggested that a biography of Harold Langley, one of NH's finest bridge engineers, also be prepared as mitigation measure. The monograph would include a technical discussion and comparison of his bridges in the state. A monograph of Robert Prowse was noted as an example <http://www.nh.gov/nhdhr/publications/documents/prowsemono.pdf>. Monographs are also available for other engineers and architects on the NHDHR website. The cost for preparation of the Prowse monograph was approximately \$40,000. Joyce McKay will check to ascertain this cost. (J. McKay subsequently found that the cost was \$37,000.). The cost for completing the monograph is definitely higher than the suggested contribution of \$15,000 towards completion of the bridge preservation plan. It was additionally noted that the costs of initial identification and evaluation of the bridge were free to the Town, as opposed to the usual situation where the Towns have to pay for the preparation of an individual inventory form for the bridge. NHDHR later stated the monograph is more costly and perhaps not as beneficial at this time. Placing a marker at the site was also discussed in lieu of doing the monograph.

### *Conclusions/Next Steps*

Concerns were raised about timing of advertising the new bridge construction and actually being able to start. Jim Marshall and Sally Gunn will meet with the Town of Littleton at a public meeting next Tuesday, Dec. 8 to discuss the mitigation measures.

### **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, HSI; Jim Marshall, Marc Laurin, NHDOT**

Tim Roache and Pete Walker discussed public feedback received at the open house meeting. In general, there was wide support for the project. Pete Walker, who was at the cultural resources booth, reported that people were very interested in the history; VHB brought copies of the completed inventory forms, which generated a lot of interest. In particular, the current residents of the Nimco Building were in attendance, as were residents from Baldwin Street. Nimco appreciated VHB's effort to avoid its building. Both asked for copies of the survey forms once approved by NHDHR. Peter talked about Section 106 Consulting Party status with a few people, but he did not get the impression that anyone would be formally requesting CP status. John Vancor reported that the City met with the members of the Mill Yard Association separately about the update. Their concerns are mainly about utilities and the schedule, but for the most part they want the project to begin.

### *Archaeological Investigations Update*

Rita Walsh read a memo from Carol Weed, Senior Archaeologist of VHB, which outlined the previous archaeological investigations for the project. There is a 1987 report authored by Victoria Bunker, of which little is known at this time as the report was not yet obtained from NHDHR, in addition to reports from 1995 and 2003. Only the selected alternative, Alternative 4C Modified, was the subject of archaeological investigations. The latest report, Independent Archaeological Consulting's report from 2003, stated that due to extensive land modifications in the project area (construction and demolition in the mill yard over time), no further archaeological investigations were recommended for alternative 4C.

Edna Feighner suggested that Carol Weed look at the new alternative, Option 2, through a site walk and historical research to determine previous locations of buildings and structures and land modifications. She would like the areas of disturbance noted in the Phase IA report that Carol would prepare. She noted that Native American resources could be deeply buried as could features associated with the historic mill yard. E. Feighner also asked how deep any excavation for the road would go; knowing the depth would be helpful in defining the areas of disturbance. She also noted that if some part of Option 2 is currently under pavement, that it may need to be examined later.

### *Possible Treatment Measures*

Pete Walker raised the question about NHDHR's ideas regarding possible mitigation measures. Beth Muzzey said one of her concerns was how the north end wall of Storehouse #2 would be rebuilt. She stated that it needs to very accurately match the current north end wall. She also

requested more information about how the stone wall bordering the Nashua River is constructed and how the top sections that need to be removed would be disassembled. This work will undoubtedly affect the remaining sections below.

*Explanation of Refinements in Option 2*

Frank O'Callaghan explained the latest refinements to Beth Muzzey, who was not at the last meeting. A question arose about the penstock at the north end of the existing canal section as to when it was altered, the concrete section here appears to date to the 1970s. The canal east of this section was filled when the Clocktower Project (residential development on the east side of the complex) was developed, so it is possible that the construction of the existing penstock happened at that time.

*Update on Cultural Resources Work and Reviews*

The group reviewed the status of inventory form submissions and any subsequent decisions regarding eligibility or additional work. The status is as follows (as of 12/14/09):

**Project Area Form** – submitted, VHB made revisions to photo locations map and description of two trestles per NHDHR comments, and re-submitted. We presume no other comments have been made and no further work is needed.

**Nashua Mfg. Co. Historic District National Register Re-evaluation** – submitted, edits completed, re-submitted, review and decision to be made at DOE meeting on Dec. 9

**French Village Modified Historic District Area Form** – submitted, currently responding to McKay's edits and questions, hope to re-submit next week (12/21)

**Baldwin/Prescott Streets Modified Historic District Area Form** – submitted to NHDOT in electronic version, awaiting comments

**12-14 Baldwin St. Individual Inventory Form** – submitted, eligibility review completed (not individually eligible, but contributes to potential Baldwin/Prescott Sts. Historic District)

**40 Pine Street Individual Inventory Form** – submitted, edits completed, eligibility review at DOE meeting on Dec. 9

**85 Pine Street Individual Inventory Form** – submitted to NHDOT, edits completed, and re-submitted to NHDOT for review; will send hard copies to NHDOT week of 12/14

**73 Broad Street Individual Inventory Form** – almost complete; should be submitted to NHDOT in electronic version by 12/18

**75 Broad Street Individual Inventory Form** – almost complete; should be submitted to NHDOT in electronic version by 12/18

**Baldwin St. Overhead RR trestle Individual Inventory Form** – research continuing; goal is have the form completed by 12/22

**Fairmount St. Overhead RR trestle Individual Inventory Form** - research continuing; goal is have the form completed by 12/22

*Conclusions/Next Steps*

Pete Walker noted that VHB would soon be doing a preliminary draft of the 4(f) document and anticipates distribution by the end of February. In addition to the description of effects and discussion of avoidance, minimization, and mitigation, the statement would contain clear graphics, showing eligible boundaries and the square footage of impacts for eligible resources. Currently, VHB is proposing to relocate the waste house in front of the bleachery building. It was noted that the site might represent the location of a former mill building.

The next step is to have the eligibility decisions completed in January 2010 at one or both of the eligibility meetings scheduled for the month (Jan. 13 and Jan. 27). An effects discussion meeting is suggested for sometime in January. R. Walsh will coordinate with J. McKay on the date for the Effects meeting, most likely the 28<sup>th</sup> or 29<sup>th</sup>. [Jan. 28, 10-4 at NHDOT.]

December 10, 2009

**Salem 14881 (no federal number)**

**Participants: Jason Gallant, Judy Huston, and Marty Bowers ([mbowers@louisberger.com](mailto:mbowers@louisberger.com)), Louis Berger**

The proposed project consists of the replacement of the municipal red list bridge that carries Emerson Way over Widow Harris Brook (Br. No. 114/108). An initial project review, including natural resource involvement, was presented.

The Emerson Way Bridge consists of a cast-in-place concrete slab bridge supported on gravity abutments of dry-laid rubble. The wing walls are a combination of dry-laid and partially mortared rubble. The concrete slab clear span is approximately 8'-10"; however, the average channel width is approximately 6.65' due to a 4'-6" diameter concrete pipe culvert situated beneath the east abutment, partially within the hydraulic opening. There is approximately 4'-6" of vertical clearance from the streambed to the underside of the concrete slab. The resulting hydraulic opening is approximately 50 square feet.

The bridge is on the NHDOT Municipal Red List. The overall condition of this structure is poor due to the condition of the substructure. The stone abutments and wing walls show signs of cracking and settling. Structural damage to the deck, abutments, and the approaches has occurred due to past flooding events.

At present, the bridge is limited to one-way traffic by precast barriers at each curb line with an alternating stop condition at each approach. A 14-foot wide by 9 feet tall precast rigid frame is proposed with stone fill and natural materials under the bridge. A spring 2010 construction period is anticipated.

Work for the proposed concrete rigid frame bridge includes a 14 ft. span, sidewalk, and approach work. A natural stream bed will be maintained.

Cultural concerns were discussed. NHDHR suggested that Louis Berger update its files with the latest Request for Project Review forms (9/2009). E. Feighner noted that any areas of excavation would be considered sensitive for archaeological resources, including any storm water areas. The stone abutments and pipe (which is not new), have unknown origins, and DHR would like additional information on this culvert. The surrounding area was not developed until 1950s-1960s. DHR requested that Louis Berger submit a "culvert form", as this structure is not currently included in the Stone Highway Culvert in NH inventory. (Note: Culvert form has since been obtained from Joyce McKay).

\*Additional notes pertaining to the Natural Resources can be found at <http://www.nh.gov/dot/org/projectdevelopment/environment/units/projectdevelopment/nracrmeetings.htm>

### **Salem 15772 (no federal number)**

**Participants: Jason Gallant and Marty Bowers ([mbowers@louisberger.com](mailto:mbowers@louisberger.com)), Louis Berger**

The proposed project consists of the replacement of the bridge that carries North Main Street over Widow Harris Brook (Br. No. 115/115). An initial project review, including natural resource involvement, was presented.

The North Main Street Bridge consists of a masonry stone arch and a reinforced concrete arch culvert. The upstream wing walls are partially mortared rubble and the downstream wing walls are reinforced concrete. The original stone arch structure was constructed in 1900 and the reinforced concrete portion of the structure was added in 1930 to facilitate a wider roadway. The clear span of the stone and reinforced concrete arch culvert is approximately 10'-0". There is approximately 7'-6" of vertical clearance from the streambed to the high point of the arch culvert. The resulting hydraulic opening is approximately 62 square feet.

The overall condition of this structure is poor due to the condition of the arch culvert. The concrete bridge rail is deteriorated and is protected from traffic by a temporary concrete barrier system. The structure also lacks energy-absorbing transitions at the ends of the bridge rail. Structural damage to the roadway and the culvert have occurred due to past flooding events, and most recently, due to the fall 2005 and spring 2006 flooding of the area. After the spring 2006 floods, interim repairs were performed on this structure to fix sinkholes that developed from water washing roadway base fines through the structure.

Presently the bridge is open to two way traffic but due to the temporary concrete barrier system the roadway has been restricted to a width of approximately 24'-5". A 15.5-foot by 10.5-foot structure with two feet of stone fill and natural materials under the bridge is proposed. A spring 2010 construction period is anticipated.

R. Roach, asked if this bridge was an eligible historic structure, and was concerned with possible impacts down stream. He inquired if the design met Section 106 and EO 11988 requirements? Louis Berger will confirm with R. Roach

NHDHR requested that a “culvert form” be submitted, as this structure is not currently included in the Stone Highway Culvert in NH inventory. (Note: Culvert form has since been obtained from Joyce McKay). This bridge has been altered in the past, by widening the structure in 1930. The guardrail is deteriorated and/or removed. There is no map evidence of historic period mills or other water-powered industry or commerce at this location. E. Feighner added that areas outside of those previously disturbed for construction should be considered sensitive for archaeological resources.

\*Additional notes pertaining to the Natural Resources can be found at <http://www.nh.gov/dot/org/projectdevelopment/environment/units/projectdevelopment/nracrmeetings.htm>

### **Merrimack, X-A-000(353), 14413**

**Participants: Mike Haley ([mikeh@cldengineers.com](mailto:mikeh@cldengineers.com)) and Erin Clement, CLD Engineers**

This meeting was held to receive input from NHDHR, FHWA, NHDOT, NHDES, and additional resource agency staff regarding proposed improvements along Daniel Webster Highway (DWH), and their potential impacts to cultural (both historic and archaeological) and natural resources.

#### **DANIEL WEBSTER HIGHWAY/ ROUTE 3**

Michael Haley of CLD Consulting Engineers, Inc., presented the project on behalf of the Town of Merrimack to improve Daniel Webster Highway (DWH). The project, which has federal funds, would improve the overall safety of motorists and pedestrians on DWH from the proposed project’s northern limit near Connell’s Shopping Center to the southern end of the proposed project at Chamberlain Bridge. Tom Jameson is the NHDOT Project Manager.

#### **PROJECT OVERVIEW**

The project consists of installing a new five-foot wide bituminous asphalt sidewalk with granite curbing along the east and west sides of Daniel Webster Highway (D.W. Highway), from the recently completed Connell’s Shopping Plaza entrance to Chamberlain Bridge in the Town of Merrimack. The total length of the project is approximately 1,050 feet.

Currently, all areas adjacent to the project limits are residential or commercial lots. A portion along the east side of D.W. Highway at the southern limit of the project is open space and is planned to be a Town owned park. Previous land use and disturbances at this site included a furniture factory, a shoe factory, a tannery, and most recently Hacros Chemical.

The project will require re-grading of roadway side slopes and re-alignment of drainage swales to accommodate the sidewalk. The project does not require wetland permits; however, a shoreline permit will be required to work within the 250-foot buffer of the Souhegan River as it is a 4<sup>th</sup> order stream at the project’s location.

As proposed, the project will not impact private structures. The majority of work is within the existing right-of-way. Areas where work will be performed outside the right-of-way are for grading purposes, and temporary construction easements will be acquired.

Some minor excavation work will be associated with the project. Excavation for curbing and sidewalk will be approximately 1.5 feet below the existing surface to provide appropriate bedding depth.

A number of new catch basins are proposed for installation along the new curb lines. Catch basin installation will include excavation 2 feet outside the structure, to an approximate average depth of 6 feet. Drainage pipe will be installed to connect catch basins. Also, there are a few locations along the project length where existing drainage manholes will be uncovered to provide access for tying in new drainage pipes. Currently, the existing drainage system outlets untreated near Chamberlain Bridge. As part of the sidewalk project, storm water treatment may be installed at this location to treat any additional flows caused by the proposed project.

CLD provided packets of requested information in the Request for Project Review to all members of the Cultural Resources review committee. Materials provided are attached to this memo.

#### NHDHR DETERMINATIONS

- E. Feighner asked about plans for storm water runoff.
  - M. Haley explained that the existing drainage system outlets untreated near Chamberlain Bridge, the proposed project plans to use the existing system as much as possible. At the outlet, treatment would need to be provided for the additional flows caused by the project.
  - E. Feighner noted that an archaeological review might be necessary depending on where the treatment measures are proposed. An initial archaeological study has been completed, and the area near the bridge may be identified as a sensitive area.
  - E. Feighner would like to review design plans once the drainage design has been more developed.
- E. Feighner asked for clarification on the sidewalk that loops away from the roadway.
  - M. Haley explained that as part of the TE project, the design incorporates the sidewalk layout from the Park conceptual plan.
  - E. Feighner confirmed that the sidewalk was proposed to be outside of the fenced-in area.
    - M. Haley said that was correct.
- L. Wilson asked about the retaining wall near the insurance company (Gagne & Dager Insurance, 442 DWH). She noted it appeared to be modern in the photos provided.
  - M. Haley explained that there were no plans to impact the wall; the sidewalk would abut the wall.
  - M. Haley noted that in front of Buckley's Steakhouse (438 DWH), granite back curb against the back of sidewalk would be installed to avoid additional grading impacts to the Buckley's property.

#### OTHER RESOURCE AGENCY DETERMINATIONS

- M. Haley noted that the Souhegan River is impaired for e coli and aluminum near the project area.

- M. Haley noted a Shoreland Permit would be necessary since work is proposed within the 250-foot buffer for the Souhegan. However, no work is proposed on the banks of the river.
  - M. Haley asked for input from NHDES if a waiver or variance would be appropriate since impacts would be minimal.
    - NHDES said no, a normal Shoreland Permit should be completed, and since the project appeared to be basic, permitting should be straightforward. M.Haley asked about review time, and NHDES said review time is currently 3 weeks.
- K. Nyhan confirmed that the project is still planned for advertising in mid-February 2010, M. Haley said yes.

CLD will need to forward plans to NHDHR for review before the environmental process can be completed. Assuming there are no archaeological concerns, the project will be programmatic, and the short form Categorical Exclusion (checklist) can be completed.

### **Hampstead-Atkinson, X-A000(859), 15663**

**Participants: Matt Urban and Mike Dugas, NHDOT**

Hampstead - Atkinson is a Highway Safety Improvement Program project also known by its acronym (HSIP). The project is located at the intersection of NH Route 111/West Road/Island Pond Road in the Towns of Hampstead and Atkinson. The intent of the proposed project is to install traffic signals and improve NH 111 extending 800' from the intersection. NH 111 will be widened to provide exclusive left turn lanes both eastbound and westbound, and an eastbound right turn lane. West Road will also be widened to provide a southbound right turn lane. The existing roadway configuration is a 6'-12'-12'-6' typical. Creating the proposed layout will require widening the west approach by approximately 4' to the north and 12' to the south. Little or no widening will be required on the east approach as this segment has recently been widened by a Dunkin' Donuts development. There is one building located adjacent to the intersection. This is a nursery that was constructed post 2005 as evident in 2005 aerial imagery. There are a few nearby wetlands that are not anticipated to be impacted by the proposed work. The project as proposed will not require any ROW acquisition. The Department would like to advertise and begin construction in 2010.

Rich Roach asked if there were any wetlands that would be impacted, and Michael Dugas confirmed that it is not anticipated that there will be any wetland impacts despite the close proximity of the stream adjacent to the nursery near the existing toe of slope for NH Route 111. Joyce McKay inquired about any changes to drainage. Michael Dugas informed the agencies that the intent of the proposed project is to utilize the existing drainage as is and not modify it. In addition, Michael noted that as part of the Dunkin' Donuts construction they have done some drainage work that outlets near the intersection.

There were no concerns expressed by the Agencies, and SHPO agreed that this project would qualify for a No Historic Property Affected Memo.

### **Derry, X-A000(897), 15690**

**Participants: Cathy Goodmen and Mike Dugas, NHDOT**

This project is to improve safety at the intersection of NH Route 28 and Kilrea Road/Windham Depot Road as part of the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). Due to very heavy traffic on NH 28, particularly during commuter hours, side road traffic experiences long delays entering NH 28. Due to the poor traffic operations and the lack of appropriate turn lanes, numerous crashes have occurred. Plans are not developed yet, but it is proposed to install a traffic signal and widen NH Route 28 to add left turn lanes. Work would extend approximately 1,000 feet in each direction from the intersection on NH Route 28. Widening would be approximately a total of 12 feet.

There are wetlands along the edge of NH Route 28 (Ezekiel Pond and smaller areas) that may be impacted with widening. There is a rail trail that crosses NH Route 28 at grade, next to the intersection, which is conservation land. There are no known occurrences of endangered species in this location. There is a house on the northeast corner of the intersection that is potentially eligible for the State or National Register of Historic Places. The building is very close to the road, and design plans will make every attempt to avoid impacts to the property.

Jamie Sikora asked if the rail line was active. Mike Dugas stated that it is abandoned and is now a trail. This line goes to Windham Depot. B. Muzzey did not believe this was the abandoned Manchester-Lawrence Railroad, and suggested that more research be put into determining which line this was. B. Muzzey and J. Sikora noted that historic impacts would probably be 'no adverse effect' and could be 'de minimis'. [The line began in 1868 as the Nashua and Rochester, and it was leased to Worcester to Nashua in 1872 before construction was complete. In 1883, the line became consolidated under the Worcester, Nashua, and Rochester Railroad. The Boston and Maine leased the line in 1885-86, and it became the Worcester, Nashua, and Portland Division. The Boston and Maine purchased the line in 1911. Taken from the B&M Bulletin, Winter 1976-77.]

A search of the water quality noted that Ezekiel Pond does not have any contaminants that are above normal except Mercury, which is an airborne contaminant and not a traffic related issue. Gino Infascelli noted that the developer of a nearby residential subdivision had received several permits for work in this area and was required to develop mitigation for the work. Gino asked that we determine if this mitigation was ever completed.

B. Muzzey asked for pictures of the modern buildings in the area. C. Goodmen noted that she would get them to her. B. Muzzey also noted that if there were impacts to the historic property, an Individual Inventory form would need to be completed. Edna Feighner noted that there are probably no archaeological resources in the project area. This qualifies as a Non- Programmatic CE.

### **Epping, X-A000(886), 15693**

**Participants: Cathy Goodmen and Mike Dugas, NHDOT**

This project consists of two parts.

Part One is for safety improvements to the intersection of NH Route 125 and NH Route 27. Currently there is a large volume of traffic heading north and south on NH Route 125 and there have been many rear end collisions, which are congestion-related. There are no design plans yet,

but it is proposed that a second northbound and southbound through lane be created on NH 125. The width needed for the new lanes will be achieved by narrowing the existing wide shoulders and eliminating the existing raised median. This design approach will avoid the need to widen the NH 125 bridge over the Lamprey River. Work would extend 1000 feet north and south of the intersection. As there will be no work beyond the existing pavement, there should be no impacts to any natural or cultural resources.

There are potentially historic properties on NH Route 27 near the intersection. Roadwork is not anticipated to extend to the historic properties, but if there were widening proposed which would encroach on these properties, additional historic documentation may be needed. Beth Muzzey asked to see if historic surveys had been done on the properties on NH Route 27. [NHDOT has not completed architectural survey in this area.]

Part Two would entail extending the additional through lanes created within Part One approximately 1,000 feet south to match into the existing five-lane section of NH 125 south of Railroad Avenue built by the Epping Crossing development. This segment of the project would most likely require some road widening. The roadway is mostly abutted by commercial properties, but there are two residences that would have to be surveyed, if impacted, to determine if they are eligible for listing in the State or National Register. Edna Feighner noted that if there were widening and additional drainage construction outside the limits shown today, archaeological testing may be necessary.

When plans are developed, this project will be reviewed with the resource agencies again. Rich Roach asked that we coordinate with Jamie Fosburg at the National Park Service since the project is adjacent to the Lamprey River, which is a part of the Federal Wild and Scenic River Program.

### **Lee, X-A000(885), 15692**

**Participants: Cathy Goodmen and Mike Dugas, NHDOT**

This project is to address safety concerns at the Lee Traffic Circle. Currently the intersection is a large one-lane traffic circle and has many low impact collisions, indicative of congested traffic operations. There are no plans yet, but changes could range from simply re-striping the approaches and the circle to better define the travel paths to reconfiguring the circle as a modern two-lane roundabout. Minor improvements would likely be accomplished within the existing pavement limits and thus would not have many impacts. Reconfiguring the circle as a two-lane roundabout would require widening the roadway approaches, which could lead to resource impacts.

Historical resources appear to be limited to one building on US Route 4 at the east end of the project area beyond Dunkin Donuts. Beth Muzzey asked that more information on this structure be presented if the improvements include any impacts to the property. E. Feighner noted that there are most likely no archaeological resources here as the area has been disturbed. This project will be presented again when plans have been developed.

### **Gorham, X-A000(891), 15699**

**Participants: Mike Dugas and Laurel Kenna, NHDOT**

Mike Dugas introduced the project as an intersection improvement project. This project has not been discussed previously at a cultural resource meeting. He indicated that there were no concept plans prepared at this time. Traffic data has been collected, but not yet analyzed. He anticipated that the project would most likely be minor, and include work within the current pavement/roadway structure. Photographs indicated the presence of buildings older than 50 years immediately adjacent.

Beth inquired about the possibility of a light being installed at the intersection, and Mike indicated that this would most likely not be warranted due to the amount of traffic at the intersection. He did mention the possibility of adding turning lanes, but again this would likely not warrant work outside the roadway structure.

Regarding archaeology, and underground historic resources Edna indicated that if there were to be any work outside the limits of disturbance archaeological survey might be necessary. Survey has been completed in the general area for the Portland-Montreal Oil Pipeline, and may be applicable to this project.

As the project develops, Mike will continue to update the Cultural Resource group, especially if work outside the roadway structure and its area of disturbance is anticipated.

### **Lincoln-Franconia, A000(808), 15603**

**Participants: Matt Urban, Kurt Mudgett, Christine Perron, NHDOT**

The subject project was previously reviewed by SHPO on September 3, 2009. SHPO had asked that the Department return to another scheduled meeting to further discuss a few items that were still under review by Design and the other environmental stakeholder groups (Appalachian Mountain Club and Society for the Protection of NH Forests) that were part of the original White Mountain Environment Committee.

Kirk Mudgett of Highway Design explained that the Department would like to move forward with a new type of guardrail in the center median of the project referred to as Nu-Guard. Kirk explained that the White Mountain Environment Committee wished to uphold the aesthetic value of the parkway by powder coating the Nu-Guard Rail a rusty/brown color. Kirk stated that there has been very little research in regards to how well the powder coating will hold up against the constant weathering and tear of the plow trucks. Kirk believes that chipping is to be expected when using a powder coat option. However, this option will hold up better than the existing Cor-ten "Rusty Rail". The Nu-Guard guardrail offers a slimmer post and beam than the other alternatives. Kirk reiterated that the Department wishes to move forward with the powder coat or similar option. The White Mountain Committee has been involved in the decision process throughout the investigation of alternatives, and this powder coated Nu-Guard is their preference. SHPO commented that they liked the new slim look that the Nu-Guard offered. They felt that it was compatible with the park like aesthetic that was originally desired in the Notch. As such, SHPO agrees with the decision to move forward with the Department's preferred alternative and no further follow up is required in regard to guardrail.

Kirk also spoke about the proposed snow fence along approximately 300 ft of Echo Lake and 200 ft of Lafayette Brook. Kirk presented two alternatives for each location. The alternatives were a standard chain link fence that is identical to the fencing already installed in other locations throughout the Notch. The second alternative has been referred to as the option with vertical bars. SPNHF has a preference for the vertical bar option at the Echo Lake Location and is amendable to the chain link option on Lafayette Brook to match existing fence throughout the Notch. SHPO felt that the aesthetic of the vertical bar option was more park-like and therefore would like to see it utilized at both locations. SHPO suggested that the other fencing throughout the Notch could be replaced to match the vertical bar option as these existing fences need to be replaced over time. Kirk stated that the cost of the vertical bar fence has not yet been determined, but the Department would look into using this option as fence is replaced in the Notch in the future.

As previously mentioned at the September 3<sup>rd</sup> SHPO meeting, Kirk described the Department's proposal to remove the existing granite curbing throughout the project length. Removing the curbing will improve water quality, allowing sediments an opportunity to settle prior to outletting directly into surface waters and/or wetlands. Another benefit to the removed curbing includes improved conditions for plowing. Currently, the plows have a difficult time fully clearing the road due to the slightly raised curbing. As a result of the difficult plowing conditions, the plows often scrape topsoil off the shoulders. The Department believes that the proposed removal of the curbing in addition to a salt tolerant seed mix may be able to improve the look of the parkway by getting grass to reestablish along the sides of the road. SHPO agreed that removing the granite curbing would improve the park-like feel of the Notch. They admitted that the expectation to have lush green grass right up to the edge of pavement is not high. Nonetheless, SHPO thinks that the proposed action will be an improvement worth trying. Beth Muzzey did express concern that removing the curb would lead to a higher number of vehicles parking on the shoulder. She does not want the curb removal to result in a lot of new signage. Kirk also explained that areas with guardrail would require curb to protect slope erosion from runoff. In these areas, the Department is proposing asphalt curb, which is cheaper, easier to install, and easier to maintain. Asphalt also blends in with the pavement and is used statewide. No one had concerns with the use of asphalt curb under guardrail.

Kirk discussed the Department's proposal to rehab the existing dam located on the headwaters of the Pemigewasset River on the east side of the Parkway at mile marker 110.1. The dam leads to a concrete channel. The dam has a crack down its face, and the proposed repair involves replacing the grout in the Mortar Ruble Masonry (MRM). The water would be temporarily diverted down an existing overflow swale in order to work on the wall in the dry. In addition, the Department proposes to repair an existing MRM wall located on a bend of the Pemigewasset River. Beth suggested that a mortar analysis should be completed to determine which type of mortar to use in these repairs (the wrong type of mortar could do more harm than good). DHR would provide DOT with more information on this analysis. . Beth also offered to provide the Department with a list of recommended masons. Kirk agreed to look into the possibility of requiring the Contractor to hire a mason from the DHR list. Alternatively, J. McKay suggested that specific qualifications of masons could be listed in the contract.

L. Wilson concurred that this project resulted in No Adverse Effect as presented.

**Hopkinton, X-A000(791), 15555****Participants: Larry Keniston**

This project includes the installation of flashing school zone speed limit signs along four highways, located as follows: (1) Harold Marin School, driveway and walkway entrance at Main Street (NH 9), (2) Maple Street School, driveway entrance at Maple Street (NH 127), (3) Hopkinton Middle High School, driveway entrance at Park Avenue (NH 103), and (4) HMHS driveway entrance at Kearsarge Avenue. L. Keniston provided location maps, and presented photographs of the proposed areas. B. Muzzey stated that there did not appear to be any above ground resources that would be impacted, however asked if there were any concerns voiced from area residents about historic properties located in the area. Except for one resident who has voiced an opinion in favor of the beacons, none have voiced any concern. A Memorandum of Effect was signed, stating No Adverse Effect, however with the condition that if any residents do present concerns regarding their historic properties, that the project again be reviewed with FHWA and NHDHR.

**Boscawen-Canterbury 15281 (no federal number)****Participants: Dave Eckmann ([david@eckmanengineering.com](mailto:david@eckmanengineering.com)), Eckman Engineering; Michael Wright ([mwright@townofboscawen.org](mailto:mwright@townofboscawen.org)), Town of Boscawen**

Beth Muzzey indicated that the bridge was eligible on a statewide level. Michael Wright, Town Administrator for the Town of Boscawen, recognized its significance. He presented the project, and briefly discussed the documentation that was compiled by the town and distributed to NHDHR and NHDOT. This documentation contained letters, correspondence and meeting minutes from the Towns of Boscawen and Canterbury, dating from the 1980s to present. They document all the efforts that have been undertaken in the past 20 years to try to preserve, collect funding sources, and rally support for the re-use of this historic Parker Truss Bridge. M. Wright then indicated that all efforts to save the bridge have been exhausted, and all of the reports and consultations the towns have received on the bridge have recommended the removal of the structure to its abutments. He explained that the truss structure itself is curving, the members are perforated, and they cannot sustain themselves or support any sort of load. B. Muzzey explained that the floor system of the bridge could be removed without creating an adverse effect; they are often considered sacrificial. Removal and storage of the bridge was broached.

L. Wilson suggested that brainstorming sessions for the preservation and re-use of this structure might be best on-site. To date, DHR has not received any information that the existing truss structure could not be rehabilitated to a stable condition. L. Wilson also noted that there have been many success stories in removing and re-using metal truss structures, and that the DHR has a responsibility to the cultural resource to avoid any and all negative impacts if possible. M. Wright informed DHR that he has seen multiple reports and analyses stating the structural insufficiency of the structure, and will provide documentation of such to the DHR. B. Muzzey agreed with L. Wilson that a joint meeting on site would be helpful. This would also allow the public to join in and comment on the outcome of the bridge project, discussing, in part, if the bridge needs to be removed. Mitigation measures could also be discussed at that time, whether removal is necessary. M. Wright again noted that the structure is not viable for any use. Reports by NHDOT and Rich Casella have both stated that the bridge cannot be rehabilitated for other uses.

Both Towns have stated their concern with safety issues. The Towns have developed fines for people found jumping off of the bridge, however M. Wright feels the \$50 fine is not sufficient enough to deter people from jumping off the bridge and possibly harming themselves. B. Muzzey explained that regulatory agencies cannot be blamed for a child's death. M. Wright emphasized that safety concerns need to be addressed. Although death is an extreme case, the towns will not allow the issue of safety to be overlooked.

L. Wilson reiterated her position that there needs to be a public meeting, and that the residents need to be properly informed by a qualified Architectural Historian about the importance of the bridge and possible re-use. She stated that often times residents and concerned citizens have good mitigation ideas that lessen the harm of removing the bridge. She likened it to the traditional wedding ceremony, "Speak now or forever hold your peace," stating that you need to allow the public to present their opinions.

B. Muzzey and L. Wilson, although appreciative of the documentation that was compiled, stated that more information needs to be presented regarding the bridge, including, but not limited to, data on the bridge site gathered by a professional architectural historian, information about the bridge designer, the surrounding areas, and public input. M. Wright noted the existence of the outdated and defunct Historic Bridge Inventory that is located in NHDHR's research files, which subsequently lead the towns to hire Rich Casella to inventory the bridge. B. Muzzey stated that a qualified Architectural Historian would have known that the old Bridge Inventory rating system is no longer valid.

M. Wright stated that he would schedule a meeting in early January at noon for the public to join the Town and DHR on site and then at the town hall for further discussions. Per request of the DHR, the town of Canterbury should also be in attendance in order for the DHR to hear both Town's opinions on the bridge's status. A meeting notice would be placed in the Concord *Monitor*. M. Wright stated that The Friends of the Northern Rail Trail would also be informed, as they would like a functioning crossing at this location. B. Muzzey stated that her office would make a presentation to those in attendance, discussing the values of the bridge. Open discussion would address the disposition of the bridge and mitigation efforts. She will also forward recent bridge removal Memorandum of Agreements for the Town's to review. They would suggest the kinds of mitigation that have been agreed to for removals.

Discussion of the project's outcome will continue after the visit to the bridge, at the town hall.

**\*\*Memos/MOA's:** Charlestown, 13534, X-A000(921); Lee, 14842; Northfield, 13693; Hopkinton, X-A000(791), 15555

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