BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT
CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting
DATE OF CONFERENCES: January 5 and 12, 2012
LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building
ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT
John Butler
Jill Edelmann
Cathy Goodmen
Doug Gosling
Steve Liakos
Matt Urban
Tony Weatherbee
C.R. Willeke

Federal Highway Administration
Jamie Sikora

NHDHR
Laura Black
Edna Feighner

AECOM
Jennifer Doyle-Breen

Town of Boscawen
Lorrie Carey

Town of Bristol
Michael Capone

Town of Campton
Sharon Davis

Town of Canterbury
Tyson Miller

CLD Engineers
John Byatt

Headwaters Hydrology
Sean Sweeney

HEB Engineers
Doug Heller

Hoyle Tanner
Sean James

Inter-Fluve
Nick Nelson

KVP Partners
Mike Vignale

Town of Merrimack
Kyle Fox

M.Moore Civil Eng
Matthew Moore

City of Nashua
Joe Mendola

Preservation Consultant
Liz Durfee Hengen

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

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

January 5, 2012 1
Bristol, X-A001(092), 16026 2
Tamworth, X-A000(982), 15831 2
Epsom, Suncook River Restoration Project 4
Boscawen-Canterbury, 15281 (no federal number) 5
Merrimack-Nashua, 13964 (no federal number) 6
January 12, 2012 7
Campton, X-A001(090), 12407 7
Barrington, X-A001(173), 16178 8
Barrington, X-A001(181), 16201 9
Chichester 16432 (no federal number) 10

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

January 5, 2012

Bristol, X-A001(092), 16026
Participants: Mike Vignale, KV Partners (mvignale@kvpllc.com); Liz Hengen, Preservation Consultant; Michael Capone, Bristol Town Administrator (townadmin@townofbristolnh.org); William Rose, NHDOT

Updated Preliminary Plans were presented by Mike Vignale (KVPartners) and Liz Hengen.

Project Limits:
The limits of work include portions of Pleasant Street, North Main Street, South Main Street and Summer Street as depicted on the attached plans. The project includes roadway reconstruction, sidewalks, drainage improvements, intersection improvements, street trees, and streetscape amenities at Central Square in Bristol, NH. The project area is within the Central Square National Register Historic District.

The plans were revised based on previous comments as follows:

1. No trees were installed within the open area of the square. It was discussed that all vegetation within the square will be less than 4 feet high. Trees around the perimeter of the square are acceptable. This is to maintain the character-defining feature of the openness of the square.

2. The layout in the new "Town Common" area was presented. The sidewalk configuration and the location of the war monuments were discussed. The large mortar will be moved slightly to the east, maintaining it in close vicinity to its current location, and the smaller monuments will be located in locations decided by the Town.

3. Ornamental street light and street furniture options were presented. The lights were selected to match the light type (probably from the 1920s-30s) found in a historic photo from the 1950s and were acceptable to the group. The style of lighting and street furniture (i.e. benches, garbage cans) is flexible but should be complimentary to the historic district. It was noted that money for lighting and street furniture is not included in this project at this time.

4. The wall along the northern end of the project will be constructed out of granite slabs and be about 3' high.

5. Appropriate levels of archaeology will be completed in areas of concern.

Michael Capone from the Town of Bristol added that the feedback he has received from the townspeople has been very supportive of the increased pedestrian access in the downtown, and that the local garden club is willing to help with some of the low plantings throughout the area.

The group found that the revisions addressed all previous comments, that a finding of No Adverse Effect would be appropriate and asked for the applicable documentation be submitted by KVPartners.

Tamworth, X-A000(982), 15831
Participants: Doug Heller, HEB Engineers (dheller@hebengineers.com); Bob Abraham, Town of Tamworth; William Rose, NHDOT

Doug Heller, P.E., of HEB, presented a summary of the Chorcorua Village Safety Improvements project:

- Project is Phase II of a multi-phase project in Chocorua Village.
- Phase I included reconstruction of Route 16 in the village core.
- This is the 2nd Cultural Resource meeting for this project, first attended in October 2010. Scope of project has been decreased since the first meeting due to maintenance considerations. Also since the first meeting HEB has coordinated with Lynn Monroe from the Preservation Company who indicated that a DHR file review was completed for the project area during Phase 1.
- Phase II includes:
    - Realignment Chocorua Road intersections with Route 16 and Page Hill Road. Chocorua Road will be reclaimed, regraded, paved, and curbed. New closed drainage system will be installed.
    - Two small parking areas will be constructed on the library property off of Runnells Hall Road and Deer Hill Road.
    - Access improvements to GIII convenience store and a Jeep repair shop.
    - Stone wall will be constructed along the ROW at the southern portion of the project area.
    - Two gateway signs will be constructed to the north and south of the village.
    - Lighting and landscaping will also be added within the project area.

1. **Discussion:**
    - Laura Black asked if the proposed project will impact any of the contributing resources.
        - The library where the proposed parking spaces will be located is a non-contributing resource. Work along Chocorua Road will be within the existing pavement limits except for a small area where the intersection of Chocorua Road will be realigned with Route 16. This area is manly scrub growth and there are no structures on the property that will be disturbed.
    - J. Sikora asked if the proposed stone walls will impact the abutting properties and if any of the existing walls will be disturbed.
        - The proposed stone walls will be located within Route 16 ROW and no existing stone walls will be disturbed.
    - L. Black recommended that HEB coordinate with Lynne Monroe of Preservation Company in choosing the light pole/fixture to be sure it matches the historic nature of Chocorua Village. Once a light pole/fixture is chosen it should be sent to NHDHR for review.
    - It was indicated that the proposed project has no adverse effects on historic resources

2. **Actions:**
    - Submit a Cultural Resources Effect Memo with the determination that there will be No Adverse Effect on Historic or Archaeological Properties. A description should be added to the memo on why it was determined that No Adverse Effect will occur as part of this project.

Epsom, Suncook River Restoration Project
Participants: Jennifer Doyle-Breen (Jennifer.doyle-breen@aecom.com), AECOM; Nick Nelson, Inter-Fluve; Sean Sweeney, Headwaters Hydrology; Matt Urban, NHDOT; Steve Landry, NHDES

Jennifer Doyle-Breen of AECOM submitted two copies of the complete Request for Project Review (RPR) form to Jill Edelmann, DOT Cultural Resources Specialist, and Nick Nelson of Inter-Fluve presented the proposed project. N. Nelson explained that in 2006 a large flood event resulted in a channel avulsion between the Huckins Mill Dam and the Route 4 Bridge, which led to the river permanently changing its course. As a result, the river bed is experiencing morphological changes, resulting in erosion migrating upstream, as well as upstream along Leighton Brook and Little Suncook River. This erosion is threatening road infrastructure, including the Route 4 Bridge in Epsom and the Black Hall Road culvert at Leighton Brook. In addition, due to the changes in the Suncook River the base water level in the Little Suncook River has lowered, resulting in incision in the area of the prior railroad bridge across the Little Suncook, resulting in the failure of the railroad bridge. If this knickpoint continues migrating upstream in the Little Suncook it could threaten the Black Hall Road Bridge over the Little Suncook River. In order to prevent further migration of erosion in the river system, the proposed project would implement streambed and bank stabilization measures, which include:

- addition of rock within the river bed and adjacent banks at the second riffle area downstream of the Route 4 bridge within the river channel and stream banks
- addition of stone to the left bank (looking downstream) located 1,000 feet upstream of the avulsion site
- creation of a step-pool system in Leighton Brook by addition of rock and appropriate grading
- installation of sheet piling immediately downstream of the railroad opening on the Little Suncook River

N. Nelson also identified project access and laydown/staging areas in the project vicinity. Edna Feighner of NH Division of Historic Resources indicated that above-ground historic resources are not a concern as there are none, but that archaeological surveys would be needed in the areas of rock placement in the river and on its banks. She asked if the access areas would require road construction. N. Nelson indicated that the access areas had historically been traveled by heavy equipment so it was believed that the substrate was compacted sufficiently such that road improvements would not be necessary. E. Feighner indicated that archaeological surveys would not be needed for the access areas since improvements would not occur, however the staging areas and any areas of grubbing/clearing should be surveyed. A Phase I archaeological sensitivity study should be completed at a minimum for all areas of disturbance.

Matt Urban asked if this project might be a candidate to use the “SCRAP” group, which DHR and DOT are trying to use on some upcoming projects. SCRAP stands for State Conservation Rescue Archaeology Program. As part of the SCRAP program, amateur and professional archeologists to perform archaeological surveys around the state. Since the Suncook River Restoration Project is a NH Department of Environmental Services (DES) project, and impacts are fairly contained, it may be eligible. The use of SCRAP on smaller DOT projects is still being evaluated, however J.

Edelmann indicated that she would investigate the use of SCRAP and coordinate with E. Feighner. J. Edelmann asked about the project schedule. N. Nelson indicated that the final designs would be done by fall 2012, and so construction would be anticipated to occur in 2013. Therefore, there is sufficient time for the SCRAP program to conduct the surveys.

Boscawen-Canterbury, 15281 (no federal number)
Participants: Lorrie Carey (myflower@tds.net), Town of Boscawen; Tyson Miller, Town of Canterbury; Steve Liakos, NHDOT

Canterbury Selectman Tyson Miller and Selectwoman Lorrie Carey met with the DOT and the Division of Historical Resources to discuss the remaining elements of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) signed 12/7/2010, by both Board of Selectman Chairs, NHDOT and NHDHR, regarding the Canterbury-Boscawen Storrs Bridge (132/085).

The agreed upon stipulations in the MOA and their progress is listed below:

1. Recordation of the bridge: A New Hampshire Historic Property Documentation form was completed by Rich Casella, and documentation was accepted by NHDHR's office on August 25, 2011. This stipulation is complete.

2. Adaptive Reuse: The towns agreed to accept the cost of conducting an assessment of the viability of reusing the bridge. This assessment was to occur after the removal of the truss spans from its abutments, however after the MOA was signed and estimates were placed for the removal of the truss spans, the cost increased exponentially, which the towns were not able to afford. It was agreed that the truss spans would be left in place for one year, which would also create less of a liability than leaving the spans on the river bank where they would draw even more attention as they would be more accessible for people to climb on. No report to date has been submitted to NHDOT or NHDHR on the viability of reuse of the truss structures.

3. Advertising/Storage/Sale of the Bridge: If the bridge was determined suitable for reuse in the above stipulation, the town will advertise each truss structure or reuse. If multiple parties were interested a competitive bid process would be used. A new MOA would be executed if the structure were to be reused. If there was no suitable adaptive reuse of the structure, the towns agreed to leave the bridge on the riverbank (now in-place) for one year, to afford time for an alternative plan for the bridge to be established if need be. The towns provided clippings from area newspapers discussing the possible sale of the bridge. NHDHR did not believe that the clippings provided detailed enough information on the possible reuse of the structure for sale. It was noted that if the adaptive re-use study proves there is no viable option to re-use the bridge, marketing would not be necessary.

4. Covenant: Should the bridge be reused a historic covenant will be placed on the structure. No action necessary at this time.

5. Public Education: The towns agreed to prepare some sort of interpretive signage, kiosk or other memorialization at the site of the removed bridge, which discusses the history of the structure and its importance to the community. This effort has not been initiated as the bridge currently rests in-place. When the town move forward with the education effort, they will coordinate with the NHDHR.

The town of Canterbury added that they no longer own the land adjacent to the bridge, and that any hopes of re-establishing a connection between the two towns at this site is no longer possible.

Selectwoman Carey provided additional police reports for this bridge and the neighboring Route 4, Hannah Dustin Memorial bridge, most of which included kids/young adults jumping from the bridges. She stated that although the towns did not remove the bridge, as stated in the MOA, they did "keep the spirit of the agreement" by leaving the bridge in-place for one year.

Jill Edelmann and Laura Black agreed that leaving the bridge in-place made sense given the increase liability and cost of moving the structure, however needed the information that was agreed to in the MOA to complete the stipulations. Without the adaptive reuse study, the MOA has not been completed. A letter from Eckman Engineering was presented, in which David Eckman states that there is no feasible reuse of the bridge, DHR asked that more concrete information be presented than what appeared to be a letter of opinion. Selectwoman Carey believes that the reuse of the bridge was addressed in the engineering study, and again in the Boscawen public hearing notes from April 19, 2010.

Selectman Miller and Selectwoman Carey believed that enough information exists between the two towns to fulfill the stipulations of the MOA in regards to reuse and marketing of the bridge. Once that information has been presented to NHDOT and NHDHR the project will be reviewed again.

Merrimack-Nashua, 13964 (no federal number)
Participants: John Byatt (johnb@cldengineers.com) CLD Engineers; Kyle Fox, Town of Merrimack; Joe Mendola, City of Nashua; Steve Liakos, NHDOT

This was the fifth meeting in regard to this project. The following items were discussed:

John Byatt summarized the previous work. The municipalities wish to replace the Manchester St. Bridge but this would involve removal of the top four feet of the existing abutment and wingwalls of the historically eligible bridge. NHDHR has asked the municipalities to look at an option that involves avoiding all impacts to the walls. This required raising the roadway profile over the walls but increased the construction cost by approximately $200,000 and almost doubled the wetland impacts. The municipalities then looked at a middle option that raised the profile to a level in between the original and non-impact options. The cost increase for this option was approximately $150,000 and the wetland impacts increased proportionally also. At the last Cultural Resources meeting, NHDHR said they were agreeable to proceeding with the Middle Profile option. ACOE sent a letter in March 2011 stating they would approve the Middle Profile option also.

J. Byatt said the municipalities would also be agreeable to moving forward with the Middle Profile option presuming there would be no further mitigation requirements. They felt minimization of the adverse impacts by the costly design changes was achieved. J. Byatt noted an e-mail he received from Erika Mark of ACOE where E. Mark said she spoke to Edna Feighner and it was agreed that further mitigation beyond the minimizing design changes was not necessary.

Laura Black asked for consideration for some mitigation such as a plaque placed on site was still appropriate. J. Byatt noted that that Pennichuck Water Works might not desire such as plaque as it might draw attention to the new bridge. The bridge is and will be surrounded by fencing so as to be inaccessible to the public as the area is a public water supply. J. Byatt was afraid the plaque might encourage people to climb the fence to view the new bridge.

J. Byatt asked how the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) should be drafted. NHDHR responded that the municipalities should work with ACOE to draft the MOA and then it would be distributed to the signatories for review. The signatories would be: the municipalities, NHDOT, NHDHR and ACOE. J. Edelmann asked that the Cultural Resources Effect Memo also be filled out and submitted and it should indicate that there is an "adverse effect" for the individually National Register-eligible bridge and the National Register-eligible Pennichuck Water Works Historic District of which the bridge is also a contributing element.

It was agreed that there was no need for further meetings for this panel.

January 12, 2012

Campton, X-A001(090), 12407
Participants: Sean James, Hoyle Tanner; Matt Moore, Moore Engineering; Sharon Davis, Town of Campton; CR Willeke, NHDOT

This is the third NHDOT Cultural Resource Committee (CRC) discussion of this project with the previous discussions held on 11/5/2009 and 10/13/2010. Sean James from Hoyle, Tanner presented an update to the project with Campton Selectboard Chair Sharon Davis and Town Consultant Matthew Moore also in attendance. The proposed project includes rehabilitation of the Blair Covered Bridge for a 6-ton live load capacity. Major components of the rehabilitation include replacement or repair of deteriorated members, substructure repairs and improvements for scour protection as well as the addition of fire protection/detection systems.

S. James began by discussing the current status of the project. Preliminary plans have been submitted to the NHDOT, Town and NHDHR for review. The NHDOT has reviewed and approved the plans with minor corrections and comments. Based upon previous correspondence with the NHDHR, it appears the only portion of the project that requires additional discussion is the substructure. S. James described the proposed work including reconstruction of three of the four wingwalls, additional of missing stones to all faces of the substructure, addition of a concrete cap to the pier and west abutment, minor concrete repairs and protection of the center pier with steel sheeting to protect against scour.

L. Black noted that NHDHR's concern is ensuring that these changes are necessary and are they are the least harm alternative (from the perspective of the Secretary's Standards). The interaction of the trusses and arches on the substructure was discussed and Hoyle, Tanner's previous analysis discussed. Monitoring of cracks was also discussed as it was previously recommended by Jim Garvin of the NHDHR. Crack monitoring was not completed at the project was put on hold for 18 months pending FHWA funding notification and a lack of consensus on the most appropriate method.

It was agreed that Hoyle, Tanner would prepare a memo outlining the proposed work for the bridge substructure. The DHR requested that the memo directly address the two underlying concerns that have been expressed in previous comments; confirmation to the best level possible the existence of assumed structural issues should be presented clearly in the memo. The memo will include a background on the necessity of the work as well as a comparison of the proposed work to The Secretary of the Interior' Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings. It was agreed that the FHWA, NHDOT and NHDHR would review the memo and so that the effects of the proposed work could be ascertained and that no further meetings would be required to discuss the memo.

Barrington, X-A001(173), 16178
Participants: John Butler, NHDOT

John Butler described the project. The project is located at the intersection of US Route 202 and NH Route 9 and is part of the Highway Safety Improvement Program. The intersection has a confusing configuration and it is not always obvious who has the right-of-way. Accidents average approximately 1.5 crashes per year. The state-owned right-of-way in this area is narrow and irregular. Given the stonewalls, cellar holes, and cemetery in the area, the Department had a historic study completed to provide guidance as alternatives were developed. That study determined that the entire project area is located within the 19th century Hale farmstead. The most culturally sensitive area is the NE quadrant of the intersection where cellar holes and numerous stone walls are located. Another sensitive area is the Hale cemetery located at the western extent of the project on US Route 202/NH Route 9. The study determined that the area south and east of Routes 202 and 9 no longer conveys its associations with the Hale farm since it has been subdivided and developed, although stone walls still remain.

Two alternatives have been developed for the project. The first alternative involves reconfiguring the intersection to a "T" intersection. NH Route 9 would be widened to accommodate a left turn lane onto US Route 202, and would be realigned to smooth out its profile and alignment. Limits of the project would extend west beyond the cemetery and Gooseneck Lane. This alternative would impact three properties.

The second alternative is much smaller in scope. The intersection would be reconfigured to a "T" intersection, but there would be no left turn lane on NH Route 9. The east shoulder of Route 9 would be widened enough to serve as a bypass shoulder for vehicles to move around left turning traffic. The alignment and profile of Route 9 would not be changed. Limits of the project would be relatively contained to the intersection, although the widened shoulder would extend along the east side of Route 9 to the cemetery. The only property impacts would consist of easements on 2 properties. This alternative is preferred by the Commissioner's Office.

Edna Feighner stated that an archaeological monitor would be needed for work within 25 feet of the cemetery. DHR concurred that the second option with reduced impacts would be preferred, as the cemetery would not be impacted, and only the stonewall policy would have to be followed. The impacts to stonewalls were discussed and it was decided that the Department would follow the stonewall policy to determine if each wall would be eligible for reconstruction, for both alternatives. DHR requested 11x17 copies of the presented concepts, which transmitted on January 20, 2012.

Barrington, X-A001(181), 16201
Participants: John Butler, NHDOT

John Butler described the project. The project is located at the intersection of NH Route 125, Tolend Road, and Green Hill Road and is part of the Highway Safety Improvement Program. The intersection has an average accident rate of 2.5 crashes per year, three quarters of which have resulted in injuries. The project area is predominantly commercial. There is an existing 150' wide controlled access right-of-way along NH Route 125.

One alternative has been developed for this project and will consist of signalizing the intersection and widening for left and right turn lanes on NH Route 125. All work will be done within the existing right-of-way.

Edna Feighner stated that there were no archaeological concerns with the project.

Laura Black had concerns about the potentially historic house located at the corner of NH Route 125 and Tolend Road, and suggested that a form should be completed. She felt that the house still had a rural feeling and the introduction of a signalized intersection could increase the traffic and the increased noise could present atmospheric changes to the property. Jill Edelmann replied that the project would not physically impact the property, and did not see the need to complete an Individual form. It was noted that the roadway alignment has changed over the years in regards to this house; NH Route 125 was relocated to its current location from where it had once followed the property line located at the back of the subject property, connecting up to the current Baldwin Drive then continuing north. If the house were determined eligible for architecture only, which is very likely given the commercial infill in the area, the addition of the turning lane would not impact the property's eligibility. L. Black recommended contacting the homeowners to determine if they have any concerns with the project, particularly in regard to noise increases from vehicles starting and stopping at a signal. J. Butler replied that as abutters the homeowners would get a notification letter prior to the Public Informational Meeting.

It was agreed that the project would be discussed again after the Public Informational Meeting. If the homeowners of the potentially historic house had no concerns, then a No Historic Properties Affected memo would be signed, as the project impacts are contained within the ROW. If the homeowners had concerns, the eligibility of the house would be re-visited and the concerns of the homeowners addressed. DHR requested 11x17 copies of the presented concepts, which transmitted on January 20, 2012.

Subsequent to this meeting it was also determined that a noise analysis will be done at this location.

Chichester 16432 (no federal number)
Participants: Doug Gosling, Matt Urban, Tony Weatherbee, NHDOT

Doug Gosling and Tony Weatherbee presented the project which includes repairs to a 1931 jack arch bridge on Main Street over Sanders Brook. They explained that the structure is currently Red Listed due the condition of the deck and substructure. D. Gosling said that with the proposed work, the deck will be replaced with a concrete slab, the substructure will be repaired, and a concrete invert will be installed. The current structure was widened sometime before 1981 on both the upstream and downstream sides. Laura Black asked that if DOT is going to remove the jack arch feature, that it be documented with an individual inventory form. Jillian Edelmann explained that this structure was previously inventoried in the *Historic Jack Arch Bridges of New Hampshire Inventory and Significance Study*, completed in 2010 by Historic Documentation Company. The study describes the engineering significance of the remaining jack arch bridges in the state, and specifically mentions the Main Street Chichester Bridge as an example that is/was easily widened. Laura Black requested that an individual form be completed to document a structure that currently exists and will not after construction. DHR proposed not to spend $20,000 on a form because it is already documented, but we could hirer someone to do a shorter report for perhaps around $5,000 or $6,000. D. Gosling expressed that Bridge Maintenance simply does not have that kind of money in the budget, and if forced to spend that in order to do the work, Bridge Maintenance will not be able to remove the structure from the Red List. DHR noted that there is some discretion in the level of effort necessary to prepare the form and it need not involve excessive effort nor cost. T. Weatherbee proposed building the replacement structure in such a way where the bottom of the slab would look like a jack arch, in order to preserve the character of the structure. Although the gesture was appreciated, E. Feighner noted that the documentation would be to capture the bridges existing features, and should be documented. J. Edelmann suggested that since the structure has already been researched, the cost for the individual inventory form might only be around $1,000, as the majority of research on jack arch structures has been completed. D. Gosling said that Bridge Maintenance could afford $1,000. It was agreed that an inventory form will be completed on the bridge, focusing on the current description of the bridge, noting that a more detailed comparative analysis on jack arch structures could be found in the *Historic Jack Arch Bridges of New Hampshire Inventory and Significance Study*.

****Memos/MOA's**: Lebanon, X-A000(235), 13558A – No Historic Properties Affected Memo
Bradford, X-A001(098), 16032 – No Adverse Effect Memo
Grafton, no project number – No Historic Properties Affected Memo
Lincoln, 22292 (no federal #) – No Historic Properties Affected Memo
Sunapee, 15836 (no federal #) – No Historic Properties Affected Memo
Tamworth, X-A000(982), 15831 – No Adverse Effect Memo
Bristol, X-A001(092), 16026 – No Adverse Effect Memo
Merrimack-Nashua, 13964 (no federal#) – Adverse Effect Memo

Submitted by: Jill Edelmann, Cultural Resources

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