BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT
CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting
DATE OF CONFERENCES: February 7 & 14, 2013
LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building
ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT
Sheila Charles
Jill Edelmann
Nick King
Jim Kirouac
Marc Laurin
Stephen Liakos
Don Lyford
Carol Niewola
Christine Perron
Mike Pouliot
Mark Sanborn
Linda Schoffield
Mike Servetas
Corey Spetelunas
Jason Tremblay
Matt Urban
Alex Vogt
C.R. Willeke
Trent Zanes

Federal Highway Administration
Jamie Sikora

NHDHR
Laura Black
Edna Feighner
Beth Muzzy
Nadine Peterson

City of Concord
Ed Roberge
Gloria McPherson

City of Nashua
Geoff Daley
Katherine Hersh
Roger Houston
Barbara Pressly

Hoyle Tanner
Kimberly Peace
Jason Lodge
Matthew J. Low
Jillian Semprini

Jacobs Engineering
John Gorham

McFarland Johnson
Gene McCarthy
Brian Colburn

Pease Development Authority
Bill Hopper
Maria Stowell

Preservation Consultant
Elizabeth Hengen

Quantum Construction
Anna Giraldi
Jennifer Reczek

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

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

February 7, 2013 2
New Ipswich 14465, X-A000(403) 2
Rochester 20254, X-A002(056) 3
Peterborough 14935 (no federal number) 3
Rochester Airport (no project number) 4
Skyhaven Airport, SBG 15-03-2011 4
February 14, 2013 5
Concord 23717, X-A002(742) 5
Nashua 13117, CM-X-5315(041) 7
Nashua Broad Street Parkway 10040A, NRBD-5315(021) 7
Tilton-Northfield 14839, X-A000(567) 9
Dummer 15815 (no federal number) 10
Merrimack 15841 (no federal number) 11
Lancaster 16208, X-A-001(188) 12

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

February 7, 2013

New Ipswich 14465, X-A000(403)
Participants: Matt Urban, Jim Kirouac, Don Lyford, Jason Tremblay, Linda Schoffield, Corey Spetelunas, NHDOT

Continued consultation for the proposed construction of the new bridge to replace the c.1900/1957 I beam and concrete deck bridge (157/093) atop the c.1817 lower stone arch spanning the Souhegan River. NHDOT presented new information regarding updates to the bridge design, including some minor design changes as the small expansion of the southwest approach.

Matt Urban provided a brief introduction to the project stating that the project is located in the Town of New Ipswich located on NH Route 123/ NH Route 124. As previously discussed at other resource agency meetings (previously reviewed on 6/3/2010, 3/4/2010, 2/11/2010, 1/14/2010, and 3/6/2008), the project consists of replacing the upper deck to the historic stone arch structure. M. Urban then passed the conversation off to Jim Kirouac to go into greater detail regarding the updated information that needed to be reviewed.

J. Kirouac explained that the project needed to make an adjustment to the bridge abutment on the southwest corner of the bridge. It was discovered during rock investigations that the abutment, in its proposed location, could not meet the load bearing needs of the proposed bridge design. As such, the abutment has been extended further to the West.

The proposed change is still within DOT Right-of-Way (ROW) but is now encroaching towards the historic view-shed of the adjacent homeowner. As a result, the guardrail will also be extended which eliminates the ability for the homeowner to use the steps that are currently in the DOT ROW. J. Kirouac explained that there were no plans to replace this staircase and that it would be removed. along with several shrubs and a portion of the retaining wall, during the excavation required to construct the bridge abutment and wingwall foundations. He also explained how the current homeowner has already removed the walkway that was in the yard leading to this staircase. Photos were available for SHPO to review. J. Kirouac also explained that as a result of the proposed impacts there would be a drop off where the yard meets the abutment's wing wall. In this location the Department is looking into fence options to best match safety requirements and the aesthetics of the fence already on the homeowner's property.

J. Kirouac also mentioned that as part of this project the utility lines would need to be relocated to accommodate the construction methods. SHPO asked if the homeowner had been contacted yet. The project manager Don Lyford explained that the homeowner has not yet been contacted and that they are typically contacted by ROW during the appraisal process.

Jill Edelmann recommended that the homeowner be contacted as soon as possible to determine if the homeowner has any concerns about removing the stairs. SHPO and FHWA indicated that if the homeowner had no issues the existing memo from DHR would stand. If the homeowner does have issues, this project would need to be revisited at another monthly meeting.

Rochester 20254, X-A002(056)
Participants: Marc Laurin, Mike Servetas, NHDOT

Marc Laurin stated that this discussion would focus on the effects of the proposed Park and Ride to the abutting potentially eligible 183 Washington Street property, located along the south side of the project. Mike Servetas gave a brief description of the project and its relationship to the property.

The house is situated higher than the proposed Park and Ride, portions of which are depressed and should not be visible from the property. Tree clearing will be limited to the work limits and some remaining large pines could still provide a small buffer to the site. In addition, the Department has been coordinating with the owner and will be constructing an eight (8) foot high wooden privacy fence along the property line. This shadow box fence will be constructed to meander through the remaining wooded area with the goal of minimizing tree cutting as much as possible. The project will be going out to bid in April and construction should begin in late summer/early fall.

Laura Black summarized the outstanding historical issues that need to be resolved: as DHR disagreed with the consultant's report, resolution of the historic boundaries is needed, and; Section 106 requires that DOT communicate with the owner to get their understanding of the impacts the project will have to this historic resource and document this process. An Effects Memo will be evaluated after these are received.

M. Servetas stated that Ron Grandmaison has been in contact with the owner regarding the privacy fence and that R. Grandmaison will further coordinate with the owner on the historic impacts.

Edna Feighner inquired about sound and lighting issues. M. Servetas replied that there should not be an issue with noise as buses will only be at the site to pick up passengers and would not be idling for long periods of time. The light poles are to be only 30 feet in height and their numbers were limited to the minimum needed to provide safety lighting of the Park and Ride. The light fixtures are to be equipped with cut-offs and will focus light forward and down on the site, limiting any light escaping from the Park and Ride. L. Black stated that in the future photos from the perspective of the historic resource would be helpful in making an informed decision.

Peterborough 14935 (no federal number)
Participants: Jason Lodge, Matt Low, Jillian Semprini, Kimberly Peace, Hoyle Tanner; Steve Liakos, CR Willeke, NHDOT

Continued consultation regarding the rehabilitation of the Union Street Bridge (157/108) over Nubanusit Brook. J. Lodge provided an update on the project since the first follow-up September 6, 2012 consultation with the committee. In accordance with the committee's feedback from the first follow-up consultation, the following items of work were completed:

- The temporary pedestrian bridge location was determined. The temporary pedestrian bridge will actually be comprised of a dock facility and will be located approximately 10' upstream of the Union Street Dam. Because the temporary pedestrian dock was located at the upstream side of the bridge, a Phase 1B Survey was performed and submitted to the

committee. The survey concluded that there wouldn't be any adverse effects to archaeological resources and E. Feighner concurred. As such, no further archaeological investigation is required.

- All temporary and permanent project impacts were finalized and shown on the plan.
- We consulted with Preservation Company (PC) who evaluated the project impacts against the contributing features described in the Project Area Form (PAF). PC summarized their evaluation in a review letter and concluded that there wouldn't be any adverse effects to historical resources. The review letter was submitted to the committee.
- PC's review letter was discussed and it was agreed that there wouldn't be any adverse effects to historical resources.

There was discussion regarding the mapping, removing, and resetting of the fascia stones. C.R. Willeke indicated that the DOT may not participate in all of the cost associated with mapping, removing, and resetting of the fascia stones. There would be cost savings on the order of $80,000 if new stones were put back into the reconstructed top slab. L. Black indicated this would require mitigation. C.R. Willeke indicated that he would discuss funding the mapping, removing, and resetting of the fascia stones with his Bureau.

It was determined that if it was agreed that the fascia stones would be mapped, removed, and reset, then an Effect Memo (finding of No Adverse Effect) could be drafted and submitted to the committee for review, comment, and approval. However, if new stones were put back into the reconstructed top slab, then further consultation with the committee regarding mitigation would be required as the effect finding would be Adverse Effect. It was noted that the Town has made a commitment to the Heritage Commission to reset the fascia stones.

L. Black indicated that she had comments on PC's review letter that she would e-mail to J. Lodge. J. Lodge will forward those comments to PC and coordinate the revised letter back to L. Black.

L. Black asked about the relocation of the fire hydrant in the northeast quadrant. J. Lodge stated that the relocation of the fire hydrant wouldn't have any impacts to the contributing features described in the PAF.

Rochester Airport (no project number)
Skyhaven Airport, SBG 15-03-2011
Participants: K. William Hopper, Maria Stowell, Pease Development Authority; John Gorham, Jacobs Engineering Group; Michael Pouliot, Carol Niewola, NHDOT

Continued review of Skyhaven Airport Project pertaining to the Dupont Property Demolition Project associated with a vacant building at 290 Rochester Hill Road, acquired in fee simple by the Pease Development Authority (PDA) for the purpose of protecting the Runway 33 approach surface and runaway protection zone. The Grassie-Duponte House (built ca. 1957), 290 Rochester Hill Road, was determined eligible for listing on the National Register on March 9, 2012. Preservation Company submitted an individual inventory form (NHDHR ROC0056) documenting the structure.

The purpose of this meeting was to continue the Section 106 process, specifically to discuss the possible mitigation efforts. The NHDOT (on behalf of FAA) concurred with the NHDHR's recommendation that the property at 290 Rochester Hill Road, Rochester, NH, is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places in accordance with 36 CFR 800.4(c)(2) for Criterion C because of its architecture. Mitigation is needed because the intent of the project is to demolish the structure, which adversely affects the historic nature of the property. L. Black suggested that the proposed memorandum of agreement be split in two documents: (1) concurrence with eligibility, and (2) agreed upon mitigation efforts. J. Edelmann would provide Niewola with samples of these documents that could be used.

J. Gorham proposed possible mitigation of the adverse effect that could include filing of the Individual Inventory Form and its description of ranch-style homes with the Rochester Historic District Commission and color photos of the property. L. Black said that while sharing the NH Inventory Form, a public document, would be a nice gesture, it would not constitute mitigation under Section 106. Further, while traditional large format pictures and State-level documentation has been accepted by NHDHR in the past, the ACHP has directed state SHPOs to think outside the box when it comes to mitigation in order that the mitigation is more meaningful and useful in the future. L. Black suggested that the Rochester Historic District Commission be contacted for possible mitigation ideas. M. Stowell explained that the Commission was given over 90 days to comment on the eligibility of this property, but no response was ever forthcoming. Using an existing mid-century modern architecture Table of Contents prepared as part of context development for industrial/commercial/public buildings as mitigation for another project resulting in an Adverse Effect finding on a mid-century modern building, L. Black made four suggestions for possible mitigation efforts:

- Prepare a historical context for mid-century (1945-1975) modern architecture, specifically residences, or
- Document the styles that comprise 1945-1975 residences in New Hampshire, or
- Prepare a short monograph of the builder (Lionel J. Moore), or
- Prepare an annotated bibliography for future context of 1945-1975 residences.

C. Niewola stated that the airport will need to get back to NHDHR after discussing the mitigation possibilities presented by L. Black. Niewola stated that whatever mitigation is selected, if FAA funds are to pay for the effort, the mitigation must be reasonable, appropriate, and justified in relation to the impact the project has on what makes this property eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. J. Edelmann said that she'd work with C. Niewola to provide samples of the mitigation documents proposed by L. Black.

February 14, 2013

Concord 23717, X-A002(742)
Participants: Ed Roberge, City of Concord; Gene McCarthy, McFarland-Johnson; Elizabeth Durfee Hengen, Preservation Consultant; Laura Black, Elizabeth Muzzey and Nadine Peterson, NHDHR; Gloria McPherson, City of Concord

Continued consultation and update on project, previously reviewed on September 13, 2012 and November 3, 2011. The purpose of the meeting was to present the potential roundabout at the North Main Street and Pleasant Street intersection and the challenges associated with making some or all of the historic buildings on Main Street accessible for all users. A plan of the overall proposed design for the project was presented. The first point made was that the roundabout had since been eliminated from consideration and therefore no discussion was necessary.

Gene McCarthy stated that one of the established goals for the project was to make the entire street accessible. One plan to that end is to remove the double curb created in 1953 and that runs along the west side of Main Street. There are several ground floor doorways that have either one or two steps that make them inaccessible for some citizens. The goal would be to make as many of these doorways as possible accessible for all citizens. Gene stated that there are engineering solutions for each of the inaccessible doorways; the challenges are with the impacts these solutions may have to historic buildings, and that the owners of the building would have to participate. The federal funds for this project cannot be used to make modifications to buildings, only to changes in sidewalk or street grades. The building owners would have to pay for any of the necessary modifications to their buildings.

The three ground level doorways into Phenix Hall were then discussed as examples of the accessibility challenges. Elizabeth Muzzey updated those present on the role DHR had played in the recent issues regarding Phenix Hall. The facade of Phenix Hall was recently repaired without making entrances accessible, and this is the subject of an ongoing legal case. Beth and Nadine Peterson shared some of the documentation and correspondence DHR has had regarding the case.

DHR staff explained that in dealing with accessibility issues for an historic building, its role, if requested by the property owner, is to render an opinion regarding whether the proposed accessibility improvements would “threaten or destroy historic features” of the property. If the state preservation office determines that this is the case, the regulations implementing the Americans with Disabilities Act offer special considerations for historic buildings to meet code requirements. In the case of Phenix Hall, the DHR reviewed a number of very conceptual designs to increase the building’s accessibility, including alternatives that would build a new structure with various railing designs on the sidewalk in front of the storefronts. The DHR found that these conceptual designs each had the potential to threaten or destroy historic features of Phenix Hall, given that they would
“cut off the feet of the building, ” changing the historic proportions of the storefronts, as well as changing or destroying historic materials and design. The Phenix Hall case is still pending.

The idea of a “net benefit” 4(f) was mentioned by Jamie Sikora. A net benefit is where the proposed improvement may in fact cause an adverse effect to a resource’s integrity under Section 106, but there is an overall gain for the resources in the project. Jamie stated he would investigate this further.

It was stated that the overall Section 106 determination of effect for the historic district could be influenced by the proposed accessibility improvements. DHR will need detailed drawings for each location where accessibility options are offered. The City suggested that workshop-type meetings, held outside of the Cultural Resources meeting at DOT, might be the best format to review and discuss potential designs, before they are set in stone.

It was also stated that the Consulting Parties need to be contacted. The plan is to hold a formal Section 106 meeting in coordination with the March 7th City of Concord Heritage Commission Meeting. [It was subsequently decided to coordinate the Section 106 meeting with a scheduled project public meeting on March 12.]

Nashua 13117, CM-X-5315(041)
Participants: Katherine Hersh and Robert Houston, City of Nashua; Alex Vogt, Mark Sanborn, NHDOT; Elizabeth Muzzey, NHDHR; Barbara Pressly, interested citizen

Initial consultation on the proposed Nashua Park & Ride at 25 Crown Street. Hersh gave a brief overview of the project. The City is pursuing acquisition of 25 Crown Street for use as a park and ride. The site has an industrial history. Initial industrial activity started at the site in the early 1870s. The largest building on the site, a 90,000 square foot warehouse building, was built in the late 1960s. The Gregg & Son building was taken down in 2002 and 2006. The only remaining historic buildings are the showroom and office. The property is adjacent to the railroad and other industrial properties. Properties to the west of the site are residential. Photos of all the residential properties were included in the application.

Hersh informed the committee that a neighborhood meeting was held on February 11th. Direct abutters were notified by mail, the meeting was posted, and the local newspaper put the meeting date and time on the front page the week before. Hersh will provide the public meeting invitation and articles.

Black said she did not see adverse impacts from developing the site as a park and ride. Sanborn said the park and ride was a separate project from the rail. Sikora said he did not believe there were any archeological impacts. Charles said she walked the site and took 60 photos. She spoke with Klavs Salgals, owner of 19 Crown Street, adjacent to 25 Crown Street. Salgals was very supportive of the project.

Discussion ensued regarding the viewshed between the residential properties and 25 Crown Street. The existing vegetative buffer was discussed. It was noted that the buffer is minimal between 25 Crown Street and 19 Crown Street, but that abutter is supportive.

Sikora and Black agreed that there are no adverse impacts. They directed Hersh to the link for the Effects memo for her completion.

Nashua Broad Street Parkway 10040A, NRBD-5315(021)
Participants: Katherine Hersh and Robert Houston, City of Nashua; Alex Vogt, Mark Sanborn, NHDOT; Elizabeth Muzzey, NHDHR; Barbara Pressly and Geoff Daly, interested citizens

Continued consultation and update on aspects of mitigation commitments, including the chimney rehabilitation, efforts to determine waste house relocation, and selection of consultants to support the City in other aspects of the mitigation program.

Hersh explained that John Vancor was unable to attend today's meeting and that she would read the information that Vancor provided to Hersh for that purpose. Hersh stated that we requested to be put on the agenda to provide an update on efforts underway to complete work on measures included in the Memorandum of Agreement.

Chimney Restoration
As previously reported, the City issued a RFP for design/build services to restore the chimney. The RFP asked for pricing of 4 height alternatives (180 ft.; 165 ft.; 150 ft. and 120 ft.). The RFP clearly stated the preference for the 180-foot alternative. If the lowest responsive bid for this alternative is within the established budget of $650,000, this alternative would be selected.

Two submittals were received and after review only one was determined to be responsive. FHWA expressed their concern that requirements for bidder qualifications may have been too restrictive and may have discouraged competition. At the direction of FHWA, the City has revised the qualification requirements and reissued the RFP.

The revisions which were made removed specific requirements for past experience on historic preservation projects and replaced these requirements with a general requirement that the bidder "demonstrate their familiarity with referenced standards for work on historic masonry structures. At least two references cited shall be able to attest to past experience on relevant historic structures."

The standards referenced include four relevant documents available from National Park Service:
Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, 1992 (or latest edition)
Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings, 1995 (or latest edition)
Preservation Brief Number 1, Assessing Cleaning and Water-Repellent Treatments for Historic Masonry Buildings
Preservation Brief Number 2, Repointing Joints in Historic Masonry Buildings

Submittals are due on February 27, 2013. Hersh asked if there were any questions.

Waste House Relocation
The City continues in the effort to identify a reasonable and sustainable location and use for the Waste House building. The intent is to relocate the building out of the path of the Parkway.

The City issued a RFP which solicited ideas for reuse of the building within the boundaries of the Nashua Manufacturing Company Historic District. The RFP identified City owned property within the district. However, proposals were encouraged for any location within the district. This request sought concepts. Detailed cost proposals were not required. It was noted that the costs associated with building relocation would be borne by project funding. The RFP was issued to property owners within the historic district as well as to local developers. While the RFP generated interest and several potential respondents asked follow up questions during the process, no responses were submitted.

The City continues in the effort to identify a feasible and sustainable reuse for the Waste House building.

Muzzey asked if the location just out of the District was still being considered. Hersh said it was although she understood it was not well received by DHR. Muzzey responded that it was not the preferred site and referred Hersh to the letter sent from DHR on this subject. Muzzey stated that they need a good preservation project, not just a good neighborhood project.

Selection of Consultants
As previously reported, the City issued a RFQ for Architectural Historians and Archaeologists. These consultants will complete other tasks listed in the Memorandum of Agreement. Responses were received on October 3, 2012. Three consultants were selected:

- Historic Document Company (HDC)
- Vanasse Hangen Brustlin (VHB)
- Hartgen Archaeological Associates (HAA)

Several high priority tasks have been scoped.

HDC will be performing tasks associated with the two wooden trestle bridges over the railroad. The City is committed to investigating possible reuse of these bridges. Alternatives for reuse within the City are under evaluation. Should it be determined that reuse within the City is not feasible, HDC will assist the City in preparation of an advertisement to market possible uses outside the City.

VHB will perform tasks associated with the Fairmount Heights Historic District. Finalization of the scope for other tasks is continuing.

In response to questions, Hersh explained that the City's RFQ had 13 tasks. Consultants were given the opportunity to propose on one or more tasks. The City will provide the specific tasks and which consultant is doing each task.

Other Discussion
In response to a request, Hersh said the City will provide information regarding what Boiler House artifacts were saved and where they are being stored.

Tilton-Northfield 14839, X-A000(567)
Participants: Anna Giraldi, Jennifer Reczek, Quantum Construction; Steve Liakos, NHDOT

Initial review of the Winnipesaukee River Trail, a pedestrian/bicycle bridge across the Winnipesaukee River and approximately 1,600 feet of associated unpaved pedestrian trail. This project will connect the Franklin, Northfield and Tilton trails, which were recently constructed, with one of three different alignment options.

Alignment one identifies a pedestrian bridge crossing adjacent to the existing railroad bridge. The trail starts at the end of Granite Street and then continues east parallel to the existing railroad for approximately 370 feet on the north side of the railroad. The trail then crosses the Winnipesaukee

River with a 200 foot long steel truss pedestrian bridge. After the river crossing, the trail makes a right turn and continues to run parallel to the tracks on the north side for approximately 400 feet. At Knapp Road the trail will cross the railroad tracks and continue on the south side until Maher crossing where it will meet up with the existing trail.

Alignment two will also start at the end of Granite Street, but will then continue north for approximately 150 feet before it crosses the river. The proposed pedestrian bridge will be located just upstream of the old dam remnants (dam # 237.04 which is now in ruins). After the river crossing, the trail will continue east along the river until it reaches the railroad and then the trail will be the same as alignment #1.

Alignment three will start with either alignment one or two. However, at Knapp Road, the trail will continue on the north side until Maher crossing where it will cross the railroad tracks and meet up with the existing trail.

For all three of the above alignments, the bridge will be a pre-fabricated 10-foot wide by 200-foot long steel truss bridge which will be placed above FEMA's 100-year floodwater elevation. The superstructure will be supported by cast-in-place concrete abutments. The proposed gravel trail will have an 8-foot width.

NHDHR requested that an Individual Inventory Form be completed for parcel U7-101-1. The extent of impacts (physical and visual) needs to be determined for all properties older than 50 years within the Area of Potential Effect (APE). It will then be determined if Individual Inventory Forms are needed for those properties. The rail road is eligible for the National Register (8/14/2002) and a survey (via an update to the original inventory form) needs to be done to determine if any contributing elements to the rail road are impacted. There are also concerns that the site may have archaeological significance, therefore a Phase 1A Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment will be performed.

Once the location of the trail has been decided, QCC will contract to get the required work done. Once the required work has been completed, QCC will follow up with the Cultural Resource Committee.

Dummer 15815 (no federal number)
Participants: Anna Giraldi, Jennifer Reczek, Quantum Construction; Steve Liakos, NHDOT

Initial review of the Old Route 110 Bridge over Upper Ammonoosuc River (042/043), a 1944 I-Beam bridge with a concrete deck.

The existing bridge is a steel girder bridge with concrete deck founded on stone and concrete abutments. The steel girders and concrete deck and back walls are severely deteriorated and in need of replacement, and the concrete back wall in the west abutment is touching ends of the steel girders, suggesting that there has been significant movement in the west abutment. Also, the St. Lawrence & Atlantic Railroad tracks run just behind the west abutment. The Engineering Study evaluated three alternatives for this project.

The first alternative was bridge rehabilitation. Due to the poor condition of the existing superstructure and observation of the abutments, if the abutments could be re-used, the cost of rehabilitation would be similar to replacement. Additionally, boring performed during the second phase of the study indicated that there is a layer of sandy silt with organics, approximately 9 feet thick, in the area behind the existing abutments. This layer of soil can become unstable and the likelihood of a slope failure caused by the railroad loading is very high. Due to the presence of this soil layer, the abutments cannot safely be reused. Therefore, Alternative I is not feasible.

The second alternative is bridge removal; the entire bridge would be removed and the banks would be stabilized on a 2:1 slope with keyed stone fill. The third alternative is bridge replacement. To avoid conflicts with the railroad tracks, the roadway alignment will be shifted slightly downstream at a skew. This will allow more room to install the concrete abutment and stabilize the slope, while minimizing the impacts to the adjacent railroad bridge abutment.

The proposed replacement bridge would have a steel girder superstructure and an 80-foot span. It would be founded on cast-in-place concrete abutments and spread footings placed below the sandy silt layer. Since the second and third alternatives will both require sheeting to protect the railroad and removal of the sandy silt layer in the vicinity of the work, either can be implemented.

NHDHR indicated that there will be no archaeology work needed for this project due to the sandy silt soils.

It was requested that an Individual Inventory Form be completed for the bridge and the adjacent lot U-3-1 that will be impacted by slope stabilization on the east side of the river. Additionally, since the St. Lawrence & Atlantic railroad is National Register eligible, it must be determined if any of contributing elements will be impacted via an update to the original inventory form..

QCC will hire a consultant to review the impacts to the railroad and complete the required Individual Inventory Form once the required work has been completed, QCC will follow up with the Cultural Resource Committee.

Merrimack 15841 (no federal number)
Participants: Anna Giraldi, Jennifer Reczek, Quantum Construction; Steve Liakos, NHDOT

Initial review of the proposed replacement of an existing 21-foot, 1984 corrugated metal arch pipe (113/159) on Bedford Road over Baboosic Brook.

The existing bridge, built in 1984, is a severely undersized corrugated metal pipe (CMP). The roadway to the west of the pipe is approximately 5 feet below the 100-year flood elevation and is overtopped every several years in storm events. There is also an abandoned bridge on an old roadway alignment immediately upstream of the CMP. Bedford road is a heavily used commuter route and cannot be closed during construction. Therefore, a detour is planned on the old roadway alignment and a one-lane temporary bridge will be placed over the abandoned bridge. Temporary traffic signals will be needed at the bridge to control the flow of traffic.

The original alternative was to place the new bridge in the same location as the existing CMP, on a roadway alignment very similar to the existing. The soils in the area have very poor bearing capacity, so the new bridge will need to be supported on piles and keyed stone fill will be placed on a 2:1 slope around the pile caps. Based on hydraulics and the use of piles, the required hydraulic span of the proposed bridge is 95 feet. For that span, the new bridge will have a steel girder superstructure. The road will be raised to above the 100-year flood elevation and all flood flows will pass through the new bridge. Additionally, the abandoned bridge will have to be removed if this alternative is chosen.

There is a slight possibility that the location of the bridge will be moved to the west bank of the Baboosic River flood plain. The viability of this alternative is currently being reviewed with the environmental agencies. If this alternative were to be implemented, the CMP would be replaced with a 12-foot concrete box culvert and the larger 95-foot structure would be placed in the area of Bedford Road where Baboosic Brook is attempting to cut through the roadway fill. A new river channel will also need to be created through the roadway fill and existing flood plain. If this alternative is implemented, the abandoned bridge could be left in place.

NHDHR requested that an Individual Inventory Form be completed for the abandoned bridge if the bridge is to be removed and that a Phase 1A Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment study be performed if the new bridge is placed in the alternate location on the west side of the flood plain. Once the location of the new bridge has been selected, QCC will contract to have the required work performed. Upon its completion, QCC will follow up with the Cultural Resource Committee.

Lancaster 16208, X-A-001(188)
Participants: Christine Perron, Trent Zanes

Continued consultation (previously reviewed 10/11/2012) on the proposed improvements of the intersection of US RT 2/3 and the existing triangle configuration.

Trent Zanes provided an update on the project, which is located at the intersection of US Route 2 (Bridge Street) and US Route 3 (Main Street). The intersection is a triangle configuration, and the confusing traffic patterns cause safety concerns and create three locations for potential head-on collisions. A roundabout is proposed.

The Lancaster Historical Society property (Wilder Holton House), a National Register listed property, is located along the northwest side of the intersection. To minimize impacts to this property, the proposed curb line will be held in the same location as the existing curb line. A sidewalk will be added along the north side of the roundabout to provide connectivity for pedestrians around the entire roundabout. The sidewalk will require a permanent right-of-way acquisition of 1,900 sq. ft. The driveway to the parcel will need to be shifted slightly to the west, requiring a temporary construction easement of 2,200 sq. ft. The entire parcel is 2.2 acres. The large trees to the east of the driveway will not be impacted by the project.

Christine Perron stated that she spoke to Jamie Sikora about the project prior to the meeting. He felt that the project as proposed would be a de minimis 4(f) impact if everyone agreed that the

project would result in no adverse effect. Laura Black agreed that the project would result in no adverse effect.

L. Black asked how wide the sidewalks would be. T. Zanes replied that the plan currently shows 5’ wide sidewalks, although a 6’ width may be required for ADA compliance.

L. Black requested that the Department get written confirmation from the Historical Society indicating that there were no concerns with the proposed property impacts. She also asked that the sidewalk design be sympathetic to the presence of the historic property.

C. Perron asked about curbing and T. Zanes replied that granite curbing would be used.

Sheila Charles commented that the Phase 1A/1B archaeological survey was completed and no further work was recommended. The report would be forwarded to Edna Feighner for review. C. Perron commented that an inventory form was completed for the Reindeau property located just to the west of the project and it was determined that the property was not eligible for National Register.

Submitted by: Sheila Charles and Jill Edelmann, Cultural Resources

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