BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT
CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting
DATE OF CONFERENCES: February 9, 2012
LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building
ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT
Jill Edelmann
Cathy Goodmen
Tom Jameson
Steve Liakos
Kevin Nyhan
C.R. Willeke

Federal Highway Administration
Jamie Sikora

NHDHR
Laura Black
Dick Boisvert

HEB Engineers
Jonathan MacDougall
Jason Ross

Historic Documentation Co.
Richard Casella

Hoyle Tanner
Sean James

City of Manchester
Jessica Fleming

McFarland-Johnson
Vicki Chase

Normandeau
Jameson Paine

VHB
Nicole Benjamin-Ma
Peter Walker

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

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

February 9, 2012 1
Stark, 20224 (no federal number) 1
Weare, 14339 (no federal number) 2
Rindge, X-A001(190), 16210 4
Londonderry Surplus 4
Nashua, X-A000(372), 14432 4
Harts Location, A001(289), 16396A 6
Manchester, X-A000(416), 14412A 6

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

February 9, 2012

Stark, 20224 (no federal number)
Participants: Jason Ross (jross@hebengineers.com), Jonathan MacDougall, HEB Engineers; Rich Casella, Historic Documentation Company; Steve Liakos, CR Willeke, NHDOT

Purpose of Meeting:
- To introduce the Stark Covered Bridge Rehabilitation Project to the Cultural Resources Team and to discuss the expectations for the preliminary design.

Items discussed:
- Jason Ross reviewed the bridge construction as well as the history of the bridge and past rehabilitation measures.
- J. Ross reviewed the expected items needing rehabilitation as outlined in the application for the National Historic Covered Bridge Preservation Program.

- Rich Casella questioned what was needed for documentation to allow for a proper decision.
- Laura Black recommended that much of the bridge historical documentation should be complete prior to inspection of the bridge in order to confirm the anticipated existing conditions.
- L. Black said that we need to determine the "character defining features" of the bridge. The character defining features will reflect what is significant to the bridge and will help to focus rehabilitation. It would also be beneficial to have the architectural historian working with the engineers throughout the process.
- HEB will schedule a second meeting with the Cultural Resources committee prior to submitting the final Engineering Study.

Action Items:

- Determine specifically what construction was completed during the 1982 roof repairs.
- Review the National Historic Bridge Preservation Program application to determine if specific additional background research was anticipated.

Follow Up Items:

- On Friday, February 17, 2012, Jillian Edelman sent an e-mail stating that the DOT and the DHR suggesting HEB look into a Historic Structures Report, as that type of document would best serve the project moving forward.
- HEB will contract with Rich Casella to prepare this report and include it in the Engineering Study.

Weare, 14339 (no federal number)
Participants: Jamie Paine (JPaine@Normandeau.com), Normandeau Associates

The purpose of this meeting is to update the group on the Town of Weare's Peaslee Road Bridge Replacement Project (State Bridge No. 125/141), discuss historical and archaeological work completed to date, the project's impacts, and receive a signed effect memo.

Project Overview

Jameson Paine provided a brief project update, reminding the group that as part of a NHDOT Bridge Aid Project (State Project No. 14339), the Town of Weare is proposing to replace the single lane Peaslee Road Bridge over the Piscataquog River. This single span beam girder bridge, with a cast-in-place concrete deck, was built in 1940.

The project was presented at the November 12, 2009 cultural resource agency meeting. At the meeting, NHDHR determined that a Phase IA/IB (if needed) be completed to review for archaeological sensitivity and an Inventory Form be completed for the bridge. The archaeology report (Phase IA) recommended no further survey necessary and DHR concurred on 6/24/10. An Individual Inventory form was prepared for the bridge and a Determination of Eligibility Committee meeting was help on April 13, 2011. The bridge was determined eligible for the National Register under Criterion C as a relatively rare example of its type (1 of 5 known in the state).

The existing bridge structure is proposed to be replaced. There is currently a problem with roadway flooding on a regular basis during large storms. The subject bridge was substantially flooded during May 2006 storm events. The bridge, transition, and end approach rails are all substandard. The overall condition of the existing bridge warrants complete replacement of the structure at this time.

The proposed bridge replacement will include removal of the existing superstructure and substructure, installation of a new bridge system, construction of new roadway approaches, and installation of new guardrail. The proposed bridge will be wider than the existing to accommodate two-lanes of traffic with travel lanes and shoulders that meet current design practice. A clear span of 94 feet is proposed as this increased span meets the NHDOT hydraulic requirement for passing the 100 year storm event and it allows the proposed abutments to be constructed near the banks of the Piscataquog River which will improve the flow of water through the site. The bridge will also be raised approximately six feet in order to meet the hydraulic requirements for the new bridge structure and reduce the likelihood of future flooding and damaging washouts. As part of the project, a temporary detour bridge is proposed immediately downstream from the project area.

Due to the fact the bridge was determined eligible for the National Register of Historical Places and would be removed as part of the project, the consultant proposed that a State of NH-level HAER documentation (New Hampshire Historic Property Documentation) of the bridge be completed.

Effect Determination

DOT and DHR determined that the project as proposed would have an adverse effect on historical resources. L. Black asked if the Town had been approached regarding mitigation options, and noted that the DHR is strongly recommending that projects move away from standard mitigation ideas (markers, documentation) towards more creative ideas that will better benefit the community. After some discussion of potential mitigation options (e.g., development of operations and maintenance plans for the four similar bridges in the state [not viable as these are located all over the state, not just in Weare] or installation of wayside interpretive panel [not viable as there isn't a logical place near the bridge to place or view it]), L. Black requested that the project team follow-up with the Town, Weare Heritage Commission and Historical Society for their preferred idea(s). J. Edelmann noted that the Individual Inventory form completed by Preservation Company included a very detailed discussion on comparable bridges that may be useful in whatever mitigation measure is chosen. J. Paine stated that he would coordinate with the Town.

It was agreed that an adverse effect memo could be signed now, stating that proper mitigation for the removal of the bridge would take place.

Subsequent to the meeting, J. Paine discussed the project with Ms. Sherry Burdick, President of the Weare Historical Society. Ms. Burdick agreed that the state-level HAER documentation was appropriate and agreed to the proposed measures. The Weare Heritage Commission has also been contacted, and the J. Paine is awaiting their comment on useful mitigation measures. Since this meeting, NHDHR has signed the project's Cultural Resources Effect Memo, identifying its adverse effect.

Rindge, X-A001(190), 16210
Participants: Cathy Goodmen, NHDOT

This project includes creating a left turn lane on the northbound travel way of NH Route 202, to allow dedicated left turns into Forristall Road and installing a signal at the intersection. All work will take place within the NHDOT Right of way. L. Black had noted that there was a house and church identified near this intersection and wanted to know what their probable ages are and if they would be impacted.

C. Goodmen showed a map of the area and the location of the house and church. The Department did not know the date of these properties, but they are approximately 700 feet from the intersection on the south side of the road. Work will extend approximately 100 feet from the intersection onto Middle Winchendon Road so there will be no impacts to the house and church. Looking at air photos of the property, the church appears to be newer construction and neither are located on the 1988 Topographic map.

Given that there are very limited impacts to the area, and there are no historic structures in the area, L. Black and Jamie Sikora agreed that the project would have a No Historic Properties Affected determination. Jill Edelman will compose a memo for signing at the next meeting.

Note: During the review of the RPR form by NHDHR, Edna Feighner did not see any concern with archaeological resources in the project area.

Londonderry Surplus
Participants: Cathy Goodmen, NHDOT

An abutting landowning is seeking the purchase of an 8 acre parcel of land from the State in the Town of Londonderry for development. A location map was previously emailed to Richard Boisvert of the NH Division of Historical Resources, and this meeting was scheduled to follow up with current photographs of the area. D. Boisvert noted that the area appeared undisturbed, and has the potential to be highly sensitive for archaeological resources. It was agreed that as a condition of the sale, the potential purchaser should conduct a Phase IA/IB archaeological survey of the property to NHDHR standards. Cathy Goodmen would also fill out an RPR form and submit to NHDHR for their records.

Nashua, X-A000(372), 14432
Participants: Peter Walker (pwalker@vhb.com), Nicole Benjamin-Ma, VHB; Kevin Nyhan, Tom Jameson, NHDOT

- Pete Walker (VHB) offered a summary of the project description detailed in the submitted RPR. He noted that this congestion management project involves a number of intersections across the city. It consists of improving signal coordination utilizing existing infrastructure at most of these intersections, though at 19 intersections some sort of ground disturbance work is anticipated. Disturbance will take two forms: the installation of

pedestrian signal posts, and the installation of new controller cabinets. The involvement of FHWA funds necessitates a NEPA review.

- Laura Black (NHDHR) asked follow-up questions for clarification:
    - Confirmation that the four signals in the French Village area will just have timing improvements and no ground disturbance
        - P. Walker – confirmed
    - While it appears from looking at the provided photos of the proposed installation items (poles and controller cabinets), the poles seem low-key and non-intrusive. The cabinets, however, appear to be much larger and more intrusive, and consideration should be given to how well (or not) these will fit into residential neighborhoods. As such, discussion should focus on any intersections that 1) are in smaller-scale residential neighborhoods; and 2) will receive a controller cabinet as part of the proposed project.
        - P. Walker – Noted that the picture of the controller cabinet provided in the RPR offers little sense of scale; the cabinets are actually only 3-4 feet tall.
        - L. Black – Acknowledged the additional information
    - For the intersections where pedestrian signal poles are going to be installed, is there only one pole per intersection?
        - P. Walker – The number of poles installed will vary by intersection. The exact number anticipated per intersection has been included in the RPR for reference.
- Nicole Benjamin-Ma (VHB) summarized the methods for carrying out the site file search, and the results. Only two inventoried properties were found that are adjacent to the 19 intersections where ground disturbance is anticipated. The Nashua National Fish Hatchery (NAS area F) is adjacent to intersection #48, and the NHDHR DOE indicates that the property is considered Not Eligible for individual or district listing. 4 ½-6 Canal Street is adjacent to intersection #81, and the NHDHR DOE indicates that the property is considered not eligible for individual listing; it was not evaluated as part of a district. The intersection does lie within the Nashua Local Historic District.
- Pete Walker noted that there is one additional National Register district that was not placed on the map used at the meeting – the Nashville Historic District is wholly contained within the Nashua Local Historic District.
- Laura Black noted that she responded with comments to the RPR, but that they probably hadn't been received yet. She summarized her comments for the benefit of the discussion. As the project is not particularly intrusive, NHDHR recommends that there are no historic properties affected.
- Jaime Sikora (FHWA), as the representative of the lead federal agency, agreed.
- Pete Walker confirmed that a municipal memo containing this information will be prepared. Jill Edelmann confirmed that the most current version of the memo template can be found on the DOT website. P. Walker said the memo should be completed this week. J. Edelmann confirmed that she can get it signed.

- Laura Black noted that the reasoning behind NHDHR's decision that no historic properties will be affected should be included in the memo. Pete Walker asked L. Black to reiterate the exact reasons. L. Black indicated that the majority of the project is about adjustment of signal timing of existing infrastructure, and that the signal poles and cabinets that will be installed are non-intrusive. The installation of signal poles are relatively unobtrusive in intersections that have already been altered. All three sites that will get cabinets are very urbanized and dense and the 3-4' tall cabinets should also be relatively unobtrusive. L. Black also indicated that the memo should specifically note when there are already alterations and intrusions at the 19 intersections where there is anticipated ground disturbance.

Harts Location, A001(289), 16396A
Participants: Vicki Chase, McFarland-Johnson (vchase@mjinc.com); Kevin Nyhan, NHDOT

This design-build project consists of the replacement of the bridge that carries US Route 302, in the White Mountain National Forest, over Sawyer River (Br. No. 235/059) The bridge was damaged during flood events associated with remnants of Hurricane Irene in August 2011.
The bridge that was damaged was built in 1990, when the alignment of Route 302 was shifted. A temporary bridge was built and was constructed in the location of the pre-1990 bridge, spanning the remaining abutment from the earlier 1926 bridge.

When US Route 302 was re-aligned in the early 1990's, the existing bridge and surrounding area were reviewed by DHR. (November 12, 1987, December 10, 1987, February 8, 1988) At that time, DHR determined that the existing bridge, built in 1926, was not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. A nearby CCC camp site with chimney remnants were also evaluated as a potential archaeological site and was found to be of less importance than other sites in the WMNF and that there were no other prehistoric or historic archaeological resource concerns in the project area.

A railroad bridge (built 1875) directly downstream of the bridge was also damaged during the tropical storm. Repairs to the railroad bridge are not part of this Categorical Exclusion, and there are no impacts to the railroad bridge anticipated to occur as a result of the US Route 302 bridge replacement.

Dick Boisvert stated that he had no concerns about archaeological resources in the project area. Laura Black requested that the bridge abutment under the temporary bridge be left intact when the temporary bridge was removed. A Memorandum of No Historic Properties Affected was signed for the project stating that there would be No Effect on Historic or Archaeological properties, with the condition that the southern abutment under the temporary bridge remain intact.

Manchester, X-A000(416), 14412A
Participants: Sean James, Hoyle Tanner; Jessica Fleming, City of Manchester; Tom Jameson, NHDOT

This project was previously presented to the Cultural Resource Committee (CRC) on January 13, 2011 and November 3, 2011. S. James presented an overview of the project and progress since the last CRC meeting. A Public Information Meeting was held on January 26, 2012 in Manchester. Copies of the meeting minutes and attendance were presented to the Committee and the results discussed. All people in attendance who spoke were in favor of Option 3 which includes removal of the existing rail trestle. Mitigation was briefly mentioned at the meeting; however no specific ideas were presented so that the audience was not swayed in favor of one option over another. After weighing all options and public input for the project, the City of Manchester has decided to pursue replacement of the trestle with a single span bridge as part of the project.

At the previous meeting for this project, adaptive reuse of the trestle and advertising were discussed. J. Sikora noted that the trestle does not need to be advertised for sale as it is not a highway bridge.

The Effect Memo was discussed and minor changes made to the draft. S. James will revise and forward to J. Edelmann for routing and signatures.

Finally mitigation options for the loss of the resource (trestle) were discussed. The two options discussed were preparation of a preservation plan for a similar trestle located in South Manchester and public education/interpretation/outreach. J. Fleming indicated that the City has experienced problems with vandalism of other plaques and kiosks within the City. These options will be researched further and presented back to the committee in the form of a draft MOA for the project. No further meetings with the committee should be required.

****Memos/MOA's**: Harts Location, A001(289), 16396A – No Historic Properties Affected
Manchester, X-A000(416), 14412A – Adverse Effect Memo
Weare, 14339 (no federal number) – Adverse Effect Memo
Wilton, X-A001(147), 16128 – No Historic Properties Affected

Submitted by: Jill Edelmann, Cultural Resources
http://www.nh.gov/dot/org/projectdevelopment/environment/units/technicalservices/crmeetings.htm