BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT
CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting
DATE OF CONFERENCES: March 3 and 10, 2011
LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building
ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT
Keith Cota
Jill Edelmann
Cathy Goodmen
Bob Hudson
Joyce McKay
Kirk Mudgett
Carol Niewola
Kevin Nyhan
Christine Perron
Brian Wilmot

Federal Highway Administration
Mark Hasselmann*
Jamie Sikora
NHDHR
Laura Black
Edna Feighner
Peter Michaud
Beth Muzzey
Linda Wilson

Albacore Park
Ken Herrick

BMS
Roger Sample

City of Concord
Martha Drukker

City of Dover
Ben Clark

HEB
Bill Rossingol

Town of Hudson
Gary Webster

IAC
Kathy Wheeler

Jacobs
John Gorham

City of Manchester
Bruce Thomas

NTHP
Betsy Merritt*

Portsmouth Historical Society
Richard Candee

Preservation Consultant
Liz Durfee Hengen

Warren Street
Jonathan Halle

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

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

March 3, 2011 1
Dover, A-001(063), 15990 1
Franconia, X-A000(789), 15554 2
Portsmouth-Kittery, A000(911), 13678F 3
March 10, 2011 7
Concord Municipal Airport 7
Hudson, X-A000(348), 14408 10
Laconia, X-A000(884), 15691 11
Lebanon, NH - Hartford, VT, A000(627), 14957 12
Manchester 15401 (no federal number) 13
Alton (no project number) 14

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

March 3, 2011

Dover, A-001(063), 15990
Participants: Ben Clark, Assistant City Engineer, City of Dover (B.Clark@dover.nh.gov)

The City of Dover is proposing a Safe Routes to School project that constructs a pedestrian/ bicycle lane adjacent to Woodman Park Elementary School. Ben Clark, assistant City Engineer for the City of Dover, presented the project, which contains all of its construction within the existing right of way. There may be temporary impacts to lawns during construction, however all lawns will be returned to their original state. Excavation for the sidewalks would be no more than one foot deep.

It is proposed to install vertical granite curbing and a 5'-wide concrete sidewalk. B. Clark believes the area consists of mostly newer construction homes, however he did not have pictures to provide to the committee. Plans of the project and the RPR form were submitted.

It was agreed that B. Clark would email pictures of the area and a typical cross section of construction to Joyce McKay, who would then forward on to NHDHR. Linda Wilson and Laura Black also suggested that for this and future projects to look into historic maps such as Sanborn Fire Insurance maps. After the review of the pictures, the committee will determine if the proposed project has any affect on historic properties and if the project needs to be presented in front of the committee again. Laura Black reminded B. Clark that for future projects photographs of the area, known dates, and NHDHR file research should be submitted to NHDHR prior to the review meeting on their Request for Project Review form.

Franconia, X-A000(789), 15554
Participants: Bill Rossingol, Holden Engineering (HES@Holdenengineering.com)

William Rossignol opened the meeting with a brief summary of the SRTS sidewalk project. The sidewalk reconstruction follows the northeasterly side of Main Street (NH Routes 18 & 116). It begins in front of MAC's Market near the intersection split of Routes 18 and 116, and then proceeds northwesterly approximately 2,100 feet to the Lafayette Elementary School. Handouts for the project were distributed, and included:

- Photo package along the sidewalk route
- Photo package (Google Views) of all building fronts
- Typical Section for the sidewalk
- Completed RPR form
- Map showing location of the Abbie Greenleaf Library (unaffected by the project)
- School Zone Speed Limit Assembly with Driver Feedback Display

The proposed project will maintain (hold) the existing road centerline. The typical section shows a 12-foot travel lane, a 2-foot paved shoulder (to improve separation between the vehicle and the pedestrian), granite curbing with a 7-inch reveal, and a 5-foot paved sidewalk. Drive ramps will be reconstructed with a 1-inch lip at the gutter line, a 1% slope upward, and then matching up or down to the existing driveway. Two existing crosswalks will be maintained, and ADA compliant sidewalk ramps are proposed at the crosswalk junctures.

Abutter meetings have been held with each property owner fronting the project for purposes of explaining the project work and impacts. There are several locations where the proposed sidewalk will spill over (by a few feet) onto private property. This situation exists because the existing roadway pavement doesn't lie in the physical center of the existing Right of Way. Temporary and

permanent easements are being obtained from each abutter, with the Town securing the required signatures on the easement (recordable) documents. No monetary compensation is attached to these easements.

As construction dollars are limited, add-alternate work for two sidewalk segments (north end near Lafayette School) will be included on the bidding package.

Holden has prepared the Categorical Exclusion – Programmatic Determination Checklist, and Kevin Nyhan has done a preliminarily review of this form.

Conclusions by the committee: No Historic Properties Affected. Linda Wilson did note one property (a rehabilitated building at the north end) that may have potential to be listed. This building is significantly distant to the proposed sidewalk work, and will not be affected.

Portsmouth-Kittery, A000(911), 13678F
Participants: Keith Cota, Jill Edelmann, Joyce McKay, Kevin Nyhan, NHDOT; Laura Black, Elizabeth Muzzey, Linda Wilson, NHDHR; Mark Hasselmann, Jamie Sikora, FHWA; Ken Herrick, Albacore Park; Richard Candee, Portsmouth Historical Society; Betsey Merritt, National Trust for Historic Preservation

Joyce McKay opened the meeting by passing out copies of the latest Adverse Effect Memo. Kevin Nyhan pointed out that the smaller changes that had been discussed at the February meeting were incorporated into the latest version, and only the signatory pages have changed from what had been emailed prior to this meeting. K. Nyhan noted that the most significant changes from the version presented at the February meeting were removing the Albacore from the adversely effected list, and noting that the Warner House now has a "conditional no adverse effect." Keith Cota added that the Department would commit to doing a concept design for the Albacore Park, which will analyze alternatives to the current road location. Joyce McKay noted that the Warner House will undergo a preconstruction survey, and that the vibration monitoring will be active during construction to make sure that any vibrations do not go above the set range. If the ranges are exceeded then the construction method will be altered. Richard Candee reminded the group that the University of New Hampshire completed an earthquake study on the building, and that report should be referenced when compiling information for the preconstruction survey.

Betsy Merritt noted that the approach makes sense with the conditional no adverse affect to the Warner House, however she would caution that a cap be placed on the vibration levels. It is believed that the federal standards for vibration on historic structures is 0.2 inches per second, and believes this will help with any issues that arise in the future. She made mention to previous projects that a cap was not set, and the levels that were reported back in the preconstruction survey were higher than what the National Trust was comfortable with. B. Merritt will forward on examples for MOA's where vibration limit caps were used.

J. McKay noted that the vibration limits noted in several MOA's from the National Trust were considerably different and suggested that there are many variables to consider and that using standard limits was not appropriate. They need to be established through a consideration of the condition of the specific building, the environmental circumstances, and the location and nature of

the sources of vibration. K. Cota cautioned that national levels for vibration monitoring might not be appropriate for the Warner House. It was agreed that the national standard would be noted; however the recommended limit should be based on the preconstruction survey recommendations. It was determined that NHDOT, FHWA and NHDHR would sign off on the vibration level limits and plan.

B. Muzzey added that the Warner House is a very special building, and typical construction crews do not regularly deal with buildings of this nature. She also noted that typical construction specs do not apply to buildings of this type. B. Muzzy asked if it was possible to include someone on the design build team that is an expert in historic masonry construction and building techniques. Mark Hasselmann added that the design build team would need to know where the vibration is coming from before corrective action can be taken. B. Muzzey agreed and cautioned that that reason alone may be why an expert would in integral in the design build process. Linda Wilson suggested that the Harpers Ferry Center be contacted, as they would know the precautionary principles to embrace, and would help with special construction expertise. Richard Candee also noted local New England masonry experts, including Ivan Major and John Wastrom. The design build contract would then include the monitoring plan and specify hiring a masonry consultant experienced with such impacts to historic buildings similar to the Warner House.

B. Muzzey asked whether the term “conditional” needed to be used when referring to a no adverse effect. She noted that in the past, the NHDHR has been twice admonished by the ACHP that the term does not exist. B. Merritt agreed that the term does not exist, however it is used. B. Muzzey stated that the vibration monitoring should be included in the MOA, however the use of the term “conditional” should be downplayed. Properties that have no adverse effect are typically memorialized in the NEPA document.

K. Cota stated that the NHDOT will commit to design oversight, and will make sure that a vibration expert is brought on as a sub-consultant to monitor, plan, and program vibration monitoring during construction. It was noted that there will be no pile driving, and the largest issue K. Cota anticipates seeing is the drainage area reconstruction for Scott Ave. L. Wilson commended the DOT for the proposed language, and it was agreed that NHDHR would have the ability to comment on such language prior to a contract being granted.

B. Muzzey brought up the discussion of traffic issues and disturbances that have been discussed at previous meetings, and the potential impacts traffic my have to the visitation of these historic resources. It was determined at previous meetings that the traffic impacts, although potentially adverse, were only a temporary impact, and that proper signage would help mitigate these impacts during construction, therefore a no adverse effect determination was made. R. Candee noted that the Warner House economics need to be treated the same as other businesses in the downtown area, with the use of signage and outreach. Laura Black asked if there was some way to monitor the visitor counts to the surrounding museums, and place appropriate wording in the MOA. J. McKay noted that the purpose of the outreach coordinator that will be hired as part of the mitigation of this project would be looking at those numbers and addressing traffic flow as needed.

R. Candee relayed a question from the Chamber of Commerce, wanting to know if events can be held at the closed bridge end. K. Cota answered that there would be a closed off staging area, and a

safe viewing area for the public. The parking lot at the base of the bridge will be maintained, and it is in the Department and the City's best interest to maintain the public access in the area.

The effects to Albacore Park were discussed at length. Currently there are two easements in place retaining the used of the Connector Road, one easement was put in place for the Portsmouth-Kittery 13678 project, which stated that the Connector Road would be maintained during construction periods of the Memorial Bridge and removed thereafter. After this easement was issued, an easement for the use of the Connector Road was signed for work done on the I-95 Bridge, with language that the road would be constructed and maintained. It was stated in the Connections Study that the Connector Road would be needed in the future when the I-95 bridge and Route 1 Bypass reach capacity. However, one has not superceded the other.

Ken Herrick, representing Albacore Park, stated that he disagreed with the Federal Highway Administration's finding "*that the original construction and use of the Temporary Connector Road* [across Albacore Park property] *has no direct tie with the Memorial Bridge Project nor any federal action or funding.*" This finding was placed in Jamie Sikora's (FHWA) E-Mail dated February 11, 2011 (3:10 PM). K. Herrick noted that paragraph two of the currently active easement reads: "*The temporary right and easement to construct, maintain and remove a temporary highway needed for the purpose of detouring traffic during the construction/reconstruction of the Memorial Bridge (Bridge Project) 13678;"* which, in his opinion, confirmed a relationship between the connector road and the Memorial Bridge Project. Keith Cota (NH DOT) stated that the connector road was constructed as a result of a "political" agreement between the City of Portsmouth and NH DOT; and that the agreement was related to the original Memorial Bridge Project (Project 13678). K. Herrick said that he was under the impression that the current Memorial Bridge Project (Project 13678F) was a "revision" to the original project. K. Cota stated that it was not; that Project 13678F was an entirely new undertaking.

K. Herrick took exception to J. Sikora's determination relative to the (Section 106) impact of the increased traffic volume in the vicinity of Ex ALBACORE (AGSS 569). J. Sikora stated (in his E-Mail of February 11, 2011 (3:10 PM)) that it is unreasonable to presume that the increase in traffic volumes on the existing roadways near the resource would automatically result in an adverse effect; and that there should not be any increase in heavy truck traffic as a result of any detours given current load restrictions on the Memorial Bridge. K. Herrick explained that, in his opinion, the presumption of adverse effect was not unreasonable given the magnitude of the traffic increase across the connector – there would be no traffic across Albacore Park property if the temporary road were closed/not there. K. Herrick also noted that the lack of an increase in heavy truck traffic is specifically because it already existed. When the load restriction occurred on the Memorial Bridge on Nov. 19, 2009, an increase in heavy truck traffic occurred. This traffic continues today, and it will continue through the entire Memorial Bridge construction period.

K. Herrick made several comments about FHWA's findings relating to the recently completed Determination of Eligibility and Effects Sheet for Albacore Park. J. Sikora, in his E-Mail dated February 11, 2011 (6:21 PM), wrote:

> "*The existing National Register Form which was completed for the NHL does not include the park or waterfront setting as contributing elements of the historic significance. Based upon discussions with MaryAnn Naber and Mark Hasselmann, FHWA does not believe the*

park/setting contributes. We feel the eligibility of setting issue could be sent to the Keeper of the NR for resolution if/when necessary, but believe that could be done concurrently, yet separate from the project."

K. Herrick noted that:

The Albacore's Historic Significance is not in question – she is a National Historic Landmark (NHL);

The New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources (NHDHR) Determination of Eligibility (DOE) Sheet dated December 8, 2010, states that Albacore Park is not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places;

Albacore Park (probably) does not contribute to Albacore's eligibility as an NHL;

The NHDHR DOE Sheet does describe a potential Adverse Effect on Albacore's Historic Integrity aspects of Setting and Association;

The FHWA determination and NHDHR DOE Sheet seem to be in direct conflict.

J. Sikora suggested in his E-Mail that the eligibility of setting issue could be sent to the Keeper of the National Register for resolution. K. Herrick stated that he believed that the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) would be a more appropriate arbiter. It was noted that the Advisory Council does not have a role in the determination of eligibility.

B. Muzzey reiterated that the road was not looked at from a cultural resources standpoint when it was constructed. M. Hasselmann noted that there were no federal funds involved at its original inception. No matter how the road was constructed, B. Muzzey reminded the group that removal of any waterfront setting would be extremely adverse to the Albacore according to NPS Bulletin 20. J. Sikora added that FHWA has had internal discussions on the existing view shed of the Albacore, and believes the setting may already be diminished with Market Street and the railroad. K. Herrick noted that their waterfront was considered the North Mill pond. J. Sikora stated that FHWA would complete a detailed conclusion of their determination on the Albacore.

B. Muzzey noted that this was all discussed back in November when the group was discussing effects, and the conversation has changed since then. The group needs to consider the continued use of the road on the effect of the setting and association on the Albacore, and remember that the Market Street extension and the rail line are lower than where the submarine is currently sitting.

K. Nyhan noted that the potential adverse effect issues and the relationship between the Albacore Connector and the Memorial Bridge Project need to be resolved quickly given the current planning/construction time constraints imposed on the project. K. Cota agreed that the effects to Albacore Park need to be addressed, and that a concept design will be completed prior to 2017. The concept design will set the parameters for the Connector Road. This design will be presented to Maine as they will be the lead DOT for the SML project. It was suggested that a MOU be prepared to guide this work. J. McKay suggested that the MOU spell out that the Connector Road is adversely effecting the Albacore, however under the Memorial Bridge project, the Connector Road is only a temporary structure, and therefore not adverse under the 13678F project. L. Wilson agreed that the preexisting adverse condition be noted in the MOU, and that it be drafted quickly for use with other projects, including the Route 1 Bypass project and the SML bridge project.

After some discussion, K. Herrick agreed that the best way to decouple the temporary connector road from the Memorial Bridge Project would be to issue a MOU, which would delineate mutually

agreeable specific steps for resolving the Adverse Effect issues; and enumerated a timed step proposal to effect a "final disposition" for the Albacore Connector.

J. McKay asked for a table consensus that the 13678F project did not adversely affect the Albacore. L. Wilson agreed with the reasoning that if the road were not there today, DOT would not be building it for this project. J. Sikora acknowledged that FHWA had enough information to support a no adverse effect finding. B. Merritt did note that the Section 106 regulations do look at cumulative effects, and that past actions are part of the cumulative effects analysis. K. Herrick stated that the owners group could not sign an MOU until FHWA has completed their determinations. L. Wilson and J. McKay will draft the MOU; time frames will be set once they determine the needs of the MOU. It was determined that signatories for the MOU would be NHDOT, Albacore Park, and NHDHR. J. Sikora was asked whether FHWA should also be a signatory to the MOU. J. Sikora noted that although FHWA would likely assist in the development of the MOU and implementation of related activities, it wasn't clear whether FHWA needed to be a signatory at this point. B. Muzzey and L. Black also suggested that a site visit take place to facilitate the next steps of the MOU.

The MOU would acknowledge the adverse effect of the Connector Road on the Albacore outside of the current Memorial Bridge project. The MOU would summarize the current understanding of its eligibility in relationship to the park setting and the waterfront. It would provide a background of the issues to date. It would commit the NHDOT to a concept design with the cooperation of the Port of Portsmouth Maritime Museum Association. The work outlined in the MOU would be completed before the NEPA study for the Sarah Long Memorial Bridge and provide guidance for its treatment under that document.

With the conclusion that the Connector Road is not adverse under the current project phase (13678F), the adverse effect memo was signed at the meeting by FHWA and SHPO. The memo was edited prior to signatures to remove the "conditional" no adverse finding for Warner House.

B. Merritt asked if consulting parties now had an option to comment on the effect memo. K. Nyhan responded that all consulting parties have been informed from the beginning on the effects on resources, and that a copy of the memo was sent out for comment prior to signatures. K. Nyhan also undated that group that the NEPA document was still being looked at, and that the draft 4(f) should be submitted for review shortly by McFarland-Johnson.

March 10, 2011

Concord Municipal Airport
Participants: Carol Niewola and Brian Wilmot, NHDOT; John Gorham, Jacobs (john.Gorham@jacobs.com); Martha Drukker, City of Concord; Liz Durfee Hengen, Preservation Consultant; Kathy Wheeler, Independent Archaeological Consulting

- Introductions of those in attendance were made. NHDOT circulated a sign-in sheet.

- Martha Drukker with the City of Concord provided an overview of the environmental assessment (EA) project for the Airport. M. Drukker noted the airport has a Capital Improvement Plan

(CIP) that projects the funding for future projects at the airport. She noted that the EA project is evaluating the next 5-7 years of projects at the airport so that the airport does not need to do individual environmental assessments for each future project. M. Drukker noted that through the EA project the project team has been working with the Natural Resource agencies over the past year coming up with impacts and mitigation measures for the projects. She stated that written documentation is needed for each EA project from the cultural resource agencies perspective.

- John Gorham with Jacobs stated that the EA project requires written documentation from SHPO on the effects of the project. He asked the group how we could make that happen.

- Joyce McKay with NHDOT recommended that Jacobs write an "effects memorandum" for the EA projects. She will provide a sample plan that can be used for NHDHR approvals.

- Edna Feighner stated that she approved of the Phase 1A archeological report so that the meeting could focus more on the historical aspects.

- J. Gorham noted that the EA is due to be completed as a draft in April and asked how long written documentation from NHDHR on the project effects would take. J. McKay said the memo could be signed at the next NHDOT Cultural resources meeting, which occurs on April 14, 2011. M. Drukker said that the City could circulate the memo for required signatures.

- Elizabeth Hengen, a subconsultant, to Jacobs provided an overview of the Airport Project Area form's historical findings. She noted the Airport dates back to 1926 and was transferred to the City of Concord in 1937. E. Hengen noted that the Airport is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places because of the Airport's early role in aviation history in NH. She then reviewed the airport buildings that might be considered individually. She noted that the terminal and the two earliest hangers were key resources. Similarly, retention of the current linear pattern of the runways that had been laid out by 1942 was significant. E. Hengen noted that buildings less than 50 years old are noncontributing resources. She described how the current Airport runway layout is similar to the original Airport runway layout.

- J. Gorham then described in detail each of the EA projects. He emphasized that all the horizontal nature of the EA projects do not directly effect the airport buildings.

- J. McKay asked the group to discuss the effects of each of the EA projects.

- Area A: Future Hangar and Regional Drive Development. Laura Black with the NH Division of Historical Resources (NHDHR) noted that there was already modern development in this area. She stated the Area A undertaking would have no adverse effect on the Airport. E. Feighner noted the archaeological sensitivity of a portion of Area A on the north end of the project. M. Drukker stated that the land disturbances would consist of pavement construction and slab on grade foundations. She noted that many utilities had already been installed. M. Drukker also noted that the Regional Drive construction disturbed approximately 40' from the edge of Regional drive into Area A, which also has been designated as sensitive. She noted that a condition of the construction would be an archaeological phase IB assessment of the area.

- Kathleen Wheeler with IAC, a subconsultant to Jacobs, described the phase IA archeological report she prepared. She explained that City's records for past land disturbances at the Airport were examined. K. Wheeler was able to approximate from these records the limits of disturbance from the 1947 construction at the Airport. She further noted that project area's A and E were noted as areas of possible archeological sensitivity. K. Wheeler also noted that area B was determined not to be sensitive based on the 1947 grading limits and the previous work done with NHF&G.

- Area B: New Taxiway B. Laura Black noted that Taxiway B remains parallel with the adjacent runway. She stated that the arrangement of Taxiway B is consistent with the current airfield configuration. L. Black also stated that Taxiway B would have no adverse effect to the Airport. E. Feighner stated that no archaeological resources would be impacted.

- Area C: New Taxiway C on the abandoned runway pavement. L. Black asked if the pavement dated back to the original airport. M. Drukker stated this pavement was newer than the original airport pavement. L. Black stated that the project had no adverse effects to the Airport. E. Feighner concurred from an archaeological perspective.

- Area D: Taxiway A Reconstruction and Lighting. L. Black stated that this was similar to Area C. She stated that the project had no adverse effects to the Airport. E. Feighner concurred.

- Area E: Expansion of the Itinerant Apron. L. Black noted that this was an incremental expansion of the existing apron. E. Hengen reviewed the project area form diagram that showed the Itinerant Apron pavements and noted no impact to historical properties for the area of apron expansion. Linda Wilson indicated the project is not permanent and continues the separation of the terminal building from the runways. L. Black stated that this project had no adverse effect on the airport. E. Feighner noted that the area was identified for archeological sensitivity in the phase IA archaeological report. She noted that a phase IB study would be required. M. Drukker noted that the area is currently used by helicopters and therefore is mowed.

- Area F: Expansion of the Airport Based Aircraft Tie-down Apron: L. Black stated this project was similar to Area E in that the project is not permanent and is an incremental expansion of the existing apron. L. Black stated this project would have no adverse effect to the airport. E. Feighner agreed with the no adverse impact determination from an archeological perspective.

- J. McKay then discussed the contents of the project effects memo previously noted. The contents should include the following: an overall description of the airport and the EA project; listing of the project with description; discussion of no adverse effects; a section on the commitment to conduct phase IB archaeological survey for the projects identified; and signatures. She will email J. Gorham for a sample memorandum.

- M. Drukker then discussed how the City could work with NHDHR on projects at the airport based on the eligibility of the airport for the National Register. She asked about the preparation of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) that would outline what the airport could do without further consultation with NHDHR and what would require further consultation. E. Feighner noted that what may suit the airport better is a Programmatic Agreement (PA). She noted that the SHPO office could provide examples for M. Drukker to review other PA's, including the

Army Guard's PA at the SHPO office. M. Drukker noted that the City's goal is to be proactive with the agency approval requirements at the airport because of the deadlines imposed by the grant funding process. E. Feighner noted that the reports generated from the EA project (2 historical area forms and the phase IA archaeological investigation) were a significant hurdle to overcome in the development of the PA. She suggested that the airport come up with a list of possible projects on the airport. M. Drukker said the Airport CIP lists these projects.

- M. Drukker noted that outside of the project in the EA work on Grant and Greeley Streets as well as an obstruction removal project were on going. M. Drukker noted that the Grant and Greeley Street properties had already been deemed as having no adverse effect and no archeological sensitivity. She noted that with respect to the obstruction removal project tree removals were usually specified as leaving the stumps so that the ground was not disturbed. E. Feighner suggested getting those areas tested so the stumps could be removed if needed.

- L. Wilson noted that the airport is a phenomenal educational resource to see where wildlife resource and the community can meet in one place.

- L. Black noted that the E. Hengen's project area forms were well done and are a great resource.

- J. Gorham asked if the follow up comments in NHDHR's 2/3/11 DOE Sheet from Christina St. Louis to NHDOT had been addressed by E. Hengen. E. Hengen said the last submittal of the project area forms had addressed the comments.

Presentation Materials:
- EA Projects - Preferred Alternatives (Plan)
- Page 2 and 3 of the Airport Project Area Form (Plans)

Hudson, X-A000(348), 14408
Participants: Gary Webster, Town of Hudson (gwebster@hudsonnh.gov); Bob Hudson, NHDOT; Jonathan Halle, Warren Street Architects; Peter Michaud, NHDHR

Discussing the depot, Peter Michaud gave Gary Webster a memo with clarification on the easement process. He indicated that the town needed his written approval before proceeding with work. P. Michaud needs 30 days to review submitted materials and provide a written response. The responses he provides at the Cultural Resources Meetings should be viewed as technical assistance. However, P. Michaud gave his approval for the vendor to do the test borings at the train station, and the town will receive an official letter from NHDHR. The boring will take place in approximately 3-4 weeks from now. The town can schedule the borings before receipt of the letter.

For the next scope of work, 100% of the interior/exterior design needs to be completed in order to finalize what can be done with the current monies the Town has set aside. The group will meet on April 12th at the depot to inspect the gutters, which are now under the temporary roofing, and also to look at the inside of the train station.

P. Michaud noted that the presence of lead paint does not necessarily mean that drastic measures are needed to remove it from the premises. The use of the building, for example as a visitor's center as opposed to a child care center, would dictate the level of lead paint mitigation. P. Michaud has approved in concept the three tab asphalt shingles, but the details of their type and application needs to be submitted.

It was agreed that Jonathan Halle from Warren Street would hire a building preservation specialist during design phase. This consultant can review the work in the design phase and define quite precisely how to approach the rehabilitation, the priority of work, and the material quantities as necessary under the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. He would address, for example, the manner in which the building would be moved, the extent of siding replacement, treatment of the windows, the identification of modern materials to be removed as opposed to the historic materials to remain and their treatment, and the treatment of hazardous materials. This consultant would develop the recommendations in the HSR in more detail. NHDHR has a qualified list of consultants that can be used and will send the list to J. Halle. Warren Street will be working closely with Peter Michaud on this effort. P. Michaud noted that while the depot has been mothballed for a period of about five years, some areas, which are not addressed in this phase of construction may require extended mothballing.

Robert Hudson from the NHDOT has funding for the entire engineering estimate of $105,059.00, approval from FHWA; the Town's share is 25%. Construction money is now $268,000 +/-. R. Hudson still has $50,000 for overages due to cost overruns. Joyce McKay indicated that LCHIP may be a source of funding, and the next round would typically start in June or July. The Historic Structures Report for the three buildings at Benson's was completed under a LCHIP grant. Peter Michaud suggested that Hudson might apply for a grant of $10,000 to the Moose Plate Grants to help complete some of the work.

J. Halle will be working closely with Peter Michaud on the design of the rehabilitation. The Phase I preliminary engineering work should be completed by next week. J. Halle will be working on the design and identifying contractors. The Town does not have Phase II of the contract signed yet, and are hoping to have it signed later in April. .

The Town now has directions for the next phase of the contract. It would be a huge cost saving measure if there was permission from the Town to use town forces. G. Webster needs to work with R. Hudson to determined FHWA's approval process for the use of town forces for the utility work.

Laconia, X-A000(884), 15691
Participants: Cathy Goodmen and Kirk Mudget, NHDOT

This project proposes to construct a one-lane roundabout at the intersection of US Route 3 and NH Route 11B in the City of Laconia. This intersection is on the east side of the stone arch bridge over the waterway at the Weirs.

This project has been presented previously on October 1, 2009, January 7, 2010 and May 6, 2010. Cathy Goodmen and Kirk Mudgett presented a proposed change to the alignment due to consultation with one of the abutters. The profile of the roundabout needs to be lowered to match

into the driveway of the Donna Jean restaurant on the west side of the roundabout. This lowering will require limited vertical impacts to the approach of the stone arch bridge. As noted in previous meetings, there is a closet or tunnel that was constructed in the bridge approach when the bridge was constructed in the 1930's. This closet provided access to a water well. The lowering of the roundabout will require impacts to the closet, including lowering the roof of the closet. The most efficient method of construction would be to take off the paving and the roof of the closet, fill the closet, and re-pave the approach at a lower profile. Joyce McKay, C. Goodmen and K. Mudgett visited the site to determine the status and age of the well and the type of construction of the inside of the closet and see if any part of the previous older bridge was evident. Photos of the results were presented. The well had been concreted over and buried in sand. The inside of the closet was finished with a concrete layer, and there was no evidence of the previous older bridge exposed. It was noted that the closet was not an engineering feature of the bridge

The only request was to keep the door in place as the hinges are of an older style. As such, it was determined that the work would have no adverse effect on the bridge, maintaining the same status as previously determined.

Lebanon, NH - Hartford, VT, A000(627), 14957
Participants: Joyce McKay and Christine Perron, NHDOT

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss Stipulation VI of the MOA (placing outreach materials on a website to promote the history of transportation over the Connecticut River). Joyce McKay explained that Rich Casella found an existing webpage on the Connecticut River Joint Commissions website (www.crjc.org) dedicated to NH-VT Connecticut River bridges, with descriptions provided by Jim Garvin. J. McKay suggested that Stipulation VI could be fulfilled by expanding on this existing information to provide more of a contextual understanding of the importance of Connecticut River bridges and the history of transportation on the river.

Several options were discussed pertaining to the most appropriate location for this material online. The DOT website may limit the quantity and type of information allowed. Linda Wilson said that NHDHR has a draft bridge website that could be developed as part of this effort. She further added that the state tourism office is getting more interested in cultural heritage and may be in interested in hosting a site, or at least linking to a site, on the Connecticut River bridges. Shelly Angers would be the contact person. Christine Perron suggested that the proposed information could be used to further develop the existing CRJC webpage. She suspected that the group would welcome this. C. Perron would provide J. McKay with contact information for CRJC and Shelly Angers. L. Wilson agreed to speak to Jim Garvin for his permission to use the bridge information that he wrote for CRJC.

C. Perron provided updates on two additional stipulations in the MOA. She had contacted the City of Lebanon in the fall regarding their interest in using the stones from the abutments and piers in the proposed park at Westboro. The idea had been enthusiastically welcomed, and the Department will continue to coordinate with the City to identify an appropriate location to stockpile the stones. NHDHR concurred that this would be an appropriate use of the stones. C. Perron also mentioned that the design of the replacement bridge would be discussed at an upcoming meeting, likely in April, as specified in Stipulation III of the MOA.

Manchester 15401 (no federal number)
Participants: Bruce Thomas, City of Manchester (bthomas@manchesternh.gov)

Bruce Thomas from the Manchester Highway Department met with the cultural resources committee to present the Goffs Falls Road project.

This is the third time B. Thomas has met with the committee for this project. At the first meeting held on January 6, 2011, B. Thomas noted that the Goffs Falls Road Bridge Replacement Project consists of replacing the steel beam, concrete deck bridge with a 14' x 14' concrete box culvert. The culvert would be installed on two 18" pipes and raised slightly. At the meeting, it was confirmed from a study done by Lisa Mausolf called the "Manchester-Lawrence Area Form - 2008-2009", that the trail is "not eligible" at this location.

The committee requested additional information regarding the bridge structure including:
• How many bridges of this type are there?
• Are there other bridges like it?
• Is the bridge technology unique?
• Is the bridge intact (in the same condition/configuration as it was initially constructed)?
• If not in the same condition/configuration, how has the configuration changed over the years?

At the second meeting held on February 3, 2011 with the committee B. Thomas responded with information from NHDOT bridge engineer David Powelson, who stated the following in correspondence to
B. Thomas:

"The bridge type is colloquially referred to as a 'regular bridge', in NHDOT terminology it is a IB-C (Steel I Beams with a concrete deck). There are 1138 bridges coded that way out of our 3806 bridge records. "

In response to these statements J. McKay, noted that she thought that the Division of Historical Resources was particularly interested in the IBC's with the metal trestle substructure.

D. Powelson responded again with the following comments:
"We have many bridges with Steel Piles supporting the substructure elements. We do not track them as a bridge type, our interest in the NH Bridge Type is limited to the identification of the Superstructure and Deck elements of a bridge. The Federal Highway Administration's National Bridge Inventory has no data about the substructure at all, other than the single digit, zero through nine-condition rating.
For highway bridges over waterways we show 426 *bridges with steel piles supporting at least one substructure. (This data was assembled specifically for resistance to scour caused by flowing water and the stability of the bridge in extreme events. We do not always have the data in this format for grade separation bridges. The Goffs Falls Bridge has visible piles; it is counted in the list.)*

For many bridges we *code an AASHTO CoRe (COmmonly REcognized) Element for steel columns and or piles. We show approximately* 54 *bridges that carry one of the following elements:*
• *201 Weathering Steel Column or Pile Extension.*
• *202 Painted Steel Column or Pile Extension.*
• 225 *Unpainted Steel Submerged Pile. "*

The committee had additional concerns that some of these 54 elements of the bridge trestle columns and assemblies may be of historic value and determined that further investigation is needed.

At the third meeting on March 10, 2011, Mr. Thomas provided information for each of the 56 bridges that have steel columns. He also showed that there were three types of columns as follows:
• 201 Weathering Steel Columns or Pile Extensions
• 202 Painted Steel Columns or Pile Extensions
• 225 Unpainted Steel Submerged Pile

Of these three types, the only type that applies to the Goffs Falls Road Bridge is 202 Painted Steel Columns or Pile Extensions. B. Thomas provided information that noted that there were 45 of these 202 columns with 36 of these (including the Goffs Falls Road Bridge) constructed before 1961 (over 50 years old). It was determined by consensus that this particular example is not eligible. With this information, the Committee was able to deem that "No Historic Properties are Affected".

Alton (no project number)
Side of the Road Excavation Permit
Participants: Roger Sample, Contractor

R. Sample had applied for a Side of the Road Excavation Permit from District 3 for work in the NHDOT right of way. District 3 requested that he review the work on the property at a Cultural Resources Meeting. The property is located along the south end of Lake Winnipesaukee, and he noted that the shoreline review by DES had been successfully completed. The project will occur in front of 71 Mount Major Highway in Gilford. It will involve the removal of a low 16” high concrete wall and excavation to the dwelling so that the owner can access the basement from the street. Given the purpose of the excavation, he could not rebuild the low concrete wall. The associated row of cottages appeared to be eligible for the National Register. If it were eligible, the project would have an adverse effect on the property. Given that the project had already received approval from DES, NHDHR requested photographs of the property so that R Sample could receive his NHDOT permit. [Subsequently, R. Sample set a front digital view of the property to J. Edelmann who placed it on appropriate paper, and it was transmitted to NHDHR.]

****Memos/MOA’s**: Alstead X-A000(425), 14540M; X-A000(473), 14541J, 14541J (update); Clarksville, X-A001(176),16183; Hudson-Windham, X-A000(950), 15790; Keene, X-A000(562), 14834

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

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