BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT
CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting
DATE OF CONFERENCES: March 4 and 11, 2010
LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building
ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT
Mike Dugas
Jill Edelmann
Jon Evans
Jon Hebert
Laurel Kenna
Larry Keniston
Marc Laurin
Brian Lombard
Don Lyford
Joyce McKay
Christine Perron
Peter Salo
David Scott
Matt Urban

Federal Highway Administration
Jamie Sikora

NHDHR
Edna Feighner
Jim Garvin
Beth Muzzey
Linda Wilson

CLD Engineers
Brian Pratt

CMA Engineers
Roch Larochelle

Dubois & King
Bob Durfee

HSI
John Vancor

City of Nashua
Leon Kenison

Nashua RPC
Tim Roache

VHB
Dayl Cohen
Frank O'Callaghan
Bruce Tasker
Pete Walker
Rita Walsh

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

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

March 4, 2010 2
Newington-Dover, 11238L 2
Westboro Rail Yard, Lebanon 2
Winchester, DPR-BRF-X-0111(005), 12906 3
New Ipswich, 14465, X-A000(403) 4
Old Town Road Bridge, Carroll 4
Alton 14239 (no federal number) 5
Temple 14937 (no federal number) 5
Gilford 15890 (no federal number) 6
March 11, 2010 6
Walpole Stone Arch Culvert 7
Westmoreland Stone Arch Culvert 8
Canaan 15942 (no federal number) 9
Walpole-Charlestown, X-A000(487), 14747 9
Winchester, DPR-BRF-X-0111(005), 12906 11
Berlin, X-A000(052), 12958B 13
Troy, X-A000(768, 769), 15537, 15337A 13
Durham, 15944 (no federal number) 14
Nashua, NRBD-5315(021), 10040A 15

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

March 4, 2010

Newington-Dover, 11238L
Participants: Pete Salo and Marc Laurin, NHDOT

Peter Salo briefly described the impacts of the contract, which is scheduled to advertise in May. Edna Feighner wanted to be assured that the detention areas had been surveyed or reviewed by IAC. Joyce McKay will check the submitted archeological reports and see if these areas were reviewed. P. Salo discussed the design changes that are necessary to connect the proposed sidewalk along Hilton Drive to Hilton Park West of the Turnpike. The original concept would have required a break in the guardrail, which is a safety issue. The sidewalk will now be placed under the proposed pedestrian access bridge to the General Sullivan Bridge, and will run to the south and tie into an existing trail by the gazebo. The slopes have been steepened to 3 to 1 to reduce the additional impacts, which will be minor and will avoid the gazebo. Also, a small berm will be constructed to avoid impacting an existing walnut tree located near the gazebo. E. Feighner asked that IAC review of this area be confirmed. J. McKay suggested a chain-linked fence be installed along the work limits to protect the gazebo during construction. P. Salo stated that this will be incorporated in the plans and J. McKay will review its location. P. Salo stated pedestrian access along Hilton Road from the west side to the east side of Hilton Park, under the existing bridges, will be restricted during construction. He noted that the driveway into Hilton Park East of the Turnpike has also been reconfigured. Marc Laurin questioned whether these minor design changes required any updates to the 4(f) documentation. Jamison Sikora stated that there were no concerns with 4(f) or Section 106 issues. E. Feighner reiterated that review of the archaeology already undertaken should be done to be sure that the additional minor impact area has been investigated by IAC.

Westboro Rail Yard, Lebanon
Participants: Joyce McKay, NHDOT

Linda Wilson and Edna Feighner reviewed the restrictions that were placed on the Laware parcel, although not the dwelling, as a condition of sale from the NHDOT to the dwelling's owners. NHDOT owns the property as part of the Westboro Rail Yard, and the house was previously deeded to the Laware family. L. Wilson explained that the dwelling and its associated property were eligible for the National Register of Historic Places as part of the Westboro Yard Historic District. Few if any other standing railroad bunkhouses have been identified in the state. The intent of the restrictions were: (1) to protect the setting of the eligible dwelling and (2) to protect archaeological deposits associated with the dwelling, given its history of use as a bunkhouse for railroad workers and possible use during the Civil War. Concerned about property development that would destroy these two values, the NHDHR continues to object to the sale of the property without these restrictions.

Littleton, X-A000(298), 14307

The adverse effects memo for the project was signed, so that Sally Gunn of VHB could complete the environmental document.

Winchester, DPR-BRF-X-0111(005), 12906
Participants: Mike Dugas, Jon Hebert, Loey Kenna, Donald Lyford, and Dave Scott, NHDOT

This project was previously seen in January 2010.

Jon Hebert presented the project. It was explained that the shoulders on the bridge would be widened, providing 12-ft lanes and 4-ft shoulders on the approach to the bridge and 12-ft lanes and 6-ft shoulders on the bridge. This was a design change decreasing the shoulder to lessen impacts and still provide a safe shoulder for pedestrians and bicyclists.

J. Hebert also reviewed the plans to construct the canoe launch/ river access parking lot where the current roadbed exists in order to lessen impacts to the archeological resources. The lot will be 1-ft above the original ground level and there will be some tree clearing required. Edna Feighner indicated that because there may still be some areas of sensitivity under or near the roadbed, an archaeologist may still be needed, and a backhoe may be used for testing. Don Lyford mentioned that since the roadbed would not be removed until construction of the new bridge is complete, that the testing must be conducted at the time the roadbed was removed. E. Feighner agreed but mentioned that the archaeologist should also check any topsoil that needs to be removed for prep work as well since the archaeological resources found were located close to the topsoil layer. Joyce McKay concurred and said they would conduct soil cores along the roadway, in addition to conducting the Phase 1B in the area of the new design for the entrance to the parking lot. Additionally, DHR requested a state historic marker at the parking lot to describe the significance of the bridge and its design engineer. Additional research would need to be done to provide test recognizing the engineer that would also be added to the documentation of the bridge.

J. McKay mentioned recycling the bridge girders as one of the previously mentioned mitigation options for replacing the bridge. After contacting DRED, they indicated that they would be able to re-use the recycled girders if the DOT could deliver them to a storage location. Laurel Kenna said that we could look into some nearby sand and/or gravel pits owned by the department for a storage area nearby, but the DOT would have to have the contractor relocate the beams to that location. David Scott brought up the concern that there should be an agreement made with DRED limiting the time that they have to reuse the beams. It was agreed that an MOU could be signed stated that DRED has a predetermined amount of time to use the beams before NHDOT can dispose of them and free up the storage location.

L. Wilson brought up another mitigation option documentation. J. McKay indicated that there was already good inventory information, and we can archive a copy of the plan and large format photographs to add to that information that was provided. This information plus some additional research related to the bridge designer would be used to create a NH Historic Property Documentation Form.

J. McKay also mentioned that previously NHDHR had stated that public outreach could be a mitigation option, in the form of a monograph of G.R. Whittam. L. Wilson mentioned conducting a bridge rail study to look at options, and what other states and AASHTO have done regarding crash worthy rail that can replace historic rail. She mentioned that the focus should be on collecting information on safety and compatible design when dealing with historic rail. A collection of resources may also be helpful.

J. Sikora asked if the project team could provide him with information from the draft study so he can notify the Advisory Council. L. Wilson also indicated that she would try to speak with Beth Muzzey by Monday. L. Kenna indicated we would like this to happen because we would like to try and have the memo signed at next weeks meeting on the 11th.

New Ipswich, 14465, X-A000(403)
Participants: Mike Dugas, Jon Hebert, Donald Lyford, Dave Scott and Matt Urban, NHDOT

New Ipswich 14465 was previously reviewed by SHPO in March of 2008, January of 2010 and February 11 of 2010.

NHDOT presented the subject project to the Cultural Resource Agencies showing latest set of plans. The latest updates to the plans include the known contributing and non-contributing historic structures within the limits of the New Ipswich Historic District. In addition, the NH DOT has established preliminary impacts in square footage to each of the contributing properties.

The NHDOT went through each contributing parcel one by one, showing where the anticipated impacts were and the associated square footage of impact as a result of the proposed work. The Department asked the SHPO if they thought these impacts would qualify for a no adverse effect memo. The Cultural Resource Agencies agreed the impacts to these properties were minimal and that there was an overall benefit to historic district and therefore would qualify as a no adverse effect. There is one contributing property that may have some significant impacts, and its continued eligibility will be investigated.

The NHDOT then discussed the impacts associated with the removal of the upper deck of the existing "High Bridge" structure. Removing the upper deck would require dismantling a portion of the previously disturbed top of the stone wall. This section of the wall would be restored in to its original condition after the deck removal. In addition, the Department is proposing to restore the integrity of the stone arch structure by addressing issues underwater at the footing of the bridge. Considering these impacts the Department asked SHPO if the project would still be eligible for a no adverse effect memo so long as the bridge survey concludes that the upper deck of the bridge is a non-contributing structure. SHPO agreed that these impacts were minimal and would benefit the overall goal of keeping the historic integrity of the district, and therefore would still be eligible for a no adverse effect memo.

Having determined the potential for a no adverse effect memo the NHDOT asked Jamie Sikora of FHWA if this would qualify as a deminimus 4f. J. Sikora stated that it would.

Old Town Road Bridge, Carroll
Participants: Joyce McKay, NHDOT

J. McKay presented Harold Garneau's proposal concerning the disposition of the low Warren Truss that was recently relocation to Route 3 in the Town of Carroll by the town. He indicated that a property owner in Bartlett expressed interest in relocating the bridge over a stream on his property. The new location is close to Route 3 so that it would be visible to the traveling public. L. Wilson stated that a

MOA would need to be signed and that the preservation stipulations could be placed in that document rather than in a covenant.

Alton 14239 (no federal number)
Participants: Bob Durfee, Dubois & King (rdurfee@dubois-king.com)

Bob Durfee provided an overview. The scope of the project is to replace an I-beam/concrete deck slab bridge built in 1930 with a new bridge structure. Places Mill Road Bridge over Sunset Lake Outlet (Br. No. 098/178) will be replaced with a precast concrete arch structure or a precast concrete deck structure. The current bridge is 20 feet long, but due to hydraulic requirements, the new bridge will be 36-38 feet long, and the roadway raised 1.5 to 1.75 feet to pass the 50-year flood event.

It was noted that a historic mill dam (Places Shingle Mill) is immediately upstream of the bridge. The stone dam was constructed around 1825 and has been abandoned and breached (spillway removed). Approximate 60 feet of the southern end of the dam is within the Town's Right–of-Way.

All work is proposed to occur within the existing Right-of-Way, with the exception of new roadway side slopes on the downstream side near the bridge that will extend beyond the ROW. Bridge replacement and roadway reconstruction (including new upstream roadway side slopes) will not impact the dam.

The Committee determined there were no historic properties affected as long as the drainage and roadwork was shifted away from the dam as much as possible. There were some archaeological concerns, but there were no concerns with the existing bridge.

The Committee required that all phases of necessary archaeology be performed to determine if underground features were within the impact area. Initially, a Phase IA assessment is requested for roadway and drainage impacts.

Linda Wilson signed a Memorandum of Effect, indicating that no historic properties are affected.

Temple 14937 (no federal number)
Participants: Bob Durfee, Dubois & King (rdurfee@dubois-king.com)

Bob Durfee provided an overview. The scope of the project is to replace two (2) I-beam/concrete deck slab bridges built in 1930 with new bridge structures. Putnam Road Bridge over Stony Brook (Br. No. 116/139) will be replaced with a precast concrete arch structure or a precast concrete deck structure. Bridge superstructure (deck) and substructure (stone abutments) will be removed. Putnam Road over Stony Brook Overflow (Bridge No. 117/138) will be replaced with a 36-inch diameter reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) culvert. Bridge superstructure (deck) will be removed, and the substructure (stone abutments) will be retained and buried. One-lane bridge structures are proposed for both bridge structures.

All work is proposed to occur within the existing 2-Rod Right-of-Way, with the exception of new bridge wing wall and new toe of roadway side slopes near the bridge that will extend beyond the ROW. .

The Committee determined there were no historic properties affected, and there were no archeological issues or concerns. There were no concerns with the existing bridge

The Committee requested that the stone for the abutments at Bridge No. 116/139 be salvaged and reused for culvert headwall construction at Bridge No. 117/138.

The Committee also required that photo documentation be completed for the substructure (stone abutments) on Bride No. 116/139 and for the superstructure and substructure on Bridge No. 117/138. Photo documentation will include color photographs of all aspects of the structures, photo log sketch plan or design map, a photographic description, and a CD containing digital format of all photographs. Documentation is to be submitted to the Temple Historical Society, NHDOT, and the NHDHR for filing/archiving.

The NHDHR representative signed a Memorandum of Effect.

Gilford 15890 (no federal number)
Participants: Bob Durfee, Dubois & King (rdurfee@dubois-king.com)

Bob Durfee provided an overview. The scope of the project is to repair and strengthen a concrete deck slab bridge on Belknap Mountain Road (Br. No. 184/098) to raise the live load capacity from 14 tons to over 20 tons (legal loads). The bridge was built 1907 and last repaired in 1994. Current repairs will include attaching Fiber Reinforced Polymer (FRP) sheets to the underside of the deck slab for strengthening, and to place riprap in front of the abutments to prevent scour. Existing timber bridge rails will be repaired where damaged.

All work is proposed to occur within the existing Right-of-Way.

The Committee determined there were no historic properties are affected. There were no archeological issues or concerns. There were no concerns with the existing bridge.

The NHDHR representative signed a Memorandum of Effect.

March 11, 2010

Walpole Stone Arch Culvert
Participants: Larry Keniston, Brian Lombard, and Christine Perron, NHDOT; Jim Garvin, NHDHR

Walpole Culvert at Houghton Brook (Mile Marker 105.32):

Current Conditions
The culvert is 19-foot by 19-foot stone arch culvert, which is 150 feet long. The culvert has developed a large hole toward the upstream side of the center of the culvert. The headwalls both upstream and down stream appear to be in excellent condition. With the exception of the hole in the culvert, the interior of the culvert appears to be in excellent condition. The hole, however, has already allowed an estimated 750 cubic yards of sandy fill material to enter the brook, leaving a crater 50 feet in diameter. The crater is very steep and therefore unstable meaning a continued flow of fill material into the stream is likely even if the hole in the culvert does not get worse.

The culvert has thus far successfully discharged the fill material that has fallen into it. Now, trees and root balls from far above have reached the culvert and are beginning to constrict the structure. If left unattended, the hole in the culvert would be subject to continuing collapse as trees pry additional stones loose during various flood cycles.

Since the area of collapse is closer to the culvert inlet and distant from the culvert outlet, this culvert is particularly unpredictable. Rather than just being washed out the outlet end, it is conceivable that material and stone debris falling into the culvert could create a catastrophic blockage as materials get firmly lodged in the middle of the culvert with no prospects of relief through an outlet close by. This could result in total culvert blockage, flooding upstream and a subsequent flood surge downstream.

Solution
Immediate action includes clearing of a large area around the damage. Excavation of the embankment should then be undertaken in order to stem the flow of earth into the culvert. Fill would be hauled to an adjacent gravel pit.

Subsequently as funds become available, the hole could be formed up from the inside, with the new surface access to the hole in the culvert used to patch the culvert with concrete from the outside. Inside the culvert, the toe wall may need to be reconstructed as necessary to stabilize the culvert on a more permanent basis. Subsequent to the repair of the hole, at least some of the fill could be restored to the surface in order to restore the embankment to the desired level.

E. Feighner indicated that there should not be any potential to impact archaeological resources. J. Garvin stated that in order to stabilize the soils above the hole, the fill would need to be removed. He expressed interest in looking at the site, and a meeting was set for March 24th. Larry Keniston indicated that Bridge Maintenance was ready to remove the fill to keep further debris from sliding into the hole.

Mitigation
Although the effect is adverse, the mitigation would be to repair the hole in the culvert and to return part or all of the overburden to the trail embankment. Should the actual situation and recommendations change

after the culvert is exposed, Jim Garvin and Linda Wilson will attend a field review for consultation prior to any change in the plan to repair the hole.

Until the fill is lowered, it was agreed that DRED Trails Bureau should run safety tape along the top of the embankment in the vicinity of the steep crater.

Westmoreland Stone Arch Culvert
Participants: Larry Keniston, Brian Lombard, and Christine Perron, NHDOT; Jim Garvin, NHDHR

Westmoreland Culvert at Mill Brook (Mile Marker 100.05):

Current Conditions
The current culvert is a 15-foot by 13.5-foot stone arch culvert, which is 180 feet long. The outlet headwall has collapsed. A hole in the culvert has developed about 40 feet upstream of the original outlet headwall location. Fill material, trees, and root balls are constricting the culvert opening. The existing headwall and hole are subject to continuing collapse. This is an unpredictable situation, which could possibly result in a culvert blockage, flooding upstream and a subsequent flood surge downstream. Since the damage is at the outlet end, it is possible that material subject to continued erosion might simply be washed downstream in a controlled fashion as head builds behind the material. This cycle of culvert and slope sloughing followed by small increases in head with material subsequently washed downstream under some control could be repeated for some time before any catastrophe occurs.

Solution
Immediate action includes the clearing of nearly an acre along the existing embankment lowering the fill about 20 feet at the culvert using a trail profile grade of 8% in order to return the trail to the existing grade. The excavation will take down the embankment from the outlet side of the existing steep slope. This will leave a lowered embankment centered horizontally about 30 feet upstream of the current embankment location. The slope at the outlet end will be laid back to a 2:1 slope. The work will remove about 25 additional linear feet of the culvert (10 linear feet is already at the brook bottom). The removal should go back beyond the existing hole to the point where an earlier repair project (2008) constructed a concrete floor in the culvert. This should stabilize the culvert at least temporarily by creating an angle of repose that will limit continued sloughing of the culvert and embankment slope.

As funds become available, a new concrete headwall can subsequently be constructed at the new outlet location.

In accordance with DHR request, geotextile will be placed below any fill (temporary or not) stored along the toe of the existing embankment slope. Any fill stored in the existing cut section need not include geotextile.

Mitigation
The mitigation is for the Department to field-review any potential damage to the four remaining large culverts along the line, excluding the Cheshire Branch Stone Arch over Branch River, which has already

been well documented. The field review will include qualified bridge or bridge maintenance personnel and participation, if feasible, by the Historical Society of Cheshire County with the intent that the Historical Society will perpetuate inspections into the future. It is especially unlikely that vigilant inspection of the Houghton Brook Culvert could have averted the current situation at Walpole. It is conceivable, however, that vigilant inspection of – along with early action to repair - the culvert at Westmoreland might have averted the current situation.

Canaan 15942 (no federal number)
Participants: Christine Perron, NHDOT

Christine Perron presented the project, which consists of rehabilitation of Bridge 178/141 on NH Route 118 Bridge over Indian River. The bridge is a 1950 I-Beam Bridge with a concrete deck (IBC). Work will include deck and approach rail replacement as well as structural steel repair. The bridge is 24' wide. In order to maintain one lane of traffic during construction, the bridge must be widened 2' downstream and 5' upstream to a width of 31' curb-to-curb. The abutments will be extended on the east side of the bridge and new wing walls will be constructed on the SE and SW corners. This is a state-funded Bridge Maintenance project that qualifies for coverage under the Army Corps programmatic permit.

The extent of disturbance beyond the area of existing roadway fill was not known at the time of the meeting. C. Perron will provide this information to Edna Feighner subsequent to the meeting, and Edna will review the RPR form and provide comments.

As a sixty-year-old structure, the bridge is potentially historic. Jim Garvin noted that the only unusual feature of the bridge is its degree of skew. He did not consider the bridge a pioneering example of its kind; however he noted that DHR did not have a full grasp on the full universe of IBC bridges in the state.

Linda Wilson suggested that a consensus determination of eligibility would avoid the DOE process for this bridge. J. Garvin and L. Wilson agreed to a consensus determination of eligibility.

J. Garvin stated that the project as proposed destroys the historic integrity of the bridge. He suggested that mitigation could consist of 1) providing DHR with copies of original plans and other documents on file for the bridge, and 2) documenting the bridge with large-format photography. If Bridge Maintenance cannot expend funds for large-format photography, then J. Garvin was agreeable to accepting 35mm black & white photography, which Joyce McKay could complete herself. C. Perron will follow up with Bridge Maintenance to determine a course of action.

Walpole-Charlestown, X-A000(487), 14747
Participants: Jonathan Evans and Don Lyford, NHDOT

This project involves the reconstruction of approximately 2.7 miles of NH Route 12 between Main Street in North Walpole and NH Route 12A in Charlestown. The preferred alternative involves shifting the

roadway to the east along the northern and southern segments and a slight shift to the west in the middle segment. This project will require the relocation of the existing New England Central Railroad line adjacent to the northern and southern segments.

Joyce McKay began by giving a brief overview of the project and an update on the cultural resource investigations. She indicated that the architectural surveys for parcels 4 (LenTex), 15 (Tacy, Drusendahl, Saladyga), 17 (Konesko-Gilbert) and 25 (Augustinowicz) would be completed this spring. She also noted that the phase 1B archaeology for the affected portions of archaeological sites 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 10 would also be completed this spring. The remaining archaeologically sensitive areas are not expected to be impacted as a result of the project. The results from each of these investigative efforts will be presented to NHDHR as soon as they are available.

Liz Hengen reviewed her preliminary findings for the four determinations of eligibility. Because of extensive changes, she will complete two front forms. She will complete a full form for the 1930s/1940s dwelling and outbuildings. Although they appear to have integrity, she didn't think the property rose to National Register eligibility as individual properties. Because of the innovative construction of the industrial building, Liz Hengen thought that its footprint might be eligible.

J. McKay indicated that it had already been determined that the New England Central Railroad is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places as an historic district. She indicated that this project included extensive public involvement through the Context Sensitive Solutions process and several public informational meetings and coordination with both the towns and local organizations. As a result the Department feels that there has been adequate public involvement to make an effect determination for the impacts to the railroad. She confirmed that the proposed impacts to the New England Central Railroad Historic District would result in an adverse effect to this resource. Linda Wilson agreed that the project would result in an adverse effect to the New England Central Railroad.

J. McKay indicated that although mitigation for the proposed impacts had been discussed briefly at several previous meetings, the Department would like to confirm the proposed mitigation plan for these impacts. She then highlighted the Department's mitigation proposal for the impacts to the New England Central Railroad. A NH Historic Property Documentation Form with large format photographs, more complete culvert descriptions, and the narrative history and significance statement in the existing determination of eligibility would be prepared for the affected portions of the railroad. This form will include large format photos. Upon completion of the project, the Department will provide and appropriately place a NH Historic Marker highlighting the importance of the railroad. Any remaining existing concrete mile-markers will be appropriately relocated to the east of their existing locations.

J. McKay and Jon Evans indicated that the proposed railroad relocation would require the removal of a granite block retaining wall adjacent to Parcel 25 (Augustinowicz). J. Evans noted that a concrete replacement wall has been proposed at this location and that the Department is looking into the possibility of facing the wall with the existing granite blocks. He noted that even if this were possible, the new wall will be larger than the existing one and therefore there are not enough blocks to face the entire wall. He indicated that the Department is still looking into other potential uses for the blocks within the project area. He indicated that the blocks would be reused for some purpose within the project area.

J. McKay indicated that public involvement in the project had not resulted in any additional potential mitigation opportunities. L. Wilson agreed that the mitigation proposal was appropriate and that no additional mitigation for the railroad impacts would be necessary.

J. Evans indicated that although the architectural forms for the four previously mentioned properties still need to be prepared, he anticipates that they will at the most result in a No Adverse Effect determination as all impacts to these properties are minor strip easements or acquisitions. He asked Jamie Sikora if a No Adverse Effect Determination were made for the impacts to these properties, if a *de minimis* Section 4(f) determination could be made for the impacts to these properties even though the property would have an Adverse Effect determination for impacts to the New England Central Railroad. J. Sikora indicated that multiple Section 4(f) determinations could be made for different resources within the same project and that doing so would be preferable, as it would likely simplify the Section 4(f) documentation.

Winchester, DPR-BRF-X-0111(005), 12906
Participants: Loey Kenna, Don Lyford and Dave Scott, NHDOT

This project was previously seen March 4, 2010.

During this meeting, the mitigation options for removing the bridge were addressed. Jaime Sikora of FHWA was provided with maps of the project area, and he requested that a Draft Document be sent shortly.

It was requested by the DOT that, due to the amount of money that would have to go into the mitigation option that recycles the steel girders, the DOT would want to provide the following mitigation items:

- Recycle the steel girders, relocating them and storing them until DRED is able to use them (MOU will be needed limiting the time they have to use the girders).
- Prepare text for a historic marker that can be placed near the parking area to be built that would potentially discuss early 20th Century transportation trends in relationship to the bridge and Whittam, the engineer who designed the bridge.
- Documentation of the bridge including large format photographs as a NH Historic Property Documentation Form.
- Conduct all necessary phases of archaeological investigation. (Not mitigation measure).

The first item, recycling the steel girders, was met with great support from both FHWA and DHR. DHR requested more information from Bridge Design regarding the overall cost of the relocation as opposed to demolition, keeping in mind the added cost to carefully remove the steel girders for reuse. David Scott indicated an estimated cost for bridge demolition is around $50,000.00, however he was not able to provide an estimate at this time for the careful removal and storage of the beams. The total cost would also include transporting the girders, which would also be dependent on where they would be stored. D. Scott will research the estimated cost and provide that information to the committee.

Locations for storing the girders were discussed. One option mentioned was storing them near the proposed reuse location, off DOT property. Another option would be storing the beams at a DOT pit site, again near the reuse site. Either option would most likely require coordination and a MOU between DOT and DRED to specify the length of time the girders would be stored before they must be used, and other details regarding the transport, storage and use of the girders.

J. Sikora of FHWA noted that the Department must still market the bridge before allowing DRED to reuse the beams. L. Wilson asked the definition of marketing, and inquires whether we could consider marketing to state agencies first sufficient. J. Sikora will look into this question.

Both the DOT and FHWA were reluctant to fund the historic bridge rail research and G.R. Whittum Monograph as part of the proposed mitigation package. The Department saw this as additional cost and time that was more than would be needed for mitigation, considering the cost of recycling the girders. However, J. Sikora suggested that if by chance the girders could not be reused, then a monograph on G.R. Whittum be prepared instead.

The other mitigation option mentioned above was developing and researching text for a historic marker that would be placed near the access parking area. DHR said they would like to see some information regarding 20th century transportation trends and patterns around the site of the bridge and some information on Whittum. They suggested possibly adding information regarding any nearby bridges that were also designed by Whittum. L. Wilson said she would look into a list that Jim Garvin had put together to see if she could locate other Whittum bridges in the area.

In addition, the aesthetic appeal of the rail was discussed. DHR indicated that they would like to see the new rail hold some of the historic value or feel of the old bridge. D. Scott indicated that there were some rails used in a Plymouth project, but they have not been crash tested. He indicated that he would look into this further and see if there were options that would meet safety standards and continue to maintain a scenic parkway feel. L. Wilson stated that it would be aesthetically pleasing if concrete rail could be used, and forms used on the exterior rails for the viewing enjoyment of people using the boat launch area.

J. McKay reiterated DOT's proposed mitigation package to DHR as follows:

1. Reuse of the girders, pending marketing efforts. If the bridge were not reused, then a Monograph would be considered
2. Documentation of the bridge, including large format photographs and copies of plans with completion of a NH Historic Property Documentation Form, using the existing information plus the data gathered for the marker.
3. A historic marker placed at the boat launch, discussing the topics previously stated by NHDHR. The text gained on research for Whittum would be added to the NH Historic Property Documentation Form.
4. Completion of all necessary phases of archaeological investigation.

DHR asked that cost estimates on the reuse of the girders and more information on the bridge rail be provided.

Note: D. Scott researched the removal and relocation of the beams, including storage, and the total amount needed to secure this action is approximately $100,000. Typically, it would cost $50,000 for simple removal. He also noted that he had failed to find crash-tested concrete railing options that fit this design situation.

Berlin, X-A000(052), 12958B
Participants: Marc Laurin and Don Lyford, NHDOT

B. Muzzey and L. Wilson reviewed the final version of the MOA. B. Muzzey stated that she appreciated all the effort that went into crafting the document. The document was signed by SHPO and NHDOT. The MOA was subsequently signed by FHWA and has been sent to the City of Berlin for their signature.

Troy, X-A000(768, 769), 15537, 15337A
Participants: Brian Pratt, CLD Engineers (brianp@cldengineers.com)

Brian Pratt of CLD Consulting Engineers presented the project on behalf of the Town of Troy. The project is a municipally managed SRTS funded project.

Project Overview:

The purpose of the project is to improve the safety for pedestrians in three areas of Town to provide safe access to schools and other Town facilities. The first area is the construction of 1,500 linear feet of sidewalk along the west side of South Street, from Route 12 to the Sand Dam Recreation Area. The second area is the construction of 300 linear feet of sidewalk along Mill Street, and the third area is the repair of existing sidewalks in Central Square. The majority of the project is located within the Troy Historic District, which ends halfway up South Street. Ideally the Town would prefer to use granite curbing with concrete sidewalks.

The following was discussed:

1. A question was raised about trees being relocated. It was noted that likely only 1 shrub would need to be relocated; most of the trees and shrubs were far enough back.
2. Catch Basin locations: there are 4 proposed catch basins on South Street; no others are proposed.
3. Fences: There are fences in front of 2 of the properties, which will likely need to be relocated. They noted that the specific fences did not appear historic.
4. They asked that we re-use the granite in the wall in construction of the new wall.
5. We discussed the small drainage easement that will be required in the existing wetland area.
6. They prefer granite curbing with concrete sidewalks as opposed to bituminous (or other materials) at least in the portions of the project within the Historic District.

NHDHR Determinations

1. They asked that B. Pratt contact Tonya Krajcic 271-3483 to see if an updated historic map is available and if the culvert is eligible for the National Historic Register. They also asked that we contact the Town Heritage Commission for information on the Historic District.
   - **Follow up Subsequent to the Meeting:** a meeting with Tonya is scheduled for Wednesday March 17th at 8:30 am to check the district boundaries.
2. Edna will check for archaeological sensitivity
   - **Follow up Subsequent to the Meeting:** The archeological Sensitivity came back negative (attached).
3. No Adverse Effect pending the Archeological Sensitivity Study

Jamie Sikora noted that there will be no 4(f) issues and to mark *de minimis* on the form due to the small drainage easements.

Durham, 15944 (no federal number)
Participants: Roch Larochelle, CMA Engineers (rlarochelle@cmaengineers.com)

This Municipally Managed project will involve the construction of an eastbound dedicated left-turn lane to Morgan Way with minor widening to the north along Route 4 (Piscataqua Road). The total length of the project is estimated at approximately 1,100 feet and is intended to provide necessary safety improvements at a known high accident location. This project need was identified as part of the Route 4 Corridor Study that was completed in 2000. Roch Larochelle, PE presented the project for preliminary scoping purposes using a USGS map of the subject area along with an enlarged color aerial plan, an enlarged widening concept plan that was developed by NHDOT for a preliminary neighborhood meeting, and several photos depicting the existing conditions and pertinent features of the site.

The Town has identified the Morgan Way intersection improvements as high priority to improve intersection safety. Safety issues result from poor intersection sight distance and intersection recognition at Morgan Way coupled with a high prevailing speed on Route 4.

The intended widening will begin just east of the inlet to the Oyster River (Bunker Creek) and will extend easterly approximately 1,100 feet. As contemplated, Route 4 will be widened by approximately 4-8 feet to the north while holding the southern pavement edge to achieve the left-turn lane to Morgan Way. Design controls include a house and driveway on the south side of Route 4 as well as cemetery adjacent to Route 4 just east of the intersection, and it is intended that all permanent improvements will be contained within the existing right-of-ways. Existing drainage consists of open ditches and several catch basins and cross culverts that will be modified and/or extended. It was noted that the cemetery has been previously disturbed by development and as long as no work encroaches further onto that site, no additional study would be required for this project.

Some discussion concerning the existing stone walls and it was noted that their relocation may be required. Any relocation will need to be in conformance with the DHR's stone wall policy. It was advised that ground survey should locate the extent of the existing stone walls as well as any other granite post markers that exist.

The group concluded that a modified Phase IA would be required (with hand auger tests) to identify any potentially significant resources within the widening area. It was also requested that the team conduct a file review for the Victorian structure on the north side of the highway (locally known as Map 11, Lot 23-2 – Eckhardt, 3 Williams Way). If no file exists on the structure, it is requested that an individual form be filed for the structure.

The project will be brought back to the group once a preliminary design has been developed and impacts are better defined.

March 17, 2010

Note: This meeting was held outside of the monthly Cultural Resources meeting.

Nashua, NRBD-5315(021), 10040A
Participants: Pete Walker (pwalker@vhb.com), Frank O'Callaghan, Dayl Cohen, Bruce Tasker, and Rita Walsh (rwalsh@vhb.com), VHB; Tim Roache, Nashua Planning Commission; Leon Kenison, City of Nashua Engineer; John Vancor, HSI; Jim Marshall, NHDOT

We met to review the effects of the BSP project on the properties (2 eligible and 1 listed historic districts) and 14 individual buildings or structures (most of which are contributing resources to historic districts).

Frank O'Callaghan reported that there have been no changes to Option 2 since the group last met in December 2009. Pete Walker reported that a draft of the environmental re-evaluation is complete, except for the cultural resources section and a chapter reserved for the 4(f) evaluation pending the outcome of this meeting. Jamie Sikora of FHWA has requested that the No Build, Option 1, Option 2, and the FEIS option (Alt.4 C Modified) alternatives be assessed in the Section 4(f) Evaluation. Joyce McKay noted that Chapter 2 needs to include existing conditions, not just the Section 4(f) resources. Jamie Sikora stated that the minimum 60-day DOI Section 4(f) review period has to be followed unless the DOI provides comments earlier.

The table below summarizes the comments, determinations of effects for all four options, and proposed mitigation and commitments.

Property/ Form	Determination of Effects	Comments	Proposed Mitigation	Commitments
Storehouse #2 (N. End) – NAS-NMC	**No Build** – No historic properties affected **FEIS Option** – no Adverse Effect**Option 1** – No Adverse Effect**Option 2** – Adverse Effect	Gate City Falls is owner – will they have a say in what new N. end will look like (windows vs. no windows, for example?);	(1) NH State Property Documentation (research and field work) that answers the questions on how the building evolved and when (built in 5 sections); other documentation prior to removal; (2) Design new exposed north end, based on what is found on interior/and/or historic documentation; review and	

		North end is very visible to traveling public	approval by NHDHR; (3) re-use elements of building in recreation of N. end, if appropriate	
Boiler House – NAS-NMC	**No Build** – No historic properties affected **FEIS Option** – Adverse Effect **Option 1** – Adverse Effect**Option 2** – Adverse Effect		(1) Smokestack will be retained and stabilized; rehabilitation and design to be reviewed and approved by NHDHR; (2) Complete HAER recordation work that was begun by L. Mausolf (with focus on engineering aspects of building, not architecture; (3) vibration monitoring	
Railroad Siding – Granite Wall (n. of Boiler House – NAS-NMC	**No Build** – No historic properties affected **FEIS Option** – Adverse Effect **Option 1**– Adverse Effect **Option 2** – Adverse Effect	3-sided wall is approx. 10 feet high and 30-50 feet long on south end; Buried fuel tank in vicinity may have an impact on being able to save certain wall segments; # of parking spaces left after the bridge is constructed may impact how much of wall can be kept	NH State Property Documentation (1) Measured drawing of wall using digital technology; Other documentation prior to removal (2) Re-use stones within complex; (3) Attempt to keep section of wall in place.	
Wastehouse – NAS-NMC	**No Build** – No historic properties affected **FEIS Option** – No historic properties affected **Option 1**– No historic	Payne-Geddes Moving Co. examined feasibility of moving the 40′ x 70′ structure (it is feasible - $400-$500K)	(1) City will consider move of building to NW part of complex and either retain (possibly as a museum) or sell to new owner; (2) Preservation easement will be put on building (if moved) to protect most important features; (3) NH State Property Documentation prior to building move	City commits to finding a new use for the structure at new location

	properties affected **Option 2 –** Adverse Effect			
Granite Retaining Wall at Nashua River – NAS-NMC	**No Build –** No historic properties affected **FEIS Option –** Adverse Effect **Option 1–** Adverse Effect **Option 2 –** Adverse Effect	Approx. 4′ taken from top for new bridge crossing; raising the bridge up to avoid wall may have more of a visual effect on district; Drilling pilings in vicinity may be an issue	NH State Property Documentation prior to removal of stone (1) Measured drawing of wall using digital technology; large format photos; (2) Explore re-use of stone elsewhere in complex; (3) Work with experienced mason to determine best way to cap wall after stone removal	
NIMCO Building –NAS-NMC	**No Build –** No historic properties affected **FEIS Option –** Adverse Effect **Option 1–** Adverse Effect **Option 2 –** No Adverse Effect			
Canal/Penstock – NAS-NMC	**No Build –** No historic properties affected **FEIS Option –** No Adverse Effect**Option 1–** Adverse Effect **Option 2 –** Adverse Effect	East end of canal filled in early 1970s; existing penstock estimated to date from that period	(1) Re-use stones here, if feasible or from granite walls elsewhere in complex; (2) Recreate the stone masonry techniques seen elsewhere in canal; (3) Documentation prior to removal	

Tunnels to Picker Building #6	**No Build –** No historic properties affected **FEIS Option –** Adverse Effect **Option 1–** Adverse Effect **Option 2 –** Adverse Effect	Retention pond proposed on west edge of Millyard in vicinity of these tunnels. These tunnels went from the Picker Building to the slope of the bluff. The hillside exit of these tunnels may have been filled in.	(1) Reuse stone/brick from these tunnels elsewhere in the complex	
Nashua Mfg. Co. H.D. – NAS-NMC	**No Build –** No historic properties affected **FEIS Option –** Adverse Effect **Option 1–** Adverse Effect **Option 2 –** Adverse Effect		(1) Complete NH State Property Documentation for previously affected buildings, including the already removed Picker Building #6; (2) Prepare millscape design principles document regarding landscaping, signage, hardscape, traffic signals, use historic photos for reference; NHDHR to review and approval; (3) submit final design plans on same to NHDHR for review and approval; (4) Submit updated documentation of NRHP district to NR office – use materials prepared for re-evaluation; (5) Vibration monitoring throughout the complex	
NAS0199/0209 Fairmont/Baldwin Street Bridges	**No Build –** No historic properties affected **FEIS Option –** No Adverse Effect to Baldwin St. Bridge, but		(1) NH State Property Documentation reports before removal (context of wood RR trestles in State?); (2) Market bridges for re-use to rail-trails/recreational groups; (3) management plan for remaining wood trestles in the state	

	Adverse Effect to Fairmount St. Bridge **Option 1–** Adverse Effect **Option 2 –** Adverse Effect			
NAS0192 12-14 Baldwin Street	**No Build –** No historic properties affected **FEIS Option –** No Adverse Effect **Option 1–** No Adverse Effect **Option 2 –** No Adverse Effect	Driveway slightly re-graded to meet new road grade		
32 Prescott Street	**No Build –** No historic properties affected **FEIS Option –** No Adverse Effect **Option 1–** No Adverse Effect **Option 2 –** No Adverse Effect	Driveway slightly re-graded to meet new road grade		
NAS-BSPS Baldwin/Prescott Street District	**No Build –** No historic properties affected **FEIS Option –** Adverse Effect **Option 1–** No Adverse Effect, pending design of new bridge **Option 2 –** No Adverse Effect, pending design of new bridge		(1) Prepare design guidelines document regarding landscaping/signage/hardscap e for entire project area, based on physical qualities and archival documentation (historic photos of area)	
NAS0114 40 Pine Street	**No Build –** No historic properties affected **FEIS Option –** No historic		(1) NH State Property Documentation before removal; (2)) pocket park and interpretive signage (double-sided marker) on lot of 40 Pine Street	

	properties affected **Option 1**–No historic properties affected **Option 2** – Adverse Effect			
NAS0132 85 Pine Street	**No Build** – No historic properties affected **FEIS Option** – Adverse Effect **Option 1**– Adverse Effect **Option 2** – No historic properties affected		(1) NH State Property Documentation before removal	
NAS0128 Moody Estabrook Factory 57 Palm Street	**No Build** – No historic properties affected **FEIS Option** – No Adverse Effect **Option 1**–No Adverse Effect **Option 2** – No Adverse Effect	Slight re-grading in parking lot on Palm Street side		
NAS-FV French Village District	**No Build** – No historic properties affected **FEIS Option** – Adverse Effect **Option 1**– Adverse Effect **Option 2** – Adverse Effect		(1) Prepare design guidelines document regarding landscaping/signage/hardscape for entire project area, based on physical qualities and archival documentation (historic photos of area); (2) pocket park and interpretive signage on lot of 40 Pine Street	

<u>Record of More Detailed Discussions</u>

N. End of Storehouse #2, Nashua Mfg. Co. Historic District

The building was built in 5 separate sections, but it is unknown how the building construction episodes actually evolved. No one has been inside the building to understand if sections were added, but retained the original exterior building walls intact, removed them, or substantially cut

into them for doorways, etc. The appearance of the north end of the building, after 175′ of the north end is removed, will be very visible to the traveling public. Its final appearance is an open question as it is not known if there were windows/doors or a blind brick wall in this area originally. DHR will be looking for a design that reflects the data gathered on the design of the original north wall through inspection and research that would be supplemented with information on the design of the overall building and others buildings in the district erected during the period of that section of the building. Research will need to be conducted to help answer this question, which may involve a field visit to tour the interior, search for historic photographs, other images, or plans. The north end's appearance may otherwise just need to be an agreed-upon appearance. Gate City Fence Co., the current owner, will likely need to be involved, depending on their needs for windows or doors, on this elevation.

Documentation of the building will need to occur before demolition. The level and type of documentation needs to be discussed with Mary Kate Ryan, State Survey Coordinator, NHDHR, but it will likely include large format photography and an exploration of the question as to when the various segments of the building were constructed. It was also suggested that materials be reused on the new north end, from the section being removed if appropriate or to reuse elsewhere for landscaping within the complex.

Boiler House, Nashua Mfg. Co. Historic District

The entire building is proposed for demolition under Option 2, although the brick smokestack will remain. The smokestack's current condition is unknown, but will be evaluated in the near future. Stabilization of the smokestack may be a mitigation measure. Vibration monitoring of buildings that will remain was suggested as a possibility; there is a combination of soils in the area. Documentation of the boiler house was begun previously by Lisa Mausolf, preservation consultant to FS& T, but the status of completion and question as to whether photographs were taken needs to be determined. It was acknowledged that the engineering significance of the building was more important than its architectural significance.

Granite Wall at Nashua River, Nashua Mfg. Co. Historic District

Approximately 4 feet off the top of this wall may need to be removed for the girders of a new bridge over the Nashua River. The design will attempt to keep the girders off of the wall as much as possible, but raising the bridge's height too much may have a visual impact on the entire complex and will definitely result in higher construction costs. The abutments will be placed beyond the wall, if possible, so that they will not impact the wall. FEIS option, Option 1 and Option 2 all have an adverse effect, although the FEIS option had a much wider bridge.

A question was raised about vibration in the area due to pile installation; it is unknown at this time what level of pile construction will be needed.

A question was raised about a distinctive capstone on top of the wall – no one can answer the question as it is difficult to get close to the wall. It was suggested that measurements of the wall for documentation purposes employ digital technology in order to produce measured drawings. It was also suggested that stones removed from the top part of the wall be re-used elsewhere within the complex, or at least the possibility explored. Another suggestion was to work with a mason experienced with old stone walls be consulted to determine the best way to cap the wall after the removal of the top portion.

Railroad Siding Granite Wall, N. of Boiler House, Nashua Mfg. Co. Historic District

This 3-sided, 10-foot high wall served as a retaining wall for a late 19th century railroad siding. In each of the options besides No Build, some portion of the wall will be removed. A large (4,000 gallon) fuel tank may be buried in the area, which may necessitate entire removal of the wall, however. Re-use of any stone elsewhere in the complex that needed to be removed and digital documentation of the wall prior to removal were recommended as mitigation measures. The level and type of documentation needs to be discussed with Mary Kate Ryan, State Survey Coordinator, NHDHR, but it will likely include large format photography.

Wastehouse, Nashua Mfg. Co. Historic District

The building is proposed for removal in Option 2, but moving the small brick structure (40 feet by 70 feet) elsewhere within the complex has been investigated. A feasibility study determined that the cost for moving to the north area of the complex would range from $400,000-$500,000, but its structural condition has not been fully investigated. It has been suggested previously that the building be leased or sold to a private entity or be converted to a museum for the display of historic artifacts from the complex, although the latter may be an expensive option for the City. It was suggested that a preservation easement be granted on the building in order to protect it in the future. The commitment to move the building and then find a new use was also suggested. Documentation of the building before its removal from its original location is required. The level and type of documentation needs to be discussed with Mary Kate Ryan, State Survey Coordinator, NHDHR, but it will likely include large format photography.

NIMCO building, Nashua Mfg. Co. Historic District

A portion of the building was proposed for demolition in the FEIS option and Option 1; Option 2 avoids the structure. The Mill No. 6 annex building to the south has already been removed. Documentation of the Mill No. 6 annex building, previously begun by Lisa Mausolf, preservation consultant to FS & T, will need to be completed.

Canal/Penstock, Nashua Mfg. Co. Historic District

The north end of the canal was re-built when a portion to the east was infilled for parking in the 1970s. The penstock at the canal's north end was re-built at this time. A small section of the parkway is extended over the north tip of the canal in Option 2, necessitating rebuilding of the wall. The rebuilding will reuse existing stone as much as possible. The question was raised as to whether the canal walls were mortared or not; the question could not be answered at the meeting. Wall reconstruction appearance would need to match whatever is there, with SHPO review beforehand of proposed materials and technique.

Documentation of the wall prior to removal is required. The level and type of documentation needs to be discussed with Mary Kate Ryan, State Survey Coordinator, NHDHR, but it will likely include large format photography.

Tunnels leading from Picker Building #6

Two tunnels which led from the Picker Building #6 to th slope of the bluff may be impacted by a proposed retention pond on the west side of the Millyard. It is unknown if the hillside exits of these tunnels have been filled in or not. The tunnels may need to be documented in some manner

(NH State Property Documentation reports) and their materials reused within the complex where appropriate.

Nashua Mfg. Co. Historic District

The impacts to the individual buildings listed above that are within this historic district were recounted. Buildings are being removed, a new bridge and new type of roadway are being added, and the area will see increased traffic. In addition to these individual impacts, it was pointed out that 50,000- square foot stormwater treatment/retention basin (dry basin with stone walls) will be located at the west end of the complex, near the Nashua River. There are brick tunnels in this area, but it is unknown what they lead to. Screening of the basin or placing it so that it is not visible was suggested for mitigation.

It was acknowledged that Option 2 design represents a minimization of earlier plans, seen in the way buildings were avoided. Minimization and mitigation to knit the district together again might include landscaping for the parkway; a nomination amount is anticipated, but more could be added. It was suggested that landscaping be based on what was there historically. If historically there was only minimal landscaping, then it would be inappropriate to overly landscape the area. It was suggested that good photographs of the complex in the 1940s be used to research its earlier landscaped appearance; otherwise, a study of similar mill complexes in the state may lend some ideas about what was typical.

Design guidelines for landscaping were suggested as the starting point for the final design. If new curbing is installed, it was suggested that old granite stones be used so that the edges are not too crisp. Both the guidelines and the final design would be reviewed by NHDHR. Although vertical curbing is desired as a bumper on streets, it was suggested that more sloped curbing could be used in parking lots within the complex.

The new bridge design and its materials are unknown at this time, and it may have one pier in the river, but hydraulic analyses need to be conducted to determine. If concrete girders are chosen over steel, it was suggested that the concrete be a different color (or take cues from the remaining stone walls) than concrete building sections within the district and that the new concrete not be textured. The railing might approximate railings on the Cotton Transfer Bridge within the complex; but a simple vertical railing is best.

It was further suggested that the landscaping guidelines and plans include signage, lighting, traffic signals, and hardscape that would result in a millscape design principles for certain features. The package could be distributed to owners within the complex for their use, as well as for the parkway design within the complex. The City's Planning Department would need to be on board. These materials could be placed in the library and be available on-line as well. Links to NHDHR, City of Nashua, and Nashua Historical Society's websites could also be explored as a way to distribute the materials.

Completion of the previously-commenced HAER documentation for 4 buildings by Lisa Mausolf needs to be finished in some manner, but needs to be examined for its state of completion and to determine how it can be most useful.

The National Register nomination of the complex, which dates to 1987 and is outdated, might be updated and submitted to the National Register office in Washington DC, since so much new information about the integrity of buildings and structures in the complex was compiled in the re-

evaluation form. The information in the re-evaluation form would need to be re-formatted to conform to NRHP registration-nomination format, however.

Baldwin Street Overhead RR Bridge/Fairmount Street Overhead RR Bridge

Both bridges are proposed for replacement under Option 2. These bridges are part of a small number (15) of wood railroad trestles in the state, as of 2000 NHDOT database. Avoidance of these bridges would inevitably result in impacts elsewhere, however. The question was raised if the wood elements of these bridges could be re-used elsewhere; the pressure treatment of the wood is considered hazardous materials and may not likely be able to be salvaged. The bridges will be marketed for a two week period, as agreed to by NHDHR and the NH Division of FHWA; a longer period of marketing was discussed. The marketing effort should employ on-line advertising rather than printed materials (EBay?). A number of groups (trails, recreational, etc) may be interested in the bridges for pedestrian crossings. Temporary storage of the bridges was suggested – possibly at the Fimbel Door property (city-owned) at the north end of the project area.

Documentation of the bridges prior to removal is required. The level and type of documentation needs to be discussed with Mary Kate Ryan, State Survey Coordinator, NHDHR, but it will likely include large format photography. A context of wood railroad trestles in NH/possible preservation/management plan was suggested as a mitigation measure.

12-14 Baldwin Street, Baldwin Street/Prescott Street Historic District

The house is a contributing element of the historic district, but is not individually eligible. The only effect is slight re-grading of the driveway in Options 1 and 2, so there will be no adverse effect.

32 Prescott Street, Baldwin Street/Prescott Street Historic District

The house is a contributing element of the historic district, but is not individually eligible. The only effect is slight re-grading of the driveway in Options 1 and 2, so there will be no adverse effect.

Baldwin Street/Prescott Street Historic District

Design plans for Option 1 and 2 were revised to avoid the removal of 12-14 Baldwin Street, but some grade and ROW changes will need to occur north of this house. Re-grading will be done to the driveways of both 12-14 Baldwin Street and to 32 Prescott Street, and some approach work for the new bridge (taking the place of the Baldwin St. Overhead RR Bridge) are anticipated, but no buildings will be taken within the historic district. The design of the new concrete bridge is unknown, but it will be 4 to 5 feet higher than the existing bridge. The appearance of the railing of the new bridge is unknown, but a common type is preferred so that if it is damaged, it can easily be replaced. The railing design is determined in final design.

It was suggested that the bridge railing design be included in a design principles package that is project-wide (i.e. for use in the bridge over the Nashua River next to the Nashua Mfg. Co. complex).

Pending the design of the new bridge, it was considered that Option 1 and 2 would have no adverse effect to the Baldwin Street/Prescott Street Historic District.

40 Pine Street, French Village Historic District

This building, a contributing element of the French Village Historic District, but not an individually eligible structure, is proposed for demolition in Option 2. The intersection of Central and Pine Streets, where the building stands, is being widened and the SE corner that currently holds 40 Pine Street will be smoothed out. The width of Pine Street will remain the same. Avoiding 40 Pine Street would require going north into the public housing development on the north side of Central and Pine Streets. The intersection design was made as tight as possible to avoid taking any more property.

The disposition of the lot that holds 40 Pine Street will likely result in a small, pocket park. It was suggested that a two-sided interpretive panel (state historic marker) be installed on the lot, which could discuss the neighborhood's history on one side and perhaps the story of the Labine Building (on the SW corner of the intersection) be on the other. This sign would need to be paid for by the project as the property is not on a state road.

Documentation of the building will need to occur before demolition. The level and type of documentation needs to be discussed with Mary Kate Ryan, State Survey Coordinator, NHDHR, but it will likely include large format photography.

85 Pine Street, French Village Historic District

The house, a contributing element of the French Village Historic District, but not an individually eligible structure, is proposed for demolition in FEIS option and Option 1. Documentation of the house would be required before removal, if either of these options were to go forward.

Moody, Estabrook Shoe Factory, 57 Palm Street, French Village Historic District

A small area in the SE corner of this complex's parking lot will be re-graded along Palm Street in Options 1 and 2. It was asked if any kind of granite wall was located there that might be affected; it was affirmed that no wall is located in that area. There will be no adverse effect to this property as a result.

French Village Historic District

The area was originally determined not eligible in the 1980s, but that decision has been re-evaluated and the area is now determined NRHP eligible. In addition to the removal of 40 Pine Street in Option 2 and the removal of 85 Pine Street in Option 1 and the FEIS option, there will be some changes to the intersection of Palm and W. Hollis Street and Pine and W. Hollis Street. Work within Palm and Pine Streets will be within the ROW, with lane width possibly being reduced. The FEIS option, Option 1 and Option 2 will all have adverse effects on the historic district.

It was suggested that the design principles package (landscaping, signage, hardscape, traffic signals) discussed for Nashua Mfg. Co. H.D. be extended to address project design in French Village H.D. The park space and interpretive panel on the 40 Pine Street parcel was suggested as

mitigation for the district as well. Although a NHDOT marker cannot be used here (not on a state road), a cooperative marker could be installed.

28 Fairmount Street

This c. 1905 house, proposed for demolition under FEIS option, Option 1, and Option 2, is considered potentially eligible as part of a district by NHDHR, but a determination of the district's eligibility and boundaries has not yet been completed. NHDHR is reviewing additional materials in order to determine if a modified historic district area form for the area needs to be completed first.[1]

Next Steps:

- Meeting with Mary Kate Ryan of NHDHR to determine specific levels and type of documentation for properties that are adversely affected.

- A project-wide effects memo needs to be prepared, as well as draft determination of effects forms (yellow sheets) for each property. The yellow sheets will be an appendix to the Section 4(f) re-evaluation document.

****Memos/MOA's**: Littleton 14307 (memo); Merrimack 14413 (memo); Milton 15905 (memo); Woodstock 15885 (memo); Milford 14837 (memo); Concord 15902 (memo); Manchester-Hooksett 14604; New Castle 15916 (memo); Alton 14239 (memo); Gilford 15890 (memo); Temple 14937 (memo); Berlin 12958B (MOA)

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

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

[1] NHDHR determined that information that discusses 28 Fairmount Street's association to the potential district, both architecturally and historically, to supplement the individual inventory form would be sufficient for this review.