

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting

DATE OF CONFERENCES: April 1 and 8, 2010

LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building

ATTENDED BY:

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| NHDOT | Christine Perron | Town of Henniker | Town of |
| John Butler | Mark Richardson | Leon Parker | Peterborough |
| Mike Dugas | David Scott | Peter Flynn | Rodney Bartlett |
| Jill Edelmann | Matt Urban | | |
| Darrel Elliott | Alex Vogt | Historic Doc. Co. | Peterborough |
| Jon Evans | | Rich Casella | Historical Com. |
| Cathy Goodmen | Federal Highway | | Mose Olenik |
| Bob Hudson | Administration | HTA | Duffy Monahon |
| Tom Jameson | Jamie Sikora | Todd Clark | Richard Estes |
| Ernie Jeffrey | | Sean James | Debby Kaiser |
| Steve Johnson | NHDHR | Matt Low | |
| Wendy Johnson | Edna Feighner | | Preservation |
| Laurel Kenna | Jim Garvin | Town of Hudson | Company |
| Jim Kirouac | Peter Michaud | Bernie Manor | Lynne Monroe |
| Don Lyford | Beth Muzzey | Gary Webster | |
| Jim Marshall | Linda Wilson | | Preservation |
| Nancy Mayville | | Town of New | Consultant |
| Joyce McKay | CHA | London | Liz Hengen |
| Kevin Nyhan | Robert Faulkner | Richard Lee | |
| Don Patten | | Jessie Levine | |

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

PROJECTS/PRESENTATIONS REVIEWED THIS MONTH:

(minutes on subsequent pages)

| | |
|--|----|
| <i>April 1, 2010</i> | 2 |
| Peterborough 14933 (no federal number); 14772A, X-A000(535): | 2 |
| Winchester-Swanzey, DPR-BRF-X-0111(005), 12906..... | 4 |
| New London, X-A000(764/765), 15534, 15534A..... | 5 |
| Dixville-Millsfield, X-A000(810), 15605 | 6 |
| Concord, BRF-X-5099(021), 12004..... | 7 |
| Sanbornton-Tilton, (no project number)..... | 8 |
| <i>April 8, 2010</i> | 9 |
| Sanbornton SP-5794 | 9 |
| Harts Location, 15315 (no federal number)..... | 9 |
| Milton, 99036Z (bridge maintenance) | 9 |
| Plaistow, X-A000(849), 15654..... | 9 |
| Bath, X-A000(901), 14439 | 10 |
| Derry (no federal or state number) | 11 |
| Henniker, 15718 (no federal number)..... | 11 |
| Walpole-Charlestown, X-A000(487), 14747..... | 13 |
| Alton, X-A001(051), 14121D..... | 14 |

| | |
|----------------------------------|----|
| Alton, 14121A..... | 14 |
| Hudson, 14408, X-A000(348) | 14 |

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

April 1, 2010

Peterborough 14933 (no federal number); 14772A, X-A000(535):

Participants: Matt Low (Mlow@hoyletanner.com), Todd Clark, HTA; Lynne Monroe, Preservation Co.; Rodney Bartlett, Town of Peterborough (rbartlett@townofpeterborough.us); Mose Olenik, Duffy Monahan, Richard Estes and Debby Kaiser, Peterborough Historical Commission (Consulting Party), and Jim Marshall, NHDOT

M. Low provided an overview of the process, which has been undertaken to date and concepts that have been developed for discussion. The Town of Peterborough retained Hoyle, Tanner in the fall of 2009 to develop two (2) separate but related projects. The projects are as follows: rehabilitation or replacement of the Main Street Bridge and reconstruction of the US 202/Main Street Intersection and US 202 stone retaining wall.

Hoyle, Tanner provided 11” x 17” color concept plans to all attendees. The concept plans included intersection reconstruction concepts as well as landscape/hardscape concepts. M. Low explained that these same concepts have been presented to the Town as a part of a local Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) project development process over the last several months. The concepts were intended to be discussion starters and are not intended to appear finalized. The Town has not established a preference with regard to the disposition of the bridge, intersection or retaining wall at this point.

Hoyle, Tanner provided the Request for Review form to Ms. Muzzey to initiate the Section 106 process. M. Low explained that the bridge was constructed in 1940 by the New Hampshire Department of Public Works. The engineer’s name was not known at the meeting but would be available on the original design drawings. In October/November 2009, Hoyle, Tanner initiated a concrete testing program consisting of extraction and testing of six (6) cores in the top slab of the bridge. The cores revealed an arrested Alkali-Silica Reactivity (ASR) condition as well as elevated levels of chloride in the order of three (3) to five (5) times normally acceptable levels. Where concrete was found to be intact, the concrete strength was reasonable at 3,000 psi to 4,000 psi. At the downstream curb line, approximately 8” to 10” of powered concrete overlaid the intact concrete.

The existing bridge was designed for an H 15 live load vehicle. Hoyle, Tanner performed a structural capacity rating and determined the bridge could carry approximately an H 11 loading at the Inventory Level when considering the bridge to be in pristine condition. This information combined with the fact that the bridge is so severely deteriorated prompted a recommendation to down post the bridge to “Weight Limit 15 Tons”. The Town down posted the bridge recently. Hoyle, Tanner composed a report entitled “Existing Bridge Conditions Summary & Recommendations” and submitted it to the Town and NHDOT on December 22, 2009. The Town and NHDOT concurred with the findings in the report.

For presentation to the Town, Hoyle, Tanner developed bridge replacement concepts including replacing the existing bridge with a new rigid frame bridge and reusing the existing stone for facing. Other options included more conventional steel and concrete beam bridges with architectural precast panels. Each of these alternatives is significantly more expensive than the \$825k programmed by NHDOT for rehabilitating the existing bridge.

The group discussed the possibility of rehabilitating the existing bridge and what its HS load capacity could be. M. Low explained that due to profile limitations and the fact that the structure capacity is controlled by the top knee reinforcement, strengthening is not likely. A rehabilitated structure would likely have a posting of 15 tons and a life expectancy of another 20 years. A 15-ton posting would not address the Town's functional needs for emergency vehicles. To receive state and federal funding a new bridge would need an HS 25 capacity, a rehabilitated bridge would require a 15-ton capacity.

M. Low discussed Roadway Concepts 1 and 2. Concept 1 is a concept, which closely emulates the existing condition with a safety improvement. The safety improvement is the addition of shoulders and the straightening of the "kink" to the south of the intersection to eliminate off-tracking of large vehicles onto the westerly sidewalk. Concept 2 is an irregularly shaped roundabout developed to improve intersection flows and level of service.

M. Low commented that the existing intersection functions at lower than a Level of Service (LOS) F. Concept 1 will not improve the LOS. Concept 2 would improve the LOS to a C in the current year and to LOS D in the design year, or 2030.

The group discussed traffic control during construction. Hoyle, Tanner presented phased construction and a temporary bridge as options to the Town. Each option has drawbacks. A temporary bridge will require temporary filling of the Contoocook River on the upstream side of the existing bridge. Phased construction will require over widening of the bridge by 10'-6" minimum, to facilitate two (2) lanes of traffic in Phase 1 and Phase 2. Each option includes a temporary pedestrian bridge on the downstream side of the existing bridge.

D. Monahan distributed a handout entitled "Cultural and Historic Identity Economic Advantage". She explained that the Peterborough Heritage Commission is extremely interested and concerned with the project and its effect on Peterborough. Comments with regard to the area included the frequent artistic renderings of the area, including the Samuel Smith House, the Unitarian Church, and the bridge. The Heritage Commission is not in favor of Roadway Concept 2, the roundabout, due to the changes it would have on the character of the intersection. The roundabout would affect the Samuel Smith House by pushing the roadway closer to the house, perhaps 5 to 10 feet from the corner. D. Monahan is also not in favor of the widened bridge, a cantilevered sidewalk or a sidewalk on the east side of US 202.

E. Muzzey thanked everybody for the valuable conversation and content provided. The conversation turned to what historical and archaeological investigations may be needed to evaluate the impacts of any selected concepts.

It was agreed that the following tasks must be performed by Hoyle, Tanner's historic resource consultant, Preservation Company, prior to making judgments:

- Individual Inventory Form for the bridge.
- Individual Inventory Form for the retaining wall.
- Individual Inventory Form for the Samuel Smith House.
- Modified Historic District Area Form, defining the boundaries of the area, and singling out the buildings directly affected by the design plans, including the Transcript Dam.

E. Feighner was not present at the meeting. Hoyle, Tanner will need to contact her next week to determine what archaeological investigations should be performed.

Winchester-Swanzey, DPR-BRF-X-0111(005), 12906

Participants: Don Lyford, Dave Scott, Loey Kenna

This project was previously seen in March 2010.

Discussions regarding the signing of the effects memo started the meeting.

Joyce McKay indicated that all the necessary steps for conducting the archeological study would be completed prior to work occurring on site. There had already been a Phase IA study conducted in the area and additional studies would be completed. She also indicated that the DOT planned on installing a fence to prevent any excavation or work occurring in the area of the identified site. Everyone present was satisfied with this.

The next item on the effects memo discussed was in regards to recycling the I-Beams as mitigation. After discussing the matter with DRED, Dave Scott found that they want to use portions of beams utilizing the end spans and would remove the middle sections creating a simple span that would preserve the features of the beams, but not necessarily all the engineering characteristics. DRED indicated that they really only need 30 Feet of beam, and would utilize the 40 feet from the end spans. Thus, they would utilize more of the beam than they actually need. Beth Muzzey indicated that she felt reusing the beam in this way would be more of a green perspective rather than historic, and asked if there would be any value in marketing the bridge and seeing if anyone would like to use it in its entirety. Jamie Sikora of FHWA stated that if they were not going to retain any of the historic value, NHDOT should market the beams prior to committing their transfer to DRED. DRED should be held responsible for transporting the beams. Don Lyford responded to J. Sikora by indicating the transport could be covered as part of the demolition cost anyway. J. McKay brought the conversation back to mitigation and whether this type of action would count towards mitigation, or not. B. Muzzey responded that it would not be an ideal situation but would be better than nothing, and could count towards mitigation if no other options were available.

As discussed, the only other option would be to advertise the bridge in attempts to have someone utilize the entire structure. However, this option from previous attempts at advertising bridges seemed to be unlikely, and B. Muzzey asked that wording be added into the Effect Memo regarding DRED utilizing the portions of the bridge as mitigation.

B. Muzzey also asked that at some point DRED, DHR and DOT should meet to discuss the use of these beams and the specific locations where they will be used. All agreed that a meeting will be set up in the future to discuss these details further, and asked J. Sikora how much detail

FHWA needed before agreeing to allow this as mitigation. J. Sikora indicated that they did not need to know exactly where these beams would be used, and the general descriptions provided would be sufficient for now.

Linda Wilson also indicated that she appreciated the efforts of DOT in reusing these beams and hopes that we will receive some recognition in way of green credits.

The Effect Memo was signed on April 8, 2010 after rewording several items on the memo.

New London, X-A000(764/765), 15534, 15534A

Participants: Robert Faulkner (rfaulkner@chacompanies.com), CHA; Jessie Levine and Richard Lee, Town of New London

Robert Faulkner presented the preliminary plan for the Safe Routes to Schools (SRTS) sidewalk to be constructed on the west side of Pleasant Street in New London from Cougar Court to Job Seamans Acres. It was explained that the current layout is a 12' travel lane and 4' gravel shoulder on which children currently walk to and from school. This layout will be changed to an 11' travel lane and 5' sidewalk (granite or bituminous curb), so the sidewalk footprint will be over the existing gravel path.

R. Faulkner reported that the archaeological review, completed by Victoria Bunker Inc. on 1/19/2010, found nothing within the limits of the proposed sidewalk. There is one historic property within the project limits, the Job Seamans parsonage. However, this project will not impact the property. There was a sewer main installed in west shoulder area of Pleasant Street in the mid 1990s, so the area has been previously disturbed. The sidewalk installation will be above grade and only very limited excavation will be required.

R. Faulkner said that the right-of-way extends beyond the footprint of the sidewalk. There will be some ancillary slope work to establish the appropriate grade, with some right-of-way impacts. However, at the parsonage there will be no slope impacts because the property slopes towards the road. The Town will seek temporary easements for those areas where the project boundaries exceed the right-of-way, and will avoid Section 4(f) altogether.

Joyce McKay asked about the project photos, and R. Faulkner explained that each photo in the archaeological report relate to a point on the plan. R. Faulkner made one correction in the report: that the slope impacts are 25' away from the Job Seamans parsonage, not 50' as indicated in the draft report (a revised report was submitted at the meeting with the correction noted).

Jamie Sikora asked if the project would impact the stone wall, and R. Faulkner said that it would not as the stone wall is outside of the right-of-way.

Elizabeth Muzzey asked about drainage. R. Faulkner explained that currently water sheet-flows off the existing pavement. There is closed drainage on the east side of the road that ultimately discharges on the west side via a cross culvert at the low point of the road. The proposed curbing and sidewalk will require that catch basins be added along the new sidewalk curb. At the time of this meeting, the meeting date with Natural Resource Agencies had not set, but it is now set for April 21, 2010. CHA and the Town will be talking to them about the discharge of

water and whether any water quality treatment will be required. If treatment is required, R. Faulkner is hoping for a simple drainage swale within the right-of-way, which would minimize impacts to wetlands and ROW. The need to meet current water quality treatment requirements would cause significant impacts in these areas.

J. McKay asked if this area had been examined in the archaeological report, R. Faulkner confirmed that they had, as referenced on page 3 of the report.

B. Muzzey explained to the group that the NHDHR staff archaeologist, Edna Feighner (271-3483) could not be present and asked R. Faulkner to be in touch with her to make sure she has reviewed the report, including the catch basin and swale locations.

Linda Wilson said that she has no concerns with aboveground resources because most of the corridor has modern homes with the exception of the Job Seamans building, which will not be impacted.

B. Muzzey concluded that if there are no archaeological concerns, that Effect Memo can be signed, "No historic properties affected." J. McKay asked that R. Faulkner email her to receive a copy of the Effect Memo, and noted that he will have to fill out the memo, remembering to check the "No" 4(f) box.

Dixville-Millsfield, X-A000(810), 15605

Participants: Wendy Johnson, Loey Kenna, and David Scott, NHDOT

This has not been previously seen at Cultural Resource Meetings.

Wendy Johnson briefly presented the project. She stated that the project begins approximately 2.1 miles north of the Dixville-Millsfield town line, and continues south 3.1 miles from the town line. It includes pavement rehabilitation/reclaim of approximately 5.2 miles of roadway. This project will also include some culvert extensions, and improvements associated with the roadway, such as raising the roadway 8-12-inches in some locations along the stretch of the project. This will extend out the roadway slope in these areas. All work shall remain within the NH DOT Right-of-Way. She also explained that there would be three (3) bridges that would be having work completed and indicated that Dave Scott would go into detail on the bridgework.

D. Scott described the associated bridge rehabilitation and guardrail replacement. The northernmost bridge is located in Dixville and carries NH Route 26 over Home Brew Brook. This bridge (#224/113) is a slab on mass abutments. The structure was built circa 1960. The second bridge (#236/122) is also in Dixville and carries NH 26 over Clear Stream. This bridge is a slab on mass abutments and was built circa 1949. The southernmost bridge (#106/174) is located in Millsfield and carries NH 26 over West Branch Clear Stream. This bridge is a concrete rigid frame structure and was built circa 1953. All bridges will require some deck work.

There were no concerns voiced with regard to any historic structures. However, it was mentioned that E. Feighner was not present to speak about any archaeological impacts the project may have in this area. Beth asked that the appropriate RPR form be filed so that E.

Feighner would be able to respond after reviewing it, and could e-mail us if there were any questions. If there are no issues, then a no historic properties affected memo can be prepared.

Concord, BRF-X-5099(021), 12004

Participants: John Butler, Cathy Goodmen, and Mark Richardson NHDOT

This project is the replacement/rehabilitation of the one-lane High Pratt Truss bridge over the Merrimack River on Sewell's Falls Road. This meeting was a follow up to previous meetings to determine effects of the removal of the stone pier and abutments and the WPA floodway approach spans on the west side of the river.

Cathy Goodmen introduced this project review since the City of Concord would like to bring this project to a public hearing this summer, which will require the environmental document to be completed in draft form. This will also require that impacts to cultural resources be determined. The city officials are very supportive of this plan to rehabilitate the existing lane and add a new bridge with one lane. C. Goodmen noted that currently the weight limit prevents emergency vehicles from using this bridge. Mark Richardson stated that we want to go forward with this proposal to finalize the effects memo and determine details of mitigation as the project proceeds.

Discussion included the following. C. Goodmen noted that the existing plan calls for work west of the RR tracks on the west side of the river, but the work will probably end before the tracks, minimizing impacts to the LCIP land on the north side of Sewell's Falls Road. Archaeological testing of this area is currently being conducted, and a report will be available in the next month or so.

Planned rehabilitation to the existing bridge includes the following. The metal grid travel-way will be removed and solid asphalt will be placed on the rehabilitated truss lane. M. Richardson added that the new sidewalk would be cantilevered on the side of the existing truss bridge. John Butler noted that the sidewalk will be five feet wide and there will be bike shoulders on both bridges. He added that there are plans for more industrial development in this area, making this construction/rehabilitation a timely project.

M. Richardson noted that the elevated viaduct constructed by the WPA after the 1936 or 1938 flood is not hydraulically needed any longer and will be removed. The new approach will be asphalt on fill, and a box culvert will be installed under the roadway to allow pedestrian travel between both sides of the road. Jim Garvin noted that there are new flood controls in place upstream and that is why the viaduct is not necessary. He also noted that he is unsure how the 1930's flooding and viaduct construction may have changed the bridge that we see today and that the existing granite foundation might be on top of an earlier circa 1874 foundation. He stated that the current plan seems to be the best approach to save the high trusses. M. Richardson also stated that the existing foundation is not stable and has had many repairs due to scouring. This prompted the design of a new pier and abutments. To save the truss system, a new substructure needs to be constructed.

B. Muzzey asked that we look at the Stratford-Maidstone project to see how that changed the historic appearance of the area. She also asked if there can be any re-use of the granite from the pier and abutments and if the city had any thoughts for their reuse in the city. Jim Garvin stated

that the city might have ideas of how the stone could be used, including an interpretive use about the bridge or other subject. M. Richardson noted that we would ask about the granite at the public meeting.

B. Muzzy asked if there are any aesthetic concerns for the people that use the trail and if we have any consulting parties. M. Richardson noted that we would include that in the public meeting.

M. Richardson noted that we still need to address the question concerning whether a lane will be left open during construction, or if the bridge will be closed the entire time of construction.

J. McKay added that the approach is considered an eligible part of the bridge. Mitigation would include documentation of the approaches as well as the bridge.

B. Muzzey noted that this would be an Adverse Effect due to the loss of the stonework pier and abutment and the 1938 extension. In the effect memo, we can note that some portions are adverse, but the overall project is beneficial to the preservation of the eligible High Pratt Trusses. She also noted that we still need to look at the railings, the sidewalk and the smaller details and have continued 106 review as the design is finalized.

J. McKay will put together a memo noting mitigation as: rehabilitating the trusses; work with the City about the re-use of stone; final design of landscaping with NHDHR and the City of Concord; documentation of the bridge with additional details about the involvement of the WPA; and coordination of continued consultation with reviewing parties.

Sanbornton-Tilton, (no project number)

Participants: Matt Urban, NHDOT

Matt Urban presented the subject project to the Cultural Resource Agency. The project is located on NH Route 132, just North of the US 3/NH Route 11 intersection in the Town of Tilton and ends approximately 4.8 miles north at the intersection of NH Route 127 in the Town of Sanbornton. The project as proposed consists of pavement rehabilitation in addition to the replacement of 3 culverts and the dredging of the existing ditches and in some areas installing underdrain below the ditch. M. Urban informed the Cultural Resource Agency that a portion of this stretch of road does go through a posted Historic District in the Town of Sanbornton. However, due to the extent of the proposed work, Linda Wilson and Beth Muzzey were not concerned about having an effect on the surrounding properties. As such, they agreed a “no adverse effect” memo contingent on Edna Feighner’s review and approval of the ditching since she was absent. This would clear the project of any archaeological sensitivity. The draft memo states that no mature trees will be cut and there will be no disturbance of any stonewalls. Matt will follow up with E. Feighner before a memo is provided.

April 8, 2010

Sanbornton SP-5794

Participants: Darrel Elliott

NHDOT is looking to sell a surplus land property that is located between exits 20 and 22 on I-93 off the southbound side of the interstate. E. Feighner asked that D. Elliott fill out the RPR form, and be sure to include a USGS map for review.

It was determined that a decision would be withheld until J. McKay, E. Feighner and D. Elliott conducted a field review of the parcel to determine if there is any historical and/or archaeological sensitivity on the parcel. J. McKay indicated that she would schedule a time sometime in Late April.

Harts Location, 15315 (no federal number)

Participants: Matt Urban

Matt Urban presented the subject project, located on NH Route 132 in the Town of Harts Location. The project as proposed consists of bank stabilization, minor drainage improvements, and guardrail replacement. M. Urban explained that this project had previously been permitted for only 150' of bank stabilization. However, due to lack of District resources the project returned to Highway Design without being stabilized. After further review, Highway Design determined that it would be best to stabilize 300' of embankment along the Saco River. The Committee members expressed no above ground or archaeological concerns. As such, they signed off on the "No Historic Properties Affected" on the RPR form.

Milton, 99036Z (bridge maintenance)

Participants: Matt Urban

@

Matt Urban presented the subject project, located on Old NH Route 16B in the Town of Milton. The project as proposed consists of placing grout bags underneath the undermined bridge footings. Riprap will be placed in front of the structure where scour holes have developed. The Cultural Resources Agencies felt that the bridge did not appear to be historic; it appeared to be a prefabricated concrete form. However, Edna Feighner was uncertain of the archaeology and asked that some additional photos be sent to her via email. Subsequent to the meeting, photos were sent to E. Feighner, and it was determined that there was no archaeological issues to be concerned with, and the project was clear to proceed. As such a "No Historic Properties Affected" memo will be issued for this project.

Plaistow, X-A000(849), 15654

Participants: Jill Edelman and Joyce McKay, NHDOT

This project was previously reviewed in February 2010, at which time the committee asked for more information about the culvert, specifically more pictures and information about the surrounding area. Additional pictures were presented, and Joyce McKay described the

surrounding area. J. McKay described the pipe lined culvert inlet and outlet, showing that both sides had been altered when the pipe was installed. Also, the outlet end had likely seen flood damage, as the southern wing wall had been repaired with rubble construction. J. McKay also stated that the area has been walked over, and there were no foundation or mill site remains. Edna Feighner stated that there were no archaeological concerns with the area. Linda Wilson agreed with the statement in the Multiple Property Documentation Form for the Stone Highway Culverts in New Hampshire, which stated that impacts similar to the ones described above resulted in an ineligible resource. With the addition of the pipe, "the integrity of design has been fully compromised and therefore this culvert would not qualify as a National Register eligible stone culvert." J. McKay stated that she would draft a No Historic Properties Affected memo.

Bath, X-A000(901), 14439

Participants: Sean James, HTA (sjames@hoyletanner.com) and Rich Casella

Rich Casella from Historic Documentation Company and Sean James from Hoyle, Tanner presented the preliminary outline of the Historic Structures Report (HSR) being prepared for the Bath Village Covered Bridge. The goal of the meeting is to ensure that all parties agree on the contents of the HSR prior to it being finalized. R. Casella presented an outline for the HSR with representative samples from each section.

Jim Garvin from NHDHR commented on Section 3 (Historical & Descriptive Information) that it should take a fresh look at the history of the bridge. The uniqueness of the truss, new versus older/original material, and a discussion of what we are looking at should be included. The description and significance should be updated. J. Garvin also noted that the wainscoting on the interior of the bridge was not present after the last rehabilitation but that the Town has added it back. The wainscoting should be evaluated to determine if it does more harm than good.

S. James discussed the structural analysis of the bridge. A general discussion of the analysis of the bridge and behavior will be included in the main body of the HSR. Spreadsheets with load and capacity information will be included in Appendices. It was requested that a narrative be included in the appendices describing the information presented in layman's terms.

The splicing of truss members was discussed in some detail. NHDHR generally recommends splicing wherever possible to retain as much original fabric of the bridge as possible. This has to be balanced with the condition of the bridge and structural needs. For this project, the Town prefers that truss members be replaced in full rather than splicing for a longer service life

The draft HSR was well received and comments provided at this meeting will be incorporated into the review copy. The HSR will be finalized by the end of April 2010 and presented to the NHDOT, Town and Committee for review. A detailed schedule for the remainder of the project was provided to the Committee.

S. James noted that there are two consulting parties for this project; the Bath Historical Society and the National Society for the Preservation of Covered Bridges (NSPCB). During the research for the HSR a letter from the NSPCB was discovered that Hoyle, Tanner considered openly hostile and extremely unprofessional towards their firm. The NSPCB was provided with the project engineering study and preliminary plans nearly one year ago and has not provided any

comments or response. Due to the nature of the NSPCB letter and lack of response for the project, S. James made a request to Jamie Sikora of FHWA that the NSPCB be removed as a consulting party from the project. J. Sikora was provided a copy of the letter and noted that he will review it and Hoyle, Tanner's request.

Derry (no federal or state number)

Participants: Sean James, HTA (sjames@hoyletanner.com)

The Drew Road culvert crossing over Drew Brook is located in the Town of Derry, approximately 1.0 mile southwest of the intersection of Drew Road and N.H. Route 121 near the Derry/Hampstead town line. The existing culvert is a galvanized steel corrugated metal pipe (CMP) arch. The pipe has dimensions of 5'-11" rise by 7'-11" span with a length of 39'-11" and dry-laid stone headwalls. The culvert inlet displays obvious deformation, apparently from some sort of forceful impact. Downstream the culvert invert exhibits severe corrosion with multiple perforations indicating that the structural integrity of the pipe is compromised.

This area experiences frequent flooding during periods of heavy rainfall, in part because the existing CMP inlet greatly restricts the hydraulic capacity at the stream crossing. Dwellings situated in the northeast quadrant along the upstream marsh are threatened by encroaching floodwaters when the culvert backs up. Furthermore, the roadway was recently overtopped, which led to erosion of the roadway shoulder and required repair. An abutting dwelling in the southeast quadrant may also be flooded when the roadway overtops.

There are three (3) homes visible from the culvert and the culvert abuts the Weber Memorial Forest. There is also a stone structure located directly upstream of the culvert that will not be affected by the project. It is anticipated that no easements will be required to complete the culvert replacement.

The Town of Derry is investigating replacing the existing culvert with a new box culvert with an approximate 20' span. New guardrail will likely be installed and the existing horizontal and vertical roadway alignments maintained. It is anticipated that the NH Municipal Bridge Aid Program will provide partial funding.

The project was presented to determine if any additional cultural, historical or archaeological investigations would be required. Based on the information presented today, the Committee members did not believe any additional investigations would be required. A No Historic Properties Affected memo can be signed.

Henniker, 15718 (no federal number)

Participants: Matt Low (mlow@hoyletanner.com)

M. Low introduced the attendees and introduced them to the project. Hoyle, Tanner was retained in the late summer of 2009 to evaluate the rehabilitation and replacement options available for the Western Avenue truss bridge. The bridge is a two-span 300' long High Pratt Truss bridge over the Contoocook River. It was constructed in 1933 in Henniker but the trusses were moved from a structure in Pembroke constructed in 1915. John Storrs is noted as being the

designer of the Pembroke Truss. A new floor system was installed at the Henniker site with the relocated trusses.

Environmental elements lead to deterioration of the structure. A repair project occurred in 1987. Hoyle, Tanner under contract with the NHDOT, prepared a design, which included replacement of a few stringers, welded floor beam repairs, replacement of the deck and painting.

In 2008, the NHDOT performed a routine inspection and noted the condition of the bottom chord gusset plates. A rating was performed which determined the live load capacity of the bridge was HS0.0. NHDOT wrote a letter of Critical Deficiency to the Town recommending closure of the bridge. The bridge was closed in the summer of 2009 and has remained closed since then.

A week long, Hoyle, Tanner in October 2009, performed hands-on inspection. Each member and connection was inspected and its condition documented. The condition of the bridge was worse than Hoyle, Tanner personnel had previously envisioned. The entire bottom chord and all or nearly all the gusset plate connections are in a severely deteriorated condition. A common condition is holes of sizable diameter (1" to 5"). Pack rust is exhibited at the connections to the verticals and diagonals at the bottom chord connections. Hoyle, Tanner's preliminary assessment is that a significant number of verticals and diagonals would need to be replaced to achieve a loading capacity desired by the Town. M. Low commented that the overall capacity of the bridge is governed by the connection of the floor beam to the bottom chord. The capacity, in pristine condition, is HS17.2. This capacity could be increased by using high-strength bolts when replacing the rivets. The bottom chord connection was the next controlling rating at HS21.8. Again, this capacity could be increased by the use of high-strength bolts.

M. Low explained that replacement investigations to date have been limited to potential alignments and locations for a new bridge. Four (4) roadway concepts were presented. Concepts 1 through 3 essentially replace the bridge in proximity to the existing bridge but attempt to create a more functional intersection on the south side of the river. The reason for the development of an improved intersection was to provide the Town with a connection to Patterson Hill Road in the future when the Patterson Hill Road Bridge needs rehabilitation. The Patterson Hill Road Bridge was rehabilitated approximately ten (10) years ago. J. Garvin was familiar with the details of that project.

The Town may have approached the Patterson Hill Road project differently had they know the condition and impending closures of the Western Avenue Bridge. The Town has stated that they need a bridge in the Patterson Hill Bridge location due to the steep slope of Patterson Hill Road approaching from the south. Trucks cannot stop when coming down the steep hill. This fact led to the development of Concept 4. Concept 4 calls for removing the Patterson Hill Road Bridge from service and placing it on Town owned land at the northwest quadrant and building a two-lane modern bridge in its place.

The Western Avenue Bridge could be rehabilitated for pedestrians or just left in place and barricaded. Concept 4 allows for preservation of both truss bridges and solves the Town's transportation needs with one new structure. Concept 4 would also be a reduced project cost. Rehabilitation or replacement of the Western Avenue Bridge would likely cost \$3 million to \$4 million dollars. A new bridge in the Patterson Hill location may be half the cost.

J. Garvin commented on the lack of maintenance as the catalyst for the advanced deterioration of the bridge. He also commented that if many diagonals and verticals needed to be replaced, along with the bottom chords, there is not much preservation left. M. Low commented that a task left to do was to quantify the extent of member replacement necessary for rehabilitation.

L. Wilson recommended a mini Project Area Form be prepared by Hoyle, Tanner's existing consultant, Preservation Company, being sure to list the resource at each corner of the bridge and provide an overview of the area. E. Feighner recommended a Phase 1A archeological assessment be performed on all areas of impact by IAC, Hoyle, Tanner's archaeological resources sub-consultant.

P. Flynn concluded the meeting by stating the Town of Henniker has been very proactive at preserving its historical bridges. All attendees agreed.

Walpole-Charlestown, X-A000(487), 14747

Participants: Jon Evans and Don Lyford and Liz Hengen, Preservation Consultant

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.

Liz Hengen reviewed her preliminary eligibility findings for parcels 4 (LenTex), 15 (Tacy, Drusendahl, Saladyga), 17 (Konesko-Gilbert) and 25 (Augustinowicz). She indicated that extensive modification of the original structures on parcels 15 and 25 would indicate that they are not eligible for the National Register. She suggested that since these would not qualify for National Register eligibility, a form front would only be necessary for both properties/structures. Linda Wilson agreed that form fronts would only be necessary for both properties to determine eligibility.

L. Hengen noted that Parcel 17 included a dwelling constructed in 1942, a silo foundation, a rebuilt barn, and several 1940's-1950s outbuildings, and a 1960s ice cream stand. The farm retained integrity and therefore suggested a full individual inventory form be prepared for this structure. L. Wilson agreed.

L. Hengen indicated that the industrial structure on Parcel 4 had been extensively altered on the exterior however the original structure was still relatively intact within the building. She suggested that the property as a whole would not be eligible for the National Register, but that the footprint of the old building could potentially be eligible. She suggested doing a full individual inventory form for this structure. L. Wilson agreed.

It was agreed that it was unlikely that any of the above noted structures/properties would be eligible for listing on the National Register but that an effect memo could not be signed until a formal Determination of Eligibility is made on the forms and form fronts noted above.

Alton, X-A001(051), 14121D

Participants: Kevin Nyhan and Mike Dugas, NHDOT

Mike Dugas discussed this project, which involves upgrades to the intersection of Stockbridge Corner Road and NH Route 28 in Alton. The Project Area Form completed for the Barnstead-Alton project identified this intersection as having several potentially historic properties, including parcels 137A, 139, and the “triangle,” which resulted when the intersection was altered in 1930 to its current configuration. It was agreed at the meeting that it would be sufficient for the Department to complete several individual survey forms for the potentially historic properties at the intersection. Impacts would be determined at a later date, and the need for further archaeological survey would depend on the placement of drainage structures. By providing NHDHR with the RPR form, the Section 106 process began.

Alton, 14121A

Participants: Kevin Nyhan and Jim Kirouac, NHDOT

Kevin Nyhan and Jim Kirouac discussed this project and updated the SHPO on additional tree cutting, which may be necessary in the cemetery along NH Route 11. Pole relocations being completed by the utility company are necessitated due to the construction of this project. This work would require that small trees be cut just on the other side of the cemetery wall. Edna indicated that the trees should be cut and not stumped and that an archaeologist must be on site during the tree cutting and pole relocation work pursuant to State RSA 227C: 8. J. Kirouac indicated that the utility company already received permission from the cemetery trustees to do the work. If the utility work were to be done in advance of the project, the utility company would be responsible for the archaeological monitoring. Ernie Jeffrey and Don Patten would indicate this to the utility company. If the utility work were to be done at the same time that the contractor is doing the roadway work, the archaeologist hired by the contractor could oversee the utility work in the cemetery. It was noted that a qualified archaeologist would also monitor the sidewalk and fill removal prior to the construction of the new sidewalk.

Hudson, 14408, X-A000(348)

Participants: Gary Webster, Town of Hudson; Bernie Manor, Benson’s Park Committee; Peter Michaud, NHDHR; Nancy Mayville, NHDOT

Representatives from the Town and the Benson’s Park Committee came before the committee members to present their plans to move the depot within the park. Because DOT and DHR hold covenants on the structure, the plan needs to be reviewed to make sure they comply with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards. The proposed plan is to move the depot from behind the Office/Kitchen building, to the area of the former location of Benson’s House. The town has conducted two test pits, between 6’ and 8’ in depth, in the area of the proposed Depot location, only finding sand fill and limited rubble. E. Feighner indicated that an archaeologist be present during construction to monitor the digging. If intact remains are located, then they would need to be documented.

The Town also has plans to renovate the Depot into a visitor’s center, hopefully providing restroom facilities to the Park. B. Muzzey asked that plans be presented to the DHR, and that a

qualified architect/preservation consultant be hired for the project. J. McKay will provide the Town with a list of qualified consultants.

L. Wilson also asked if the RFQ would be available for DHR to review. Nancy Mayville stated that Transportation Planning was currently looking at the RFQ, once their remarks have been addressed, it can be passed around to the other agencies.

The Town asked about the Secretary of the Interior's Standards concerning the foundation material. J. McKay noted that it would need to comply with the Standards unless the foundation will not be seen. The Town stated that there would be a wooden walkway surrounding the depot, which will hide the foundation material. P. Michaud stated that if the walkway conceals the foundation, a poured concrete would be the most economical choice, and would comply with the Standards. P. Michaud stated that he would create a package of easement related information that he can give to the town.

The site visit to the Depot was confirmed for April 20th, in attendance will be J. McKay, J. Edelman and Bob Hudson from DOT, and P. Michaud from DHR.

B. Muzzey reminded that Town to coordinate with the DHR.

****Memos/MOA's:**

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

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