

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT CONFERENCE REPORT

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

DATE OF CONFERENCES: April 14, 2011

LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building

ATTENDED BY:

<p>NHDOT John Butler Jill Edelmann Jon Evans Steve Liakos Joyce McKay Joe Patusky Christine Perron David Scott Alex Vogt C.R. Willeke</p>	<p>Federal Highway Administration Jamie Sikora</p> <p>NHDHR Laura Black Edna Feighner Linda Wilson</p> <p>Albacore Park Ken Herrick</p>	<p>Town of Enfield Bob Cusick John W. Kluge Rep. Paul Mirski Steve Schneider</p> <p>Enfield Heritage Commission Meredith Smith</p> <p>Enfield Police Department Richard Crate</p>	<p>FRNT Alex Bernhard</p> <p>HEB Engineers Chris Fournier</p> <p>KV Partners Ray Korber</p> <p>Quantum CC Lisa Martin Jennifer Reczek</p>
<p>VTrans Scott Newman</p>	<p>Office of Congressman Bass Christopher Collins</p>		

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

PROJECTS/PRESENTATIONS REVIEWED THIS MONTH:

(minutes on subsequent pages)

April 14, 2011	1
Enfield, X-A000(087), 12967B	1
Lebanon, NH - Hartford, VT, A000(627), 14957	4
Claremont, X-A000(418), 14494	5
Moultonborough, X-A000(932), 15710	5
Lebanon, X-A000(235), 13558A	5
Bethlehem 14228 (no federal number).....	6
Merrimack 15839 (no federal number)	6
Antrim 14941 (no federal numbers).....	6
Antrim 14940 (no federal numbers).....	7
Portsmouth-Kittery, A000(911), 13678F	7

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

April 14, 2011

Enfield, X-A000(087), 12967B

Participants: John Butler, Jonathan Evans and Alex Vogt, NHDOT; Alex Bernhard, Friends of the Northern Rail Trail; Richard Crate, Enfield Police Department; Rep. Paul Mirski, Bob Cusick, Steve Schneider, and John W. Kluge, Town of Enfield; Meredith Smith, Enfield Heritage Commission; Christopher Collins, Office of Congressman Bass

Alex Vogt began the meeting by giving a brief overview of the project. This project involves alterations to Main Street and/or the Northern Rail Trail in the area of the existing rail trail overpass in Enfield, NH. He indicated that the Department has developed multiple alternatives, which were presented at a public informational meeting held on March 14, 2011. He indicated that at the March informational meeting and a meeting with the Selectman on April 11, 2011, officials from the Town of Enfield as well as many local residents have expressed support for Alternative 2. A. Vogt indicated that the Department wants to support what the Town wants.

John summarized the alternatives that have been developed to date:

No Build

Main Street would continue to pass underneath the existing rail-trail bridge as it does today. The emergency access road could either remain in place or be removed after the new bridge over Mascoma Lake is open to traffic.

Alternative 1

Construct a grade separated crossing with a new bridge carrying the rail-trail over Main Street. This alternative has not received support, therefore was not reviewed in detail. It had been reviewed at previous meetings with the following description: Main Street would be relocated slightly to the east. The rail-trail would be raised by approximately 8 feet to achieve appropriate vertical clearance over Main Street. Short 5% grades would be required on the rail-trail approaches to the bridge. A sidewalk would be constructed along Main Street to connect the existing sidewalk north of Sargent Street to the proposed sidewalk that will be constructed on the new bridge over Mascoma Lake. This sidewalk connection would be part of the proposed layout with any of the alternatives. This alternative impacts the rail-trail bridge and profile, and has a small impact on the former motel property.

Alternative 2

Construct an at-grade Main Street/rail-trail crossing by raising Main Street slightly and lowering the rail-trail. The rail-trail would be lowered by approximately 9 feet with 4% or 5% grades leading down to Main Street and short landing areas at the bottom. Main Street would be realigned similar to Alternative 1. Lowering the rail-trail may impact an underground fiber optic cable that runs along the rail corridor. This alternative impacts the rail-trail bridge and profile, and has a small impact on the former motel property.

Alternative 3

Upgrade the existing emergency access road to become a permanent relocation of Main Street. The south end of the access road would be realigned to become free-flowing rather than a 90 degree turn, the profile would be flattened near the rail trail crossing (currently about 8%), and the entire roadway would need to be widened. A "T" intersection would remain near the north end of the project. This alternative would not impact the rail-trail profile or bridge, but would impact the entire former motel property.

Alternative 4

Relocate Main Street opposite Sargent Street, forming a 4-leg intersection, which would operate as either a 3-way or 4-way stop. The rail-trail would need to be lowered by approximately 3 feet to match the elevation of Main Street. The rail-trail profile would be modified with a 1% grade on the north side of Main Street and a short 5% grade on the south side. The existing bridge would not be impacted. Approximately two thirds of the former motel property would be impacted.

Alternative 5

Relocate Main Street with short reversing curves (minimum radii for a 30 mph design speed), keeping it as a free-flow roadway similar to Alternative 2. Main Street would be raised to match the elevation of the rail-trail. A design concern with this alternative is that the position of the crest in Main Street relative to the horizontal curves could make it difficult for drivers to see the horizontal curves after traveling over the crest. This alternative would not impact the rail-trail profile or bridge, but would impact approximately two thirds of the former motel property.

Multiple town officials and residents present at the meeting expressed support for alternative 2 as it promotes preservation of the old motel property and its potential recreational opportunities, and would open up views of the lake by removing some of the railroad embankment. The motel site has been used the past three years for recreational access to the lake for non-motorized boats, and in the winter by ice fishermen. It can be a four-season resource not only for the Town of Enfield, but for the surrounding area. They also indicated support of alternative 2 because it is substantially cheaper than the construction of a new bridge (as was previously proposed during the development of the 12967 project). The officials supported flattening the approach grade of the rail trail if possible. They expressed that they are sensitive to preserving historic resources however do not consider the existing rail/trail bridge worth preserving.

Alex Bernhard indicated that he understood the Towns position however he expressed support of alternatives 3, 4 and/or 5 as he felt they would result in less impacts to the Northern Railroad Historic District, and would maintain the existing flat grades on the rail trail. He stated that there is support from other groups, snowmobile club, mushers, Trail Bureau and Rail & Transit, to preserve the existing bridge.

Jamie Sikora indicated that the Department and the FHWA would be looking at each of the alternatives and would evaluate each to determine their effects on the area historic resources under the guidelines set forth under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and Section 4(f) of the USDOT act. Until this analysis has been performed the FHWA would be unable to make a determination as to which alternative the FHWA could support.

Linda Wilson indicated that the office of the State Historic Preservation Officer (the Division of Historical Resources) will provide input on the potential effect of each of the alternatives and would act as a voice for the historical resources present within the project area. The ultimate determination of the project's effect on historical resources would be made by the FHWA. Due to time constraints the meeting ended abruptly. The project will be brought back to a future meeting for further discussion.

Lebanon, NH - Hartford, VT, A000(627), 14957

Participants: Scott Newman, VTAOT (scott.newman@state.vt.us); Joe Patusky, Christine Perron, David Scott and Alex Vogt, NHDOT

The purpose of the meeting was to provide a design update for the replacement bridge. Alex Vogt started by saying that the Department is still waiting to hear from Lebanon and Hartford officials about what the towns want for lighting. Joe Patusky provided a summary of design details known to date. The replacement bridge will have steel, haunched (“scaloped”) girders (the steel will be weathering steel). The bridge length will be 444’-0” with three spans on concrete piers (two) and abutments. Overall bridge width will be 48’-0” with a 34’-0” roadway (two 12’-0” travel lanes and 5’-0” shoulders) and two 5’-6” shoulders. The design of the superstructure is relatively complete but the substructure is still being designed. An attempt is being made to keep the depth of the structure as shallow as possible due to flooding concerns. The Department has been meeting with the towns to determine where utilities such as water lines will be located on the bridge.

Riprap will be placed along each bank for scour protection, and there will be a retaining wall in the northeast quadrant behind Stateline Sports. The NH abutment will be set farther back to accommodate a trail under the bridge that will be part of the City’s planned park in the southeast quadrant.

The apartment building in Vermont would ideally be removed in advance of project construction. The advertising date for the project is now June 2012. Joyce McKay stated that removing the building sooner rather than later would be helpful in order to complete the archaeological survey adjacent to and under the existing building.

Currently, the rail being considered is 4-bar pedestrian rail with no fencing. Scott Newman asked if this NETC rail had previously been discussed with the NH SHPO. Christine Perron said it had not been discussed. S. Newman asked if other crash-tested alternatives could be considered, such as parapet with recessed railing. The NETC rail is considered the “interstate rail” in Vermont and he felt it was too harsh for this setting. J. Patusky said that the high volume of trucks has to be taken into account. J. McKay asked if rail options could be developed and discussed at a later date. Jamie Sikora commented that maintenance should be considered for each alternative (including snow removal and potential for graffiti). S. Newman commented that he would like to see different options explored and discussed. Bridge Design agreed to do this. S. Newman agreed to send details of rail systems to Joyce, and he also asked that the transition rail be considered in the alternatives as well. Linda Wilson commented that it was her personal opinion that a metal rail, rather than concrete, may be more appropriate at this location since it would more closely mimic the bridge that will be removed. Laura Black said that it would be good to see what the options are.

L. Wilson asked if the lighting would be compliant with Lebanon’s dark sky initiative. A. Vogt said that the Department’s policy is to use full cut off lighting. J. McKay asked if options for lighting could also be developed and discussed. A. Vogt replied that the two towns first need to

determine if and where they want lighting, then the towns would decide on fixtures. L. Wilson commented that she would like to see what options are available.

Bridge Design would explore rail and lighting options. These would be discussed with Lebanon and Hartford town managers as well as the Heritage Commissions of both towns and the Lebanon Historical Society, either before or at a future cultural resources coordination meeting.

Claremont, X-A000(418), 14494

Participants: Joyce McKay, NHDHR

Joyce McKay presented a design change on behalf of the consultant. It was asked if the project could extend the W-beam rail and not install the black rail over the Maple Avenue Box Culvert as stated in the Effect Memo. L. Wilson suggested that the consultant adhere to what was written in the Effect Memo. However, if there were major objections a review could take place with the committee.

Moultonborough, X-A000(932), 15710

Participants: CR Willeke, NHDOT; Ray Korber, KV Partners (rkorber@kvpllc.com)

Ray Korber reviewed the plans for the intersection improvements at Route 25 and Fox Hollow Road. J. McKay questioned the eligibility of the dwelling, given its large 1970's addition across one end of the house, the limited representation of the detailing common to the style, and the builder's limited role in architectural design of buildings prior to 1961. This issue remained unresolved.

The majority of the impacts to the Mullen property will be within the existing tree line, and impacts to the house's view shed should be extremely limited. Given the limited impacts to the house, it was decided that there would be a No Adverse Effect to the house with de minimis findings, as the impacts to the property do not affect the current view shed and are within the existing tree line of the property.

Lebanon, X-A000(235), 13558A

Participants: Joyce McKay, NHDHR; Laura Black and Linda Wilson, NHDHR

Joyce McKay explained that NHDHR had requested that individual forms be prepared for 24 and 26 South Main Street at the February 10, 2011 meeting. However, Preservation Company had reviewed and documented 24 and 26 South Main Street during an earlier survey in 2007. The properties were found to be ineligible as part of the South Main Street Historic District Area. Since these buildings would be noncontributing in a district if it existed, it was asked if additional documentation was necessary. Laura Black agreed that these two properties did not need survey. Preservation Company will be submitting an individual for 3 Seminary Hill, which is the same dwelling as Elm Street (lot 86-56), referenced in the February minutes. The archaeology will be completed this spring.

Bethlehem 14228 (no federal number)

Participants: C. Fournier, HEB Engineers (cfournier@hebengineers.com); Steve Liakos, NHDOT

Chris Fournier presented the Prospect Street Bridge # 071/137 over the Ammonoosuc River. This project was last discussed in this forum on October 14, 2010. At that time it was requested that A Phase IA/IB archaeological survey be completed as well as an Individual Inventory Form. Victoria Bunker, Inc. and the Historic Documentation Company, Inc. completed the work, respectively. Both documents were submitted to NHDHR and NHDOT for review. NHDHR responded to the archaeological findings with concurrence that no resources are present and that no further survey is required. The High Warren Truss Bridge was found to be eligible for the National Register based on the information in the Individual Inventory Form. This presentation for the rehabilitation project is being performed to determine if there is an adverse effect based on the proposed rehabilitation.

The original design drawings as well as the preliminary design plans were reviewed. It was discussed that the floor system is not as shown in the original design drawings and appears to have been modified over the years. Many of the floor system connections have been welded, and the timber deck has been replaced many times. The bridge has been painted as recently as 1995. The proposed work includes removing the existing transverse timber deck, stringers, floor beams, and guardrail and replacing them with a longitudinal glulam timber deck, new floor beams and a crash-rated bridge rail with approach rails and terminal ends units. The substructure is currently susceptible to scour and erosion and is proposed to be protected by riprap and a toewall. The bridge is proposed to be spot cleaned, where rust is present, and the entire bridge will receive a new topcoat of paint.

Based on this information, it was agreed that the project, as proposed, has No Adverse Effect on the bridge.

Merrimack 15839 (no federal number)

Participants: Lisa Martin and Jennifer Reczek (JReczek@quantum-cc.com), Quantum CC; Steve Liakos, NHDOT

Through review of the RPR form early submission, SHPO agreed that there would be no historic or archaeological properties affected and that an Effect Memo can be filled out and signed.

Antrim 14941 (no federal numbers)

Participants: Lisa Martin and Jennifer Reczek (JReczek@quantum-cc.com), Quantum CC; Steve Liakos, NHDOT

This project includes the replacement of the Depot Street Bridge (183/071) over the Contoocook River Relief. The existing concrete slab bridge was built in 1947. The cast-in-place concrete deck is founded on abutments made of mortared rubble masonry. The concrete has deteriorated and evidence of past repairs can be seen on the underside of the slab. The bridge is on the Municipal Redlist and posted for 15 tons, which is a concern because Depot Street experiences heavy truck

traffic. This structure provides flood relief during high water conditions of the Contoocook River but is dry under normal conditions. The existing bridge spans approximately 25 feet, and is 18 feet wide curb-to-curb, with an approximate 22-foot overall width. The span of the proposed bridge may be increased slightly from the existing 25-foot span. The new bridge is expected to be a prestressed concrete slab founded on concrete abutments. A temporary detour road may be constructed (at the contractor's option) across already disturbed agricultural land on the south side of the existing road in order to be able to travel from the arch bridge to the slab bridge since both bridges may be constructed simultaneously. The proposed detour road will be built on the existing grade so it will not require any excavation. At the end of the project, the entire temporary detour road will be removed and the area will be returned to agricultural use. There was initial concern about the detour road impacting the adjacent farm, but there are no farm buildings located near the proposed project, and the fields will be returned to their previous condition, so NHDHR concluded that there would be no impact.

NHDHR concluded that this is a common bridge type and found nothing on file at NHDOT about a previous bridge at this location. It was concluded that the project would not impact any historic or archaeological properties.

Antrim 14940 (no federal numbers)

Participants: Lisa Martin and Jennifer Reczek (JReczek@quantum-cc.com), Quantum CC; Steve Liakos, NHDOT

This project includes the replacement of the Depot Street Bridge (181/071) over the Contoocook River Relief. The existing bridge, built in 1914, is a cast-in-place reinforced concrete arch with 10-inch thick concrete parapets and cast-in-place concrete footings. The bridge is not on the Municipal Redlist, but has structural and geometric deficiencies. The concrete has several areas of spalls with rebar visible at some locations and the footing and lower parts of the arch have deteriorated. This structure provides flood relief during high water conditions of the Contoocook River but is dry under normal conditions. A scour hole exists to the north of the structure, indicating possible high velocity during flood conditions.

The new bridge will be a precast concrete arch or voided slabs on concrete abutments. The proposed bridge will increase in span from approximately 12 feet to approximately 20 feet in order to reduce the velocity of the water. NHDHR representatives noted that this is an early concrete bridge and requested that an Individual Inventory Form be completed. There are no archaeological concerns for this project.

QCC will hire a consultant to review the history of the structure and complete the required Individual Inventory Form. It was asked that the consultant check from comparables in the area and also to check the Storrs files. Once the required work has been completed, QCC will follow up with the Cultural Resource Committee.

Portsmouth-Kittery, A000(911), 13678F

Albacore Park

Participants: Ken Herrick (kash61@comcast.net)

It was agreed that the Connector Road is creating an adverse effect on the Albacore. Ken Herrick stated that to ensure the long-term retention of its National Landmark status, it needed to maintain its visual setting, which included a view to the river and North Mill Pond. It was proposed that Albacore Park, for the purpose of the MOU, be looked at on the state level as opposed to federal level.

Joyce McKay outlined that the adverse effects are coming from the current width of the Connector Road and its built up height with solid barricades, which obstruct the views to the north millpond from the Albacore property. Laura Black added that the continued use of the road by tractor-trailers has created a “wall” of moving traffic.

Ken Herrick stated that Peter Michaud’s suggestion of relocating the roadway through the current parking lot was rejected by the Albacore Park board members. The proposed 100’ ROW would impact the basin of the vessel, and the members are not willing to give up that much of their current land holdings. The Albacore Park Board was not in favor of requesting removal of the Connector Road. It was also agreed by the Board that they would not be writing to the National Park Service to object to any findings or project results.

It was the Board’s hope that historic mitigation for the continued use of the road would be funding towards the park and reduction of some of the loss of integrity of setting. K. Herrick noted that there is now considerable drainage into the Albacore basin, which will impact the condition of the Albacore. In October 2012, the NHDOT will request an extension of the land easement, and the Park will allow the extension on the condition that they receive payment for it this time. It was their belief that with the removal of integrity of setting but with increased funding the park could increase integrity of workmanship. It was also the boards wish to install and/or move its signs for better direction to the park.

Linda Wilson suggested that part of the Memorial Bridge mitigation should be able to address visitorship issues.

It was agreed that a MOU between the NHDOT and Albacore Park would be prepared. The MOU should address an alternative concept design including modification options, signage, landscaping, and drainage.

****Memos/MOA’s:** Laconia X-A000(884), 15691; Rumney 99411Z; Bow-Concord 13742B; Manchester 15401; Manchester 15988

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