BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT
CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting
DATE OF CONFERENCES: April 5 and 12, 2012
LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building
ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT
Phil Beaulieu
Jill Edelmann
Cathy Goodmen
Jon Hebert
Amy Lamb
Marc Laurin
Steve Liakos
Michelle Marshall
Kevin Nyhan
Christine Perron
Brian Schutt
Michael Servetas
Matt Urban

Federal Highway Administration
Jamie Sikora

NHDHR
Laura Black
Edna Feighner

Army Corps of Engineers
Rich Roach

Town of Bedford
Jeff Foote

Town of Boscawen
Lorrie Carey
Michael Wright

Town of Canterbury
Tyson Miller

CMA
Roch Larochelle

DuBois & King
Bob Durfee

Town of Farmington
Kathy Menici

Hoyle Tanner
Sean James

Jacobs Engineering
Aaron Seaman
Ted Setas

McFarland-Johnson
Vicki Chase
Jeff Lund

Rogers Engineering
Ed Rogers

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

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

April 5, 2012 1
Barnstead, X-A000(180), 16200 2
Farmington, X-A000(693), 15333 2
Rochester, X-A000(056), 20254 3
Bedford, 21685 (no federal number) and Bedford (no project numbers) 4
Wentworth, 14516 (no federal number) 4
Haverhill, 14154 (no federal number) 6
New Ipswich (ACOE/DES, no DOT involvement) 7
April 12, 2012 7
Stratford, 21386 (no federal number) 7
Canterbury, 16418 (no federal number) 8
Littleton Surplus, SP-RR-110211 9
Boscawen-Canterbury, 15281 (no federal number) 10
Bath, X-A000(901), 14439 11

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

April 5, 2012

Barnstead, X-A000(180), 16200
Participants: Kevin Nyhan and Jon Hebert, NHDOT

John Hebert and Kevin Nyhan presented this project. The project consists of 1,600 lf of roadway improvement at the intersection of NH Route 28 and NH Route 126. This section of roadway was built in 1967 with a 12-10 typical section. Approximately 10,000 vehicles per day are carried on NH Route 28 and 4,000 vpd on NH Route 126. A corridor study conducted in 2009 identified this intersection as priority #8. Currently there is a flashing yellow light and the intersection is posted for 55 mph.

The proposed HSIP project would construct left and right turn lanes from NH Route 28 on to NH Route 126, and a right turn lane from NH Route 126 on to NH Route 28. The accident history at this intersection indicates that 22% of the accidents are rear end accidents. To accommodate the additional lanes, the intersection would be widened approximately 10 feet. Additional work would include signalizing the intersection, tree trimming, headwall repair at three culverts, and relocation of the snowmobile trail along the east side of NH Route 28. Pavement rehabilitation would include an overlay. All work would be contained within the limits of existing right-of-way.

There are two properties along the west side of NH Route 28 that required attention from a cultural resource standpoint. Both are mid-20th Century properties. However, since physical impacts would remain within the right-of-way, outside of the properties, and slopes would be graded as they are today (4:1), and virtually no pavement would be added on the west side of the road retaining the existing landscape from a visual standpoint, there would be no effect on the potentially historic properties.

After brief discussion, it was concluded that the two properties mentioned above are outside of the Area of Potential Effect (APE).

A No Historic Properties Affected memo would be signed at the next meeting.

Farmington, X-A000(693), 15333
Participants: Kathy Menici, Town of Farmington (planningdirector@metrocast.net), Roch Larochelle, CMA Engineers, Inc. (rlarochelle@cmaengineers.com)

This Municipally-Managed Safe Routes to School (SRTS) project will involve the design and installation of handicap accessible sidewalk ramps (detectable warning devices), flashing beacons, crosswalk/pedestrian signage and minor drainage improvements (moving frames and grates out of sidewalk ramp areas) along the “Tiger Trail” network in the vicinity of the Farmington Middle, High and Elementary Schools (Valley View Elementary and Henry Wilson Schools). These planned improvements will take place primarily along Spring, Grove, and North Main Streets in the immediate vicinity of the schools with crosswalk signage being added at the intersection of Elm and North Main Street. Additionally, the project will involve the construction of an approximate 300-foot long paved walking path/sidewalk between the two schools in order to separate pedestrians/students from a current vehicle-access route and parking area.

Roch Larochelle, PE presented the project for preliminary scoping using a colored aerial photograph depicting the project area together with photos of the individual sites that will involve sidewalk and signage improvements. Minimal grading will occur within properties, no curb cuts are planned, and asphalt sidewalks will be replaced in-kind. After some discussion, the review committee concluded that the project area is within the village center of Farmington which would likely constitute a National Register-eligible historic district, but that the project would have no effect on any individual historic resources, or on the district as a whole. The only potential contributing element that could be physically affected is the sidewalks themselves, and they are primarily newer with asphalt surface. However, as there is some evidence of older granite curbing, it was deemed advisable to investigate these issues and to have a brief memo prepared for the files. The memo should summarize the potential historic district focusing on the elements of the potential historic district that may be physically or visually impacted as a result of the project (infrastructure and viewsheds), and why there wouldn't be an Effect or Adverse Effect.

Subsequent to this meeting, Preservation Company was contacted to complete these efforts and they discussed the intended scope of work directly with Jill Edelmann. Once the report has been finalized it will be forwarded to the Committee for review and a determination of effect will be made at that time. It is not expected that the project will need to be presented at another Cultural Resources Meeting.

Rochester, X-A000(056), 20254
Participants: Aaron Seaman, Ted Setas (ted.setas@jacobs.com), Jacobs Engineering; Marc Laurin, Ron Grandmaison, Mike Servetas, NHDOT; Rich Roach, ACOE

T. Setas gave an overview of the project. The Park and Ride project is located west of the Spaulding Turnpike along Route 202 on a 4.6 acre parcel. The parcel is primarily wooded and is State-owned.

Approximately 220 spaces are proposed. There are 0.18 acres of wetlands on the parcel. Porous pavement is proposed for the parking areas. The driveways and drop off areas will be asphalt pavement (non-porous). There are no slope impacts to adjacent properties. Light pole bases are proposed as part of this project and may be constructed at a later phase. A concrete island is proposed as part of this project as a location for a future bus shelter. No other buildings are proposed in the present or future configuration.

It was stated there are no archaeological concerns in this area.

There was concern about the lighting affecting the adjacent parcels. It was asked if screening would be provided along Route 202. R. Grandmaison indicated that the City of Rochester also requested screening and that it will be looked into as part of the project landscaping. The landscaping will need to be looked at in terms of sightline distance and access to the park and ride.

Laura Black requested that Individual Inventory Forms be completed for the property to the west of the site and for the property south of the site (across Route 202), because of the substantial changes in view shed, lighting, and possible bus shelter/kiosk.

Bedford, 21685 (no federal number) and Bedford (no project numbers)
Participants: Vicki Chase, Josh Lund, McFarland Johnson; Rich Roach, ACOE; Jeff Foote, Town of Bedford; Steve Liakos, NHDOT

This project was broken into two sections, the first is the Meetinghouse Road Improvements, and the second is the mitigation for Meetinghouse Road which involves Jenkins Road Dam Removal over McQuade Brook.

The town of Bedford seeks to improve a portion of Meetinghouse Road. The project requires a Major Impact wetland permit, and sign off from the Army Corps of Engineers. There is no federal or state funding for this project. The project proposes impacts the margins of several parcels, for which the town will be acquiring easements for the property owners, and stone wall impacts, but no impacts to buildings or other structures. An RPR was submitted on February 27, 2012 for the project with a copy of the wetland permit application. Subsequently the town engineer, Jeff Foote, had discussions with Elizabeth Muzzey of DHR who requested that the town provide the additional information required with an RPR submittal including DHR town file review results and photographs of all the potentially historic structures in the corridor. J. Foote did note that any stone walls impacted by the project would be reconstructed.

Laura Black reiterated the necessity for a DHR file review be conducted for the structures in the alignment of the Meetinghouse Road improvements, and requested photographs of the existing culverts in the alignment to verify that there are no historic culverts.

The town is required to provide wetland mitigation for the Meetinghouse Road project. For mitigation, the town proposes to remove an existing dam on Jenkins Road to improve wildlife habitat in McQuade Brook and replace it with a bridge. The town is receiving state bridge aid for design of the replacement bridge. Jeff Foote provided a brief overview of this project. The existing structure carrying Jenkins Road over McQuade Brook consists of three 36-inch diameter reinforced concrete pipes with a high earthen embankment. The structure is classified as a dam (Dam 020.13) by the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services (NHDES). Exact construction date is uncertain, but is thought to be in the 1930's.

Historical resources in the vicinity of the dam include a railroad bed south of the project and mill remnants east of the project. These resources will not be affected by the dam removal.

Edna Feighner said there were no archeological concerns with the Meetinghouse Road or Jenkins Road sites.

Laura Black requested that an Individual Inventory Form be completed for the dam by a 36 CFR 61 qualified historian prior to its removal.

Wentworth, 14516 (no federal number)
Participants: Bob Durfee, DuBois & King; Rich Roach, ACOE

1. Overview:

This Project involves the replacement of a bridge that carries Evans Road over the South Branch Baker River (136/053) in Wentworth.

The existing bridge is one lane (12' wide) 41' span between bearings and 37' clear span between abutments. A review of NHDOT records indicates it was built in 1937, however it appears that the only element extant from this period is one abutment. The Towns' Road Agent has stated the superstructure was replaced in the mid 1960's (circa 1965). If so, the 1930s abutment is no longer associated with the bridge it was built for and is not a National Register-eligible historic resource on its own.

The bridge rehabilitation project is in the NHDOT Municipal Bridge Aid Program, with Study Phase nearly completed.

The superstructure consists of a bare timber deck on steel stringers. East abutment is concrete and west abutment is dry stone masonry. The bridge is on the NHDOT "Red List" and posted for 6 ton weight limit due to structural deficiencies.

The road is dead ended on the west side, providing access to three homes.

A review of the NHDHR database for Wentworth indicated that no files exist for Evans Road or the adjacent North Dorchester Road in the vicinity of the bridge. A letter has been provided by the Wentworth Historical Society indicating they do not know of any archeological or historical resources on Evans Road within the project limits.

The proposed bridge rehabilitation includes replacing the existing superstructure with a new one lane, 16' wide, precast/prestressed concrete deck panels, with 2-bar steel rails. The east concrete abutment will be repaired/reused. The west stone abutment will be replaced with a new cast in place concrete abutment and wingwalls. The proposed bridge opening will match the existing opening of 37' between abutments.

No changes to the existing road profile are proposed. The elevation of the road through the bridge will be maintained with new bridge construction.

A temporary one lane bridge will be erected upstream during construction to maintain traffic through Evans Road and the three houses on the far side.

A hydraulic and hydrologic investigation has been performed. Results indicate the current bridge and the proposed rehabilitated bridge, can pass the Q50 flood event with 2.1 feet of freeboard, and can pass the Q100 flood event with 1.2 feet of freeboard.

Repairs to the east abutment, replacement of the west abutment, and construction and removal of the temporary bridge will all have impact to wetlands. A standard dredge and fill permit will be required by NHDES.

2. Discussion

No Historic or Archeological properties will be affected, if the bridge was replaced ca. 1965 as the road agent believes. R. Durfee will confirm that the bridge was rebuilt in the 1960s, and if no, complete an effect memo stating those findings.

If there is no record of the bridge being rebuilt in the 1960s, then an Individual Inventory Form on the bridge is recommended.

The NHDHR RPR form was signed prior to the meeting, and suggested an inventory form be completed. Based on the discussion at this meeting, the inventory form will only be done if it cannot be proven that the bridge was rebuilt in the 1960s.

3. Action Items:

Assuming the bridge dates to the 1960s, submit a Cultural Resources Effect Memo (LPA Memo), noting No Historic Properties Affected. Documentation of the bridge being built in the mid 1960's (circa 1965) should be added to the memo.

Haverhill, 14154 (no federal number)
Participants: Cathy Goodmen, Ron Grandmaison, NHDOT; Rich Roach, ACOE

This project was previously presented at the joint Natural Resources and Cultural Resources agency meetings April 16, 2008.

Cathy Goodmen and Ron Grandmaison presented the project looking to reconstruct a part of the embankment along NH Route 10. The current slope is very steep and groundwater is causing it to slough into the cow pasture below. NHDOT proposes to widen the road to the west several feet to improve the existing ditch on the east side, add shoulders to improve safety and decrease the slope angle with stone to prevent the sloughing. This stone will be covered in humus and vegetated. The land impacted is held in a conservation trust by the Upper Valley Land Trust (UVLT) for important farmland. The field is currently used as a cow pasture. On June 24, 2009 the NHDOT held a joint hearing with Land and Community Heritage Investment Program (LCHIP), and agreed with the landowner and UVLT to make the slope 2:1 from the guardrail, down to the location of the existing electric fence and from there make the slope 4:1 into the field. This limits the impact on wetlands and maintains the current amount of pastureland for the cows. The existing w-beam steel guardrail will be reset at the top of the slope.

Haverhill has an historic district, but this parcel is just outside the limits of the district. The house and barn on the impacted property are set back from the road approximately 700 feet. Close-up photos of these structures were not available, but they appear they could be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

E. Feighner and L. Black were concerned that the view from the house and barns might be changed and alter potentially character-defining features of the property. As the project plan seems to indicate at this point that the landscape will generally be replaced in-kind, Rich Roach suggested and DHR agreed, that a consensus eligibility determination could be made. It was agreed that no historic inventory of the property was needed at this time. NHDOT will ask the

landowner at the Public Hearing scheduled for May 15, 2012, if he believes the proposed project will detract from the historic setting the farmstead currently has. L. Black also mentioned that any Section 106 concerns (those specifically related to historic resources/concerns v. conservation) should be solicited at the public hearing as an ACOE permit will be required for the project.

E. Feighner asked for a plan of the project with an aerial photo overlay so she could get a better picture of the impacts on the property. There are numerous Native American sites in the area, and E. Feighner will check the NHDHR database for any archaeological sensitivity related to the project. R. Grandmaison said he would get the design group to make this plan.

C. Goodmen was given two sizes of the plan and gave them to L. Black at the April 12, 2012 cultural resources meeting. Once the public hearing is held, this project will be reviewed again with NHDHR and effect discussions will be continued after archaeological information and public input has been gathered.

New Ipswich (ACOE/DES, no DOT involvement)
Participants: Ed Rogers, Rogers Engineering (erogers@res37.com); Rich Roach, ACOE

The proposed culvert extension was discussed and pictures of the existing structure were presented. Ed Rogers noted that the existing granite which serves as the upstream and downstream headwalls would be abandoned in place and buried under the new slope associated with the extended culverts.

Edna Feighner asked how old the existing structure was. E. Rogers stated that he believed it was circa 1940, based on the style of the construction, but had been unable to find a definite date of construction. Rich Roach noted that it appears the pipe was only stone faced, and was probably washed out and reset, because it sits in the flood control area.

R. Roach suggested the project would have a No Historic Properties Affected finding, however asked that E. Rogers should follow up with additional research, asking the Town of New Ipswich Highway Department, and members of the community who might recall or have an idea of the origin of the structure.

The memo will be sent to NHDHR and Rich Roach, ACOE with any new findings.

April 12, 2012

Stratford, 21386 (no federal number)
Participants: Phil Beaulieu, Michelle Marshall, Christine Perron, Brian Schutt, NHDOT

Michelle Marshall provided an overview of the project. The project is located on Bog Road, a State-maintained road with less than 400 vehicles per day. The project consists of the replacement of a 4’x5’ box culvert that was damaged during a rain event in May 2011. In order to replace the

culvert and maintain traffic, a 490-foot long temporary road realignment to the east was proposed. When District personnel discussed the project with the owners of the adjacent property (James Brown and Alta Chase), who own both sides of the road, the owners suggested making the realignment permanent. The adjacent property is 21.2 acres. The proposed realignment would take approximately 0.15 acres on the east side of the road and return to the landowner approximately 0.13 acres on the west side of the road. Proposed right-of-way lines would encompass the proposed slope lines.

The realignment is located on a sharp curve (radius 220') that does not meet the design speed of 35 mph. The proposed realignment will smooth this curve slightly, resulting in a radius of 380', which would meet the design speed. The proposed roadway would have 11' lanes. The profile of the culvert would be raised to provide 1' of cover over the top (the existing culvert currently has very little cover). The proposed culvert is a 4'x6'x50' box culvert on the same skew and same elevation.

This is a Betterment project with no federal funding. Estimated cost will be $33,400. Although not stated in the meeting, it should be noted that FEMA reimbursement is anticipated.

Laura Black asked for more information about the farm. Christine Perron stated that the house was built in 1998. The original part of the barn was constructed in 1854 and an addition was built in 1933. L. Black stated that since the house is modern and the barn is likely ineligible for the National Register, SHPO had no concerns with the project. The No Historic Properties Affected memo should detail why the property is likely ineligible (extensive alterations of the farm property, construction of a modern house, extensive alterations to the barn, such as the casement windows). L. Black also stated that Edna Feighner had no concerns regarding archaeology.

L. Black asked if the landowner or others were concerned with the potential increases in traffic speed due to improving the curve. C. Perron said that the landowner was supportive of the improvements since cars already speed along this road and he has witnessed accidents at the curve. Brian Schutt from District 1 added that the project will just be softening the curve, not straightening it completely.

Canterbury, 16418 (no federal number)
Participants: Christine Perron, NHDOT

Christine Perron gave an overview of the project. District 5 has proposed the construction of a park and ride off Interstate 93 Exit 18 in Canterbury. Cars are already using this area as an informal parking area, but the surface is uneven and often muddy. The District would like to construct a formal park and ride to provide a more suitable area for parking. The project will be constructed by District forces, with construction proposed for this summer. No federal funding is involved and no permits are needed.

The District has proposed constructing a 10-car park and ride. If there is demand for additional spaces, the area can be expanded to 20-40 spaces in the future. The park and ride would be paved and maintained in the winter. Constructing the parking area will require a foot or less of excavation to create a level surface for paving. It is located entirely on DOT right-of-way inside

the Exit 18 northbound off-ramp. This area was disturbed during the construction of Interstate 93. A drainage pipe runs through the southeast corner, and the entire area was cleared and grubbed during construction of the interstate in the early 1960s. The 1958 Interstate 93 construction plans show a house located in the vicinity of the proposed parking area, with a note that the house would be moved by the owner by April 1959. No evidence of a foundation was seen when the site was walked. Two existing houses, both potentially historic, are located across from the parking area, one near the road and the other set back from the road behind a forested area.

A Canterbury selectman recently called C. Perron to express his support for the project.

Laura Black asked if the age of the removed house was known. C. Perron referred to historic topographic maps going back to 1927. The maps indicate that the house was built sometime between 1943 and 1956.

L. Black stated that an inventory form should be completed on the house directly across the road from the parking area. She felt that there could be a significant visual effect on this house from the proposed paved parking lot. She did not have any concerns with the other existing house since trees provide a screen between it and the parking area.

C. Perron asked if a form could be avoided if landscaping could be added to the front of the parking area to provide more of a screen. L. Black responded that similar landscaping had not been supported by DOT at another park and ride location due to sight line issues. C. Perron then asked if it would be reasonable to construct the small 10-car park and ride without doing a form, and the form could be done only if the parking area is expanded in the future, noting that cars are already using the site as an informal park and ride and the house has already seen intrusions from when the interstate was constructed. L. Black stated that the SHPO's position is that a form is recommended prior to any construction.

L. Black stated that Edna Feighner did not have any concerns with archaeology; however, she did not know about the house that had been on the site. L. Black would discuss this detail with her to find out if there are any concerns.

Littleton Surplus, SP-RR-110211
Participants: Matt Urban, NHDOT

The subject rail road surplus review was presented by Matt Urban on April 12th. Laura Black was the only one in attendance from the Division of Historical Resources (DHR).

M. Urban began by re-introducing the project that had been outlined in the RPR form that was submitted to DHR a few weeks prior.

M. Urban explained that the Department of Transportation is proposing to transfer a portion of the railroad corridor to DRED for their management. This corridor includes approximately seven miles in the Towns of Littleton and Bethlehem, parallel to NH Route 116 and along the Ammonoosuc River. In response to community wishes, DRED intends to develop a multi-use trail

on the corridor. The portion to be transferred extends from .25 miles south of Industrial Park Rd. in Littleton seven miles, to approximately .3 miles south of Wing Road in Bethlehem.

The portion of this railroad to the west of where Interstate 93 crossed the rail line has already been converted to a recreational rail trail. As stated above, DRED wishes to convert the remaining portion of the rail into a recreational trail.

M. Urban noted that during his field review there were numerous stone box culverts along the rail corridor. Also noteworthy were 3 steel bridges dating back to the 1920's. The bridge decks have been converted to wooden decking.

L. Black noted that a portion of this corridor had been reviewed in 1996 and was determined to be eligible for the National Register. She has asked that the Department update the inventory to collect any changes since 1996 and re-assess contributing/non contributing features.

M. Urban and Jillian Edelmann explained that this would require a consultant and thought it would be an extraordinary cost for a piece of land that the Department was only looking to transfer. J. Edelmann estimated the cost could be between $8,000 and $10,000, based on similar reviews in the past.

M. Urban explained that in the past, for land transfer projects, the Department has placed restrictions on the deed requiring the land purchaser to coordinate with DHR if they were proposing any activities that may disturb the features of the rail line.

L. Black stated that she was not as familiar with the previous land transfers and would check with Edna Feighner to get her thoughts. L. Black's recommendation from the SHPO office was still to update the inventory information.

M. Urban and J. Edelmann agreed to further investigate the extent of the 1996 inventory. They will also look be looking for examples from the past regarding railroad land transfers.

The Department will continue consultation with NHDHR regarding the land transfer.

Boscawen-Canterbury, 15281 (no federal number)
Participants: Lorrie Carey, Michael Wright, Town of Boscawen; Tyson Miller, Town of Canterbury; Steve Liakos, NHDOT

This follow-on meeting was held to address outstanding issues on removal of the Boscawen-Canterbury Bridge. Matters outstanding involved meeting terms of an interagency Memorandum of Agreement relating to the bridge's removal and subsequent required actions.

The Towns were obligated, as its first condition, to have a Re-Use Assessment conducted by an engineer to determine the viability of reusing the bridge after its removal from the waterway. If the structure could be reused, several further conditions would go into effect. Separately, there were terms relating to memorializing the bridge and educating the community to its historical significance.

An engineering report was provided to address the re-use assessment of the bridge. It adequately addressed the viability issue indicating that the bridge could not be put back into structural use, most of the metal was not salvageable, and likely only small portions would remain intact after the removal from the waterway. However, several inaccurate statement/references to approving authority were put in a first draft of that report and a revised report was submitted at today's meeting. A discussion and review of the final report was conducted. Steve Liakos highlighted the analysis concerning the bridge's deterioration and the inability to save it. Accordingly, it was decided the MOA condition requiring an assessment on the viability of re-using the bridge had been met and it showed further efforts at re-use were unnecessary. Jill Edelmann mentioned the re-involvement of the agency if bridge removal plans change and require shoreland/wetland permits in which case the Corps would become involved in the process again.

Discussion then turned to how the Towns were planning to educate the public and memorialize the bridge. Laura Black talked about options other than a State marker and brought an e-mail printout about creative methods being used elsewhere. Michael Wright spoke about having a historical kiosk about the bridge which would match up with a boat ramp kiosk in the area. Selectman Miller shared artist renderings of site memorializations, if bridge pieces could be incorporated. It was recommended that "sculptural" aspect of salvage should either reflect the bridge – or – focus on artistic expression. Lorrie Carey talked about other educational possibilities.

It was noted that if pieces from the bridge were to be incorporated into a public art piece that specific language needed to be written in to the demolition contract.

Meeting Action: The Towns, who were already authorized to remove the bridge, may proceed without the restrictions that were conditioned on the bridge's re-use under a joint agency MOA since information provided satisfied those terms. The Towns will continue to coordinate with NHDOT and NHDHR on final efforts of community education and memorializing the site.

Bath, X-A000(901), 14439
Participants: Sean James, Hoyle Tanner

This project has previously been discussed at the 9/11/2008, 10/9/2008, 4/2/2009, 4/8/2010, 8/5/2010, 9/9/10, 11/4/10 and 12/18/10 Cultural Resource Committee meetings.

Sean James from Hoyle, Tanner provided an update on the project. The final PSE submittal has been reviewed and approved by the NHDOT. Two letters regarding the final plans have been received the National Society for the Preservation of Covered Bridges (NSPCB), a consulting party to the project, as well as a letter dated April 3, 2012 from the NH Division of Historic Resources (NHDHR). The NSPCB, as well as the Town of Bath Historical Society (the second project consulting party) were notified of this meeting but were not in attendance.

The letters from the NSPCB were reviewed first. The first letter, dated March 12, 2012, largely concerned the additional roof purlins that are proposed to be removed and requested that this be reconsidered. The NSPCB provided photographs from the 1987 bridge rehabilitation which show both the original and weathered, added purlins in place. The added purlins were previously believed to have been added by Arnold Graton during the rehabilitation. The second letter from the NSPCB, dated March 31, 2012, suggested that every other purlin is original and that the

remaining were added during a later roof replacement as smaller wood shakes became more common. After discussion of the purlins, it was agreed that the removal of the added purlins is acceptable as they are not part of the historic significance of the bridge or engineering history and that removal wouldn't affect the bridge's significance. The second letter from the NSPCB largely included a discussion of the geometry of the eastern span, which the proposed project will not change.

The April 3, 2012 letter from the NHDHR, which included four comments, was discussed next. The first comment noted that the proposed plans returned the west portal framing to a more curved appearance prominent in photos of the bridge from the 1940's. It was discussed that the portal framing was squared-off later and there was discussion regarding how this affects the bridge opening vertical clearance. S. James noted that the curved portion of the proposed portal framing was generally within the outline of the knee braces within the bridge and that the vertical clearance wasn't affectively diminished by adding a curved appearance to the portals. The second comment was regarding the use of a formliner and extent of new concrete for the northeast abutment. The concrete limits are the minimum necessary for stability of the top of the wall and the formliner is intended to better blend in with the existing stone. L. Black noted that it may be better to not try to match the stone appearance and go for an unobtrusive smooth appearance and requested that Hoyle, Tanner solicit the Bath Historical Societies opinion on this. The third comment recommended matte paint for the window protection bars which will be added and asked for a follow-up on recent information on the bridge. This recent information included the purlins discussed above and additional information on the builder of a portion of the stone substructure which is carved into one pier stone. The proposed project will have no effect on the carved stone in the pier.

S. James noted that he believes all conditions for putting the project out for bids have been met and that bidding should occur soon. Once the project is in construction, monthly construction meetings will be held with the NHDOT and project stakeholders invited as part of continuing consultation on the project.

****Memos/MOA's**: **Hollis, 16429 (no federal number) – No Historic Properties Affected**
Peterborough, X-A001(007), 15879 – No Historic Properties Affected

Submitted by: Jill Edelmann, Cultural Resources