BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT
CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting
DATE OF CONFERENCES: June 3, 2010
LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building
ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT
Bob Aubrey
John Butler
Mike Dugas
Jill Edelmann
Cathy Goodmen
Bob Landry
Don Lyford
Joyce McKay
Julius Nemeth
Kevin Nyhan
Christine Perron
Jason Tremblay
Matt Urban

Federal Highway Administration
Jamie Sikora

NHDHR
Laura Black
Edna Feighner
Peter Michaud
Beth Muzzey
Linda Wilson

HNTB
Joe Grilli

Horizons Engineering
James McMahon

McFarland-Johnson
Vicki Chase
Brian Colburn

MaineDOT
Russell Charette

National Trust for Historic Preservation
Rebecca Williams

NH Preservation Alliance
Jennifer Goodman

Portsmouth Historical Society
Richard Candee

Preservation Company
Carol Hooper
Lynne Monroe

White Mountain Survey
Scott Lees

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

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

New Ipswich, X-A000(403), 14465 1
Franklin, X-A000(806) 15584 3
Portsmouth, A000(832), 13678E 5
Lancaster, X-A000(564), 14836 10
Ossipee, X-A000(766), 15535 10
Effingham, X-A000(102), 16041 11
Plymouth, X-A000(010), 15882 11
Lyme, X-A000(887), 15695 12
Berlin, X-A000(052), 12958B 13

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

June 3, 2010

New Ipswich, X-A000(403), 14465
Participants: Don Lyford, Jason Tremblay, and Matt Urban, NHDOT

This project was previously reviewed by SHPO on the following dates: 3/4/2008, 1/14/2010, and 2/11/2010.

Matt Urban requested this meeting to discuss the results of the Determination of Eligibility (DOE) for the I-beam structure that sits on top of the stone arch structure and determine an effect for the subject project.

The results of the individual form provided by the Department's consultant determined that the 1950's I-Beam structure placed on top of the 1800's stone arch structure known as High Bridge was in fact eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. However, DHR agreed that the I-beam structure was not a character-defining element of the bridge. Thus, the replacement of the I-beam bridge would not of itself be an effect, but how or what the replacement bridge had for impacts could be an effect.

DHR asked how much of the previously disturbed rock wall or "parapet" wall would the Department be impacting in order to remove and replace the upper deck I-Beam structure. At this time it is not known how much of the rock wall will need to be removed. Those in attendance reviewed the plans from the 1950's, and it appeared that approximately 4 ft of the rock wall/parapet had been previously disturbed during the installation of the 1950's upper deck. As such, DHR indicated that if the Department could limit impacts to the parapet wall within those limits a No Adverse Effect finding could be made for that particular piece of the project. DHR also recommended that the Department utilize an expert stonemason who could help design and/or guide in the re-capping of the wall. DHR thought it would be good to also have this expert onsite for vibration monitoring. Don Lyford stated that the Department has already committed to vibration monitoring. DHR requested that the Department come back with more detailed information on the required rock removal depth to make a determination.

The group then reviewed other aspects of the project to determine the effect on those elements, as a project is not determined by a single factor it is determined by its overall impacts.

The consultant report addressed the Mill Street Jack Arch Bridge and determined that it was an eligible structure. The Department explained to those in attendance that the plan is to span the Mill Street Jack Arch Bridge using a temporary Bailey bridge. Potential impacts to the abutments of the Jack Arch Bridge are not known at this time. Once the impacts are determined, the bridge will be reviewed with DHR again. DHR indicated that if the Department could temporarily install the Bailey bridge utilizing fill placed on a geo-textile fabric for the pre-cast concrete abutments to sit on that would not result in an adverse effect.

Another area of concern was the need to pierce (or remove) the penstock in order to drive piles. The Department explained that the portion of the penstock that would be impacted was currently buried under the existing bridge structure and would not have any aesthetic impacts to the overall appearance of the District. As such, DHR determined that this portion of the project would not have an adverse effect.

The Department also discussed the impacts to the Michael Ypya property (parcel 32) located in the triangle of land by Ypya Dr. The Department is not impacting the structure of the eligible house. However, the Department is proposing to cut into a portion of the land. This land is a sloping hill of Knotweed, which is an invasive species that grows predominately in previously disturbed soils. As such, DHR determined that this portion of the project would not have an adverse effect.

The Department also discussed the old country store stone foundation located near the intersection of NH Route 123/ NH Route 124. The Department explained that they would only be placing fill in this location and that there would be no excavation or disturbance to the foundation. As such, DHR determined that this portion of the project would not have an adverse effect.

DHR wanted to assess the project as a whole to ensure that the overall work is not going to adversely affect the general aesthetic of the historic district as a whole. DHR expressed an interest in maintaining a similar bridge guardrail to the existing. That could entail vertical bars or color to match the existing green paint. The Department agreed to look into the type of bridge rail that could be used and will discuss that at the next meeting. The Department stated that no mature trees will be affected and that stone walls will be avoided.

In summary, the Department and DHR have reviewed the project as a whole with the existing details as known. DHR has requested more information on three specific areas of interest. The depth of impact to the Stone Arch Structure or parapet, the impact of the Bailey bridge on the Jack Arch Bridge, and the overall aesthetics addressed in the bridge rail. If the remaining factors are found not to be an adverse effect, then the project will be issued a "no adverse effect memo" and would qualify as a de minimus 4(f).

Franklin, X-A000(806) 15584
Participants: Vicki Chase (vchase@mjinc.com) and Brian Colburn, McFarland-Johnson Inc.

Vicki Chase and Brian Colburn provided a brief review of this project. McFarland Johnson is providing engineering and environmental permitting services for this transportation improvement project. The project involves a number of traffic routing and parking enhancements to improve the aesthetics and functionality of downtown Franklin. The Franklin Falls Historic District was listed on the National Register in 1982. There are no changes proposed to any structures within the district. The historic sub-consultant (Preservation Company), as part of their approved scope of work, did not do a re-evaluation of the National Register-listed historic district, instead, they clarified whether properties within the project's Area of Potential Effect were currently contributing or non-contributing to the district. The historian recently completed a Streetscape Assessment Report, including historical photographs and maps, which were submitted to DHR.

Brian Colburn provided a brief introduction to the funding for the project. A federal earmark, with no local or state money, funds the project. It is anticipated that the available funding will not be enough to construct the entire project. The project will be broken into phases, with the portions of the project off Central Street occurring first. The second phase will commence once funding is secured.

Vicki Chase provided an email from IAC clarifying the nature and location of the archaeologically sensitive area. IAC had recommended that the area to be repaved was sensitive below 0.5 meters, and DHR concurred with the report but requested that additional testing be done if the work was below one foot. This request for a one -foot depth was made to provide an extra measure of protection of potential resources. Brian Colburn noted that the existing catch basins are in the same locations within the project limits and that there may be replacement of clay drainage pipes

that show signs of deterioration on Memorial Street. Edna requested that IAC review the design of the drainage pipe replacement and recommended pre-testing of the sensitive areas to be repaved just prior to construction.

The streetscape report was introduced, and a discussion of some of the elements to be replaced followed. There is one new traffic signal to be installed, which will be painted black. Inquiries have been made about using a historic replica style traffic signal, but the cost may be prohibitive. There are no new streetlights planned for the project. Other new elements include “bump outs” on Central Street, new paving, new concrete sidewalks, and new granite curbing.

A recommendation was made that the sidewalk concrete be gray rather than white, and a recommendation was made that the top surface of new granite curbing to be installed not be polished.

A question was asked about whether there are any consulting parties for this project. There have been no formal consulting party invitations for this project, but there have been three public meetings. The Franklin Heritage Commission is aware of the project but has not provided any formal feedback or recommendations.

A question was asked about right of way takings for the project. There may be a permanent easement on one property, where a portion of an existing grassed area may be used for parking. There have been no discussions with the landowner, and if the landowner is unwilling, the acquisition will not occur, so it is not yet known whether this easement will be acquired. It was noted that the property is a 4(f) resource, in that it is part of a historic district, so it may constitute a 4(f) use. Further coordination with FHWA regarding the potential 4(f) use will occur after it is determined whether the easement will be acquired. [It was subsequently found that the easement would be temporary. However, the alteration from grass to pavement does constitute a 4(f) use. Jamie Sikora concluded that the use did not appear to create an adverse impact. If it did not, then it would qualify for a de minimus impact under Section 4(f).]

As discussed at the previous meeting, the project area also includes a small city park, the Scott A. Marceau Park, a portion of which is proposed to be used for parking. The park qualifies as a 4(f) resource because it is a public recreational resource. The park is the site of a formerly contributing structure, the ca. 1886 Kendrick Block, but the building was demolished in 1997, the foundation filled with sand, and subsequently grassed. At a previous meeting between MJ and Jamie Sikora, it was discussed that the use of the park (4,538 square feet) would likely qualify as a de minimis use of a 4(f) recreational resource, if the appropriate city officials provided documentation of their support of this use. A letter dated March 2, 2010 has been sent to FHWA by the City Manager, approving of the use of the portion of the park and stating that the park will not be adversely affected by the project.

MJ will coordinate with FHWA and NHDOT regarding the potential 4(f) use. If the matter is resolved, there may not be a need to return to the next Cultural Resource meeting on July 8. However, at the time of the meeting, DHR did not indicate the type of effect, i.e., whether it was adverse.

Portsmouth, A000(832), 13678E
Participants: Bob Landry, and John Butler, NHDOT; Laura Black, Elizabeth Muzzey, Linda Wilson, Edna Feighner, and Peter Michaud, DHR; Lynne Monroe and Carol Hooper, Preservation Company; Joe Grilli, HNTB; and Russell Charette, Maine DOT; Consulting Parties: Rebecca Williams, National Trust; Richard Candee, Portsmouth Historical Society; Jennifer Goodman, Preservation Alliance

Lynne Monroe, Preservation Company, provided a brief overview of the historic resources in the project area for the Connections Study. The effects meeting focused on resources adjacent to the Memorial and Sarah Long bridges. L. Monroe identified the following eligible properties associated with each of the bridges, which may be affected by the project.

Sarah Long Bridge:
Sarah Long Bridge
Memorial Bridge (3 spans)
US Route 1 ByPass
Albacore NHL
Christian Shore Neighborhood Historic District
Eastern Railroad
Jackson House, NHL

Memorial Bridge
Sarah Long Bridge
Memorial Bridge (3 spans)
Memorial Bridge Historic District
Memorial Park
Scott Avenue Bridge
Portsmouth Historic District
Warner House, NHL
Moffatt-Ladd House, NHL
Wentworth Gardner House, NHL
Gov. John Langdon Mansion, NHL

E. Muzzey expressed concern of the NHDHR about the notification of Consulting Parties and requested that the minutes indicate this concern. The letters were sent on May 26th to consulting parties identified by the consultant, HNTB. Those parties located in Concord and Portsmouth received notice by regular mail and those in Maine and Boston received notice by overnight mail.

Staff of NHDOT, HNTB, Preservation Company, Consulting parties, and NHDHR looked at the various options and possible effects on historic resources. Although effect determination was determined primarily from the vantage point of each historic property, the No-Build alternative was discussed separately.

NO BUILD:

Under the No-Build alternative, the lift span on the Memorial would be removed, closing it to traffic, and the Sarah Mildred Long Bridge (SML) would be open but not rehabbed. Traffic would increase on the SML. E. Muzzey indicated that this effect would only be adverse if the bridge were allowed to deteriorate further.

E. Muzzey stated that under the No-Build option, there would be an adverse effect on the Memorial Bridge and the Memorial Bridge Historic District. Without vehicle access to the Portsmouth Historic District, there is an adverse effect to the district because of the changed traffic patterns, commercial viability, etc., resulting in visual effects from changes in design, setting, and

feeling and potential changes in use of the buildings within the Portsmouth Historic District. The closure and removal of the lift span from the Memorial Bridge would also have a visual impact on the SML. Also, under the No-Build option, the Scott Avenue Bridge would be taken out of service and not maintained, and the Memorial Park may not be maintained. The Memorial Park would not be impacted by the Scott Avenue removal.

With the No-Build option, the study assumes that the SML will be maintained, but not widened. Its weight loading would likely be reduced. The bridge would need replacement in 20-35 years. Traffic would increase on the SML with the closure of Memorial Bridge. Because it would be maintained, the No-Build would not have a direct adverse effect on the SML only if allowed to deteriorate.

Concerning the negative impact from the closure of the Memorial Bridge on the Portsmouth Historic District from changes in traffic patterns, Maine DOT commented that traffic intersection improvements would be required in the Portsmouth Historic District. E. Muzzey asked if the model used would also look at the traffic patterns and intersections in the Christian Shore neighborhood. HNTB will look to see if they can pull this information together. Thus, the bridge closure would result in changes in the levels and types of services in Portsmouth.

Moving to the perspective of the SML and the No-Build option, E. Muzzey asked if the increased traffic patterns would have an effect on the Jackson House or the Albacore. R. Candee felt that both would not be affected.

Therefore, the No-Build option would be an adverse effect on the Portsmouth Historic District, Memorial Bridge, Memorial Bridge Historic District, the Scott Avenue Bridge, and Memorial Park, and a no adverse effect on SML if it receives maintenance. There would be a no adverse effect on the US Route 1 By-Pass. Because there would be more traffic introduced along the street crossings over the Eastern Railroad, it is unclear if the effect would be adverse. Traffic models may not support this effect. More information is needed for this determination. More information is needed on the Christian Shore Neighborhood concerning traffic patterns and changes. Please note that there are four NHL's in the Portsmouth Historic District. The Warner House would likely be adversely affected because of changes in setting. The three others, the Moffat-Ladd, Wentworth-Gardner, and Gov. John Langdon houses in the Portsmouth Historic District would be adversely affected because of changed traffic patterns. Overall, the No-Build option has adverse effects.

J. McKay noted that the process should be shifted to look at each historic property and the impact to it with each alternative. R. Candee asked if we could do all the effects from changes to the Memorial and then all effects from changes to the SML. The group agreed.

THE MEMORIAL BRIDGE OPTIONS

Rehabilitation of the Existing Bridge (Rehab) Option: This option proposed a scope of work similar to the 2008 scope, which included complete replacement of the lift span and substantial rehabilitation of the two flanking truss and tower spans. This rehabilitation would have to take out the fixed spans and towers, float the fixed spans away, and lay it on its side for the replacement of the bottom chord. A six-foot wide Bike/Ped section would be added to the southwest elevation.

The abutment and piers would remain essentially the same. Paralleling the previous determination, this option would have an adverse effect to the Memorial Bridge. However, the effect is far less than the other options.

Replacement with a Vehicular Bridge (Replacement): This option includes full replacement of the superstructure. The abutment and piers would be reused. The replacement would include a lift span and could look similar to the bridge type (a parallel example may be the Suncook Double Deck Bridge) that is there or something else. The replacement bridge would be 4' wider than the existing. It was asked if the details of the bridge, which replaces the Memorial Bridge, could change the resulting effect on the current district. E. Muzzey asked P. Michaud to give a brief overview on the Secretary's Standards on related new construction. P. Michaud indicated that according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards the new bridge should be compatible in design, scale, massing, and materials (Standards 9 and 10). The bridge should read as a modern structure but be compatible with the historic setting. For example, it should include three roughly comparable truss spans, which would convey a similar design rhythm. Close coordination with NHDHR would be necessary to achieve this goal.

NHDOT has informally asked the public what they would like. B. Landry said he has heard that what most people want is a bridge that looks similar to the original in form from a bird's eye view perspective but uses modern materials. Without a proposed design, NHDHR cannot evaluate the appropriateness of the new bridge under the Secretary's Standards. The scale should be appropriate to the Portsmouth Historic District. The use of modern materials would probably not result in a heavier look, given that the Memorial Bridge was originally designed to carry a trolley. E. Muzzey asked if the piers and abutments could handle a wider bridge and increased traffic. B. Landry commented that the piers are fine but that the abutments do need some work. It was noted that the Scott Avenue and Memorial Bridges shared a single abutment so that some modifications would be needed at that location. R. Candee asked about the abutments on Scott Avenue. R. Landry replied that they are shared with the Scott Avenue Bridge. Thus, the replacement option will have an adverse effect on the Memorial Bridge. The impact of the replacement option on other properties may be modified by the design of the bridge. B. Muzzey indicated that there would need to be close coordination during design to ensure compatibility with the historic district and the original bridge.

Replacement with a Bike/Pedestrian only Bridge (Bike/Ped): The proposed structure would be a fifteen-foot wide bridge with a lift span in the middle flanked by fixed spans. It was commented by several people that this option changes the feeling for adjacent eligible districts/properties. The impacts are similar to the No-Build. E. Muzzey asked if the piers would behave differently with a lighter bridge. B. Landry thought that it would be a better situation structurally. Thus, this option would have an adverse effect on the Memorial Bridge.

E. Muzzey noted that although we have an adverse effect with each scenario, the rehab option offers the least adverse impact and has the best overall benefit.

THE MEMORIAL BRIDGE HISTORIC DISTRICT

The district includes Memorial Park, Scott Avenue Bridge, the three spans of the Memorial Bridge, and resources in Maine.

Rehab: Although the rehab option is the one with the least impacts, this option removes the Scott Avenue Bridge and part of the Memorial Park. The park could be restored to its current appearance as in the originally proposed bridge rehabilitation. As with the impacts to the Memorial Bridge, the impacts to district as listed above are adverse.

Replacement: Under this option, the Scott Ave. Bridge and Memorial Bridge are replaced with a new bridge. The effect on the district is adverse. The level of effect to other properties may be reduced depending on the design of the replacement.

Bike/Ped: Given the width of the bridge, the elements introduced are less compatible than the other two options. The effect of this option is adverse. There would also need to be a significant redesign of the Memorial Park.

In all, the rehabilitation has less adverse effects than the two replacement options.

SCOTT AVENUE BRIDGE

Rehab, Replacement, and Bike/Ped: With all the Memorial Bridge options including the original rehab option, the Scott Avenue Bridge is removed and the effect is adverse.

MEMORIAL PARK:

Rehab/Replacement/Bike Ped: The removal of the Memorial Park, which in part overlaps with the Scott Avenue Bridge, creates an adverse effect with all three of the above Memorial Bridge options. The rehabilitation and replacement options would have a similar effect adjacent to the Scott Avenue Bridge. The strongest effects would be created by a redesign of Memorial Park with the Bike Ped Replacement option.

PORTSMOUTH HISTORIC DISTRICT

The Portsmouth Historic District is a local historic district whose boundaries, which are approximate, were used in the original Memorial Bridge Rehabilitation project. It was noted that the NHL's in the Portsmouth Historic District should be addressed separately as noted below.

Rehab: This Memorial Bridge option creates a no adverse effect on the district. The resulting appearance of the rehabbed bridge is compatible with the existing.

Replacement: If the new design follows the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (standards 9 and 10), concentrating on the guidelines for new construction, it would result in a no adverse effect to the district. P. Michaud will forward the guidelines for Standards 9 and 10. It was noted that the piers and abutment would be reused.

Bike/Ped: The replacement bridge would have a different scale and shape and involves all five criteria for an adverse effect under Section 106, creating the adverse effect.

SIX NHL PROPERTIES IN THE PORTSMOUTH HISTORIC DISTRICT AND ADJACENT TO THE SARAH LONG BRIDGE

The NHL properties are especially sensitive to the visual change in the neighborhoods surrounding the Memorial Bridge. All in the Portsmouth Historic District, they include the Warner House, the Moffat Ladd House, Wentworth-Gardner House, and the Gov. John Langdon Mansion. Two additional NHL's are located near the SML Bridge and in some cases may be impacted by changes to the Memorial Bridge: the Albacore and the Jackson House.

Rehab: For the rehab option of the Memorial Bridge, there will be no adverse effect to the six NHL's.

Replacement: The bridge is in view from Warner, Moffatt-Ladd, Wentworth Gardner, and partially from the Jackson house. The towers of the bridge can also be seen from the Gov. Langdon house. If the design follows the standards above, then there is a potential no adverse effect.

Bike/Ped: The design of the proposed Bike/Ped bridge will be a noticeably narrower bridge than the existing, creating a visual impact. Additionally, a change in the traffic patterns would adversely affect visitation to some of the museums. It will create an adverse effect on five NHL's: the Warner, Moffatt-Ladd, Wentworth-Gardner, Gov. Langdon, and Jackson houses, but not on the Albacore.

Sarah Mildred Long

No Build: Considering SML as a historic resource, the discussion returned to the No-Build option concerning the effect of removing Memorial Bridge on the Sarah Mildred Long (SML) Bridge. The removal of Memorial Bridge resulting from the No-Build option has a visual impact on SML, which is an adverse effect. The Memorial Bridge is visible to the SML Bridge along the river. Note that under the No-Build option in the short term the SML Bridge would be maintained, but with altered traffic patterns and increased traffic on the SML it would eventually require replacement with a new four-lane option, an adverse effect (see Bike/Ped option).

Rehab: The rehabilitation of the Memorial Bridge would not have an adverse effect on the SML.

Replacement: Replacement of the Memorial Bridge has a potential effect depending on design for SML. If the design follows the Secretary of the Interior's Standards items 9 and 10 with the new bridge being compatible in design, scale, massing, and materials to the existing, then there would be no adverse effect (see notes pertaining to design above). Thus, the replacement would have potential no adverse effect.

Bike/Ped: This option for the Memorial Bridge has an adverse effect on the SML. Under it, there would immediately be a visual effect through at least the different in scale of the Bike/Ped Bridge. As with the No-Build, in the short term the SML Bridge would be maintained, but with changes in

traffic patterns and increased traffic it would eventually require replacement with a new four-lane bridge to accommodate the increased traffic on that bridge.

Note: The options for the Memorial Bridge appear not to affect the US Route 1 By-Pass. More information is needed to assess the effects to the Christian Shore Neighborhood.

J. McKay suggested another meeting to review the SML options and respond to questions from consulting parties about the above minutes from the June 3rd meeting. The next meeting on the 24th of June will be at 8:30 am to approximately 12:30 at the Offices of the Federal Highway Administration in Concord. The meeting adjourned at 12:40 pm

Respectfully Submitted, Peter Michaud, NHDHR and reviewed/edited by Joyce McKay, NHDOT

Lancaster, X-A000(564), 14836
Participant: Jim McMahon, Horizons Engineering (jmcmahon@horizonsengineering.com).

Cultural Resources Meeting Summary: The preliminary design plans for the project were presented and the limits of work along Route 2 (Portland & Prospect Street) and Mechanic Street were identified. The concrete sidewalk in front of the Town Hall will remain, as it is in good condition. The granite block wall will be replaced with a new block wall at the request of the owner and the Town of Lancaster. A photo of the replacement wall was presented. There were no objections to replacing the wall with the type shown in the photo. The use of polished granite is discouraged and will be excluded from the design plans for the curbing and the short wall. Curb inlet storm drains will be incorporated into the design along the new sidewalk alignment to collect stormwater. No trees are being taken. Photos of the surrounding buildings will be submitted to Jillian Edelmann for the file. The Cultural Resources Memo was signed as No Adverse Effect. A copy of the memo will be forwarded to Kevin Nyhan to complete the CE package.

Ossipee, X-A000(766), 15535
Participant: Scott Lees, White Mountain Survey (wlees@WhiteMountainSurvey.com) (539-4118, ex 317)

Scott Lees, PE from White Mountain Survey Co., presented the Town of Ossipee Safe Routes to School project off Route 16B in the downtown to the Cultural Resources Committee for Review. The project area is 1300' in length. The limits of excavation in most areas are 1 foot.

Mr. Lees walked the group through the project. His presentation included plans and photographs of the project area. After reviewing the project, DHR representatives requested a Phase 1B review of those portions of the site where the proposed sidewalk is not directly adjacent to the pavement of Main Street. They stated test holes should be dug on an eight-meters grid with an end-of-field letter. If deposits are found, then an array of 4-meter units should be excavated. Since the area is known to be archaeologically sensitive, no literature search was requested.

DOT indicated to Mr. Lees that since this is a federally funded project, and the Safe routes to School Program may fund the costs associated with this review. However, this statement should be verified with John Corrigan of DOT to confirm whether or not this assumption is correct.

DHR representatives requested a history of the concrete steps in front of the town library, and the concrete steps on Tax Map 92, Lot 83 because the steps are being removed as part of the project. They were wondering if the steps are an original part of the buildings' design. DHR also requested that unpolished granite be used for replacement curbs.

Mr. Lees informed DHR that he would provide them with a photo of a 32-inch diameter maple tree that is located near property identified as Tax Map 92, Lot 116. He also informed the group that this maple is scheduled to be removed as part of this project and that the tree has significant amounts of rot. DHR representatives requested a copy of the photo for their files.

Mr. Lees gave DHR representatives one copy of their RPR form for review.

Effingham, X-A000(102), 16041
Participants: Cathy Goodmen and Julius Nemeth

Initial review of an intersection improvement at the NH Route 25 and 153 intersection was presented. Part of the project involves clearing trees.

This project is to improve the safety at the westerly intersection of NH Route 25 and NH Route 153. The project is to install a raised concrete median on NH Route 153 at the approach to NH Route 25 to provide lane separation and to improve the sight distance. The project is also intended to have a better intersection recognition for the motorist puling onto NH Route 25. The sight distance will be improved by cutting and grubbing the vegetation on the northeast corner and by moving the existing ditch line farther back from the roadway. This project is located approximately 1800 feet from the Ossipee River and 725 feet from Hodgedon Brook. Effingham is known for pre-historic resources, and the project is located on upland between the two waterways. The excavation will range from 0-3'. Grubbing also involves some below ground disturbance. The project will also remove a short length of stone wall that is perpendicular to Route 25. This roadway was constructed in the 1960's through area that had no historic resources, but there may be pre-historic resources in the area where the tree cutting and grubbing occurs. DHR requested a Phase I archaeological survey of the area being cleared and grubbed. This has been approved and will be started in June or July 2010.

Plymouth, X-A000(010), 15882
Participants: Christine Perron and Bob Aubrey

Bob Aubrey provided an overview of the project. The project is a bridge rehabilitation that will consist of replacing the deck, including shoes and expansion joints, and cleaning and painting structural steel. The bridge carries NH Route 25/3A over the Baker River and was constructed in 1968 when NH Route 25 was constructed. The bridge is on the Department's Red List, and the deck has a rating of 3 (serious condition).

Inspection reports indicate that there is undermining and scour at the two bridge piers. The subject project will address these concerns by placing stone fill on the channel bottom and one area of bank to repair existing scour and erosion and prevent future undermining.

Access for placing stone fill was described. The eastern side of the bridge would result in more tree clearing and more impact to wetlands. The northwest quadrant has a 15 – 18 foot vertical drop at the river's edge. The southwest quadrant provides the best access. Part of the access road would be in swale, which would be lined with geotextile fabric and stone to limit impacts. This access route is within the existing right-of-way except for one area that would require a temporary construction easement or temporary removal of a portion of the roadway embankment material to stay within the right-of-way. Three trees that are at the edge of the bank would need to be cut. A temporary causeway would be constructed in the river to place riprap in the channel at the piers.

B. Aubrey said that the proposed access area might have been disturbed when the road was constructed. There is a sewer line just off the state ROW to the south of NH25. Access could potentially be used for the bridge project instead of creating a new access road; however the location of this sewer access has not yet been confirmed. There is a Public Informational meeting scheduled for June 8, 2010, and the location of the sewer access road will be confirmed at that meeting or soon thereafter.

Edna Feighner stated that this area has high archeological sensitivity, and asked that a Phase IB survey be completed prior to construction if the sewer line access road/swale area could not be used. B. Aubrey was concerned about the timing of a survey since the project is scheduled to advertise in September 2010. The area that would need to be surveyed is approximately 500 ft. long by 25 ft. wide. E. Feighner said that one transect down the middle would be adequate, and a literature search would not need to be completed prior to surveying. Joyce McKay indicated that the survey wouldn't take long to complete and would cost $2000 - $3000. If resources were found during the survey, the project would need to try to avoid impacts in order to avoid project delays.

E. Feighner said that an alternative to completing a survey would be to place a minimum of 1 ft. of fill over geotextile fabric for the access road.

Once the location of the access road is determined, the DOT will make a decision regarding the archaeological survey. If necessary, the project will be discussed at a future meeting following this decision.

Lyme, X-A000(887), 15695
Participants: Mike Dugas and Kevin Nyhan, NHDOT

Kevin Nyhan and Mike Dugas discussed this project, which involves upgrades to the intersection of East Thetford Road and NH Route 10. At the last meeting, Linda requested pictures of the Common area, within the Lyme Village Historic District. Kevin and Mike provide photographs. Kevin reviewed the National Register Nomination for the district in an effort to determine if the triangle, remnant piece of the common in the intersection, was discussed as a contributing element. It was not. After discussion regarding the changes that will take place at the intersection,

including the addition of green space along the roadway frontages of several parcels, it was agreed that, subject to any comments or concerns at the public meeting, the project would have no adverse effect on historic properties. *Subsequent to the meeting, no property owner expressed a concern with the additional green space at the intersection.* Given these circumstances, the project would have a no adverse effect on the district. There is no property taking and no 4(f).

Berlin, X-A000(052), 12958B

The proposed scope of work was given to NHDHR for review.

****Memos/MOA's**: Lancaster, X-A000(654), 14836

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

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