BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT
CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting
DATE OF CONFERENCES: June 4 and 11, 2009
LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building
ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT
Jill Cunningham
Jon Evans
Cathy Goodmen
Charlie Hood
Tom Jameson
Steve Johnson
Marc Laurin
Don Lyford
Joyce McKay
Kevin Nyhan
Christine Perron
David Scott
Matt Urban
Alex Vogt

Federal Highway Administration
Jamie Sikora

NHDHR
Jim Garvin
Beth Muzzey
Edna Feighner
Linda Wilson

VTrans
Scott Newman

CMA
Jeff Murray

Dubois & King
Bob Durfee

HTA
Matt Low

IAC
Ellen Marlett

Underwood Engineering
Ben Dreyer

City of Portsmouth
Peter Rice

Town of Sugar Hill
Bill McCarthy

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

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

Berlin, X-A000(052), 12958B 1
Greenland, X-A000(825), 15618 2
Sugar Hill (no project numbers) 3
Merrimack, X-A000(937), 15324 3
Nottingham 15720 (no federal number) 4
Hinsdale (no project numbers) 4
Portsmouth (no state/federal number) 7
Strafford 15502/15502A (no federal number) 10
Rochester 10620D (no federal number) 10
Lebanon-Hartford, 14957, A000(627) 11

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

June 4, 2009

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

J. McKay discussed the concerns that NHDHR had with the proposed Effect Memo placing specific mitigation and their feeling that any mitigation in the Memo will need to be more general. E. Feighner stated that the MOA would define the stipulations, which the Effects Memo would refer to the MOA for the specifics. J. McKay will revise the memo to provide this level of documentation.

A review of the specified mitigation ensued. For documentation, B. Muzzey stated that she will look at HABS/HAER guidance to determine whether Level I documentation would not be needed for as many properties as has been estimated. J. McKay stated that she estimated documentation just based on the exterior, and it could very well be less.

B. Muzzey expressed the need to have more practical hands-on workshop so the owners understand how to maintain their property in a historically viable manner. D. Lyford suggested that the memo/MOA should separate out the hands-on workshop from the overall neighborhood conceptual/planning discussions of a charrette on the neighborhood, all agreed and J. McKay will separate out into two components.

No changes were suggested on the historically compatible landscaping.

Regarding the relocation of historic properties, this mitigation effort will need be coordinated with the City's stabilization program. J. Cunningham agreed that we would need to wait to hear from the City. J. Sikora stated that an outline of the more intact and/or significant buildings for possible relocation or marketing would be needed.

Salvage of materials will remain as mitigation as the City is interested in pursuing this option. B. Muzzey has no problem with this in this instance, but as this is not an option that she would want to consider for every future projects.

B. Muzzey thought that the public outreach mitigation should be more specific on how it will get done and offered that the web information could also be placed on the DHR website.

No changes on the archaeology mitigation were suggested.

J. McKay summarized that the Effects Memo would just include a list of the types of mitigation as has been discussed and will not discuss the specifics of the mitigation.

Greenland, X-A000(825), 15618
Participants: Joyce McKay, NHDOT; Beth Muzzey, NHDHR; Jamie Sikora, FHWA

B. Muzzey, NHDHR and J. Sikora for FHWA signed the No Adverse Effect Memo. The NHDHR's Request for Project Review form was also signed with the 'No Historic Properties Affected' box checked. The Memo was distributed to NHDHR and FHWA, and given to K. Nyhan for NHDOT distribution.

Sugar Hill (no project numbers)
Participants: Bill McCarthy, Town Engineer (rkkski@myfairpoint.net, 603-616-7024)

The purpose of the project is to replace the existing concrete slab bridge (208/125) over Indian Creek. The bridge is placed on the Municipal Red List by NH DOT in an inspection report dated 11/07/06.

The existing bridge is an un-reinforced concrete structure, built in 1940 with a span over Indian Creek of approximately 9'-0. From inspection of the structure it appears to have been formed on site with concrete poured in place. The length of the bridge at centerline is 25 feet. Bridge rails at upstream and downstream ends of bridge are 3 feet high concrete walls. The bridge has settled over the years and many stress cracks appear in the structure. The paved roadway over the bridge is 16 feet. Traffic is moderate.

The bridge is located in a rural setting with one resident within ½ mile on either side of the bridge. The bridge is surrounded by tillable farmland and is an active vegetable farm, managed by the Turtle Ridge Foundation, formerly Sel Hannah Farm. The stream banks are vegetated, and tillable farmland starts 10-20 feet from the stream bank.

The proposed construction sequence for the project is as follows:

1. Excavate temporary 70' by pass channel
2. Construct cofferdam to bypass Indian Creek
3. Remove existing bridge and appurtenances
4. Place 3 sided bridge culvert, bridge will be 37' long at centerline and have an opening 4' high at streambed and 10'-wide
5. Remove cofferdam, fill by pass channel, and restore to existing condition

The entire project is expected to take less than 2 weeks.

It was concluded that the existing bridge was not historically significance; and no architectural survey needs to be undertaken. However, in as much as there is ground disturbance associated with the project, an archeological assessment including phases IA and IB, if needed, will be required. This action will be undertaken.

Note: A Phase IB Intensive Archaeological survey was undertaken, E. Feighner concluded on July 13, 2009 that no further survey work was required.

Merrimack, X-A000(937), 15324
Participants: Matt Low, HTA (mlow@hoyletanner.com)

All parties signed the Municipally Managed Memorandum of Effect. No historic or archaeological properties will be affected. It was noted that all necessary archaeological survey was completed, and the project area was determined not sensitive. The completed memo was distributed to, NHDHR, NHDOT, FHWA and Hoyle, Tanner and Associates.

Nottingham 15720 (no federal number)
Participants: Matt Low, HTA (mlow@hoyletanner.com)

M. Low provided an overview of the project explaining that it involved the replacement of an 8' ± diameter corrugated metal pipe (CMP) with a 20' span precast concrete box culvert on Deerfield Road. The existing CMP was likely built in the late 1970's and replaced an earlier timber deck/steel stringer bridge constructed in the 1940's. The existing CMP does not qualify as a bridge; however, our recent hydrologic/hydraulic study determined that a larger structure is required to alleviate the common flooding.

E. Feighner was concerned that an undisturbed terrace at the northwest quadrant of the bridge might be archaeologically sensitive. This area would be impacted by a proposed drainage swale. It was decided that if the design stayed the way it is, with the drainage ditch, a Phase 1-A archeological investigation of that area would be necessary. If the swale and associated impacts could be eliminated, then no investigation would be necessary. Mr. Low stated that we would evaluate the situation and advise NHDHR of which way the project would proceed. It is anticipated that e-mail correspondence will be utilized to communicate the further direction of the project. (HTA conclude that the drainage swale would not be used).

Hinsdale (no project numbers)
Participants: Ben Dreyer, Underwood Engineering (bdreyer@underwoodeng.com)

Following introductions, the project limits were identified including previous work completed adjacent to the project area. The project is identified as Brattleboro Road Infrastructure Improvements and is scheduled for construction in 2010. A state (NHDOT) project number has not been assigned at this time. It is anticipated during design phase.

Ongoing improvements related to the proposed project previously completed in the downtown area include two similar sidewalk projects. The Main Street Sidewalks Project (STP – TE – X – 000S334) completed in 2003 consisted of sidewalk construction starting at the intersection of Depot Street and Main Street and continuing west to Hancock Street. The Canal Street Sewer Improvements Project completed in 2007 primarily served to replace sections of failed sewer mains but also included construction of sidewalks along Canal Street starting at Depot Street and continuing east to Cream Pot Hill Road.

The primary focus of the proposed improvements is to replace the existing sewer on Main Street and Brattleboro Road in support of the Town's efforts to reduce infiltration and inflow (I/I) at the wastewater treatment facility (WWTF).

A Sewer System Evaluation Report (UEI 2003) documented I/I data collection efforts, quantified I/I impacts to the WWTF and identified sewer replacement as the most cost effective I/I solution. Similarly, a Water System Evaluation Report (UEI 2003) documented water transmission system flow testing, water transmission system computer modeling and identified replacement of

undersized sections of water main to provide required fire flows. The water main upgrade included in the proposed project is based on recommendations identified in this report. Sidewalk rehabilitation of existing pedestrian facilities and roadway improvements will be completed in conjunction with the sewer and water system upgrades. The roadway surface within the project limits will be restored using a trench repair and overlay.

Project Area

The limits of the project area extend along Main Street & Brattleboro Road starting at Depot Street and continuing west to Rolling Hills Road (~3,200 LF). Main Street and Brattleboro Road are assimilated with State Route 119 (entirely) and Route 63 (partially) and are therefore classified under NHDOT jurisdiction (i.e. right of way). Coordination with NHDOT (District 4) for project review and approval will be initiated during the design phase.

Based on historical reviews completed by SHPO in conjunction with NHDOT improvements on Chesterfield Road (Rte 63), the entire project area (i.e. downtown Hinsdale) has been determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Therefore the provisions for the Section 106 review process apply to limit potential for adverse effects to historic features within the project area. Resolution to limit or mitigate adverse effects to historic features will be documented in a Memorandum of Agreement.

Project Scope

The infrastructure improvement project includes the following elements:

Sanitary Sewer:	3,200+/- ft. (Basis of Project)
Water:	450+/- ft. Pleasant Street to High Street
Roadway Repairs:	3,200+/- ft. (Trench patch with overlay)
Sidewalk Rehabilitation:	1,500 +/- ft. Northfield Road to Rolling Hills (continues from 2003 Main Street Sidewalk Project)
Landscaping:	Repair disturbed areas to original condition

Environmental Review Documentation

An Environmental Report will be submitted to Rural Development (RD) for review. This report serves to document review of environmental, historic and other regulated resources in support of federal funding programs relative to the sewer improvements associated with this project. The Environmental Report is intended to serve as environmental review documentation for other agencies as well. This report will incorporate information and recommendations based on discussions during the Cultural Resources Meeting. A DRAFT copy of this report will be provided to SHPO for concurrent review with RD.

Discussion

Sidewalks - The sidewalk improvements will encourage and enhance alternative modes of transportation. Specifically, the proposed improvements will provide safe, direct and convenient access to the downtown area, linking residential areas with municipal services (Town Offices),

education facilities, river walk, elderly care facility and local businesses. Note that the proposed sidewalk improvements are intended to rehabilitate existing deficient sidewalks only (i.e. new locations are not anticipated unless requested by review agencies or extenuating circumstances are encountered).

Sidewalk construction may require replacement or repairs to existing retaining structures and/or established vegetation (e.g. trees). Impacts to retaining walls older than 50 years (refer to attached photos No. 7, 8, 10-12), mature trees (photo No. 10) or established rows of trees are of significant interest to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and must be mitigated under the provisions of the Section 106 review. Specifically, close attention will be given to the nature of construction materials and aesthetic design elements supported by consultations with SHPO to mitigate any impacts to historic features.

Consideration will be given to location of proposed sidewalks during the design and review phases and may include replacing or constructing sidewalks on both or one side of the roadway. Modifying the sidewalk cross-section for consistency with the nature of the surrounding environment may be appropriate (i.e. concrete sidewalk with curb in downtown areas vs. paved sidewalk with grass strip in rural area west of downtown).

Property Impacts - Temporary construction easements may be necessary if replacement of retaining structures is pursued.

Historic District – Although the Hinsdale Zoning Regulations do not include a historic district, many of the homes and buildings within the downtown village area are historic in nature. Furthermore, the entire project area is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Reference was made to the Neighborhood Heritage Area Program as an additional resource for historic features within the project area.

Environmental - Limited environmental impacts (if any) are anticipated because the project is located within the limits of previously disturbed roadway.

Archaeological - The NH Division of Historical Resources has indicated that impacts to archeological resources within the project area are not anticipated. However, based on artifacts observed on Canal Street (i.e. stone arch culvert under roadway), any similar structures of historic nature encountered within the project area will be reported to NHDHR for appropriate action for preservation efforts.

Short Term Impacts -

- Traffic control will be implemented using a traffic control plan approved by the Town and NHDOT
- Any dust generated during construction activities will be controlled using a water truck or other dust retardant
- Noise associated with construction activity will be controlled by generally limiting the workday from 7:00 am to 5:00 pm Monday through Friday. Possible exceptions (i.e. evening work after 5:00 pm or weekends) may be necessary on occasion to complete certain phases of the work.

- Best Management Practices (BMP's) will be implemented to control potential for sediment or erosion impacts.
- Coordination with local business owners to identify peak use times and truck delivery schedules will be completed during the design phase for development of construction scheduling and traffic routing plans.

Next Steps

- UEI to submit DRAFT copy of Environmental Review Document to NHDHR for review and comment (concurrent with RD submission)
- UEI to review NHDOT/SHPO historic records documenting eligibility determination for listing Hinsdale downtown area on the National Register of Historic Places (provided by Joyce McKay)
- UEI to coordinate preliminary design (30% and/or 60%) consultation with NHDHR consistent with Section 106 Review
    - Prepare detailed photos of historic features that may be impacted
    - Consult with Richard Butler of the Marlborough Historical Society in reference to local stone masons available to examine the nature and character of existing stone walls within the project area and rebuild where necessary.
- UEI to pursue continue consultation and Memorandum of Agreement through Section 106 review process to record project effects and mitigation.

June 11, 2009

Portsmouth (no state/federal number)
Participants: Jeff Murray (jmurray@cmaengineers.com); Peter Rice, City of Portsmouth; Ellen Marlett, IAC

Project Background

- Peter Rice discussed the need for the sewer separation project with respect to USEPA Administrative Order and Consent Decree to separate sewer and storm water flows. The project is part of $100 million in utilities upgrades being completed by the City.
- While completing utilities upgrade, City takes the opportunity to upgrade water lines, roadway and streetscape features.
- P. Rice described the city's understanding of the sensitive historic and archaeological nature of the work in Portsmouth. This is why CMA Engineers has included work by IAC and the Preservation Company. City has expended approximately 20% of the design budget on the investigations and a significant amount of costs have been budgeted for work during construction. Contract Documents include compensation to the Contractor for delays associated with archaeological work.
- Jeff Murray indicated that the project is being partially funded under the SRF/ARRA loan program and was the top rated wastewater project in the state for receipt of stimulus funds. The design has been completed and submitted to NHDES-WEB for final approval. The SRF/ARRA loan documentation is anticipated to go before Governor and Council next week for authorization pending completion of environmental review and required approvals.

- J. Murray described the project limit as including Pleasant Street to Marcy Street and Atkinson Street (between State and Court Streets).
- The proposed project includes Upgrades to Existing Sewer, Water and Drainage System
    - Separation of Sewer and Storm water
    - Treatment of Storm water with settling tank and sand filter.
    - Replacing 100 yr old brick sewer and water mains. The existing brick sewer has collapsed in several areas, requiring repairs with PVC piping. Some collapses have led to development of 30-foot sinkholes.
- Project also includes significant improvements to Pedestrian Safety and Aesthetics
    - Brick Sidewalks
    - Street Trees and Landscaping
    - Bumpouts for Traffic Calming
    - Narrowed Vehicle Travel Lanes. Existing travel lanes are being reduced from 14-feet to 11- feet. The 6-feet gained from reduction in travel lanes are being distributed for additional sidewalk width. 4-feet will be added to south side and 2-feet added to the north side.

Archaeological Resources

- J. Murray and Ellen Marlatt summarized work completed by IAC for the Phase IA Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment.
    - 1813 fire destroyed or severely damaged many of the homes and businesses
    - Reconstruction included widening of State Street to the north and filling of many of the remaining cellar holes
    - 56 total sensitive areas identified in project area. Ellen described the method for preparation of the sensitive area mapping that was based on L. Monroe's report of reconstruction of buildings on the south side over existing foundations. They have some confidence in the locations shown.
    - 24 Highly Sensitive Areas on north side of State Street to be monitored by IAC. Here State Street may now cover buildings burned in 1813. During Construction
        - Work in and adjacent to the north side consists of primarily Catch Basins, Sidewalk, and Utility Services
        - Deep Trench Excavation within existing Sewer Alignment and on South Side of State Street
    - IAC was requested to identify on the sensitivity map the locations of structures that were removed for the construction of the Memorial Bridge. The project area for this bridge was partly located in the current project area.
- During monitoring, IAC will document the Pre-1813 Commercial Core of State Street uncovered during construction.
- The committee also requested that IAC observe stump removal for the two Norway Maples as appropriate for potential exposure of sensitive materials. The maples are adjacent to the duplexes on the north side of State Street.
- The committee requested a copy of IACs protocol for investigation during construction. A protocol for removing and resetting any aboveground features will also be provided.
- E. Marlatt also described their investigation work during Unitil's installation of the new gas main on the northern portion of State Street. Excavation encountered some areas that were recorded but the limited depth of the excavation (approx 4-feet) did not go below the

fill in many areas. Separately, inspection of Unitil's work on State Street and Chestnut Street (outside the project area) did not uncover any additional remnants of building foundations or burial ground artifacts.

- The committee asked about what information is known about the existing water mains and sewer lines, for example when and how was it installed, how did it function, etc. and what consideration has been given to recordation or mitigation of these features. P. Rice explained that they have some research information on when the water system was installed, ownership, etc. but very little is known about the sewer system, other than it is a single brick layer of circular pipe that is failing. P. Rice indicated that the city is not interested in expending additional resources to research aspects of the utilities and believe it is outside the required scope. IAC will be documenting the existing utility construction type and providing a diagram in their report, but are not planning on documenting the location of the utilities throughout the project area. E. Feighner indicated that impact to the water lines and sewer system needed to be mitigated. She requested a history of the development of public sewer and water in Portsmouth as background to the specific line(s) being impacted by the project.
- The committee inquired about what consideration has been given to providing public access to the property. See below.

Historical Resources

- J. Murray indicated that Preservation Company Prepared Details Area Form and reviewed a number of the photographs in the report.
    - Many Buildings' Approximate Date of Construction is around 1820.
    - After 1814 construction period, most buildings front on the existing sidewalk in a 60-foot ROW as established in 1814.
    - Durham Paver flat stones were used to pave sidewalks, but were replaced with brick and then pavement
        - Durham Pavers were reset on Chapel Street at State Street recently, and will remain in place with this project
    - State Street had, until 1953, planting strips with street trees and 5 to 6-foot wide sidewalks
    - In 1953, State Street was widened for Route 1 and planting strip were removed.
    - State Street is in City Historic District, which was established in 1976.
    - The project area has about 40 contributing properties of architectural and historical significance.
- Project includes the establishment of wider sidewalks and street trees.
- Sidewalk construction will abut existing building foundations, window wells, or granite curbing/stairs. New sidewalks will incorporate a drainage geocomposite material to direct infiltrated storm water away from existing foundations. The geocomposite will also serve as a joint between bricks and existing building and stair foundations or granite curb/slabs.
- Removal/resetting of any fencing, posts, or stairs is not anticipated. Some of the granite steps may need to be temporarily relocated and reset. CMA Engineers will provide their protocol to be followed during construction for tracking any items to be removed and reset.
- The existing granite curbing is not the wide historical curbing that was removed and reset on Court Street and other downtown areas. It is a narrow 4 or 5-inch wide curb and will be

removed and likely re-used as part of landscaping areas. New curbing will be 6-inch nominal width to be consistent with recent reconstruction in downtown Portsmouth.

Action Items

- Submittal of IAC and CMA Protocols to NHDOT and NHDHR for the investigation of sensitive areas and removal/resetting of existing features during construction. There will also be a preconstruction meeting with the contractor to review the protocols.
- IAC to add the structures removed for the Memorial Bridge construction in 1920s to the Sensitive Area Map.
- CMA to provide detail of sidewalk construction for the committee's reference.
- Committee inquired about public access to the Archaeological and Historic Preservation reports. IAC will review their report for any limitations with respect to Right-to-Know. Electronic copies of the reports will be provided to NHDOT and NHDHR as applicable for posting on their website. Additional public locations will be reviewed by City and IAC and reported to the Committee.

Strafford 15502/15502A (no federal number)
Participants: Bob Durfee, Dubois and King (rdurfee@dubois-king.com)

The Committee reviewed the Phase I stabilization and the Phase II replacement of the Northwood Road over Buzzell's Run Brook Bridge (085/040). It is a 1942 concrete slab bridge.

Bob Durfee provided a brief overview. Phase I stabilization was completed last fall (October 2008), and it addressed scour, sinkholes, and settlement of the existing bridge. Phase II is scheduled for fall 2009 or spring 2010 and will consist of removing existing bridge and wing walls and constructing a new precast concrete bridge structure, footings and wing walls. All Phase II construction will be within the existing right-of-way.

The Committee determined there are no archaeological or historic properties within the project limits. The project will have no historic properties affected. No federal funds are included.

B. Durfee will complete a Memorandum of Effect form.

Rochester 10620D (no federal number)
Participants: Kevin Nyhan

Kevin Nyhan reviewed the Rochester, 10620D project, which involves widening and completing safety improvements along the Spaulding Turnpike from Exit 11 to Exit 16. The Department is proposing to amend the wetland mitigation package to include a creation and potential preservation site at another site in Rochester: Henderson site. K. Nyhan provided a map of the area, which is in the vicinity of the Cocheco River off Chestnut Hill Road. There are no architectural resources on site. E. Feighner indicated that as long as the construction portion of the creation site was done in previously disturbed areas, she had no concerns about archaeological

sensitivity. If construction were to include areas that had not been previously disturbed, NHDHR would want to see additional information regarding archaeological sensitivity.

June 22, 2009

Lebanon-Hartford, 14957, A000(627)
Participants: Beth Muzzey, Jim Garvin, Edna Feighner, Linda Wilson, NHDHR; Scott Newman, VTrans; Jamie Sikora, FHWA; Charlie Hood, Steve Johnson, Joyce McKay, Christine Perron, David Scott, Alex Vogt, NHDOT

Jamie Sikora explained that the purpose of the meeting was to move the Section 106 process forward for the subject project. Charlie Hood added that he would like to see the project move forward to the public hearing with the modified online alignment as the preferred alternative. Section 106 consultation could continue until the hearing was held, and if that consultation determined that rehabilitation was a better alternative, then the project's document and scope would be changed accordingly. J. Sikora thought that notification of the Advisory Council should await a determination of adverse effect.

Jim Garvin asked what had been done to date for Section 106 since he did not think his office had seen anything to analyze. He asked when the Section 106 process was initiated, and stated that he still has not seen the original plans for the bridge. (After referring to minutes subsequent to the meeting, it was determined that the 106 process was initiated on July 10, 2008 when the project was first discussed at a monthly SHPO meeting. Plans will be provided to DHR.)

Christine Perron read a timeline of the project's Section 106 process to date:

- **July 10, 2008** – Cultural Resource Coordination meeting
- **September 11, 2008** – Cultural Resource Coordination meeting
- **October 8, 2008** – Letters were sent to Hartford Historical Society, Hartford Preservation Commission, Lebanon Historical Society, Lebanon Heritage Commission to inform them of the project and invite them to the public meeting,
- **October 21, 2008** – Public Officials/Public Informational Meeting, Lebanon, NH
  - Statement was read that included information on the Section 106 process and the historic resources in the project area
- **February 5, 2009** – Cultural Resource Coordination meeting
  - Brief discussion about the upcoming public info meeting
- **February 11, 2009** – Public Officials/Public Informational Meeting, Hartford, VT
  - Statement was read that included information on the Section 106 process and the historic resources in the project area
  - Three DOT presenters reiterated the fact that DOT wanted public input regarding the rehab vs. replacement options for this historic bridge.
  - A handout was provided describing the historic nature of the bridge.
- **February 12, 2009** – A Lebanon City Council member emailed local historic groups to remind them that DOT wanted their input on this project.
- **March 5, 2009** – Cultural Resource Coordination meeting
  - A matrix was completed to compare 5 project alternatives for purposes of discussion
  - DOT stated that its preferred alternative was the modified online alignment

  - Beth Muzzey asked DOT to use AASHTO Guidelines for further investigation of rehab option.
- **April 2, 2009** – Cultural Resource Coordination meeting
  - Discussed summary of Guidelines, which was, in general, considered inadequate by DHR
- **May 4, 2009** – Received comments from DHR regarding summary of Guidelines
- **June 10, 2009** – Email from Jamie Sikora, FHWA, regarding moving the 106 process forward with the information obtained to date.
- **June 19, 2009** – Email from B. Muzzey, SHPO, regarding the need for additional information.
- **June 22, 2009** – Meeting with DHR and Scott Newman.

J. Garvin stated that DHR still did not have an understanding of the bridge's significance based on the information that has been discussed, and he did not think a preferred alternative should be selected at this point. Alex Vogt said that since everyone agrees that the bridge is historic and eligible for the National Register, he didn't understand why more information on the bridge's significance was necessary. B. Muzzey explained that DHR and FHWA need to make an informed decision regarding the project's effect on the bridge. The 4(f) process requires an understanding of the relative significance of the bridge and its elements since this factors into feasibility and prudence of each alternative.

J. Sikora stated that a consensus is often made to reach a determination of effect in order to streamline the process. Linda Wilson countered that DHR was presented with a fait accompli without any technical information. J. Garvin added that federal laws assume the preferred alternative is rehabilitation until proven unfeasible and imprudent. Steve Johnson clarified that rehabilitation has been studied in detail.

J. Garvin added that since DOT is committed to the Context Sensitive Solutions process, he would expect the Department to utilize the process for this project since this is such a sensitive site. A. Vogt explained that part of the CSS process is getting public input. DOT has gone to the communities of Lebanon and Hartford a number of times to seek input on the project. Input from both communities has always been in support of a multi-modal crossing. No one from these communities has come forward in support of rehabilitation.

S. Newman said that the 4(f) process is done "in a vacuum" and isn't concerned with public input. He further summarized his position on the project. He acknowledged that the bridge is historic. It is known that the bridge can be rehabilitated, and it is known that the cost of rehabilitation is comparable to replacement. The remaining issues pertain to geometry. He explained that the 24' clear width with the current ADT was not a concern (when asked, S. Newman clarified that he was speaking for himself and that VTrans had not weighed in on the adequacy of the 24' width). He does not think the portal height is a big issue, and some modifications may be okay to do. He said that adding a second sidewalk by modifying existing abutments needed to be studied in more detail, including costs. Moreover, the necessity of adding a second sidewalk needs to be addressed. He feels that bicycle advocates tend to be very vocal, but do they really need more than they have at this time since they can currently cross the existing bridge without any modifications? S. Newman also stated that he felt the public meeting in Hartford was primarily for the temporary bridge (14957A) and not enough information was presented about the 14957 project alternatives. Finally, he stated that 4(f) requires documentation that rehabilitation of the bridge would cause extraordinary harm to the community. S. Newman will discuss 4(f) with Mary Anne Nabor.

B. Muzzey stated that she was concerned about how the project alternatives were presented at the public informational meetings. While she did not attend either public meeting, she was worried that the presentation may have appeared biased, without any acknowledgement that the bridge could be rehabilitated and remain a historic resource. C. Perron indicated that the significance of the bridge had been presented verbally at both public meetings, and also in written form at the Hartford public meeting.

Joyce McKay stated that she now has a draft inventory form for the bridge. B. Muzzey asked if the form was sufficient to take to a DOE meeting. J. McKay said that some information is lacking, and J. Garvin responded that DHR could provide additional information. J. McKay will provide copies of the form to J. Sikora, B. Muzzey, and S. Newman for review.

J. Garvin stated that he would like to know more about the railroad underpass in Vermont. S. Newman replied that the line and the bridge are eligible for the National Register. The clearance of the underpass is 13'-6". VTrans would like to address this underpass but a project to do so is not programmed. J. Garvin questioned the construction of a new bridge crossing when the underpass would still restrict height and width. L. Wilson likened this to constructing a fabulous ADA-compliant bathroom on the fourth floor. C. Perron explained that the restrictions of the railroad underpass could eventually be addressed during the life span of a new bridge crossing. Moreover, the project needs to consider projected traffic volumes and population growth. This area is expected to continue growing and is not expected to get less urban. It was noted that one quadrant of the bridge is already developed (Stateline Sports) and two developments and a public park are planned for the remaining three quadrants in the near future.

S. Newman asked if there was any information about truck traffic along this corridor, or if a corridor study has ever been done. S. Johnson explained that some information on traffic was obtained from Vermont. It was pointed out that trucks make up 6.5% of traffic over the bridge. S. Johnson said that this percentage was a little higher than the average of approximately 4%.

S. Newman reiterated that the chosen alternative really comes down to geometry. C. Perron added that accident rates are an important component of any discussion about geometry, and that the section of Route 4 from Crafts Avenue west to the state line has been identified by the NHDOT as having an accident rate that warrants further investigation. Only 170 miles of roadway in NH are identified in this way. J. Garvin asked about the types of accidents that are occurring near the bridge. C. Perron answered that most of the accidents are rear-end collisions. One cause of rear-end collisions at this site may be due to the bridge's narrow width. While a vehicle going under Vermont's railroad underpass may yield to let an opposing vehicle pass through the underpass due to concerns of narrowness, that same vehicle would not wait at one end of the bridge for an opposing vehicle to cross the entire length of the bridge despite their being uncomfortable with its narrowness. This may cause the driver to unexpectedly reduce the speed at which he crosses the bridge, which is not always anticipated by vehicles traveling behind him.

B. Muzzey stated that more information is needed about property impacts that would result from improving the approaches under the rehabilitation alternative, and how this compares to other alternatives.

S. Newman asked if there were similar bridges that could be compared to the subject bridge in regard to geometry and safety. S. Johnson replied that any comparisons should be to bridges of similar length, width, traffic volumes, etc. in order to make a fair comparison. It was also noted that this bridge has much higher traffic volumes than all other high truss bridges in NH.

L. Wilson said that the existing bridge likely serves as a traffic calming measure. She stated that the project needs to look at the whole context of the area. S. Newman said that more information is needed on roadway width and surrounding intersections relative to traffic and safety concerns. B. Muzzey said that more information is needed about how sight distance could be improved without bridge replacement and how possible improvements would compare to other alternatives. S. Newman asked if anything else could be done to improve safety. S. Johnson said that the speed limit could be reduced from 30 mph to 25 mph or less, but the towns wouldn't like it. Vehicles leaving Prospect Street cannot see the traffic on the bridge even within the stopping sight distance. For an intersection, the minimum sight distance should be 290 feet; however, the existing condition provides approximately 180 feet of sight distance (the 180 foot intersection sight distance equates to a design speed of less than 20 mph). S. Newman said that more information is needed regarding how a wider bridge with better sight distance would impact safety.

B. Muzzey stated that DHR would like to review and comment on the 4(f) analysis when it is written.

****Memos/MOA's**: Merrimack 15324; Antrim 14944; Derry 13652; Wentworth 14517A

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

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