BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT
CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting
DATE OF CONFERENCES: June 8, 2017
LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building
ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT
Joseph Adams
Sheila Charles
Victoria Chase
Ron Crickard
Michael Dugas
Jill Edelmann
Bob Juliano
Ron Kleiner
Robert Landry
Marc Laurin
Kevin Nyhan
CR Willeke

NHDHR
Laura Black
Richard Boisvert

FHWA
Jamie Sikora

FHI
Stephanie Dyer-Carroll

HDR
James Murphy

HTA
Matthew Low
Kimberly Peace

IAC
Jacob Tumelaire

VHB
Nicole Benjamin-Ma
Greg Bakos
Steven Hodgdon
Karen Huberdeau
Marty Kennedy

City of Manchester
Bruce Thomas

Town of Peterborough &

Peterborough Heritage Commission
Rodney Bartlett
Peggy Shaughnessy

Via teleconference:
Corinne Chronopoulos
Kitty Henderson
Esther Kennedy
Marcia Patten
Stephen Skoglund
Karen Struthers

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

Peterborough 14933/14772A, X-A002(107)/X-A000(535) 1
Manchester 16099 (no federal number) 4
New Castle-Rye 16127, X-A001(146) 7
Manchester 29811, X-A004(311) 9
Manchester 40428, X-A004(399) 11

Peterborough 14933/14772A, X-A002(107)/X-A000(535)
Participants: Matt Low, Kimberly Peace, HTA; Rodney Bartlett, Peterborough Town Administrator; Peggy Shaughnessy, Peterborough Heritage Commission; CR Willeke, Marc Laurin, NHDOT; Via teleconference: Corinne Chronopoulos, Peterborough Library; Karen Struthers, Peterborough Library Board of Trustees; Marcia Patten, Peterborough Library Board of Trustees

The Department of Transportation held a cultural resources meeting to review the NEPA re-evaluation for the above-listed projects. Hoyle, Tanner personnel presented to the Committee to update them on the current status of the project and to discuss the steps necessary to complete the NEPA re-evaluation, including Section 4(f) analysis.

M. Low provided an introduction of the project, briefly, replacement of the Main Street Bridge with an in-kind structure, reconstruction and stabilization of the boulder retaining wall along US Route 202, and safety improvements to the intersection of US Route 202 and Main Street.

K. Peace provided a more detailed review of the project's history and NEPA evaluation. The project will affect the following historic Section 4(f) resources: The Main Street Bridge, the Peterborough Town Library and the Brick Block Row House, which are eligible for listing on National Register of Historic Places (National Register); the Peterborough Downtown Commercial, Civic and Residential Historic District, eligible for listing on the National Register as a Historic District; and the Transcript Dam and Retaining Wall, which are contributing elements to the District.

The following steps have occurred to complete the NEPA process:

- An Effect Memo was issued January 22, 2016, noting adverse effects to the Bridge and Historic District;
- An MOA was developed between SHPO, NHDOT and FHWA, May 31, 2016, stipulating mitigation targeted towards loss of the Bridge and changes to the Historic District, including:
    - Re-use of stone facing on bridge
    - Develop tri-fold brochure with information about Historic District
    - Develop video documenting Bridge before, during and after construction
- A NEPA Cat Ex and Final Section 4(f) Evaluation was completed on October 2016,
- FHWA Execution of the Cat Ex and Section 4(f) Determination was completed on December 2, 2016.

Consulting parties to the project include the Peterborough Heritage Commission, Peterborough Town Library, Peterborough Economic Development Authority and Peterborough Greater Downtown Tax Increment Fund.

K. Peace explained how the original Proposed Action included a permanent pedestrian bridge located downstream of and adjacent to the replacement Main Street bridge. In December 20, 2016, the Town of Peterborough and several consulting parties requested re-evaluation of alternatives to eliminate the permanent pedestrian bridge, in part because the Library has plans for the outdoor areas adjacent to the Bridge. Four new alternatives were evaluated:

#1 – Relocate the permanent pedestrian bridge upstream of the vehicular bridge.
#2 – Eliminate the permanent pedestrian bridge and maintain only one sidewalk on the new vehicular bridge, likely on the downstream side.
#3 – Eliminate the permanent pedestrian bridge and put two sidewalks on a new vehicular bridge matching the width of the existing bridge.
#4 – Eliminate the permanent pedestrian bridge and construct two sidewalks on a new wider vehicular bridge.

The Select Board approved Alternative #4 on May 16, 2017. This alternative will have reduced permanent impacts to the Library. Because a mitigation stipulation is re-use of the stone facing from the existing bridge on the replacement bridge, the proposed alternative will allow for a

reduced visual impact as removal of the pedestrian bridge will result in an unimpeded view of the downstream side of the bridge from the Library.

A NEPA Draft Re-Evaluation was submitted to NHDOT and FHWA May 18, 2017, including support letters from the Select Board, the Heritage Commission, the 1833 Society, and the Library Trustees. R. Bartlett provided a letter of support from the Economic Development Authority. M. Laurin had responded with edits and comments on the Re-Evaluation, including a comparison table of impacts to the historic Section 4(f) resources and a more detailed review of the Least Overall Harm Analysis criteria. K. Peace handed out a comparison impact table and discussed how the only two of the criteria will be changed, reflecting the reduction of permanent impacts to the Library lawn.

L. Black asked about the proposed width of the Main Street Bridge as compared to the original proposed action. K. Peace explained that although one of the alternatives discussed in the original NEPA Evaluation included a wider bridge to include sidewalks on both sides of the bridge, this would have been in connection with a phased construction schedule, so the bridge would have had to be over-widened by approximately 15 feet. The new proposed action will only need to widen the bridge approximately 5 feet as the Town has decided to close the bridge during construction, eliminating the need for an additional lane.

R. Boisvert asked about the impacts to the historic canal and the proposed rehabilitation. M. Low explained the canal will be slip-lined and stones from the canal ceiling, which have fallen, will be re-used in future Town development to show the historic location of the canal through the Town.

R. Boisvert suggested that the re-use of the canal stones should be included in the MOA as a stipulation.

K. Peace asked if the Effect memo and the MOA would need to be re-issued, or could the documents be line edited? J. Sikora stated he would defer to NHDOT for this determination. J. Edelmann stated that the MOA could be amended, with signatures as needed, to preserve project chronology. J. Sikora said he would determine if the Re-Evaluation and Amendment would need to be reviewed by others within FHWA (Legal staff and/or Federal Preservation Officer).

R. Boisvert asked if the MOA stipulation regarding the video would be available online? K. Peace stated that the MOA specified the Town would post the video on YouTube and the Town website, and DVD’s would be available.

K. Peace stated the next steps in the process: Amend the MOA, line item the Effect memo, respond to NHDOT comments and revise the Draft NEPA Re-Evaluation. This was agreed to verbally by the attendees.

Manchester 16099 (no federal number)
Participants: Nicole Benjamin-MA, Karen Huberdeau, Marty Kennedy, Frank Koczalka, VHB; Jake Tumelaire, IAC; Ron Crickard, Keith Cota, Mike Dugas, Trent Zanes, Marc Laurin, Chuck Schmidt, NHDOT

Continued consultation on proposed alternatives for improvements to I-293 (F.E. Everett Turnpike Exits 6 & 7), potential impacts to cultural resources, results of the Phase IB archaeological investigations, and public information meeting comments.
Mr. Marty Kennedy, VHB's project manager for the project, informed everyone that there was a public informational meeting held on June 7th in Manchester with nearly 175 attendees. He stated that there is not much opposition to the project and that most would just like to see it built. Mr. Kennedy explained that the "proposed action" will include relocating the Exit 7 interchange to the north of the landfill. The new full access/egress interchange would connect Front Street with Dunbarton Road. He also noted that the previously considered connector road from Dunbarton Road to Goffstown Road has been eliminated as both the Town of Goffstown and the City of Manchester feel it is no longer needed due to the changes in truck access along Goffstown Road. Mr. Kennedy explained that the "proposed action" for the mainline calls for one additional lane in each direction (2 lanes to 3 lanes) - although the future design volumes suggest that the segment north of Exit 7 would not need the additional lane.

Mr. Kennedy then discussed the alternatives for the Exit 6 interchange, starting with the Offset Diamond Interchange alternative. He stated that this alternative works well operationally. However, it was recently brought to the project team's attention that there is an approved site development for a subdivision off Coolidge Ave that would be directly impacted by this alternative. He stated that NHDOT would need to acquire this property or build a 60-foot retaining wall. He also discussed issues with the Coolidge Ave intersection and its proximity to the proposed signal. He stated that additional improvements would have to be made at this intersection and potentially Montgomery Street to safely accommodate traffic maneuvers in this area. There is a potential for a raised median to restrict access to Coolidge Ave, which would negatively affect the business across the street.

Given these new issues with the Offset Diamond configuration, Mr. Kennedy noted that the design team analyzed a modified SPUI interchange. The modified SPUI is similar to the previously studied SPUI alternative with the difference being that the modified SPUI would not provide a connection to Eddy Road and Front Street. This would eliminate the need for the additional bridge crossing of I-293 as well as the additional signalized intersection, which had created the previously described queuing issues. He explained that one potential issue with this alternative is that the residential neighborhood on Dunbarton Road would not have direct access to the Exit 6 interchange and the Amoskeag bridge.

Mr. Kennedy added that eliminating this connector, which the Modified SPUI would do, would allow Eddy Road and Front Street to function more as a local, low volume roadway. He stated that the proposed SPUI and Offset Diamond interchanges, currently project future traffic volumes to be about 1,100 vehicles/hour (vph) on Eddy Road and Front Street. He added that with the modified SPUI interchange, the traffic volumes would be substantially lower at approximately 400 vph. The lower traffic volume demand would be consistent with the City's multimodal vision by providing a corridor that would enhance connectivity for bicyclists and pedestrians. This would provide a nice bicycle route connecting the west side neighborhoods with the Manchester Community College.

Mr. Kennedy also noted the Modified SPUI has an advantage over the Offset Diamond alternative in that there is no signalized intersection at the Goffstown Road/Front Street intersection thereby reducing the potential impact vehicles queuing back and blocking the Coolidge Avenue intersection.

Mr. Kennedy completed his discussion by noting the design constraints along I-293 where the project is proposing to add an additional lane in each direction between the historic mill building and the Merrimack River.
Ms. Nicole Benjamin-Ma, with VHB, continued the meeting by handing out a summary of potential historical resource impacts accompanied by an index map and property photos. Ms. Benjamin-Ma discussed that the biggest change since the previous meeting is that the Goffstown Connector Road has been eliminated which means that 1198 and 1270 Goffstown Road and 629 and 655 Straw Road can be removed from the list.
Discussions on each parcel are summarized below:

Amoskeag Dam and Amoskeag Hydroelectric Station
- The interchange reconfiguration likely to have an indirect visual effect on these resources

Ranch homes along Coolidge Ave
- Potential slope work along the back side of the properties
- Offset Diamond Interchange alternative pushed further into the slope in the area
- Offset Diamond Interchange to extend project limits into this area/intersection

Former Amoskeag School
- Potential visual effects with interchange reconfiguration
- Similar with each alternative, height of new interchange should not vary much from existing

Front Street
- Potential district area
- 333/367 Front Street may require form updates
- 254/260 Front Street, potential home acquisitions, same for both alternatives, although likely not eligible
- 575 Front Street, newer warehouses behind the property blocks the view of the property from the interstate where the work is proposed. Impacts same for both alternatives.
- 1824 Front Street, back side of property within the APE (area of potential effect) although direct impacts will likely not be within property

Goffstown Road
- 170 Goffstown Road within period of significance, will likely need an individual form if not contributing to district

Stark Lane
- Radio station/towers within the APE
- 317 Stark Lane is outside of APE but garage across the street falls within

In summary, Ms. Benjamin-Ma stated that the Modified SPUI alternative seems to have less impacts to the identified historic districts. She explained that she has already been developing the obvious inventory forms and would like input on which others should be included.

As the in-meeting quick run-down of properties and impacts included many relative statements, i.e. “less impacts than,” Ms. Laura Black suggested that Ms. Benjamin-Ma and Mr. Kennedy

discuss the listed properties and potential impacts further and finalize which ones will require forms based on the extent of current proposed impacts. She suggested developing a scope of work and submitting it to her and Jill Edelmann.

Mr. Jake Tumelaire then began to discuss the archeological work he and IAC have performed to date. He provided everyone with a handout that included a summary/map of the 4 sensitive sites within the project area. The handout also recommended further testing needed to confirm horizontal and vertical site limits. Mr. Tumelaire stated that IAC has tested ROW sections only in MUs 1-3 and 16-19. Per Pete Walker, IAC was not permitted to begin Phase IB testing in any other MUs due to the lack of more refined design alternatives (see the MU map in handout and the IB testing status table sent earlier). In essence, IAC only started IB testing in a small portion of the overall IA project area. In addition, no testing has been performed on private property to date.

Ms. Sheila Charles asked if the depth of impact area has been confirmed, if not how will it be determined? Mr. Tumelaire replied that IAC has performed safety trenches, removed fill and hand excavated about 3 meters in depth and they are still recovering artifacts. He recommended Phase II testing for both alternatives for the McGregor 1 site.

Discussions on each site are summarized below:

Milestone Brook Site

- Phase II work recommended if final plans include potential ground disturbance in/near site, otherwise no further archaeological survey recommended

Exit 6 Site

- Additional Phase 1B work needed in and around site regardless of final alternative selected
- The additional Phase 1B testing is to establish archaeological integrity and need for additional investigation. This will include mechanized trenching in surrounding median area to test for deeply buried but intact cultural deposits (artifacts and/or features) beneath the documented fill deposits

McGregor Street I Site

- Site to be impacted regardless of final alternative selected, therefore we recommend a Phase II Determination of Eligibility

McGregor Street II Site

- Site core may escape direct impact but both alternatives include ground disturbance across nearby landscape
- Additional Phase 1B work recommended to confirm presence or absence of site components within final project impact area
- If site core will be subject to ground disturbance, Phase II DOE recommended

Ms. Black stated that the Section 106 consulting parties document was incorrect as it stated that you must be a property owner to be eligible. Ms. Jill Edelmann and Mr. Marc Laurin explained that they fixed the document previously and that this one must have been copied from a previous release.

Mr. Kennedy explained that the website has feedback forms available.

Ms. Charles asked Mr. Tumelaire to inform the NHDOT when they will be out in the field doing testing.

New Castle-Rye 16127, X-A001(146)
Participants: Stephanie Dyer-Carroll, FH; James Murphy, HDR; Esther Kennedy, Kitty Henderson, Stephen Skoglund, Consulting Parties; Victoria Chase, Marc Laurin, NHDOT

Continued consultation to provide an update on the proposed project. The seventh coordination meeting with NHDOT, NHDHR and Consulting Parties on the New Castle-Rye Bridge Project was held on June 8, 2017 at the offices of the New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NHDOT). Jim Murphy, Project Manager with HDR, opened the meeting, providing a brief summary of the project history and the meetings that have occurred to date. Stephanie Dyer-Carroll, a Cultural Resources Specialist with Fitzgerald & Halliday, Inc. (FHI), said the focus of the meeting would be on the comments received on the Environmental Assessment Excerpts provided to NHDHR and Consulting Parties following the April coordination meeting. She said the Project Team had reviewed the comments provided by NHDHR and the Historic Bridge Foundation (HBF) and prepared draft responses. She referenced a Draft Comment/Response log sent by Jill Edelmann to NHDHR and Consulting Parties the previous day and said those comments requiring clarification appear shaded. The intent of the meeting was not to review all the comments and responses, but rather to focus on those comments requiring additional clarification. She said they would also like to discuss the Effects Forms submitted to NHDHR in July 2015. Stephen Skoguland said he didn't receive any files by email. Jill Edelmann said they would send a hard copy by mail together with additional project documentation that had recently been distributed electronically.

Stephanie Dyer-Carroll then turned the conversation to the Draft Comment/Response Log. She said the first comment the project team wanted clarification on was related to the coordination of the Section 106 and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) processes. Laura Black with NHDHR said that this comment was drafted by Beth Muzzey. She explained Beth may have meant that the project team has implied that issues we are trying to resolve for the purposes of Section 106 would be addressed in the NEPA documentation, suggesting NEPA was being substituted for Section 106. Stephanie Dyer-Carroll clarified that NEPA is not being substituted for Section 106 but rather that the two processes are being coordinated in accordance with guidance provided in the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) Handbook.

Laura Black went on to say that she and Edna Feighner have spent a long time reviewing the documentation provided and drafting questions so she wasn't sure how much more she could add. She said it might be more useful to have a new voice make the clarifications and would defer to Dick Boisvert, also with NHDHR, to reiterate the DHR's comments. Dick said that he'd received a voicemail from Donald Coker with the Portsmouth Harbor Council indicating he has concerns about the project. Esther Kennedy said Mr. Coker wrote a letter in support of a bascule bridge.

Stephanie Dyer-Carroll then moved on to the next comment which indicated NHDHR hasn't concurred with the effects findings or mitigation measures presented in the EA Excerpts, with the exception of the specific adverse effect of demolishing the historic bridge. She said the EA Excerpts document the conversations that have occurred to date, including those pertaining to mitigation. She indicated the list of mitigation measures was intended to be preliminary and that the project team anticipated additional discussions with NHDHR and Consulting Parties about mitigation. Stephanie then asked participants for input on additional mitigation measures.

Esther Kennedy said she attended all the Public Meetings and her recollection of those public meetings is that the public overwhelmingly clearly wanted a bascule bridge. residents want a fixed bridge. She said that New Castle has mentioned it could benefit from fixed bridge because it would allow a new water line to be run from the south to serve New Castle. However, the City recently upgraded a water line from 8 to 12 inches as part of their work on the wastewater treatment plant, and therefore it may not be necessary to run a water line across the new bridge. Jim Murphy said he believed the two projects were independent of each other but that he would confirm this. Esther Kennedy then asked where the US Coast Guard (USCG) stands on a fixed versus bascule bridge. Jim Murphy said they won't know officially until NHDOT goes through the permitting process. He said there is no consensus from the public on a fixed versus bascule bridge. Laura Black said she spoke with Chris Bisignano at the USCG in 2016 and that he wasn't in favor of a fixed bridge. She said, based on her communication and their correspondence, that she believes the USCG favors a bascule but they don't have the numbers to justify it within the confines of their own agency requirements/regulations. Esther Kennedy said she thinks the limited number of lifts is due to the required four-hour notice.

Stephanie Dyer-Carroll then requested clarification on an additional comment from NHDHR about mitigation. The comment indicated that the mitigation measures outlined in the EA Excerpts don't take into account several key issues. She therefore requested additional input from NHDHR and Consulting Parties about potential additional mitigation measures. She went on to explain that in 2014 the project team contacted the archives of the Portsmouth Athenaeum and the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard to assess whether they had documentation pertaining to the NH 1B Bridge and World War II. It appeared at that time that neither organization had substantive documentation, and therefore developing a comprehensive World War II context was determined to potentially be infeasible. Laura added that additional research questions may be posed based on the information gathered. The New Castle Historical Society expressed an interest in portable panels for educational purposes that would document the history of bridges at the crossing, and thus NHDOT added that to the list of potential mitigation measures. Dick Boisvert suggested a website might be a more appropriate mitigation measure.

Stephanie Dyer-Carroll then turned the discussion to effects. She indicated that NHDOT submitted effects forms for each of the five properties in July 2015. Laura Black said NHDHR found them to be deficient and that additional analysis needs to be undertaken. Jill Edelmann said NHDOT didn't know NHDHR had any issues with the effects forms. Jamie Sikora with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) said they want to get through the project with concurrence, and that he wanted to understand what is lacking. It was acknowledged by the group that there was misunderstanding regarding the effects sheets, and FHWA's and DHR's letters of 2015.

Steve Skoglund, a Consulting Party, asked if the USCG will deny the permit if the clearance under the bridge isn't 16.5 feet, and Jim Murphy said they believe that to be the case. Kitty Henderson with the Historic Bridge Foundation asked when the effects memo will be revised. Jim Murphy said it will be completed this summer. Steve Skoglund then asked when there will be a follow up conversation about impacts. Jim Murphy responded that this will likely occur in August or September. Jill Edelmann asked Laura Black if she could provide an example of effects tables that NHDHR has found useful. Laura said she will send examples from the Northern Pass Transmission Project. She went on to say that the comments provided on the EA Excerpts broadly cover NHDHR's concerns with effects. The project documentation as it currently stands focuses on the loss of the bridge, and there are other issues that have been pushed to the side. Dick

Boisvert said there should be more attention to the qualitative issues surrounding the bridge replacement, including important views and aesthetics.

Manchester 29811, X-A004(311)
Participants: Greg Bakos, Nicole Benjamin-Ma, Steven Hodgdon, VHB; Bruce Thomas, City of Manchester; Ron Crickard, NHDOT

Initial consultation on the proposed South Manchester Rail Trail between Perimeter Road and Gold Street.

- Greg Bakos presented an overview of plans for the 10-foot paved trail, accompanied by ground photos from along the route. Few railroad elements are extant, though many people appear to use the corridor as an unofficial trail.
- RPR submitted May 22, 2017; DHR responded June 5, 2017, indicating the need for additional information regarding treatment of two railroad elements along the project corridor, which should be regarded as National Register-eligible – stone box culvert over unnamed stream (probably stormwater), and the wood trestle bridge over Cohas Brook.
- G. Bakos provided information regarding the stone box culvert, illustrated by photographs
    - Outlet side intact, inlet side completely washed out and covered by debris
    - Preference is to repair existing culvert, as installation of a new culvert would require a much larger structure (15 feet wide) as dictated by stream rules
    - To determine at what point the failure begins, the City used a pole camera and high intensity light source to take high-resolution photographs and VHB used a laser range finder to measure 3D distances
        - Failure begins at about the halfway point and is extensive internally
        - Preference is still to repair, however it will require fairly extensive excavation to do so
    - Treatment: Current plan is to repair inlet side with concrete box culvert sections and riprap to protect the slope from future washout
        - Laura Black and Richard Boisvert noted that the repair of existing materials is preferable over the use of new materials, and the longevity of the extant granite blocks – L. Black asked about the feasibility of rebuilding the washed-out end using granite blocks
        - G. Bakos said the re-use of the granite blocks may be possible, depending on how many remain and their condition; there is risk associated with reusing granite blocks of unknown condition and quantity and it is difficult to include this approach in contract documents that contractors must bid upon
        - Steven Hodgdon noted the difficulty of strength testing granite blocks, and the lack of intimate knowledge of reusing historic materials by many contractors. It may be more prudent to salvage existing blocks and re-use them on the rebuilt inlet face and headwalls where they will be visible.

        - R. Boisvert reiterated that as much material as possible should be saved.
        - L. Black noted that as the box culvert is an eligible resource type, treatment plans should start with the best-case scenario as a default – repair in-kind using existing materials – and then evaluate the feasibility of such a treatment. She suggested talking to qualified stonemasons, which would engage the industry in a meaningful way

- S. Hodgdon presented information about the Cohas Brook trestle bridge, illustrated by photographs and drawings
    - The previous MOA for the Piscataquog Bridge stipulated the preservation of the Cohas Brook trestle. Hoyle Tanner & Assoc. produced a study report in 2015 documenting structural issues with the Cohas Brook trestle. A preservation plan for the bridge was recently completed by the City's preservation consultant.
    - Existing supports are generally in good condition
    - North abutment and bents exhibit considerable failure
        - bent 11 is moving, investigations are ongoing to determine cause
        - scour issues at abutment, which pre-dates the truss
        - piers shifting, not plumb
        - some fire damage
    - VHB is seeking input on possible treatments – new decking and railings, stabilize north side, repair existing trestle
        - Alternative 1 – rehabilitate and repair in-kind
            - Reconstruct and stabilize failed masonry abutment, re-plumb pier
            - Rehabilitate or replace bents 9-14 as necessary
            - New timber ties and reposition existing stringers
        - Alternative 2 – rehabilitate and reconstruct north side
            - Remove north abutment and construct an armored slope
            - Remove bents 9, 11, 13
            - Replace bent 10 with new steel bent
            - Rehabilitation bent 12
            - Reconfigure stringers or use new/reclaimed steel beams – potentially use reclaimed steel members from Piscataquog Bridge
        - Jamie Sikora noted that since the preference would be to avoid or minimize replacement, a more detailed look at pros/cons and costs is warranted
        - L. Black indicated that the presumptive treatment should be Alternative 1, unless it becomes unfeasible – start with best-case stewardship scenario

    - Regarding reclaimed steel elements, the SOI standards specifically advise against introducing new historic elements that were not part of the resource. It was common practice in the past, when expediency was the only major factor. R. Boisvert noted that in the present, we need to consider historic character, especially in light of the previous MOA. J. Edelmann noted that if the historic steel members were reused, they could be interpreted as such for the public and made visually discernible.
    - L. Black asked whether stabilization efforts had proceeded after the 2015 study recommending such efforts, and whether any of the stabilization challenges had worsened over the past two years. The City needs to follow through on the commitments in the MOA, including removal of debris at the trestle to alleviate further scour. S. Hodgdon noted that photos in the 2015 study indicated that conditions of the abutment remain the same today.
    - S. Hodgdon presented a photo of a potential deck/railing treatment utilizing wire mesh between wood rails and posts. It was favorably received by other meeting attendees as being minimally visually obtrusive. L. Black noted that the attachment points of the decking and railings should not create unnecessary physical impacts
- VHB will keep DOT/DHR/FHWA apprised of plans for culvert and trestle bridge as assessments continue, via memoranda

Manchester 40428, X-A004(399)
Participants: Greg Bakos, Nicole Benjamin-Ma, VHB; Bruce Thomas, Manchester Public Works; Ron Crickard, NHDOT

Initial consultation on the proposed Manchester Rail Trail segment between South Beech Street and the Merrimack Riverwalk.

- Laura Black distributed copies of the DHR response to the RPR submitted May 22, 2017. While most of the project is minimally invasive, DHR requests more information regarding ledge removal, screening of trail from rear yards, and whether extant railroad elements would remain in place.
- Greg Bakos presented an overview of plans:
    - 12-foot paved trail along the railroad corridor
    - Create connections to public right-of-way where corridor meets side streets
    - Decision to utilize Baker Street and Sundial Avenue to connect to the Riverwalk, rather than continue trail along existing railroad corridor – due to difficult crossing at Queen City Avenue to north end of railroad corridor (four lanes, very busy)
    - Curve onto Baker Street will be marked by bollards or guard rail; extant railroad crossing signal will be retained, and may be utilized for a rail trail sign
    - Baker Street portion will utilize sidewalks and shared lane markings; crosswalks will be updated for ADA as necessary

- Difficulty connecting to Sundial Avenue – no immediate connection, 20-25-foot drop between streets
    - Multiple switchbacks on hillside would require a lot of retaining wall, and would be difficult for bikes to navigate
    - Currently evaluating single switchback and direct connection to corner of Queen City Avenue and Sundial Avenue
- Active railroad crossing near Riverwalk – railroad is open to the installation of pedestrian gates at the crossing for safety

- Screening and private property
    - L. Black inquired about screening between the path and private yards – would the increase in pedestrian/bike traffic reduce privacy or create safety concerns?
    - G. Bakos indicated there is some existing vegetation between the railroad corridor and private property. No concerns to this effect have been raised at the two public meetings conducted thus far. He also noted that as vandalism and safety are concerns along the corridor currently, which is being used by residents as an unofficial trail, the hope is that security concerns will actually decrease once the path is in more frequent and consistent use in an official capacity. Bruce Thomas confirmed that the City has not received concerns from abutters, and that screening will definitely be considered.
    - Jamie Sikora noted fencing may be a possibility for screening as well as plantings.
    - L. Black noted that potential impact of use of historic properties needs to be considered during project design.
- Ledge and trail connection down to Sundial Avenue
    - R. Boisvert asked about the extent of ledge removal and whether there were vibration concerns
    - G. Bakos noted there is a house located at the end of Kennedy Street at the ledge, but there will be no direct impacts. While the entrance to the trail connection will be visible from the property, the trail will quickly separate from the grade at Kennedy Street both vertically and horizontally. Both filling and cutting will be necessary to create a stable path.
    - R. Boisvert inquired whether the utility poles along Sundial Avenue would need to be moved. G. Bakos confirmed that moving the poles will not be necessary - the path would be located behind the poles and the sidewalk extends in front of the poles.
    - L. Black called attention to the house located at the end of Kennedy Street above the ledge, which is more than 50 years old. As plan details are worked through, impacts to the house may require inventory and historic assessment.
    - B. Thomas confirmed that during a meeting with the owners of the property, the sole concern expressed was the stability of the ledge.

- VHB will keep DOT/DHR/FHWA apprised of designs for trail screening and the path along the ledge, including public input or comments regarding those elements if received. Updates will be provided via written communication.

Submitted by: Sheila Charles and Jill Edelmann, Cultural Resources

New Hampshire Department of Transportation
Cultural Resources Agency Coordination Meeting

Date June 8, 2017

Please initial next to your name. Guests: Please use reverse side to sign in.

Initial	Name	Agency	Email Address
✓ LB	Laura Black	NH Division of Historical Resources	laura.black@dcr.nh.gov
✓	Richard Boisvert	NH Division of Historical Resources	Richard.Boisvert@dcr.nh.gov
✓ SC	Sheila Charles	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	scharles@dot.state.nh.us
✓	Victoria Chase	NHDOT – Highway Design	vchase@dot.state.nh.us
✓	Ronald Crickard	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	rchrickard@dot.state.nh.us
	Michael Dugas	NHDOT – Highway Design	mdugas@dot.state.nh.us
✓	Jill Edelmann	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	jedelmann@dot.state.nh.us
	Edna Feighner	NH Division of Historical Resources	Edna.feighner@dcr.nh.gov
	Ron Grandmaison	NHDOT – Highway Design	rgrandmaison@dot.state.nh.us
✓ LRL	Bob Landry	NHDOT – Bridge Design	~~rlandry@dot.state.nh.us~~ Robert.Landry@dot.nh.gov
✓	Marc Laurin	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	mlaurin@dot.state.nh.us
	Leigh Levine	Federal Highway Administration	Leigh.Levine@dot.gov
	Don Lyford	NHDOT – Highway Design	dlyford@dot.state.nh.us
	Rebecca Martin	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	rmartin@dot.state.nh.us
	Beth Muzzey	NH Division of Historical Resources	elizabeth.muzzey@dcr.nh.gov
✓ KTN	Kevin Nyhan	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	knyhan@dot.state.nh.us
✓ JSS	Jamie Sikora	Federal Highway Administration	jamie.sikora@fhwa.dot.gov
	Pete Stamnas	NHDOT – Highway Design	pstamnas@dot.state.nh.us
	Matt Urban	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	muban@dot.state.nh.us
	Cindy Vigue	Federal Highway Administration	Cindy.Vigue@dot.gov
✓	CR Willeke	NHDOT – Planning	cwilleke@dot.state.nh.us

update DOT emails.

Please fill in all of the requested information. June 8, 2017

Name	Agency	Phone #	Email Address
✓ MATTHEW LOW	HOYLE, TANNER	669-5555	MLOW@HOYLETANNER.COM
✓ KIMBERLY PEACE	" "	" "	KPEACE@HOYLETANNER.COM
✓ Peggy Shaughnessy	Pet. Hunter Commission	562-6343	peggyshau@gmail.com
Rodney BARTLETT	Tri Town	924-8000	
✓ Ron Kleiner	NHDOT- Bridge Design	271 8767	ronkleiner@state.nh.us
✓ Jacob Tumelaire	IAC, LLC	603-703-6714	jtumelaire@iac-llc.net
✓ MARTY KENNEDY	VHB	391-3900	MKENNEDY@VHB.COM
✓ Nicole Benjamin-Ma	VHB	617-924-1700	nbenjamin-ma@vhb.com
✓ Karen Huberdeau	VHB	391-3900	Khuberdeau@vhb.com
✓ MIKE DUGAS	NHDOT	271-2604	Michael.Dugas@dot.nh.gov
✓ Joseph Adams	"	271-1618	Joseph.Adams@dot.nh.gov
✓ BOB JULIANO	"	271-2731	ROBERT.JULIANO@DOT.NH.GOV
✓ Bruce Thomas	Manchester DPW	624-6444	bthomas@manchester-nh.gov
✓ Greg Bakos	VHB		gbakos@vhb.com
✓ Steven Hodgdon	VHB	391-3920	shodgdon@vhb.com

Stephanie Dyer Carroll FHI
James Murphy HDR