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September 3, 2009

Windham, X-A000(558), 14830
Participants: Jeff Adler (jadler@dubois-king.com), Scott Bourcier, Dubois and King (sbourcier@dubois-king.com), Mark Samsel, Galen Stearns, John Mangan and Dave Sullivan, Town of Windham; and William Rose, NHDOT

The Windham Administrator, Depot Advisory Committee Members and DuBois & King met with representatives from the NHDOT Divisions of Cultural Resources and the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources (NHDHR) to discuss the Windham Depot Rehabilitation and Enhancement Project located in Windham, NH. The primary purpose of the meeting was to understand the limits of the existing buildings and site would be required to be restored versus the previously understood requirement of rehabilitated; according to Dave Sullivan on previous meetings with Cultural Resource and NHDHR.

Discussions were made with respect to the evaluation and restoration of the existing buildings’ windows, siding, roof, doors and other architectural features. The Town expressed their concern that the project was being directed toward a path of restoration and the immediate financial impacts (both in restoration costs and lack of funding due to not meeting the Federal funding deadline of November 15th) as a result of being in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standard requirements. The NHDHR recommended that the Town complete the project in phases in an effort to meet the Federal finding deadline and defer restoration costs to additional phases.

At the conclusion of the meeting it was agreed that the Town would follow NHDHR’s recommendation to phase the Windham Depot Rehabilitation and Enhancement Project. It was agreed that the first phase would be to stabilize the building and that the Town would submit proposed plans to NHDHR for their review and comment mid-next week.

Hopkinton, STP-TE-X-000S(450), 13483A (80428R)
Participants: Jim Garvin, NHDHR and Dina Boles, Public Works

The purpose of the meeting was to review submittals and schematic plans for the work listed above. Speaking for the Division of Historical Resources, James Garvin approved the submittals but asked some questions and proposed some minor changes. With regard to the installation of Zone 4 of the Protectowire linear heat detecting cables beneath the floor of the bridge, he asked
whether this would be possible without hanging staging under the bridge. Dina Boles replied that the general contractor proposes to install the cable from above by removing strips of flooring at appropriate alignments along the length of the bridge and replacing the “sub-flooring” after cable installation. This was approved. Regarding the proposed placement of the three interior horn/strobes above Chord 3, about 8 feet above the floor of the bridge, J. Garvin asked whether these units could instead be placed on or near Chord 4 (about 16 feet above the floor) to elevate them above the normal line of sight and to reduce the potential for vandalism. D. Boles replied that she believed that this change could be made. She reiterated that the Protectowire control panel and associated equipment will be located in a cabinet built into the inside portal sheathing of the bridge; the electric meter must be exposed to view, but can be mounted in a recessed pocket. J. Garvin will draft a letter of approval to the Bureau of Public Works, with copies to TE coordinator Thomas Jameson, the State Fire Marshal, and the Federal Highway Administration.

**Northfield, X-A000(091), 13890**

**Participants:** Glenn Smith, Town Administrator (gsmith@northfieldnh.org); Tom Jameson, NHDOT

Glenn Smith reviewed the overall Winnipesaukee River Trail Phase II layout from Park Street to Route 140 and presented the proposal to relocate the US Rt. 3 access from Knapp Road to the Maher property. This is a temporary relocation awaiting the rehabilitation of the bridge along the trail. The entire length of the proposed relocated access will be on top of one of three previous disturbances. These are, from south to north: the existing rail line, the main sewer line of the Winnipesaukee River Basin Project and a storm water drainage system constructed in 2005.

There was a general discussion of the proposed relocated access and the disturbances that have previously occurred on the Maher property. It was the consensus of the Cultural Resource Committee that no additional archeological or historical work is required as a result of this proposal. J. McKay asked if a new memo would need to be signed, B. Muzzey indicated that the existing memo will suffice and to back up the changes from the memo with meeting minutes.

**Derry, X-A000(919), 13650**

**Participants:** Jason Lodge (jlodge@hoyletanner.com) and Sean James (sjames@hoyletanner.com), HTA

This project involves Fordway Road over Beaver Brook (056/084) in Derry. The following items were discussed:

- S. James provided an overview of the project and work performed to date.
- Since the existing bridge is less than 50 years old, it is not likely eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.
- B. Muzzey mentioned that in general, 106 review is required whenever federal funding is involved.
- L. Wilson asked if there was any information on the stone masonry headwall. S. James noted that the headwall was likely reconstructed since it met the twin CMP geometry. The age of the wing walls is not known.
L. Wilson asked if there were any other views of the northwest quadrant where older buildings may be at the end of driveway tie-ins are proposed and of the buildings in the southeast quadrant. Hoyle, Tanner will provide additional photographs of these areas to the Committee.

L. Wilson asked if there were any old maps in this area; in particular the 1850 County Map and 1892 Atlas Map. Hoyle, Tanner will see if any old maps of the project area exist.

S. James will attend the 9/10/09 Cultural Resources Committee meeting as a follow-up for this meeting.

Brentwood, X-A000(918), 15277
Participants: Jason Lodge (jlodge@hoyletanner.com) and Matt Low (mlow@hoyletanner.com), HTA

The following items were discussed for the Crawley Falls Road over Exeter River in Brentwood (073/065). The project creates an adverse effect.

This was a follow-up meeting to discuss additional archaeological investigation required from the initial 3/12/09 meeting.

J. Lodge provided an update of the project development. The additional archaeological investigation has been completed. Independent Archaeological Consulting, Inc. (IAC) provided an addendum to their original report. There are two (2) areas of archaeological significance; one (1) in the northwest quadrant, one (1) in the southeast quadrant. These areas are not within the project limits. We will conduct on-site archaeological monitoring during construction.

J. Lodge will alert Jamie Sikora of the adverse effects on the historic properties for coordination with the Advisory Council.

Hoyle, Tanner will utilize Preservation Company (PC) to conduct the NH Historic Property Documentation to HAER standards. PC will also prepare a historic marker and a monograph of the existing bridge designer, Clifford Broker.

Hoyle, Tanner will prepare a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). J. McKay will e-mail an example MOA to J. Lodge.

This project was accepted onto the approved list of “ARRA – Related” bridge projects. As such, a draft Categorical Exclusion has been prepared. A programmatic 4(f) evaluation is required as well. [An adverse effect memo was signed on September 10, 2009.]

Lincoln-Franconia, A-000(808), 15603
Participants: Mike Hazlett, Kirk Mudgett, Christine Perron and Matt Urban, NHDOT

Mike Hazlett and Kirk Mudgett gave an overview of the project. This is a 4R project that will consist of the rehabilitation of the Franconia Notch Parkway from Exit 34A northerly to the southern limits of the bridge over Lafayette Brook, north of Exit 34C (approx. 5.8 miles). Pavement, guardrail, drainage, and other structures would be addressed. A 4R project refers to a Federal Highway program involving road restoration, resurfacing, reconstruction, and rehabilitation.
C. Perron asked for clarification of the eligibility of the Franconia Notch Parkway. Joyce McKay explained that the Federal Highway Administration has identified the parkway as a potential historic resource given that it is one of only two sections of two-lane interstate in the country. Edna Feighner added that some things don’t need to be 50 years old to be considered historic, and the parkway is one of those things.

Guardrail
About 2/3 of the project has two opposing single lanes of traffic with a narrow median between those lanes. The median was 3 feet wide and consisted of granite ‘logs’ intended as a visual and audible separation between the opposing lanes. This treatment did not prove effective as a number of fatal head on collisions occurred in this area generating significant expression of public concern. Subsequently, the granite logs were removed and double-faced Cor-ten thrie beam guardrail was installed. This was a very difficult task as the highway had been built with a crushed stone base that is very resistant to normal installation practices, resulting in very slow and costly methods to install the rail. As the pavement width that was constructed was narrower than normal as part of the understanding necessary for construction of the original project in this area, the installation of the median rail resulted in traffic traveling very close to the face of the rail and the front wheel nuts of some large trucks have actually gashed the rail. Overall, the Cor-ten guardrail (“rusty rail”) both within the median and along the sides of the highway is severely deteriorated. Galvanized rail is proposed.

Linda Wilson asked about the rationale for using galvanized steel guardrail, and if the existing wooden posts would be reused. M. Hazlett explained that the Cor-ten rail rusts very quickly with exposure to road salt, and severely deteriorated rail is a safety concern. This rail is also difficult to see at night and during the poor weather conditions that are so common in the notch. Galvanized rail is easier to see and easier to install. Photographs were circulated showing that the rail was deteriorated to the point of being rusted through, literally disintegrated at certain joints. Wooden posts typically have a maximum life span of only 20 to 25 years. The existing posts are 10 to over 20 years old, and many of the posts are rotted. Also wood posts have environmental concerns due to the preservatives used and are difficult to recycle. For this reason, steel posts are proposed. This concern for the accelerated deterioration is both for the functionality of the rail as a barrier and for the increased need for maintenance, resulting in increased exposure to both the traveling public and those repairing the rail during the repair operations in this very confined stretch of roadway. Christine Perron said that in the past the Department had an agreement with the US Forest Service to use rusty rail on the National Forest; however, the Forest Service no longer requires this due to the short life span of the rusty rail. The Cor-ten rail along the Kancamagus Highway was recently replaced with galvanized rail. M. Hazlett added that galvanized rail is shiny for about the first year and then its surface gets dull. He passed around a computerized rendering of new galvanized rail and older galvanized rail along a section of the Notch. It was suggested that photographs of the Kancamagus Highway with the installation of galvanized rail be made available for review.

Granite Curb
Much of the project area has low reveal curb (3”). Because of heavy vehicles and plows driving on this curb over the years, much of it is now level or nearly level with the pavement. The purpose
of the curb, as described in the agreement with the “White Mountain Council”, was to protect the vegetated panels; however, these panels are currently very sparsely and poorly vegetated, particularly compared with Interstate segments elsewhere in the state. One option being considered is the removal of this curb. The material behind the existing curb would be regarded and grass would be re-established. With the area graded down and away from the pavement it is expected that the new vegetation would have a much better opportunity to establish and maintain itself. This option had been discussed with the Natural Resource agencies at a recent monthly meeting and was received positively as it would allow for improved treatment for water quality. Another option under consideration is the replacement of the granite curb. This option is being explored because the DOT Commissioner’s Office expressed concern that removing the curb would detract from the parkway atmosphere through the notch.

L. Wilson felt that having a clean pavement edge (without curb) with a grass panel would create a more park-like setting. M. Hazlett added that the curb was part of the agreement reached with the White Mountain Council during design of the parkway. The Department recognizes that this is a unique area and wants to be sensitive to that fact.

**Dam**

A small dam is located on the headwaters of the Pemigewasset River on the east side of the Parkway at mile marker 110.1. The dam leads to a concrete channel. The dam has a crack down its face, and the proposed repair involves casting a concrete face against the existing stone face to seal the crack.

Constructing a new stone face on the dam would be costly, and it’s difficult to find skilled stone workers necessary to build an aesthetically appropriate and durable product. E. Feighner said that more information was needed about the dam, such as when and why it was built. L. Wilson asked if it was possible to install the concrete face on the backside of the dam. Matt Urban explained that this would require dredging material from the pond since there is only about a foot of reveal on the back side of the dam. C. Perron said that the feasibility of this could be looked into.

**Drainage**

Many of the drainage basins and approximately 30 drainage pipes have deteriorated and need repair and/or replacement. In part this may be due to the difficult winter conditions and the requirement for heavy salt usage to maintain safe vehicular passage. M. Hazlett noted that the rehabilitation methods to be used for each drainage installation are being tailored to the actual deterioration, limitations imposed by the existing conditions, and probable remaining service life of the drainage. These range from very minimal impact (recoating of pipes and replacement of end sections) to more intensive efforts (sliplining and replacement of pipes). E. Feighner asked if any drainage work would be done outside of existing structures. K. Mudgett said that if the curb is removed the ditch lines would be regraded, but their depth would not exceed two feet and these are previously built ditches. M. Hazlett added that one pipe could be relocated from under the roadway to under the bike path at the north end of the project. More information about this will be presented at a future meeting. E. Feighner stated that there are areas within the notch that are archaeologically sensitive, especially the wide, flat sections. Any work, drainage or otherwise, that will be completed outside of existing disturbed areas will need further review.
Retaining Wall
There is a stone MRM retaining wall that is starting to deteriorate and needs to be replaced. K. Mudgett explained that this wall wasn’t very visible to the public and that rebuilding a stone wall would be costly and time consuming. E. Feighner said that DHR would need more information, including when the wall was built and photographs.

Snow fence
A chain link fence needs to be added to a section of roadway that travels over a snowmobile trail in order to prevent snow from falling on passing snowmobiles. The fence would be coated with green vinyl, as are other similar fences that exist in the area. L. Wilson asked for photographs of the proposed location and the existing fences.

Light poles
Existing light poles will be replaced in-kind or removed if deemed appropriate. L. Wilson asked for photographs of existing poles and wanted more information on the proposed poles. She also suggested that the DOT look into the possibility of using solar panels to power the lights. K. Mudgett mentioned that this might not be practical due to the inclement weather often experienced within Franconia Notch. M. Hazlett suggested that small-scale wind generation that is not visually obtrusive might be an option and this will be brought forward for consideration.

Other Issues
M. Hazlett noted that this project is under full overview by the FHWA. J. McKay noted that the project would need an effect memo.

M. Hazlett noted that the Department had met with DRED and that, although it is recognized that the ramps and parking areas with the attractions are not in the best condition, this is outside the present scope of work, and DRED does not have the funds to have the work done. This will be a subject for further discussion within the Department and DRED.

Lastly, M. Hazlett noted that a future public meeting would be held to present the project and receive public input.

More information on this project will be presented at a future meeting.

Madbury 15773 (no federal number)
Participants: Nancy Mayville, NHDOT

This bridge was formerly owned by the Boston and Maine Railroad and transferred under an agreement to the NHDOT in 2001. The Perkins Road crossing, a timber bridge, represents a town road over the tracks. The Town of Madbury, who will eventually be taking ownership of the bridge, requested that the NHDOT remove the bridge without replacement. The concrete abutments are seriously failing. Bridge maintenance would remove the timber structure and District 6 would aid in the removal of the abutments. The slopes would be fixed at 2 to 1. NHDHR noted that this would be an important example of grade separation, and will address mitigation for removal in a follow-up meeting.
Brookline, X-A000(785), 15552  
Participants: Nate Chamberlin (nrchamberlin@meridianlandservices.com), Meridian Land Services

Mr. Chamberlin from Meridian Land Services, Inc. stated that the town of Brookline has received a grant under the Safe Routes to School Program to construct sidewalks in two separate locations in town. The first project is located on Townsend Hill Road in the south end of town and connects a nearby residential development to the Captain Samuel Douglas Academy. This is the Town’s upper elementary school, which serves grades 4-6. The school was constructed in the mid 1990’s. Townsend Hill Road was reconstructed and widened as part of the school project. The proposed sidewalk would be constructed in the same location as the existing paved shoulder. The sidewalk is approximately 220 linear feet and will be raised with vertical granite curb. The existing stone wall that fronts the school property will remain intact.

The second sidewalk location is on Milford Street north of the center of town. This sidewalk is a continuation of the existing sidewalk that runs from the center of town to the Richard Maghakian Memorial School. This is Brookline’s lower elementary school with grades pre-K-3. The proposed sidewalk will run behind the existing utility poles, which vary in distance from the edge of Milford Street, for approximately 1,300 linear feet in a northerly direction to Austin Road. There is a small landscape wall at the beginning of the project that will be removed and reset along the existing Right of Way. With the exception of one location, the sidewalk runs along the existing grade. There is very little alteration of terrain associated with its construction. There is one embankment location which will require a 4’-6’ of fill. The sidewalk has been designed with a 3:1 slope, which extends over the existing Right of Way. The design has been reviewed with the home owner and they prefer the 3:1 slope to a retaining wall. The other area of interest is remnants of a stone wall on the north end of the project. Mr. Chamberlin agreed to revise the plans to specify remove and reset what remains of the wall along the current R.O.W.

The Cultural Resource committee members agreed that there were no historic properties affected at both locations and recommended resetting the stone wall at the Milford Street location. Effect memos can now be signed.

September 10, 2009

Derry 13650 (no federal number)  
Participant: Sean James, Hoyle Tanner

Sean James stated that the town would avoid permanent easements on the Fordway Road project, thus eliminating any effect to potentially historic properties. A No Historic Properties Affected Memo was signed.

Andover 14573 (no federal number)  
Participants: Sean James (sjames@hoyletanner.com)
Sean James presented the following summary of the project for Bridge No. 127/106 or Morrill Hill Road over Elbow Brook. He provided the committee with a NHDHR Request for Project Review, a color roadway plan, and photographs. This is the first review for this project.

The existing bridge is a steel stringer bridge built in 1967 by a former Town Road agent, John Jurta. The bridge is in poor condition with two options for its replacement being considered. The first is a 32-foot clear span precast concrete arch (CONSPAN). This option would require raising the roadway grade at the bridge by approximately 1.5 feet and would have significant impacts to an abutter's driveway. The second option is a precast, prestressed bridge superstructure on cast in place abutments with a 36-foot clear span. This second option would essentially retain the existing roadway profile. The first option is presented as it would have more slope impacts than the second option.

An NHDHR Inventory Form was completed for the bridge in August 2009 by Preservation Company. The Inventory Form was reviewed at the August 26th DOE meeting where DHR concurred with Preservation Company's finding that the bridge was ineligible. There are no known archaeological resources within the project area. The past use of the area is detailed in the Inventory Form completed for the bridge.

The traffic control plan and abutters were discussed. The current proposal is to close the road during construction, since this is a low volume road with a short detour. The project has not been discussed with the abutters, but there are plans to do so. The Memorandum of Effect was signed as a no historic properties affected with the stipulation that any abutter concerns related to the project will be addressed.

Winchester 15317 (no federal number)
Participants: Sean James (sjames@hoyletanner.com)

Sean James presented the following summary of the project for NHDOT Bridge No. 133/163 or Old Westport Road over Wheelock Brook and provided the committee with a NHDHR Request for Project Review, color roadway plan, and photographs. This is the first review for this project.

The existing bridge is a steel stringer with wood deck supported on concrete abutments and was reportedly built in 1940. The bridge is currently closed due to its poor condition. A bridge replacement is being proposed with an approximately 4-foot rise in roadway grade at the bridge due to extensive flooding at the site. The preferred bridge replacement option is a precast, prestressed bridge superstructure on cast in place abutments. 1-1/2:1 side slopes and retaining walls will be utilized on the upstream roadway approaches to minimize the wetland disturbances. There are no buildings on this portion of Old Westport Road within view of the bridge. There is however one building visible from the bridge, which is located on Old Westport Road beyond the intersection with Berry Brook Road. There are no known archaeological resources within the project area and the areas past use is unknown.

The areas on the north side of the bridge (particularly the northwest quadrant) appear to be archaeologically sensitive. The currently proposed project does not extend into the tree line but if
it does in the future, a Phase 1A investigation would be required. S. James indicated that the slope limits would be reviewed to reduce impact during the final design of the project. It was asked if an Individual Inventory Form (IIF) had been completed. A form was not completed due to the lack of integrity of the existing bridge (only the steel stringers appear to be original). It was concluded that the IIF must be completed for this project.

Derry, 13651 (no federal number)
Participants: Sean James (sjames@hoyletanner.com)

Sean James presented the following summary of the project involving NHDOT Bridge No. 066/092 or South Avenue over Shields Brook. He provided the committee with a NHDHR Request for Project Review, color roadway plan, and photographs. This is the second review for this project with the first occurring on June 5, 2008.

The bridge is located in a densely populated area in the southwestern portion of the Town of Derry. The existing bridge was constructed in 1935 and is an 18' long jack arch bridge with longitudinal steel stringers spaced at approximately 3'-0" on center. It is approximately 37' wide and accommodates two (2) 12' wide travel lanes and two (2) 5' wide sidewalks. The bridge has a slight skew angle of approximately 10°. The steel stringers have major section loss and are heavily rusted. The existing cast-in-place concrete abutments have some minor spalling and cracking.

The scope of the project is to replace the existing superstructure and rehabilitate the substructure. The new superstructure will be a precast concrete deck panel bridge, which will maintain the existing width of the bridge by providing two (2) 12' travel lanes and two (2) 5' sidewalks. The existing substructure will be rehabilitated by repairing the deteriorated areas of concrete and sealing the cracks.

Several traffic options were considered for the replacement of the superstructure. The bridge will either be replaced in two (2) phases while maintaining one-way alternating traffic and pedestrian traffic in a temporary pedestrian bridge located upstream of the bridge, or it will be replaced while the traffic is being detoured.

FEMA flood maps are available for this area, and they do show adequate freeboard to the bottom of the bridge for the 50-year design flood. Roadway improvements include replacement of pavement on each approach. There are no known archaeological resources within the project area and the areas past use is unknown.

An Individual Inventory Form for the bridge was completed. It was determined at the August 26, 2009 eligibility meeting that the bridge was eligible for National Register listing.

It was asked if there were any abutter concerns with the project. S. James indicated that the only concerns noted have been with the plan to close the bridge during construction, especially from a nearby storeowner. A public information meeting for the project will be held once the project is further advanced.
The Memorandum of Effect was signed as an adverse effect. Mitigation would be incorporated with the Florence Road Bridge, which would provide a context for Jack Arch bridges. It would review the different forms or subtypes of Jack Arch bridges and include an initial development of registration requirements. However, Beth asked that S. James present any concerns about cultural resources noted at the public hearing at the Cultural Resources Meeting.

Danville, X-A000(916), 13535
Participants: Jameson Paine, Tidewater Environmental Planning

The purpose of this meeting is to introduce the group to this project and to receive NHDHR’s determination of the project’s impacts on cultural resources.

Project Overview

Jamie Paine of Tidewater Environmental Planning, LLC presented the project to the group. As part of a State and Federally-funded American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)-related project, the proposed effort would replace the Sandown Road Bridge/culvert over the Exeter River. The existing structure, built in 1953, is a rusted corrugated metal culvert (State Bridge No. 047/126) with dry-laid stone headwalls. The span of the existing two-lane bridge is eight feet (ft) and provides an approximate paved roadway width of 19 ft.

The existing roadway is built over a causeway between two large wetland areas. There is currently a problem with roadway flooding on a regular basis. The bridge, transition, and end approach rails are all substandard. The overall condition of the existing bridge warrants complete replacement of the structure at this time. Due to the unsafe conditions, Sandown Road at this location has been closed to through traffic, including all safety and emergency vehicles.

Proposed Design

The proposed design for the project will allow for two 10-ft travel lanes with a 2-ft paved shoulder and on-bridge guardrail, providing a 24 ft road width between bridge rails. The overall bridge width will be 27 ft. The pre-cast concrete box culvert and pre-cast concrete flared wing walls design were selected to limit property impacts and to keep the length of road closure to a minimum.

In addition, the road will be raised in some areas up to three feet to minimize flooding. This work would provide 1.5 to 1 stone slopes on the sides of the road to minimize impacts and keep the project within the Town’s right-of-way.

NHDHR/FHWA Determination
E. Muzzey and E. Feighner determined that the project would not affect any historic or archaeological resources as long as the project did not go off the pavement in the upland area. E. Feighner requested that a copy of NHDHR’s Request for Project Review (RPR) Form be filled out for their signature at the NHDOT’s October Cultural Resource Agency Meeting. No further coordination for cultural resources is warranted at this time. A no historic properties affected memo can be signed.

Keene 14441 (no federal number)
Participant: Jim Donison, City of Keene Engineering Dept (jdonison@ci.keene.nh.us)

J. Donison briefly reviewed the Spring Street Bridge over Beaver Brook replacement project. There had been an outstanding question about the bridge rail since the bridge is in a historic neighborhood. He did meet with the Historic District Commission. The Commission’s preference was a concrete baluster rail.

Keene , X-A000(586), 14891
Participants: Scott Williams, Pathways Consulting (Scott.Williams@pathwaysconsult.com) and Jim Donison, City of Keene

Scott Williams, of Pathways Consulting LLC, presented the North Bridge Multi Use Pedestrian Bridge project in Keene, NH. Jim Donison, City Engineer, was also present on behalf of the City of Keene. Scott also provided handouts containing a draft “Request for Project Review by NH Division of Historic Resources” form (RPR), project narrative, site photographs, existing conditions plan, and renderings and concept plan/profile sheets for three preliminary bridge designs to the Cultural Resources Committee for reference during the presentation.

The project is municipally managed by the City of Keene and will follow the Transportation Enhancement program. The project has obtained a total of $1,263,000 in funding from several sources including $571,000 federal funds, $642,000 from the City of Keene and a $50,000 donation from Pathways for Keene, a local trail advisory group. The project involves a pedestrian bridge spanning over NH Route 9/10/12 to connect the Cheshire North Rail Trail to the Downtown Cheshire Trail. The project is needed to provide a safe crossing over Route 9/10/12 where no crossing facilities currently exist. There is a trail connection immediately east of Route 9/10/12 that extends north to West Street and reconnects to the Cheshire Rail Trail at Pitcher Street to the west of the project area, but many trail users cross directly over Route 9/10/12 instead of using this connection.

The project area is part of the former Boston & Maine rail corridor. The project area is approximately 1,200 feet long by 83 feet wide and consists of three parcels separately owned by the State of New Hampshire, City of Keene, and Heyman Properties, a private developer, who also owns the adjacent commercial plaza parcels. The Route 9/10/12 right-of-way is approximately 300 feet wide and lies in the middle of the project area. The City of Keene currently holds an easement on this private property that allows a 12-foot wide paved trail with 6.5 feet on each side for trail maintenance. The rail trail is located in the middle of the level 25-foot wide former...
railroad embankment with 2:1 side slopes ranging from 3 feet to 6 feet above adjacent grades. The western portion of the trail consists of a 6-foot wide dirt and gravel path and the western portion is a 12-foot wide paved path with a connection extending north to West Street. An existing drainage channel lies along the north side of the trail embankment and jurisdiction wetlands have been delineated on the north and south sides. The soils consist of silt loams and loamy sands with a 3-foot to 5-foot thick surface layer of sandy fills, and a layer of peat and organic material suggesting that the original fill for the railroad embankment was placed on top of the previously existing ground without removing the topsoil. The project area was formerly part of a large open floodplain, but has been significantly disturbed due to recent development and drainage improvements within the area, including the commercial shopping plaza to the northeast and Monadnock Marketplace to the southwest.

Scott Williams stated that the goal of the project team was to utilize prefabricated bridge designs instead of custom bridge designs because of the limited funding available and additional engineering costs associated with a custom bridge. Scott described the three bridge designs currently being considered. (1) The three-span truss bridge utilizes three 200-foot spans of traditional truss design, is modeled after the Schell Bridge in Northfield, MA, and is estimated at $1.25 million. (2) The single-span combination arch/truss/suspension structure consists of a 320-foot span intended to extend outside the Route 9/10/12 right-of-way and is estimated at $1.9 million. The three-span slant-leg “grasshopper” bridge utilizes a 140-foot center span with two 30-foot approach spans, similar to designs being implemented by NHDOT on NH Route 101 and 12, and is estimated at $1.25 million. Each bridge design is 14 feet wide; provides for 17.5-foot clearance (per AASHTO) at the edge of pavement and a 10-foot to 12-foot wide walking surface; utilizes vertical retaining walls for the abutments and ramp systems; and extends at 5% slope from the bridge deck down to the trail surface. Jim Donison mentioned that the City recently held a public meeting to review the bridge designs and the clear preference was for the truss bridge option 1 because of its openness, cost, and traditional look. Scott Williams also added that 10 out of 15 comments received from public meeting indicated that option 1 was the preference.

Linda Wilson commented that the bridge would establish a valuable trail connection where the former railroad corridor once existed. Since it is a new bridge, as opposed to rehabilitation or replacement of an existing bridge, she did not feel that NHDHR is in a position to recommend a specific bridge design. Beth Muzzey asked if the project team had considered using the Ash Street Bridge over Interstate 93 that the NHDOT will be replacing. Jim Donison stated that the City had considered this option, but the timing did not work because the bridge would not be replaced for several years. Beth also suggested that the prefabricated truss bridges tend to look “bulky” due to the thickness of the truss sections and she was concerned that the renderings provided did not accurately depict the look of the truss bridge option 1. She also suggested that a new “photorealistic” rendering of the truss bridge be produced for review so that those reviewing the bridge design understand what it will look like.

Scott Williams briefly described the potential project impacts. He noted that there were no stone railroad culverts in the project area. The goal of the project is to limit disturbances within a narrow corridor of the former rail bed. Although the impacts have not been specifically defined yet, they will include piles for bridge support and shallow pile cap foundations of less than 5 feet for the bridge piers, abutments, and ramp systems. Other impacts may include trail resurfacing,
minor drainage, and utility modifications, and a bypass trail to the south and parallel to the bridge structure that may necessitate minor wetland impacts of less than 3,000 square feet.

Scott Williams outlined the limited historic background found during a file review at NHDHR that included a Determination of Eligibility for a stone arch bridge on the Cheshire Rail Trail and a request for NHDHR review for improvements to the Ashuelot Trail in Keene/Swanzey. It was acknowledged that the former Cheshire railroad corridor, as a system, has considerable historic and engineering merits, but the specific historic resources that remain within the vicinity of the project are limited to several stone arch bridges and culverts well outside the limits of this project. Most of the project area has been significantly disturbed and little hardware and ballast remains from the former rail line. The project area is also not within the City of Keene’s Downtown Historic District.

Edna Feighner stated that there were no archaeological concerns for the project and a Phase 1A Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment would not be necessary. Jamie Sikora said that no Section 4(f) review would be necessary for the project. Beth Muzzey reiterated that she would like to see the project consider using the Ash Street bridge, and there may be funds available for transporting the dismantled structure to a new location. She also stated that a new modern bridge structure would be appropriate for this project, considering the state of modern development in the vicinity. Joyce McKay asked that we attend next month’s Cultural Resources meeting to provide updates on the bridge design and impact areas. The committee members also suggested several other existing bridges that the City and design team should review prior to next month and bring photographs for the committee to view. These bridges include the Ash Street (Prowse) Bridge, a bridge in Windham, NH and a truss bridge over the Connecticut River in Claremont.

The committee concluded the meeting by completing the RPR form that states that there are no archaeological concerns, and the project would have “no adverse effect” on historical resources.

**Hooksett, X-A000(407), 12573A:**
**Participants: Matt Urban, Kevin Nyhan, Don Lyford, Mike Hazlett, NHDOT**

The subject project was brought back for review to further discuss the extension of work up to and tapering off at the intersection of Martin’s Ferry Road. The project manager, Don Lyford, and the team leader, Mike Hazlett, described the scope of work that is proposed. The proposed work will occur near known potentially historic resources. Edna and Linda asked about any direct impacts to these properties. The design team explained that the project was tapering off just prior to one known location and therefore there would be no impacts to that parcel or structure. In addition, the design team explained how they shifted the road away from the stone structure home to avoid any impacts to that parcel and structure. SHPO agreed to amend the current No Adverse Effect Memo to include the proposed work up through the new intersection.

**Columbia-Lemington, X-A000(915), 13815**
**Participants: Matt Urban and Kevin Nyhan, NHDOT**
Previously signed by Vermont, the No Adverse Effect Memo was signed by B. Muzzey of NHDHR and J. Sikora of FHWA.

**Hooksett 15803 (no federal number)**  
**Participants: Matt Urban and Kevin Nyhan, NHDOT**

The proposed action of the subject project will include the installation of high speed tolling at the Hookett tolls located off of I-93. Kevin Nyhan and Matt Urban presented an aerial plan that depicted the proposed project limits with survey boundaries that extended far beyond the expected scope of work. Those in attendance all agreed that there were no concerns for archaeological or historic resources within those boundaries, and therefore no further coordination would be required.

**Peterborough, X-A000(890), 15698**  
**Participants: Cathy Goodmen and Mike Dugas, NHDOT**

This project is to improve the safety at the intersection of NH Route 101 and NH Route 123 and Old Street Road in the Town of Peterborough. Cathy Goodmen and Mike Dugas were the presenters. This project is still in preliminary design, and no determination of what will be constructed has been made. M. Dugas noted that there is a lot of traffic on NH Route 101, and vehicles on the side roads have a difficult time entering this state highway. There is also a very short sight distance from NH Route 123 and Old Street Road, creating a safety issue for traffic entering NH Route 101. C. Goodmen did a field review and noted that this intersection has 3 buildings that may be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The historic topographic maps indicate that these three houses were here prior to 1900. The DHR comment was that a survey for individual properties should be conducted if the project plans affect landscape features and/or impact the properties. There should be no archaeologically sensitive areas. M. Dugas noted that there was NHDOT work on this intersection in the past and a stonewall on the grounds of one of the houses may have already been moved away from the road. NHDOT will present this again when plans are developed.

**Swanzey, X-A000(889), 15697**  
**Participants: Cathy Goodmen and Mike Dugas, NHDOT**

This project is to improve the safety at the intersection of NH Route 12 and Lake Road/Swanzey Factory Road in the Town of Swanzey. Cathy Goodmen and Mike Dugas were the presenters. This project is still in preliminary design and no determination of what will be constructed has been made. M. Dugas noted that there is a lot of traffic on NH Route 12 and vehicles on the side roads have a difficult time entering this state highway. C. Goodmen did a field review and noted that this intersection has 2 buildings that may be historic, a motel and cabins and a connected farmstead, but showed evidence of modification. The historic topographic maps indicate that this intersection had development in 1898, so there is a definite possibility of archaeological resources in the area. The DHR comment was that an archaeological survey outside the right-of-way will be needed.
depending on the plans developed for the southeast and southwest quadrant. Two individual inventory forms will be needed for the structures that are extant in the northeast and northwest quadrants. NHDOT will present this again when plans are developed.

**Chesterfield, STP-X-000S(448), 13597**  
**Participants: Cathy Goodmen and Mike Dugas, NHDOT**

This project is to improve the safety of NH Route 63 along the west side of Spofford Lake in the Town of Chesterfield. This project has been presented in the past and is being re-presented as the scope of the project has changed. Originally, the NHDOT was going to improve NH Route 63 on line, but residents did not like this approach. NHDHR found the row of cottages eligible for the National Register. As an alternative, NHDOT proposed to construct a bypass to the west of the houses along the lake, but the Town of Chesterfield vetoed this proposal. The design now is to work only on the portion of the road north of the row of older lake houses, approximately 1500 feet north within the ‘S’ curves area, ending where the lake shoreline and NH 63 diverge.

M. Dugas explained that the existing road within the ‘S’ curves is approximately 21’ wide with no shoulders and little or no ditch between the pavement and the steep hillside to the west. Southbound sight distance within the curves is limited by the proximity of ledge and vegetation to the edge of the road. On the east side of the road, there are steep stone slopes extending down to Spofford Lake, and the aged cable guardrail is in poor condition.

NHDOT is proposing two on-line alternatives for the ‘S’ curves.

1-This alternative would hold the lakeshore as a control and widen toward the west (i.e., into the hillside) to provide 10-foot wide lanes, 2-foot wide shoulders, and a 4-foot wide ditch on the west side of the road. The widening would require the relocation of a portion of the residential driveway, which traverses the steep hillside. By providing narrow shoulders and only a modest ditch, this alternative provides a safer layout while minimizing any possible increase in speeds, and avoids impacts to the lake.

2-This alternative would hold the existing westerly hillside as a control and widen toward the lake. Some of the impacts resulting from this approach would therefore be to previously disturbed areas along the lakeshore, but would also have impacts into the lake.

These options would only add about 3 feet to the overall width that is out there today, and with the wider setback to the ledge, provided by the ditch, trucks will be able to avoid crossing the double yellow line and reduce the hazard. The new roadway would also address the cable guardrail with the construction of new guardrail along the lake.

NHDHR determined that there are probably no archaeology issues, but would like NHDOT to review one of the properties on the lakeside of the road at the north end of the project area. There are no other concerns for the historic district, unless issues are brought up by the public.
Capital Corridor Rail Project
Bill Grace of TranSystems introduced this project. The New Hampshire Rail Transit Authority (NHRTA) is considering improvements within the New Hampshire Capital Corridor Project from the Massachusetts state line north to Concord, via Nashua and Manchester. (The entire project extends southward to Boston’s North Station.) These improvements would reintroduce passenger rail service along the NH sections of the corridor. The NHRTA’s primary mission is to oversee the development of passenger rail service in New Hampshire along with the support of the NHDOT. The NHRTA is currently seeking financial assistance in the form of grants from the Federal Railroad Administration to continue the development of this project. The application for these grants requires a preliminary review of potential environmental issues and concerns. In 2003 a draft planning study of the sections from Lowell, MA to South Nashua was done, but not published or finalized.

This entire corridor from Boston to Concord was once a high-speed double track rail operation. Commuter rail service currently extends from Boston to as far as Lowell, and freight service has continued relatively uninterrupted to Concord and beyond. Passenger rail service from Lowell to Concord has not been in existence since 1965.

The proposed project will reinstall sixteen miles of second track along the existing grade of the former second tracks, and will replace sections of existing track with high-speed rail. Existing switches will be replaced with new ones to safely handle train movements at higher speeds, and all of the highway grade crossings will be reconstructed. The signal system will also be replaced with one capable of handling safe passenger train operations at speeds up to 79 mph. Passenger boarding will be through the use of temporary, low level boarding platforms at sites in or near Nashua, Manchester, and downtown Concord. Further details on potential stations at these locations, possible parking facilities, and appropriate roadway access will be advanced as the project develops.

Based on similar projects in New Hampshire and neighboring states, including the Amtrak Downeaster line, NHDHR thought that the rail corridor could be considered as a linear historic district because of its significant role in the historic development of the state and the region. The section known as the Nashua to Lowell was previously found eligible on May 22, 2002. However, they felt that the proposed project would ultimately provide environmental benefits and would continue the historic use of the railroad for both freight and passenger service. The end result would likely be a finding of No Adverse Effect, although they will require additional information before that determination can be made.

For archaeological resources, a Phase 1A survey would need to be completed, since there is likely some archeological sensitivity within the corridor. A Phase 1A was completed for the section between Nashua and Lowell. Items of interest expected along the corridor would include stone and/or concrete retaining walls, mileposts, markers, or even signals. The CE document should summarize those tasks that will need to be completed and should also reference similar projects in
Fieldwork will need to be coordinated with the railroad operator, since the railroad is an active freight line.

Nashua, NRBD-5315(021), 10040A
Participants: Frank O’Callaghan, Rita Walsh and Pete Walker, VHB; John Vancor, Hayner Swanson; Leon Kenison, City of Nashua; Mary Kate Ryan, NHDHR

We met to review the Broad Street Parkway, including a discussion of the progress of survey work as well as revised roadway alignments, which were developed to try to minimize historic impacts. Among the items discussed:

1. Rita Walsh submitted the National Register re-evaluation form for the Nashua Manufacturing Company Historic District. In general, there are few changes to the integrity of the Mill Yard.

2. R. Walsh also submitted a NHDHR individual inventory form for the house at 12-14 Baldwin Street. The recommendation regarding the significance of this house is that it is not individually eligible, but is a contributing element to a potential historic district centered on the intersection of Baldwin and Prescott streets. NHDHR will review the form and make a determination of eligibility through the regular DOE process.

3. Work is continuing on the survey work for the Project Area Form (PAF), but field review is largely complete. Some of the key findings:
   a. An 1883 bird’s eye view map of the city shows two wood trestles in the same location as the current wood trestles at Baldwin and Fairmont streets. Both have what may be original stone abutments from the Nashua & Wilton Railroad’s construction in the mid-19th century, but the wood elements have undoubtedly been replaced since that time. The existing wood trestles have not been documented on NHDHR forms, but they will be replaced as a result of the project. It was agreed that these bridges should be surveyed.
   b. Two properties at Broad Street will be impacted: 73 and Broad Street. Both buildings appear to meet the 50- year threshold; individual survey forms will be prepared for both properties. Beth Muzzey noted that an individual form should be completed for the house at 77 Broad Street as well if the property is impacted.
   c. The PAF will recommend completion of a modified Historic District Area Form for both the Baldwin/Prescott Street Neighborhood and the “French Village” District as had been discussed during previous meetings.

4. Frank O’Callaghan reviewed several design issues and plan revisions that were developed in response to questions and comments from NHDHR. For example, a revised conceptual roadway alignment known as “Option 2A” shifts the roadway about 60 ft. to the east (relative to Option 2) to avoid impacts to the mill canal and Storehouse #2. However, the revised alignment does impact about 60 ft. of the three-story Repair Shop. This contrasts with the
original Option 2, which impacts about 80 ft. of one-story Storehouse #2 as well as a portion of the canal. We discussed whether the original alignment was preferable to the revised alignment or whether Option 2A would be preferred. At this time, NHDHR could not make a determination on this question, but agreed to consider it further after a field review.

5. The roadway engineers had also been able to develop a concept plan that appears to be feasible and which would substantially reduce the impact to the Nimco Building (Mill #5 Annex). However, it does not appear possible to completely avoid the building, and the western portion would still be impacted by an access road.

6. At NHDHR’s suggestion, the designers looked at the potential to use a curvilinear road section to avoid impacting the Waste House. Unfortunately, this layout was determined to be infeasible. However, Frank indicated that the City is committed to studying the possible relocation of the Waste House.

7. With regard to the stone retaining wall along the river, it was clarified that a portion of this wall would, in fact, be impacted by the project, regardless of the option chosen. (This corrected a statement made at a previous meeting that indicated that the new bridge over the Nashua River would span the wall without impacting it.) In fact, due to the grades in the area, about 4 to 5 ft. of the top of the wall will need to be removed for a width of about 65 ft. It was noted that this impact is not new to the project – the FEIS Selected Alternative would have impacted the wall as well. In fact, the Selected Alternative would have impacted about 100 ft. of the wall.

8. There was a general discussion on the need to have a summary of the impacts resulting from each of the alternatives. Beth Muzzey requested that a summary be submitted for review, and that the summary address both the Selected Alternative and Alternative 4C. Peter Walker agreed that VHB would produce a summary in narrative and graphical form. This information would be ready for discussion at the next monthly coordination meeting.

9. Beth Muzzey requested that additional research be conducted on the date of the Nimco Building. Specifically, there is some evidence that the west end of the building may date from a later period than the rest of the building. Evidence of this should be obtained as it is potentially relevant to a determination of effect. Joyce McKay suggested that Rita Walsh interview the owner of the building.

10. Beth Muzzey requested that the engineering team look at ways to avoid the impact to the canal.

11. Peter Walker reviewed the schedule for this phase of the project. As previously discussed, it will be important to make some decision, even if informal, on whether Option 2 is viable. Peter indicated that such a decision would need to be made by mid-November. Otherwise, the project schedule would be in jeopardy. Peter asked NHDHR if they believed it was reasonable to continue consideration of Option 2 (and Option 2A).

12. In response, B. Muzzey stressed the importance of determining whether the Waste House could be relocated rather than demolished. It was suggested that the Waste House might be relocated to the area where the Boiler House is currently located since it would be demolished
under Option 2. Beth also agreed that it was acceptable to prioritize the survey work and engineering needed to make a decision on the mill yard option, rather than continuing work on areas north of the river (where there is only one alignment under consideration). NHDHR offered to send a list of contractors capable of moving buildings. This information should be directed to John Vancor on behalf of the City.

Rochester, X-A000(923), 14019

Participants: Vicki Chase (vchase@mjinc.com), Ron Joy (rjoy@mjinc.com), McFarland Johnson; Tom Willis, City of Rochester

This project involves the rehabilitation of the historic North Main Street Bridge over the Cocheco River, which was previously reviewed and determined to have No Adverse Effect.

Discussion topics included:

1. The City wishes to add the replacement of approximately 20 to 30 linear feet of stone retaining wall to the project. MJ partnered with a stone mason to inspect the wall, found it to be in serious condition, and recommended that the wall be replaced. The wall abuts the bridge, flanks the river, and is located outside the City’s right-of-way on a parcel that currently requires a guardrail easement.

2. Photos of the wall were distributed to the attendees.

3. The style of the new retaining wall may be chosen by the City as long as the following features (which were added to the Memorandum of Effect) are incorporated:
   - original stones are reused to face the new wall
   - existing granite cap stones are reused
   - if a mortared wall is selected, the mortar should be compatible in color with the existing stones

4. FHWA signed the Memorandum of Effect and determined that the project (with the stone wall replacement) is still classified as No Adverse Affect.

**Memos/MOA’s: Derry, 13651**

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

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