BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT
CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting
DATE OF CONFERENCES: September 14, 2017
LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building
ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT			**Town of North Hampton**
Sheila Charles	**GM2**	**MJ**	Donna Etela
Jill Edelmann	Darren Blood	Christine Perron	Jim Maggiore
Marc Laurin	Tom Levins		
C.R. Willeke			
	Hoyle Tanner	**Town of Bradford**	
NHDHR	Josif Bicja	Karen Hambleton	
Laura Black	Sean James		
Edna Feighner	Kimberly Peace		

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

September 14, 2017 ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
North Hampton 24457, X-A002(909), RPR 6699 1
Bradford #23819, X-A002(772). 4

North Hampton 24457, X-A002(909)
Participants: Darren Blood, Tom Levins, GM2 Associates; Christine Perron, McFarland Johnson; Marc Laurin, NHDOT; Consulting Parties: Donna Etela, North Hampton Heritage Commission; Jim Maggiore, North Hampton Select Board

The project will address the US Route 1 Bridge over the Pan Am Railroad (148/132) and improve the North Road intersections that are located approximately 300' apart to the north and south of the bridge. This project was last reviewed at this meeting in December 2016. A Public Informational Meeting was held on May 24, 2017. After considering feedback received to date, a preferred alternative has been selected and will involve replacing the existing superstructure and rehabilitating the existing substructure. The purpose of this meeting is to continue consultation by providing a summary of the proposed actions and effects on historic resources, and discuss potential mitigation options.

Darren Blood provided an overview of the proposed roadway improvements. North Road (West) will be shifted slightly to the west and North Road (East) will be shifted approximately 400' to the east. US Route 1 will be widened slightly to provide wider shoulders for improved safety. Storm water treatment will be required to address MS4 requirements and drainage easements are shown on project plans in the likely locations of treatment areas.

Tom Levins provided an overview of the proposed bridge. The existing 1935 bridge is a simple span concrete tee-beam bridge with cast-in-place concrete railings. The bridge is individually eligible for the National Register and a contributing element of the linear rail road historic district. The superstructure of the existing bridge, which was rated as poor condition, is the

primary concern. The substructure is in satisfactory condition. The proposed alternative involves replacing the superstructure and rehabilitating the substructure. The proposed structure would have the same 40-foot span and keep the existing skew. Other alternatives were studied, including the construction of a new bridge inside the existing abutments and the construction of a new bridge over the existing. These alternatives were rejected due to increased impacts and unfavorable feedback from stakeholders.

Christine Perron noted that no cultural resource concerns were raised at the Public Informational Meeting. To date, the project has four consulting parties: the Heritage Commission and three abutters – Peter Rhoades, owner of the Drake Farm; Michelle Brewster, 165 Lafayette Road; and Mary Drake Hale.

As mentioned, after considering feedback received to date, the proposed alternative will involve replacing the existing deck and rail and retaining the existing stone abutments. It was determined at the December meeting that this alternative would result in an adverse effect to the bridge and the railroad historic district.

The National Register boundary of the Drake Farm was discussed. The nomination form describes the eligible boundary as Parcels 80 and 81 on Tax Map 17. The project will not require any impacts within this boundary. However, there is a stone monument that is a contributing element to the NR property, and this monument is located within the State-owned right-of-way along the property's frontage. There is potential for this monument to conflict with proposed drainage or the water line relocation, locations of which will not be determined until final design. If the monument could not be avoided, it may be necessary to relocate it onto the Drake Farm property, further back from the roadway. This would also be a safety benefit given that the monument is currently located within the clear zone of US Route 1.

Laura Black questioned the location of the monument in relation to the NR boundary, noting that it was not possible to have a contributing element outside the official NR boundary. Jill Edelmann will discuss this with Peter Michaud at NHDHR to determine how to proceed.

In a previous discussion with Peter, it was determined that moving the monument would result in an adverse effect to the Drake Farm and would result in the delisting of the object from the National Register unless substantial paperwork was undertaken with the National Park Service to provide justification for the impact. The Department will determine how to proceed following clarification of the NR boundary and prior to completing the effect memo for this project.

Donna Etela asked if access to the Drake Farm (Hubbington's Furniture) would be cut off during construction. Marc Laurin replied that access to all properties would be maintained during construction.

Other resources in the Area of Potential Effect (APE) were discussed. An inventory form was recently completed for 165 Lafayette Road and the property was determined to be not eligible for the National Register. The Phase IB archaeological survey is underway at Resource Areas #1 and #3. The project would not result in substantial excavation at Resource Areas #2 and #4, and these areas are considered only marginally sensitive; therefore, IAC determined that these areas did not warrant further survey. Edna Feighner asked if the current footprint of the project, including proposed storm water treatment areas, was considered in the Phase IA. C. Perron replied that the

project as proposed is located entirely within the original APE that was considered during the Phase IA.

Potential mitigation for the adverse effect to the bridge and railroad district was discussed. C. Perron noted that input on mitigation was sought from consulting parties. The Heritage Commission provided feedback on a number of options that they would be interested in seeing. After considering this feedback and the impacts of the project, the Department proposes to complete a color booklet, similar to what was recently completed for a Farmington bridge project. The booklet could utilize or expand upon research from the ongoing town wide area survey scheduled to be complete this fall. As suggested by the Heritage Commission, the booklet could also incorporate oral history interviews with people like Mary Drake Hale. Additional components of mitigation could include archival documentation of the bridge, as well as salvaging a section of concrete bridge rail for the Heritage Commission's use in a future exhibit.

A pocket park along the railroad had been suggested by the Heritage Commission. However, the Department is not able to support this idea at this time since the State does not yet own the railroad corridor and there is currently no official rail trail. A pocket park at this time would require acquiring an easement from the current owner (Pan Am). There is also no access to a potential park available from existing roadways.

The concrete rail was discussed further. The Department could salvage a section of rail and the Town would be responsible for its storage and future use. Jim Maggiore offered to look into this. D. Etela asked if the Department could store the rail as they have stored historic plaques in the past. D. Blood responded that it was unlikely that the Department would agree to store the rail since it would be for an indefinite amount of time. J. Maggiore asked if a section of rail could be somehow incorporated into the project along a roadway. D. Blood stated that it was not possible to use the rail along a roadway due to safety concerns. The rail is not up to current standards for crashworthiness. J. Edelmann agreed that the best use of any salvaged rail would be for decorative purposes as part of an exhibit or park.

L. Black commented that she has not considered what appropriate mitigation may consist of but she was supportive of what has been proposed. She noted that DHR is trying to move away from archival documentation unless there are unique features that should be documented. She also noted that any future use of salvaged bridge rail should consider its original context and should include an interpretive component such as a panel. Regarding Drake Farm, all impacts, including to the stone monument, should be avoided.

D. Etela and J. Maggiore commented on Mary Hale's concern with the project's impacts to her undeveloped property and asked that the Department keep her and her attorney involved in the project. J. Maggiore asked if there was any concern with the wetlands located on this property. C. Perron replied that the project would be impacting wetlands on the Hale property. These impacts have been discussed with the regulatory agencies and the Department would need to mitigate for these impacts, likely with a payment into the DES Aquatic Resource Mitigation Fund. It was noted that the Project Manager has talked with Mary Hale. Impacts to the Hale property would be handled through the Department's Bureau of Right-of-Way and an agent would be in touch with Mary Hale after the Public Hearing.

C. Perron noted that the Public Hearing was expected to be scheduled for this winter. Once there is clarification on the Drake Farm NR boundary, the project's effect on that property will be clarified and an effect memo will be circulated. A summary of proposed mitigation will also be provided to the Heritage Commission and DHR for review.

Bradford, 23819, X-A002(772)
Participants: Josif Bicja, Sean James, Kimberly Peace, HTA; Karen Hambleton, Bradford Town Administrator; C.R. Willeke, NHDOT

Initial consultation on the Bement Covered Bridge (140/144) project on Center Road over the West Branch of the Warner River.

Hoyle, Tanner personnel presented an overview of the project using a PowerPoint presentation.

The Bement Covered Bridge (NHDOT Bridge No. 140/144) was built in 1854 and rehabilitated in 1947, 1968, 1987, 1989 and 2011. It is a Long truss structure, patented in 1830 by Colonel Stephen H. Long of Hopkinton, NH. The bridge consists of a single 60'-6" span from center-to-center of bearings with an overall width of 19'-3", a 16'-2" roadway width and a vertical clearance of 9'-6". It is a one-lane bridge and currently has a weight posting of "3-Tons / Passenger Cars Only". The south abutment is dry-laid stone while the north abutment is dry laid stone with concrete facing in the downstream end. In 2011 the Town poured concrete behind the north abutment in an effort to stabilize it until the funding was available for the full rehabilitation. Both abutments have unknown foundations. The Bement Covered Bridge is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and is owned by the Town of Bradford.

The bridge superstructure is in overall fair condition. However, the bridge was temporarily closed during the winter of 2010 to 2011 due to severe racking of the trusses most likely caused by a large unbalanced snow load on either side of the roof and insufficient lateral bracing system. As a result, the roof system was replaced in 2011 with a standing seam metal roof and upper lateral bracing was added in an attempt to prevent future racking of the bridge. Racking and misalignment of the upper chords are still visible indicating that further modifications to the lateral bracing system are prudent. According to the National Register of Historic Places Data Sheet, the bridge was extensively rehabilitated in 1968 through 1969 in which the siding, some truss members, and the bottom chord were replaced. More recent bottom chord repairs are evident as pressure treated chord plies can be seen in the bridge. The deck is in poor condition and exhibits severe rutting and deterioration. Although not specifically mentioned in the National Register of Historic Places Data Sheet, the majority of the floor beams were likely replaced during the 1968 through 1969 renovation since there are different floor beam sizes found throughout the bridge, 3-½" x 11" and 5-¼" x 11". Town records indicate that a broken floor beam was sistered during the 1989 to 1990 timeframe.

The bridge substructure is in overall poor to severe condition. The south abutment wingwalls exhibit bulges and the stump of a recently cut multi-stemmed birch tree can be seen in the bulging section of the southwest wingwall. The north abutment has a long running joint in the center of the stem and it appears as though lateral spreading of the stones has occurred. During the 1968 through 1969 rehabilitation, a concrete facing was added to the northeast corner of the north abutment. The remaining portions of the north abutment stem that are not concrete encased are

noticeably bulging outward. A number of the larger stones in both the abutment and wingwalls were observed to be cracked. Some of the breaks in these larger stones may be a result of pre-existing flaws in the stones but it is equally likely that they were caused by uneven distribution of forces within the abutment. A substandard timber approach railing is located along all four wingwalls. This rail is supported by a cast-in-place concrete cap cast on top of the stone masonry wingwalls.

The Town of Bradford is proposing to rehabilitate the Bement Covered Bridge, including the following items:

- North Abutment Replacement
- Raising Bridge 6" to Improve Drainage
- New Approach Timber Guardrail
- South Abutment Repairs
- Repaving Each Approach
- Portal Siding Reconfiguration
- Superstructure Replacements/Repairs
- Replacement or strengthening of the floor beams and truss lower chord to support a 6-ton live load per RSA 234:27
- Addition of new knee braces to better brace the truss upper chord

Hoyle, Tanner conducted a DHR file review on August 4, 2016 and no new records for this project or project site were found. Construction is slated to begin fall of 2018.

An RPR for the project was submitted to NHDHR on January 17, 2017; a response dated February 3, 2017 from Laura Black stated: "no archaeological issues" and "although this project is being administered under the LPA program, Covered Bridge Project Best Management practices should not be compromised. If not already existing, this should begin with the preparation of an Historic Structure Report (HSR) or similarly detailed document to inform the project decision. Continue consultation as project proceeds."

E. Feighner stated that upon review of the proposed impacted areas she does not support the "no archaeological issues" determination and requested that a limited Phase 1/1A be conducted along the side slopes, focusing on the potentially sensitive areas at the top of the terrace.

K. Peace asked for clarification on the request for an HSR document.

L. Black commented that the project should begin with a foundation document that can help the process of determining the potential for effect on the historic bridge. She suggested laying out a clear picture of what features will need to be altered and what the history of those existing features are to eliminate assumptions and make informed decisions. She said it should be viewed as a living document that stays with the bridge for use in future repair projects as needed.

E. Feighner stated that the report should include information on the abutments and the portals, when was the most recent work done, and should fill in any gaps in the existing information on record about the bridge.

K. Peace asked if Hoyle, Tanner could prepare this document of if an architectural historian is

needed, because there is a backlog of work for these staff and it may affect the schedule.

L. Black said Hoyle, Tanner could compile existing information and write the sections regarding what needs to be rehabilitated, and if there are questions that cannot be answered at that point then they should reach out to someone.

S. James stated Rich Casella could be brought on with a QA/QC role, or to supplement as needed, pending his schedule.

K. Peace asked how to proceed if the project is deemed an Adverse Effect, where the preparation of the HSR-like document would fit into the process.

L. Black said the project may not be considered an Adverse Effect given the limited work on existing features that were previously repaired or replaced.

J. Edelmann said NEPA requires a determination but if Hoyle, Tanner can provide a careful documentation of what is being done and how that work fits the bridge's history, then possibly there would be no adverse effect. She asked that the document be very clear on what is proposed so that everyone's expectations are the same.

L. Black said if what is proposed meets the Secretary Standards, and has minimal effects, and the document details the proposed and future stewardship of the bridge, then she agrees with J. Edelmann. If it is determined that the work needed will have an adverse effect on the bridge then there should be solid reasoning why the work is needed.

S. James stated Hoyle, Tanner will complete the document and return to the Cultural Resources meeting in December.

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

Submitted by: Sheila Charles and Jill Edelmann, Cultural Resources

New Hampshire Department of Transportation
Cultural Resources Agency Coordination Meeting

Date September 14, 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@nh.gov
	Richard Boisvert	NH Division of Historical Resources	Richard.Boisvert@nh.gov
SPC	Sheila Charles	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	Sheila.Charles@dot.nh.gov
	Victoria Chase	NHDOT – Highway Design	Victoria.Chase@dot.nh.gov
	Ronald Crickard	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	Ronald.Crickard@dot.nh.gov
	Michael Dugas	NHDOT – Highway Design	Michael.Dugas@dot.nh.gov
JE	Jill Edelmann	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	Jillian.Edelmann@dot.nh.gov
EMF	Edna Feighner	NH Division of Historical Resources	Edna.Feighner@nh.gov
	Ron Grandmaison	NHDOT – Highway Design	Ronald.Grandmaison@dot.nh.gov
	Bob Landry	NHDOT – Bridge Design	Robert.Landry@dot.nh.gov
	Marc Laurin	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	Marc.Laurin@dot.nh.gov
	Leigh Levine	Federal Highway Administration	Leigh.Levine@dot.gov
	Don Lyford	NHDOT – Highway Design	Donald.Lyford@dot.nh.gov
	Rebecca Martin	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	Rebecca.Martin@dot.nh.gov
	Beth Muzzey	NH Division of Historical Resources	Elizabeth.Muzzey@nh.gov
	Kevin Nyhan	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	Kevin.Nyhan@dot.nh.gov
	Jamie Sikora	Federal Highway Administration	Jamie.Sikora@fhwa.dot.gov
	Pete Stamnas	NHDOT – Highway Design	Peter.Stamnas@dot.nh.gov
	Matt Urban	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	Matt.Urban@dot.nh.gov
	Cindy Vigue	Federal Highway Administration	Cindy.Vigue@dot.gov
CRW	CR Willeke	NHDOT – Planning	Charles.Willeke@dot.nh.gov

Please fill in all of the requested information. September 14, 2017

Name	Agency	Phone #	Email Address
Christine Perron	MJ	225-2978	cperron@mjinc.com
Darren Blood	GMA	856-7854	dblood@gmainc.com
Tom Levins	GMA	856-7854	tlevins@gmainc.com
Jim Maggiore	TONH	556 0073	mjmaggiore@comcast.net
Donna Etela	TONH	379 2689	detela@aol.com
Kimberly Pace	HoyleTanner	699-5555	KPace@hoyletanner.com
JOSIF BICIA	HOYLE TANNER	669-5555	JBICIA@HOYLETANNER.COM
SEAN JAMES	HoyleTanner	"	sjames@hoyletanner.com
Karen Hambleton	Town of Bradford	938-5500	~~[illegible]~~ administrator@bradfordnh.org