

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting

DATE OF CONFERENCES: September 6 and 13, 2012

LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building

ATTENDED BY:

<p>NHDOT Louis Barker Sheila Charles Bob Davis Cathy Goodmen Tom Jameson Tony King Marc Laurin Steve Liakos Don Lyford Kevin Nyhan</p>	<p>Federal Highway Administration Jamie Sikora</p> <p>NHDHR Laura Black Edna Feighner</p> <p>City of Concord Martha Drukker Ed Roberge</p>	<p>CMA Rob Faulkner Roch Larochelle</p> <p>Hayner/Swanson John Vancor</p> <p>Hoyle Tanner Jason Lodge Matt Low</p> <p>IAC Kathy Wheeler</p>	<p>McFarland Johnson Gene McCarthy</p> <p>Preservation Co. Carol Hooper Lynne Monroe</p> <p>Preservation Consultant Liz Durfee Hengen</p>
---	---	---	--

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

PROJECTS/PRESENTATIONS REVIEWED THIS MONTH:

(minutes on subsequent pages)

September 6, 2012	1
Peterborough, 14935 (no federal number)	1
Brentwood, 15277, X-A000(918)	2
Lee, 15692, X-A000(885)	3
Laconia Surplus SP-10672-560.....	4
Laconia Surplus, SP-10672-561	4
September 13, 2012	5
Nashua, 10040A, NRBD-5315(021)	5
Richmond, 21190 (no federal number)	6
Antrim, 14940 (no federal number)	6
Concord, BRF-X-5099(021), 12004	7
Concord 23717 (no federal # assigned yet).....	8
Bow-Concord, 13742, T-A000(018)	10

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

September 6, 2012

Peterborough, 14935 (no federal number)

Participants: Jason Lodge, Matt Low; Hoyle, Tanner & Associates

J. Lodge provided an update on the Union Street Bridge over Nubanusit Brook project since the initial May 10, 2012 consultation with the committee. In accordance with the initial consultation, Preservation Company (PC) performed an Individual Inventory Form (IIF) for the bridge and a Project Area Form (PAF) and Independent Archaeological Consulting (IAC) performed a Phase IA Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment (Phase 1A). On August 22, 2012, NHDHR performed a DOE with the above information and agreed with the conclusions formed by both PC and IAC. The following is a summary of our discussions regarding the above documents.

Bridge IIF. The bridge was determined to be eligible for the National Register (NR). However, no adverse impact to the bridge is anticipated based on the following considerations:

- The bridge is only being rehabilitated. The rigid frame top slab is being replaced in-kind. The rigid frame legs are remaining in-place.
- The stone fascias are being mapped, removed, and reset into the new top slab.
- The dimensions of the existing bridge are maintained.

Phase 1A. The four quadrants were assessed for archaeological sensitivity. A temporary pedestrian bridge is required during the reconstruction of the bridge and is anticipated to be located either just upstream, or downstream, of the Union Street Bridge. The Phase 1A concluded that if the temporary pedestrian bridge is located upstream of the Union Street Bridge, then a Phase 1B Survey is required. If the temporary pedestrian bridge is located downstream of the Union Street Bridge, then no further archaeological investigation is required.

PAF. The project area was determined to have integrity to be potentially eligible as a historic district; however, more information is required. Either a consensus determination can be made or a Historic District Area Form could be prepared. The committee indicated that the temporary impacts associated with the temporary pedestrian bridge need to be established, drawn on the plan, and evaluated against the potential contributing features described in the PAF. All other project impacts need to be finalized, shown on the plan, and evaluated against the contributing features described in the PAF.

Based on the above discussion, the following action items will be prepared by Hoyle, Tanner:

- Decide on the temporary pedestrian bridge location.
- Perform a Phase 1B Survey if the temporary pedestrian bridge is located upstream of the Union Street Bridge.
- Finalize and show all temporary and permanent project impacts on the plan.
- Consult with PC and evaluate the project impacts against the contributing features described in the PAF.
- Meet with the committee and discuss the results of the above items. It is anticipated that the Effect Memo will be executed at the conclusion of the Preliminary Design Phase.

Brentwood, 15277, X-A000(918)

Participants: Jason Lodge, Matt Low; Hoyle, Tanner & Associates

This was a second follow-up meeting regarding the Crawley Falls Road Bridge (073/065) over the Exeter River, to discuss changes to the project funding and how it affects the Memorandum Of Agreement (MOA) that was executed prior to the change in funding. The first follow-up meeting took place on September 3, 2009 and the initial consultation took place on March 12, 2009.

M. Low provided a brief history and update on the project. In 2009, this project was selected for ARRA funding and the Town went through the 106 process. The bridge was determined to be eligible for the National Register. An MOA was executed requiring the following:

- Archaeological investigations, before and during construction.
- Preparation and installation of a historic marker.
- Preparation of a monograph.
- Reuse of the of the existing wing wall stone masonry.
- The existing bridge will be advertised for purchase.
- Documentation of bridge.

After the MOA was executed, the Town lost the ARRA funding due to ROW issues. An abutter to the bridge project would not sign off on a required easement. The Town could not execute the ROW Agreement.

Since 2009, the abutter has agreed to sign the required easement. Now, however, the project is funded under the State-Aid Program (no Federal funds). The current MOA makes several references to Federal-aid highway funds being made available for relocation of the existing bridge if purchased. Also, when Federal funds are involved, FHWA is the 'lead' and their signature is on the current MOA. But when State-Aid funds are involved, Army Corps is the 'lead' and their signature block needs to be on the MOA. So, an amendment to the MOA will be required.

The Town is concerned that the same abutter mentioned above would purchase the existing bridge if it was marketed and adversely impact (delay) the construction schedule. The easement that he signed with the Town expires after one year from the start of construction. Since the project funding changed and the problematic issues with the abutter, the Town is requesting that the requirement to market the existing bridge be waived in the amended MOA. The existing bridge is a concrete rigid frame and is not feasible to remove and transport in one piece.

J. Sikora confirmed that having to market the existing bridge is a FHWA requirement and Hoyle, Tanner should consult with Rich Roach (Army Corps of Engineers) as to whether or not we can eliminate the marketing requirement.

Based on the above discussion, the following action items will be prepared by Hoyle, Tanner:

- Discuss the MOA amendment with Rich Roach. Verify if we can remove the requirement to market the existing bridge from the MOA.
- Wait to hear back from Laura Black regarding any requirements that might need to be added to the MOA (in place of marketing).
- Prepare an amended MOA with Army Corps as the 'lead' and any other revisions discussed above.

Lee, 15692, X-A000(885)

Participants: Bob Davis, Cathy Goodmen; DOT

Previously presented on Dec 10, 2009. NHDOT has held an information meeting and a public hearing on this project. The project, located at the Lee traffic circle (US Route 4 and NH Route 125), addresses safety improvements to the intersection. The current layout of the one lane wide traffic circle and the high amount of traffic has led to many accidents. It is proposed that a two-lane roundabout be constructed at this location to reduce the number of crashes and allow vehicles to travel through the intersection at a more constant rate. This roundabout will be smaller in diameter than the existing traffic circle, which will require vehicles to

slow down, reducing the chances of crashes and lowering the seriousness of any crashes that occur. Work would extend approximately 800 feet north, south, east and west of the intersection to tie into the existing roadway. There will also be some work on the closed drainage system that is currently under the intersection.

A Mobil gas station is situated at the southeast corner of the intersection. Proceeding east, there is a Dunkin Donuts. The project corridor area ends just past this Dunkin Donuts, and the road tapers into the existing lane. To the east is a residential property. Although there was a question in the former meeting on December 10, 2009 whether the project would impact this potential historic resource, the plans indicate there will be no impacts and the parcel is outside of the project area. E. Feighner on December 10, 2009 noted that there are most likely no archaeological resources as the area has been disturbed.

It was determined that no historic or archaeological resources are affected in the project area and a memo can be drafted.

Laconia Surplus SP-10672-560

Participants: Marc Laurin, DOT

Located at 14 Main Street, this residential property is surplus land that was purchased for the Concord-Laconia project, however the parcel no longer constitutes part of the proposed ultimate configuration and construction. The house was built in 1950. L. Black stated that the house is likely an intact cottage and recommended an Individual Inventory Form would need to be done to determine if the property would be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

Laconia Surplus, SP-10672-561

Participants: Marc Laurin, DOT

Located at 24 Main Street, this residential property is surplus land, adjacent to 14 Main Street that was purchased for the Concord-Laconia project, however the parcel no longer constitutes part of the proposed ultimate configuration and construction. The house was built in 1949. S. Charles reviewed the archaeological investigations that were previously conducted in the vicinity for the Concord-Laconia project. The evaluations revealed that there were no archaeological concerns. S. Charles stated that prior consultation was done with E. Feighner who concurred that there were no issues. L. Black stated that the house has compromised integrity due to replacement siding, windows, garage door, and the construction of an addition. No inventory of the property is needed.

Hampton-Portsmouth (no project number)

Abandonment and Discontinuance Service of Hampton Branch, RPR 3050

Participants: Louis Barker and Kevin Nyhan, DOT

K. Nyhan summarized the DOT's interest in the Hampton-Portsmouth railroad corridor slated for abandonment and discontinuance. Nyhan also indicated that it was understood that the project needed to go through NEPA and 106 reviews.

L. Barker indicated NHDOT has the right of first refusal and that potential acquisition would depend on the rail appraisal. Stipulations and consideration of conditions in acquisition and maintenance could effect the valuation.

L. Black summarized the history of the project, beginning with a conference call with a Pan Am representative who indicated they intended to terminate freight service, abandon the line, and put it up for sale. Confusion arose as Pan Am erroneously had originally asserted that there were no historic resources of concern along the line, and that the line was not eligible for the National Register. Furthermore, they stated they could not indicate the potential new owners intent following purchase.

Lisa Mausolf (2001-2002) had surveyed and documented the Eastern Railroad line between Seabrook and Portsmouth (NHDOT 12630) and the Eastern Railroad Linear Historic District was determined to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places for both its historical and engineering significance (DOE letter 5/3/2002). Moreover three structures on the line were also eligible individually. L. Black noted that Lisa Mausolf's survey and documentation is comprehensive. Nevertheless, documentation of project areas surveyed over 10 years ago may need updating, with new photographs and supplemental information to indicate change (usually for the worse).

Early project confusion also related to questions regarding who were the lead governing authorities, federal or state officials. L. Black contacted the Surface Transportation Board (STB) and spoke with David Navecky, Environmental Protection Specialist (202-245-0294), NaveckyD@stb.dot.gov [<mailto:NaveckyD@stb.dot.gov>](mailto:NaveckyD@stb.dot.gov). SHPO began working with Pan Am lawyers without the formal NHDHR Request for Project Review form to help them through the review process, as there was a restricted time frame requirement by the STB. After consideration of the requested abandonment, SHPO recommended No Adverse Effect for the abandonment but wanted a guarantee of No Adverse Effect for the line. Until the Section 106 process could be fulfilled, a conditional Environmental Assessment was written, stating the line could be abandoned, but no construction or other physical alterations to the line be taken until the Section 106 process is carried out on portions of the line that would be affected. Approval will follow the successful implementation and fulfillment of the environmental commitments.

Adverse effect concerns for the Eastern Railroad line include physical changes such as issues relating to changing berms, eliminating culverts, drainage problems, altering bridges, and demolition by neglect.

The new owner(s) will have to go through the Section 106 process and avoid adverse effects. SHPO indicated to Pan Am that a statement ensuring that the future owners know that historic resources are present and that the Section 106 process must be completed should be in the deed.

K. Nyhan reiterated that if the rail line is acquired by DOT, the DOT must follow the appropriate Section 106 and RSA 227-C procedures prior to making any changes to the line. These procedures may include the identification, evaluation and determination of effect, review and possible mitigation actions of any proposed undertaking. The process also ensures maintenance, and that loss would not occur due to neglect.

L. Barker indicated that if the State acquires the line through the NHDOT there are policies in effect regarding maintaining the integrity of corridor, including rail structures and culverts. Future rail projects (and probably for trail projects) will be subject to environmental reviews, an EIS or Categorical Exclusion.

September 13, 2012

Nashua, 10040A, NRBD-5315(021)

Participants: Jon Vancor, Hayner-Swanson.

John Vancor of HSI provided an update on several topics related to the Broad Street Parkway project. The City of Nashua has issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for Design/Build – Millyard (Boiler House) Chimney Restoration. Responses are due on September 20, 2012.

Respondents to this RFP will provide costs for four alternatives. The first alternative is to restore the chimney to a height of 180 feet. The second is to restore the chimney maintaining the current height of 165 feet. The third alternative would be to reduce the height to 150 feet. Finally, the fourth alternative is to reduce the height to 120 feet.

During an update provided at the November 3, 2011 Cultural Resources meeting, John Vancor previously explained that a structural analysis performed on the chimney concluded that structural reinforcement was needed in order for the chimney to comply with wind load requirements.

Because the previously unforeseen expense of this reinforcement may exceed the budget for chimney restoration, pricing on the listed alternatives has been requested.

The City of Nashua has also issued a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for Architectural Historians and Archaeologists. The purpose of this RFQ is to select firms on the basis of qualifications who will complete other tasks required by the Memorandum of Agreement for the project. Responses are due October 3, 2012. The City anticipates that between 2 and 4 firms will be selected.

Richmond, 21190 (no federal number)

Participants: Jennifer Reczek, Quantum Construction Consultants.

Jennifer Reczek presented an update on the Fay Martin Road bridge (160/071) over Tully Brook. At the March 8, 2012 Cultural Resources meeting, it was determined that an Individual Inventory Form and a Phase IA Archaeological Assessment needed to be completed. The two studies have been completed by QCC's sub-consultants and submitted to NHDHR for review.

Laura Black said that the bridge was reviewed on September 12, 2012 at the Determination of Eligibility (DOE) meeting and determined to be not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (RIC0010). However, NHDHR has revisions that they would like made to the Individual Inventory Form. After the DOE letter is received, QCC will follow up with the sub-consultant to have the requested revisions made.

QCC submitted a completed Cultural Resources Effect Memo to NHDHR for review and signature after the revised Individual Inventory Form is received.

Antrim, 14940 (no federal number)

Participants: Jennifer Reczek, Quantum Construction Consultants.

Jennifer Reczek presented an update on the Depot Street concrete arch bridge (181/071) over the relief. QCC is attending the meeting today to establish whether the proposed rehabilitation work will be considered an adverse effect to the existing concrete arch bridge. An Individual Inventory Form has been submitted to NHDHR and the bridge has been determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

The Town plans to rehabilitate the bridge. Rehabilitation will involve installing a cast-in-place concrete slab within the roadway that will span over the arch and carry the weight of vehicles, effectively reducing

the loads that the arch must carry. The only portion of the slab that will be visible are new curbs along the inside of the existing concrete parapets. The purpose of the curbs is two-fold; they will reduce the chance of damage due to winter plowing and prevent water from entering the backfill behind the parapets that could cause freeze-thaw damage and speed deterioration of the concrete.

The road currently has little to no shoulder and steep side slopes of approximately 1.5:1. As part of the rehabilitation, precast wing walls will be added to the ends of the existing bridge and parapets. The wing walls are needed to allow for the installation of roadway shoulders and guardrail at the bridge approaches to increase vehicle safety. The guardrail will terminate with a G-2 unit at the bridge and will not be attached to the existing concrete parapet. The wing walls will be notched to allow for stones near the base of the arch to remain visible after construction is complete.

Laura Black determined that there would be no adverse effect to the arch. QCC submitted a completed Cultural Resources Effect Memo to NHDHR for review and signature.

Concord, BRF-X-5099(021), 12004

Participants: Ed Roberge, City of Concord; Martha Drukker, City of Concord; Rob Faulkner, CHA.

This project is a continuation of consultation, previously reviewed on October 7, 2010, April 1, 2010, November 12, 2009, January 12, 2006, March 13, 2003, May 1, 2002, July 1, 2002, December 7, 2000, and May 25, 2000. Since October 2010, a draft Environmental Study and Programmatic 4(f) Evaluation (November 2010), an Adverse Effect Memo (May 2010), and a Load Rating Analysis Study has been completed. Recently representatives of DHR and FHWA Bridge and NEPA representatives have been consulted. The purpose of the meeting was to update the committee on the results of the Load Rating Report and seek guidance how to proceed.

Ed Roberge, Concord City Engineer, provided a brief overview of the project outlining previous cultural and natural resource review efforts and recent structural inspection and load rate analyses completed by CHA Companies. Ed Roberge noted that previous cultural review efforts did not include detailed structural analysis of the truss bridge – which should have been done as a basis of alternative review.

A truss rating graphic was prepared by CHA and distributed to the group which Rob Faulkner explained as showing that, based on the analysis, the majority of the truss members would either need to be rehabilitated / strengthened, or replaced. This was in addition to the lower chord and floor beam system being completely replaced as previously identified. With the colored coded graphic depicting significant modification to the existing truss structure, Rob Faulkner stated that based on the level and extent of rehabilitation, the project team questions if the historical integrity of the bridge is retained.

Ed Roberge noted that Concord staff had met with staff of NHDOT and FHWA to review the load rating analysis and limited fatigue life remaining on the truss structure. Concerned with long-term stability of the truss bridge and safety, Concord, NHDOT, and FHWA concurred that given the extent of the member replacement, rehabilitation, or strengthening required to meet current bridge design standards, rehabilitation of the existing bridge is not a wise choice and therefore, should not be pursued.

Reviewing tables in the report, Laura Black noted that the bottom chord was overdesigned in 1915 but had deteriorated (as expected) and would need replacement (as already agreed to), then made the point that based on the load rating analysis, the as-built design of the diagonals, even if in perfect condition, would still need to be strengthened in order to meet current highway design loads. It was confirmed that diagonals would generally need strengthening, not replacing.

Fatigue life was then raised, based on a table on p.11. L.Black noted that if you strengthen or replace diagonals (those elements identified in the table with a finite fatigue life) to meet current highway loading needs then wouldn't that remove the "finite life span" concern, per the report? Ed Roberge expressed Concord's concern over the fatigue life of the bridge, even after it was rehabilitated. Based on the analysis, the best case remaining fatigue life of the bridge was stated as 45 years. However, the bridge has likely been overloaded through its life on multiple occasions and the remaining fatigue life would likely be less than the stated 45 years, at which point the bridge would no longer be serviceable and would need to be replaced, regardless of the degree of replacement/rehabilitation to the majority of the bridge structural members. Ed Roberge indicated that the same concerns were expressed to the Concord City Council at its September 2012 meeting where safety, sustainability, and historic integrity of the bridge were Concord's top priorities.

Laura Black asked what the remaining fatigue life of the bridge could be extended to if it were rehabilitated. Ed Roberge responded that fatigue life of the existing steel could not be extended and that old bridge structures have a finite life. Edna Feighner stated that all bridges, even new ones, had a finite fatigue life. It was then noted that the fatigue life of new bridges is much greater because of they are specifically design to handle certain loads and the strength of steel is quite different than old steel.

Rob Faulkner added that based on experience, it was highly likely that the extent of members that would need to be repaired or replaced would increase during construction due to the limited amount of each member that was visible during the inspection.

The NHDHR is still unclear as to how the *new* information, as presented in the report, justifies bridge replacement. The issues currently raised by the City are issues that would have been discussed during all the previous consultation under Section 106 that led to the rehabilitation preferred alternative. Laura Black said that NHDHR would be looking for solid justification, with backup as to why the bridge could not be rehabilitated prior to the next review at a Cultural Resource meeting. Ed Roberge noted that staff is working with CHA Companies to include review by a bridge historian to determine the impacts to the historic integrity of the bridge by rehabilitating the bridge as noted. Staff will also provide detailed justification as to why the bridge should not be rehabilitated as well as summarize project impacts and costs of the preservation, and replacement alternatives previously considered. If a replacement alternative is pursued, next steps would include revising the environmental report and revisiting Section 106 including consulting party and public involvement input.

Concord 23717 (no federal # assigned yet)

Participants: Ed Roberge, City of Concord; Roch Laroche, CMA Engineers, Inc; Kathy Wheeler, IAC; Lynne Monroe, Preservation Company

Project update from City staff following an initial review presented on November 3, 2011 of the Main Street streetscape improvement project, funded by TIGER 2012 grants. The purpose of the meeting was to review the project design, impacts, and schedule to better determine a final scope of work. [Note that a Request for Project Review had not been submitted before the meeting; and information came to light after the meeting that alters the recommendations recorded below. Therefore the scope recommendations in these minutes should not be assumed to be final.] Given the TIGER grant award stipulations, the project is on a constrained schedule so continuing the early NEPA review effort before the resource agencies will a better definition of the project scope of work

The project proposes to improve a 12-block section of Main Street, about 4,200 linear feet in length from its intersection with Storrs Street to the north to its intersection with Storrs Street to the south, by converting the existing four-lane roadway section (two-lanes in each direction) to a three-lane section (one-lane in each

direction with a two-way, left turn lane). In addition, sidewalks and walkways will be reconstructed to address ADA barrier issues. The project will also introduce streetscape features to calm traffic, promote bike use, and connect all transportation modes to the public transit system. All work is to be constructed within the existing public right-of-way along Main Street. The project will also feature an innovative roadway/sidewalk snow melt system to significantly reduce annual snow removal and ice treatment costs through the life of the project.

Ed Roberge, Concord City Engineer, provided an overview of the project utilizing colored conceptual plans prepared as part of the City's "Rethinking Main Street" project and referred to information provided at the November 2011 meeting. In general, the project is to involve a conversion of the current 4-lane section to a 3-lane section of North and South Main Street from Loudon Road southerly to Storrs Street together with streetscape enhancements throughout the corridor. He added that the City has since secured funding for the project in-part through a TIGER 2012 grant and the project is now moving forward with planning and design with construction expected to begin in 2013. The project is to be locally managed by the City of Concord and will be coordinated directly with the FHWA for design oversight. The purpose of this meeting was to better define the scope of services for the Archeological and Historical components of the project that will be required to satisfy NEPA/Section 106 requirements as the City continues to develop a comprehensive project scope of work and selection of a project consultant team.

Laura Black questioned if the current National Register district that encompasses the northern portion of the Main Street project should be re-evaluated since it has been over 10-years since the district was formed. She also questioned if the district should be extended to the south to encompass the entire project area out to the southern Storrs Street intersection with Main Street. After further discussion it was concluded that the district would not need to be re-evaluated. Further, it was concluded that the National Register District should not be extended to the southern project limit because the character of the streetscape changes significantly between the two sections. Also, the southern section does not hold together as well as a district and the individual resources are distinctive and not thematically grouped. Therefore, the 16-18 buildings that have not yet been inventoried would be inventoried individually as had been agreed at the November 2011 meeting.

Additionally, the following scope items were discussed and agreed to relative to the Historical and Archeological resources:

Historical Resources

1. **Individual Surveys:** Complete Individual Surveys for 16-18 properties along the corridor as originally discussed at the November 2011 Resource Agency Meeting.
2. **Corridor Streetscape Inventory:** Provide an inventory of streetscape details for the entire corridor that should be considered by the Design team. Details will include street configuration, sidewalk materials -- pavement and curbing, light wells and steps associated with historic buildings, fencing, bollards, landscape materials and plantings, and street furniture such as benches, trash receptacles, etc. The inventory will include photos keyed to maps of any identified resources. These will be summarized in a brief technical memorandum/report. This study will be completed early in the process so that it can be available to the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) for making decisions on materials and fixtures to be considered for streetscape elements.
3. **PAC Coordination & Section 106 Support:** The project historic subconsultant will participate in the public process and PAC meetings to help facilitate decisions that may impact historical resources within the corridor and to ensure compatibility with the Section 106 process.
4. **Streetscape Assessment Report:** From information gathered from the Corridor Streetscape Inventory and from research that will be conducted regarding changes to the streetscape character over time, a detailed Streetscape Assessment Report will be developed for use by FHWA and NHDHR. This effort will compile historic maps and photographs with research to understand the decisions that

have been made over 200 years regarding the Main Street of the Capital of the State. The historic information will be combined with the present to offer a contrast and understanding of how the current decisions fit in the continuum. The final report will be compiled as the public process/PAC process is finalized and will include information on the results of the alternatives (past, present and proposed), historical references and PAC.

Archeological Resources

The project archeological subconsultant will prepare a scope of services reflecting a corridor-wide Phase IA study. Mr. Roberge also noted that IAC would be retained for on-call field observations during the construction of the project in order to evaluate and document any resources that may be found during the construction process. This process is consistent with other recent public improvement projects that followed a similar process.

Finally, it was agreed that no formal RPR will be required as the project resources and requirements have now been adequately defined to satisfy NHDHR, NHDOT and FHWA. *[Subsequent review of meeting notes from DHR and DOT does not indicate that this was agreed to. Regardless, the lack of RPR submittal resulted in post-meeting reveal of “new” information and the necessity to “backtrack” through the process to accurately determine known information regarding historic resources and determine appropriate new survey. Furthermore, RPR submittal is necessary for a wide variety of reasons including data and project management. An RPR will be necessary for this and every project]* It was agreed that the project team would provide an update on the status of the design and streetscape elements/selections as the project moves along through the PAC/Public Process. It was noted that the likely timeframe for a project review will be once the preliminary design has been refined, the initial historical and archeological studies completed and consensus has been reached by the PAC on streetscape elements such as furnishings, finishes and fixtures. It was further agreed that information such as the initial historical resources inventory and Phase IA study will be shared with NHDHR as they become available to facilitate timely reviews.

Bow-Concord, 13742, T-A000(018)

Participants: Gene McCarthy (McFarland-Johnson), Elizabeth Durfee Hengen (historic consultant)

Continued consultation and update on project, previously reviewed on May 5, 2012, February 10, 2011, December 2, 2009, September 3, 2004, and July 11, 2002. Gene McCarthy of McFarland-Johnson reviewed the past history of this project, which has been largely dormant since 2008. Alternatives being carried forward now are within the study area of the original project. Elizabeth Durfee Hengen, consultant to MJ, then reviewed the historical resources that had been identified in the earlier phase and initiated discussion concerning an appropriate scope of work as the project proceeds. Based on her knowledge of the project area, it is anticipated that 22 individual properties and 3 areas will need NHDHR inventory or area forms. Another ten previously completed forms that are now more than ten years old will need updating. Finally, properties located within the Downtown Concord National Register Historic District that have not previously been inventoried, will need an individual inventory form.

Liz Hengen inquired what the approach for the two railroad lines that pass through the project area should be. Laura Black stated that if the line has not already been inventoried, an area form that discusses the line holistically should be prepared, with special attention given to specific resources and features that were along that line within the Area of Potential Effect. The form would include an overall evolution and history of the line. The overall description and integrity of the entire line should be assessed; however, fieldwork is would not necessarily be necessary for this, as they can be obtained via a variety of research sources such as historic maps and on-line aerial views. The portion of the railroad line that is within the project area—and

perhaps somewhat beyond—should be field-viewed, described, and evaluated for all extant resources and determined whether the resource is contributing or non-contributing (if the line is recommended National Register-eligible) to the overall line. She noted that a railroad yard might be more appropriately surveyed with a separate area form, but such a determination can be made while in the field.

Archaeology: Prepare a Phase 1A report. In areas of high sensitivity, complete Phase 1B investigation with backhoe testing and STPs.

****Memos/MOA's:**

Submitted by: Sheila Charles, Cultural Resources

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