DATE OF CONFERENCES: January 5 and 12, 2006

LOCATION OF CONFERENCES: JO Morton Building

ATTENDED BY: Marc Laurin, Cathy Goodmen, Christine Parron, Mark Hemmerlein, Charles Hood, Bill Hauser, Den Danna, Mark Richardson, Bob Juliano, Steve Liakos, Bob Landry, Chris Waszcuk, Ram Maddali, and Nancy Mayville, NHDOT; Jim Garvin, Linda Wilson, Edna Feighner, and Dick Boisvert, NHDHR; Harry Kinter, FHWA; Sean James, HTA; Paul Monyhan, City of Claremont; Karen Piacentini, consultant with TRC; Shari Colby, Land and Water Conservation, DRED; Thomas Woodley, Eric Reitter, and William Staub, City of Claremont; Tom Levins, Holden Engineering; Bruce Barnard, Town of Hebron.

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

NOTES ON CONFERENCE

Thursday, January 5, 2006

Canaan-Dorchester 14478 (no federal #). Participant: Christine Perron.

The project consists of resurfacing the existing roadway, as well as drainage improvements at 15 different sites. At 13 of these sites, the existing pipe will be replaced with a larger structure. The project is located along the Indian River. The group reviewed the map and photographs of the project area. The exact location of the cemetery located near the intersection of Route 118 and Jerusalem Road was discussed, as it appears to be near a site where a 50’ x 3.5’ x 5’ concrete box will replace twin 36” culverts. It was determined that the cemetery is, in fact, far enough from the project area to avoid impacts, and no other historical or archeological resources were of concern. [E. Feighner checked the archaeological site files and concluded that the project would not affect archaeologically sensitive areas.]

Enfield Surplus Land, STP-TE-X-000S(199), SP-12133A-5. Participant: Mark Hemmerlein

The Department has been asked to lease a portion of railroad right-of-way to allow docks or moorings on Lake Mascoma. The group reviewed the plans and aerial photographs and determined the project would not affect archaeologically sensitive areas since the railroad had added fill into the lake on which to create the bed for the tracks. There were no issues with the Northern Railroad because it is a lease that restricts any earthwork.
De Minimis Findings for Section 4(f). Participants: Bill Hauser and Den Danna.

When the Division of Historical Resources and FHWA conclude that there is no adverse effect and there is a property taking, FHWA can make a de minimis finding that excludes further consideration of 4(f) if NHDHR concurs. In those cases in which a de minimis finding applies, a paragraph in the No Adverse Effect Memo will document this finding and NHDHR’s concurrence as required by this regulation. In addition, the meeting minutes for the session reviewing the type of effect and 4(f) impact will clearly note if the finding is de minimis. [Note: A copy of the wording documenting de minimis findings on No Adverse Effect Memos was forwarded to H. Kinter and L. Wilson.]

Newington-Dover, NHS-0271(037), 11238. Participants: Marc Laurin and Chris Waszczuk.

H. Kinter stated that, since the General Sullivan Bridge (GSB) and the Hilton Park eligibility is to be discussed at the next DOE meeting, for this discussion on the determination of effect, eligibility will be assumed. The extent of the effects will be clarified after the determination is made. C. Waszczuk described the impacts to the GSB, consisting of the rehabilitation of the structure and the removal of the roadway and approach embankment in Dover. Also, the GSB abutment and wingwall will be reconfigured slightly to accommodate the widening of the connector road under the Little Bay Bridges (LBB). Access to the GSB will be limited to pedestrians and bicycles. Work is expected to be mainly within the ROW, however construction easements and staging within the west side of Hilton Park will be required. There will be no impacts to the picnic shelter.

The effects to the GSB will be Adverse. Discussion ensued regarding the adverse effects to the GSB being due to loss of the approach, but these effects would be greatly ameliorated by the rehabilitation of the structure. It was agreed that a letter from the SHPO stating that the Adverse Effect is recognized, but due to the proposed mitigation there will be an overall beneficial effect to the resource. H. Kinter stated that this letter should be referenced in the EIS and that there would be a Section 4(f) impact.

A discussion of the relationship of the GSB to the park ensued. J. Garvin stated that the question of the eligibility of Hilton Park is separate from that of the GSB, which is individually eligible. Though minor, the impacts to the west side of Hilton Park (if eligible) would be Adverse as there will also be a visual impact. H. Kinter stated that if the physical impacts were only for temporary use, there would not be a Section 4(f) impact. A de minimis finding could be used if there will be a small permanent taking. Again the letter from the SHPO should explain that the net effect of the GBS mitigation would outweigh any impacts to the park.

C. Waszczuk presented the impacts to the east side of Hilton Park. These will consist of minor widening of the access road and construction of a sidewalk onto the park property. The effects would be Adverse, however, as they are minor H. Kinter stated that the Section 4(f) discussion of the east side (if eligible) impacts would be a de minimis finding. E. Feighner expressed concerns on potential archaeological impacts in the staging areas. J. McKay stated that areas outside the ROW would be tested if they are determined to be undisturbed or marginally disturbed.
[Subsequently, at the Determination of Eligibility meeting held on January 11, 2006, all of Hilton Park was determined to be not eligible. If impacted, the picnic shelter would require an individual form with comparables to determine if it is individually eligible.]

Shelburne: Meadow Bridge. Participants: Mark Richardson (2731), Bob Juliano, and Steve Liakos.

Mark Richardson noted that the 14007 project was limited to the Meadow Bridge and pier removal from the stream and its placement on the adjacent bank. NHDOT does not have a project for the rehabilitation of the bridge in the ten-year plan. J. Garvin responded that since the bridge was out of jeopardy, some delay would allow the town to raise additional funds. The real problem is budget creep as costs increase.

The original funding agreement between the Town of Shelburne and the NHDOT stated that the town would raise 20% of the cost and the state would fund the remaining share. NHDOT also requested that the town take over ownership and maintenance of the bridge. J. Garvin noted that the town did not yet have the $286,000, it was doing additional fund raising, and it was concerned about its ability to take over the bridge without some assistance for its maintenance. The town received $220,000 from its Save America Treasures Grant. J. Garvin noted the town’s work on planning an associated wayside park under a grant from the North Country Council.

M. Richardson requested that the town and DHR prepare a letter to Carol Murray or Jeff Brillhart indicating the progress made to date and requesting an extension for fund raising. He did not feel that such an extension would be a problem, especially since the bridge is not in the ten-year plan.

J. Garvin noted that the Meadow Bridge was only the second bridge to receive a Save America Treasures Grant. It is quite a distinction. He noted that he would check to see if there was a deadline for using the money. Since the 14007 project is closed, M. Richardson thought that a project for preliminary engineering of the bridge rehabilitation may be possible to establish. It was noted that the town might reapply to Save America Treasures for additional funding.

Further discussion concerned identifying an entity to take over the bridge once it was rehabilitated if the town continues to feel uncertain about this role. It was mentioned that the Stratford-Maidstone project was initiated by an association that had no funding. The bridge was eventually rehabilitated using primarily TE funding. It would be important to create a group that had enough seed funding to conduct annual maintenance. Funding might be available from such groups as ASCE or the American Iron and Steel Institute. The TE grant round begins next August. It was suggested that Jim Garvin talk to Bill Cass about fund raising.

It was also noted that at least initially maintenance should be relatively limited since the lead paint will have been removed and it will not be subject to road salt and the stresses of a bridge in-service. The question of creating a project needed to be created at this time remained open.
Concord, BRF-X-5099(021), 12004. Participant: Don Lyford.

Jim Garvin had requested information about the funding for different alternatives. He asked whether NHDOT paid only 80% of the cost if the bridge were replaced on line with a new bridge. D. Lyford indicated that this funding approach would not be followed, and Harry Kinter concurred, indicating that this approach, which essentially forces demolition, could not be followed under current FHWA regulations. Option 4, which leaves the bridge in place and locates the new bridge upstream, provides 80% of the funding from FHWA and the cost of demolition for the rehabilitation of the existing bridge for recreational purposes. An option including the rehabilitation of the existing bridge for one-way traffic and the construction of a bridge for the other lane would be very expensive. For each option, funding is provided for a new basic stringer bridge.

H. Kinter confirmed that the approximately $80,000 for demolition can be invested in the rehabilitation of the existing bridge. J. Garvin noted that the city had been leaning toward an option that leaves the existing and builds a truss bridge. D. Lyford stated that while there was some flexibility in covering the cost of a new bridge, the funding would not cover all of 80% of an expensive option such as a truss. The cost of a basic bridge is the starting point for negotiations.

J. Garvin expressed concern about the constraints on the city’s bridge committee. It was noted that there were two groups, an ad hoc group establish to consider the bridge project and established by the city council and a second group that was working with the heritage commission. H. Kinter hoped that it was clear to the city and committees that they needed to work toward an option that preserved the bridge. It would be difficult for FHWA to fund a project that entertained its removal. Although he has not specifically acknowledged it, it was thought that this had been made clear to Roger Hawk.

Swanzey, 13904, X-A000(015). Participant: Sean James, HTA (sjames@hta-nh.com).

A handout including a description of the project and project need, construction of a shared use shoulder along NH Route 32, was presented to the review group along with an 11”x17” overhead plan view of the project with pictures of key locations. Mr. James presented a brief overview of the project including a discussion of the following major components:

- The project involves the construction of approximately 3,200 linear feet of an 8-foot wide, bituminous concrete shared use shoulder along the edge of NH Route 32.
- The location of the project is from the Town Hall passed the local elementary, middle, and high schools and the Swanzey Post Office, terminating at a local convenience store.
- The project will be completed entirely within the right of way and is being funded in part with Transportation Enhancement funds.
- The need for the project was identified as part of the NHDOT’s 2002 replacement of the Silver Bridge over the South Branch of the Ashuelot River. A total of approximately 800 feet of curbed sidewalk was included in this bridge replacement project and the Town committed to extending the sidewalk to its destination on each side of the bridge.
• The sidewalk and shared use shoulder will allow students to travel from the three (3) schools in the area to the Town Hall and a nearby residential area.

A few questions were asked by the review group relative to clarifying some of the information presented above. The committee recommended a “No Historic Properties Affected” decision pending review and approval of archaeological issues by Edna Feighner who was absent from the meeting. A completed “Cultural Resource Memorandum of Effect” was provided to the committee.

[Following the meeting, E. Feighner responded that no sites have been identified in the area of the proposed work. There have been sites identified along the Ashuelot River, which is not that far from the project area. The area is somewhat sensitive, however, with the proposed work within the ROW, NHDHR will not request an archaeological survey. The project will have minimal impact, if there are no deep trenches or additional drainage work that expands outside of the ROW. If the project remains as described, no further archaeological assessment is required.]

Randolph 14386 (no federal number). Participant: Sean James, HTA.

A handout including a description of the project and project need, the replacement of the Durand Road Bridge over Carlton Brook (140/067), was presented to the review group along with an 11”x17” engineering drawing plan and pictures of key locations. S. James presented a brief overview of the project including discussion of the following major components:

• According to the latest NHDOT Bridge Inspection Report, the current bridge was constructed in 1935 and rebuilt in 1970.
• The bridge consists of a cast-in-place concrete deck supported by steel I-stringers (S 15x42.9) covered by concrete that forms a “Jack Arch” superstructure.
• The total bridge length is approximately 21'-0” with a clear span of 17'-0”. The out-to-out bridge superstructure width is 30’-7” with metal bridge railing on each side. The travel way is 28’-3” from curb to curb.
• The bridge superstructure is supported on two (2) concrete faced stone abutments that are founded on spread footings. There is no skew to the abutments, and there are flared concrete wing walls on each quadrant of the bridge. The bridge has an AASHTO Sufficiency Rating of 48.8 and it is listed on the NHDOT Municipal Bridge Red List.
• The project involves the replacement of the Durand Road Bridge over Carlton Brook. The project limits are approximately 470’ along Durand Road (approximately 175’ west and 195’ east of the bridge). The proposed improvements will maintain the existing roadway width of 28’ near the bridge area to accommodate two (2) 12’ travel lanes and two (2) 2’ wide shoulders. The recommended bridge replacement option is a precast concrete rigid frame on cast-in-place footings.
• The project is being funded in part through the NHDOT Municipal Bridge Aid program and is scheduled for construction in 2007.
• The project is needed due to the poor condition of the existing bridge substructure and superstructure. A hydraulic evaluation of the existing bridge opening found that it was not adequate to convey the 50-year design flood as required by the NHDOT. This fact in addition to the poor condition of the abutments eliminated reuse of the existing substructure as an option.
There was discussion related to a property adjacent to the bridge that was reportedly a potato starch mill in the past. NHDHR discussed a survey that is being completed in the Randolph area and will check the extent of the survey. J. McKay noted that not all the jack arch bridges in the state had been evaluated for historic value. J. Garvin noted that since the bridge had been widened in 1970, it had lost its integrity and most likely would not score very high.

The committee recommended a “No Adverse Effect” decision pending approval by the local community and review and approval of archaeological issues by Edna Feighner who was absent from the meeting. Due to the location of the project it was felt that E. Feighner may recommend a Phase 1A archaeological investigation. A completed “Cultural Resource Memorandum of Effect” was provided to the committee.

[E. Feighner subsequently responded that recently there have been a number of sites identified in that area. Because of the amount of slope work, she requested a cultural resource specialist (an archaeologist qualified under 36CFR61) should look at this area, determine sensitivity, and provide a Phase IA report.]

**Bath 14439 (no federal number): Participant: Sean James, HTA.**

A handout including a description of the project and project need, repairs to the Bath Village Covered Bridge (137/095) pier, was presented to the review group along with pictures of key locations. Mr. James presented a brief overview of the project including discussion of the following major components:

- This project involves repairs to the westernmost stone and concrete pier supporting the Village Covered Bridge. The bridge was built in 1832 and is the longest covered bridge located entirely in New Hampshire. The pier being repaired was not original to the bridge. It was added in 1893 at the same time as the construction of the railroad. A dam is located just downstream of the bridge.
- The proposed project includes the following major work items:
  - Replacement of missing stones in the stem of the pier.
  - Replacement of deteriorated concrete in the existing footing.
  - Routing and sealing of cracks in the concrete portion of the pier.
  - Installation of a new partial width concrete footing.
  - Removal of vegetation in the pier.
  - Installation of wood shims below floor beams where they are no longer in place.
  - Installation of temporary supports at the arches bearing on the easterly face of the pier.

S. James indicated that HTA is currently finalizing a draft Engineering Study for this bridge, which will include a full rehabilitation. J. Garvin indicated that the review group will be very interested in this report and did not have any objections to the pier repair project. The review group recommended a “No Adverse Effect” decision pending review and approval of archaeological issues by Edna Feighner who was absent from the meeting. It was noted that HAER had documented the bridge.

[E. Feighner subsequently reviewed the project area for archaeological sensitivity of the area impacted, and found that no investigations would be needed.]
Nottingham (no project numbers). Participant: Matt Low, HTA.

M. Low briefly explained that the project consists of replacing two (2) existing metal pipes on Deerfield Road over Bean River (127/078) with two (2) new metal pipes. A hydraulic study and engineering study will be completed in the next week to confirm the bridge replacement selection; plans will be prepared the week after.

J. Garvin commented that the project area could be archaeologically sensitive but there are no features above ground that appear sensitive. He mentioned that there was a mill in the area of the Drown’s Dam in the 1700’s. As long as the project stays within the right-of-way and within the previously disturbed areas, there would likely be little concern.

J. McKay and other review group members recommended that Ms. Edna Feighner review the project materials to comment on the archaeological sensitivity of the area. Mr. Low will forward the project map and photos to Ms. Feighner for her review.

[E. Feighner responded with the following: I have reviewed your locational map and searched the DHR site files. As long as the construction stays within the previously disturbed area, your project is good to go. An area such as this would be considered archaeologically sensitive. If plans change and staging areas are required that may affect previously undisturbed areas, please contact this office for continued consultation. There may be a need for an archaeological assessment at that time.]

Laconia, X-A000(096), 13895: Participants: Tobey Reynolds, Mark Hemmerlein, and Ram Maddali; Shari Colby, Land and Water Conservation, DRED; Luke Powell, Public Works, Laconia; and Karen Piacentini, Archaeological Consultant, TRC.

The current drainage system down Route 3 and down Lakeside Avenue is undersized. It was noted that the first proposed route across the beach crossed a significant, multi-component archaeological site. The alternative follows an abandoned sewer line across the beach area. The proposed drainage would be no deeper than the sewer line except under the railroad corridor where the drainage would need to go deeper than the than the sewer line, about to a depth of 12’. Here, an open trench would need to be excavated during the period that the railroad does not use the line. However, the width of the trench for the project would need to be 30” and the existing disturbance is less, perhaps about 8-10”. The trench was hand-dug in the 1920s. The chlorination tank remains in the ground, and NHDOT had considered using this structure as a settling tank. However, its condition will not allow that. It currently holds water. A vortex unit could be placed inside it and the structure could then be backfilled. Thus, while the depth of the disturbance for the old sewer line is known, for the most part, the width of disturbance for its installation is not precisely known. The next step may be to identify the width of disturbance. An alternative to the tank location would be to use the existing swale along the beach to treat the water. Dick Boisvert indicated that the archaeological site continued into the beach area. This treatment option would significantly impact the site.

It was noted that Karen Piacentini did not test the beach area during the Phase IB, which is intended to identify sites, since there is a known site at that location. Portions of the beach area had been tested in the 1970s by Charles Bolian. He located Early Archaic deposits dating as early as 9500 BP. This is a poorly known period. L. Wilson thought that reports relating to Bolian’s
work may be housed in LWCF files. Additional studies occurred in the early 1990s, so that it is known that the area has been continuously occupied since that period. Testing followed along Route 3 north from its intersection with Lakeside Avenue and included the traffic island at that intersection. The testing identified intact, black rich cultural deposits below about 50 cm of disturbance for about a 30’ stretch along Route 3. Testing did not locate additional archaeological deposits north of this area.

Because the trench for the drainage is larger than the trench excavated for the sewer line, less disturbance may occur if the original route is followed. Either route would require extensive data recovery. Other alternatives were discussed. Taking the drainage across Route 3 onto the Outdoor Movie Theater would also impact identified archaeological deposits.

H. Kinter noted that because of the significance of the site, this impact would very likely create a 4(f) to an archaeological resource. The site has sufficient significance that it should be preserved in place. T. Reynolds requested an estimate for the necessary Phase III data recovery across the beach area.

**Claremont, MGS-STP-X-0131(039), 13248. Participants: Mark Hemmerlein and Nancy Mayville, and Thomas Woodley, Eric Reitter, and William Straub, City of Claremont.**

This project has become a municipally managed project, and the city will contract for the cultural resources studies. The purpose of the project is to improve the intersection of Route 12 and North Street by forming a T-intersection. It includes drainage work. The city attended the meeting to understand the scope of the needed cultural resources studies. The project will not take the dwelling at the northeast quadrant of the intersection. The later includes a small farmstead and the dams and pools of a former fish hatchery behind the dwelling. The grade down North Street to the intersection would receive limited improvement as well, but will not directly impact these resources. Several buildings now belonging to a lumberyard southeast of the intersection once functioned as part of a railroad yard. Discussion noted that Mary Monahon had completed a study of the electric rail line in Claremont and should be summarized in the discussion of these buildings.

The scope of work for the architectural survey would include: district area forms for the lumberyard, the farm and hatchery, and the cluster of buildings at the east end of North Street. One individual form would be needed for a dwelling on North Street, and a reconnaissance form may be needed for another altered dwelling along North Street. A Phase IA should be done to determine the sensitivity of areas to be impacted by the project. Because the taking is relatively limited, a combined Phase IA / IB may be possible. There may also be some waterline work that would have a depth of approximately 7’. Therefore, the possibility of deeply buried sites should be considered. H. Kinter foresaw a full 4(f) since there would be a likely taking of historic properties on the north and south sides of the intersection and possibly at other locations as well. The plan is to reconstruct the intersection in 2012. However, the project may be constructed early on a reimbursement basis.
Hebron 14261 (no federal #). Participant: Tom Levins, Holden Engineering (hes@holdenengineering.com; 472-2078) and Bruce Barnard, Town Road Agent.

Tom Levins presented the proposed plan involving the Braley Road Bridge over Cockermouth River (097/105). The plan includes building a temporary detour and constructing a new bridge in place of the existing low truss bridge. The existing bridge scored 17.5 points and is eligible for the National Register. The ca. 1921 low Warren truss bridge currently is one lane wide and two lanes are warranted at this location. Building the new bridge off-line and leaving the existing bridge in its current location is not feasible for multiple reasons:

1. Building off-line will cause major impact to abutting properties without improving the roadway alignment significantly.
2. Due to the flooding nature of the area, having the existing bridge upstream of the new bridge could cause scour problems at the new bridge; and if failure of the existing bridge occurred during a flood, it could cause significant damage to the new bridge or adjacent properties.

The Town of Hebron will make an effort to relocate the historic low truss bridge for future recreational use in town. Jim Garvin will be responsible for taking black and white photos of the existing bridge in its present location for documentation. Bruce Barnard will be available to assist Jim if needed.

The issue of riverbank impacts was brought up with respect to the temporary detour. Holden will require that the temporary abutments be perched up on the top of bank to avoid impacts.

A conditional no adverse effect was discussed. Such a project would involve block of the temporary bridge so that no digging occurs in undisturbed areas, photograph documentation of the bridge, and its relocation and reuse. L. Wilson suggested the use of Moose Plate funds for this purpose.

**Memos:  Albany 13632B**

Other projects may also be reviewed.

Submitted by Joyce McKay, Cultural Resources Manager

c.c.   J. Brillhart  K. Cota  N. Mayville  Bill Cass
       C. Barleon, OSP  C. Waszczuk  D. Lyford
       V. Chase  R. Roach, ACOE  H. Kinter, FHWA
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