BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT

CONFERENCE REPORT

DATE OF CONFERENCES: February 3 and 22, 2005

LOCATION OF CONFERENCES: JO Morton Building

ATTENDED BY: Bill Hauser, Russ St. Pierre, Ram Maddali, Jonathan Evans, Cathy Goodmen, Mark Hemmerlein, Marc Laurin, Chris Waszczuk, Mark Whittemore, Pete Stamnas, Kevin Nyhan, Kevin Prince, Alex Vogt, Robert Juliano, Charles Hood, Bob Barry, NHDOT; Linda Wilson, Edna Feighner, Dick Boisvert, and Jim Garvin, NHDHR; Harry Kinter, FHWA; Jamie Paine, CLD; Michael Croteau, Wade Brown and Ray Korber, SEA; Barbara Lucas, Town of New Hampton; Robert Veloski, Fred Smith, Bob Kurrey, Police Chief Sawyer, Town of Bristol; Michael Malynowski, Kimball-Chase; Jamie Paine, CLD; Carl Schmidt, Town of Orford; Russ Rohloff, Dubois and King; and Jim Robinson, Rick Stuart, and Mike Hansen, Louis Berger.

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

NOTES ON CONFERENCE

Thursday, February 3, 2004

Bristol-New Hampton 13573A (no federal number). Participants: Rich Roach, Charlie Hood, Wade Brown (Wade.Brown@seacon.com) and Ray Korber, SEA; Barbara Lucas, Town of New Hampton; and Robert Veloski, Fred Smith, Bob Kurrey, Police Chief Sawyer Town of Bristol, Consulting Parties.

Not yet submitted.

Walpole 14267 (no federal number). Participants: Wade Brown and Ray Korber, SEA.

S E A handed out a USGS Map showing the project location and an existing survey plan and presented a project site photo packet to the attendees. Wade Brown presented the following project information:

S E A Consultants is working with the Town of Walpole to provide engineering services for the replacement of the Bridge No. 182/064, which carries Old Keene Road over Great Brook. The project is being funded under the NHDOT Municipally Managed Bridge program.

- The existing bridge, a concrete T-beam bridge built in 1927, is in poor condition (superstructure and substructure) according to the 2002 inspection report and has been in that condition since at least the inspection report of 1991.

- The proposed bridge replacement would be approximately the same width and length but would be shifted approximately 5' to the east from its current location (towards the old rubble concrete abutments of the previous bridge).
- The old rubble concrete abutments of the previous bridge would need to be entirely removed for construction and safety reasons.
- There are remnants of an old mill downstream approximately 200' from the bridge, well beyond the project impact limits.

The following paraphrased questions, comments and discussions ensued as a result of the presented information. These do not appear in the exact order that the issues arose.

- The concrete tee beam type bridge had received a score of 13 and was therefore not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.
- It is possible that there are archaeologically sensitive locations in the area. Since Edna Feighner was not present, James Garvin will relay the information to her so she can give her opinion on whether the construction limits would have an impact on archaeological resources.
- Wade Brown sketched on the survey plan the anticipated limits of work, including the limits of removal of the old abutments to the railroad bridge.
- It was noted that the old railroad ran approximately parallel to Old Keene Road and that Old Keene Road was originally Route 12.
- It was noted the old house beyond the intersection and limits of work may be potentially eligible for the National Register, but the roadway project limits would stay within the right of way.
- Linda Wilson asked that S E A bring a map from the 1892 Atlas to future Cultural Resource meetings.

Joyce McKay will provide S E A with a standard memo for municipally managed projects used to record the decisions made at the Cultural Resource meetings once conclusions are finalized. For this project, the box stating "no adverse effect" would be checked. Before completing the form on this project, Edna Feighner will first provide a statement regarding potential archaeological effects

Monroe-Barnet, AOOO(336), 14095: Participants: Cathy Goodmen and Mark Whittemore.

J. Garvin stated that because the project involves primarily the replacement of the floor system in kind that a HAER document did not need to be completed for this rehabilitation is mostly replacing the floor system. He requested the original and current plans.

Conway, HDPPE-9117(1), 11339A. Participant: Kevin Nyhan.

Kevin Nyhan reviewed a proposal to amend the Section 6(f) mitigation for the subject project. The Conway bypass will impact approximately 22.1 acres of Whittaker Woods. The 1995 agreed-to mitigation included the preservation of the adjacent Bancroft Parcel, a Mineral Springs Parcel and a Pine Hill Parcel. The Town of Conway approached the Department with a request to forgo the Pine Hill Parcel for a 188-acre parcel, owned by Schiavi adjacent to the Pudding Pond mitigation site.

The proposed use of the Schiavi land would be passive recreation. There would be no construction by the Department before it is turned over the town. No one in attendance objected to the proposal. H. Kinter requested that the Department talk with Bill O'Donnell to address any other FHWA issues.

Bedford-Manchester 11512E. Participants: Cathy Goodmen and Alex Vogt.

Relative to the demolition of the WWII era buildings on the south end of the airport property, Linda Wilson requested more information on them so that their National Register evaluation could be completed. No determination was made when the airport undertook the study. She requested additional descriptive information and interior and exterior photographs on continuation sheets to the original forms as well as research to determine whether these buildings represent WWII standardized plans. The later information should be placed on continuation sheets to the project area form.

Canaan, X-AOOO(088), 13887. Participants: Charles Hood and Michael Malynowski and Chris Mulleavey, Kimball Chase (mmalynowski@kimballchase.com).

The project is limited to the downtown area of Canaan, specifically the four corners of Route 4 as it intersects Canaan Street and Depot Street. This will include the reduction of pavement width on Route 4 by installing traffic calming measures, principally bump outs, and improvement to pedestrian amenities at the Four Corners. As part of the pedestrian amenities, a new pedestrian connection between Williams Field and Depot Street will be accomplished by the installation of a culvert to bridge the existing drainage channel along the west side of the playing field. This portion of the project will require work within wetlands. The project will be constructed within the existing right-of-way.

Harry Kinter asked if the project would have any affect on properties outside of the right-of-way. HTA stated that the entire project would be complete within existing ROW currently owned by the Town. L. Wilson noted that while a district may exist in the village and project area, no determination had been made to date. Some properties have received individual determinations. Linda Wilson and Harry Kinter concurred that the construction of the new pedestrian access would be a betterment to the existing park (William Field) and not constitute the taking of park lands for the construction of a transportation way. It was agreed that the project would not have an adverse effect on historic properties. To date the NHDES wetlands application has been submitted to NHDES.

Portsmouth (no state or federal number). Participant: Jamie Paine, CLD.

J. Paine met with Linda Wilson and Jim Garvin from NH Division of Historical Resources (NHDHR) and Joyce McKay from NHDOT today regarding the Portsmouth High/Hanover Street Transit/Sidewalk Project.

OVERVIEW
A project overview was provided. It was explained that the City of Portsmouth and COAST are sponsoring this effort to provide a second bus transit in the downtown area. CLD is designing the

bus stop and sidewalk work on the north and south sides of Hanover Street and the alley adjacent to the east side of the parking garage. Roadway drainage will be altered slightly to accommodate the curbing changes for bus access. The project area will be aesthetically pleasing with brick sidewalks, ornamental lighting, trees, plantings, and some green spaces. Handicap access ramps will be incorporated in the areas leading from Hanover Street to the alley, located east of the parking garage, and at the corner of High and Hanover Streets, in front of the proposed Hilton hotel located on the north side of Hanover Street.

A shelter will be provided at the bus stop. To be consistent with the historic nature of the area, the structure will be constructed of glass and black ornate metal details (similar to an existing structure in Durham, NH).

It was explained that a number of utilities, including sewer, water and drainage lines, exist within Hanover Street and that the area for the proposed bus transit was previously disturbed with the construction of the Hanover Street Parking Garage.

FUNDING/CONSTRUCTION RESPONSIBILITY
Work on the south side of Hanover Street will be paid for and constructed by the City using some Federal Transit monies. Work on the north side of Hanover Street will be paid for and constructed by others as part of a Hilton hotel/condo construction project.

DHR/SHPO DETERMINATION
HISTORIC RESOURCES
It was felt that the City's portion of the project (located on the south side of Hanover Street) would have no adverse effect upon historic resources (structures above ground).

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES
The Section 106 Coordinator was not present to review the project for archaeological resources. Those present from NHDHR will review the project with her when she returns to the office. It was felt that a good portion of the area had been previously disturbed; however, it may require an archaeological construction monitor. A final determination will be forthcoming from the Review and Compliance Coordinator at NHDHR.

HILTON HOTEL PROJECT
NHDHR inquired about the proposed hotel. NHDHR staff is quite familiar with the project area, since they were present on site when some of the former structures at that location were being removed during the urban renewal process. The area used to contain a series of closely knit buildings. They feel that foundations for these former structures may remain in place only a few feet below the existing parking lot surface. In addition, based on field research completed during the initial construction of the Sheraton Hotel nearby, artifacts such as pottery fragments and other important period-related artifacts may exist.

It was stated that NHDHR has not reviewed the hotel project in order to satisfy any requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. If a federal permit is required for the project, then NHDHR must have the opportunity to comment on the project's potential impact to historic resources.

NHDHR realizes that the sidewalk work on the north side of Hanover Street in front of the proposed hotel is currently the hotel's responsibility with regards to financing, permitting and construction. It was recommended that in order to protect themselves, the City should have written documentation on file to the hotel project's development manager and engineer reminding

them that they must have all pertinent permits and approvals, prior to the commencement of construction. With the exception of potential archaeological sensitivity, it was determined that the project would have no adverse effect on historical resources.

Hampton, X-AOOO(233), 13930A: Participant: Bob Juliano.

B. Juliano stated this current project represents a scaled-back version of the original municipal project. This project would replace the upper structure of the bridge that carries NH Route 27 over the Eastern Railroad corridor. The replacement superstructure would be a precast concrete slab over the old stone abutments. B. Juliano noted that it may be necessary to make some modifications to the top of these abutments.

J. Garvin requested that NHDOT make a record of the bridge, providing large format photographs accompanied by a photo identification, map showing location of bridge, a map illustrating the direction of views, and a narrative description of the bridge and its setting. The description should summarize its association with the Eastern Railroad, and compare this bridge to others on the line. The project would thus have an adverse effect on the bridge, which is a contributing element to the Eastern Railroad Historic District, requiring an effect memo and MOA. Given the federal funding, the project will require the preparation of a programmatic 4(f) evaluation.

Warren, STP-X-OOOS(374), 13324. Participant: Mark Hemmerlein.

An update was provided prior to advertising this project. The basic design of the project remains unchanged from the last time it was presented. However, some permanent easements and a strip of Right-of-Way are necessary. M. Hemmerlein reviewed the locations of the new acquisitions and the group determined that existing No Adverse Effect Memo still remained in effect. A programmatic 4(f) evaluation will be added to the documentation.

Sutton, AOOO(322), 14328A. Participant: Mark Hemmerlein.

M. Hemmerlein reviewed the proposed scaling, rock removal, and lane reconstruction associated with is project. A large quantity of rock will be removed from the median side of the southbound barrel of I-89 just south of Exit 10. Shadow Hill Road (now dead ended) once crossed where the interstate now lies. The group reviewed the plans. There are no structures within the project area. The project area was not archaeologically sensitive and therefore a “No Historic Properties Affected Memo” was signed.

Pittsfield-Laconia, 13853 (no federal number). Participant: Mark Hemmerlein.

M. Hemmerlein reviewed this guardrail replacement project. The only portion of the project area that would possess any archaeological sensitivity would be an area along the Suncook River. Mark showed photos that indicated the bank was re-enforced with stone. The committee agreed there was no archaeological sensitivity along the river given the level of disturbance from the riprap. A “No Properties Affected Memo” was signed.

Bartlett 14372. Participant: Harry Kinter.

Concerning the removal of this bypassed, National Register eligible bridge, H. Kinter stated that he had requested a reading on the implications for 4(f) for the project from FHWA's legal counsel. He requested a formal legal opinion including any legal fiduciary responsibility under 4(f), and this decision is still pending. The main issue revolves around whether FHWA can ignore its 4(f) responsibilities after having set aside the bridge for over ten years when the reasons for its removal are not life-safety issues or its imminent collapse into the river. Does FHWA have just cause for its removal? This, evidently, is the first time the issue has been raised. Also, H. Kinter was not sure whether it would be necessary to re-evaluate the bridge under Section 106? He may request a letter from NHDHR on this subject.

Thursday, February 22, 2005

Newington-Dover, NHS-027-1(037), 11238: Participants: Marc Laurin and Chris Waszczuk.

Chris Waszczuk primarily reviewed the alternatives that affect the General Sullivan Bridge. The meeting began with a limited discussion of the Portsmouth to Dover Railroad line whose corridor is still visible in Newington, but was obliterated by the Spaulding Turnpike in the project area of adjacent Dover. The line was constructed in 1873 in association with the railroad and wagon bridge between Bloody Point and Hilton Point. It became the Western Division of the Boston and Maine in the 1890s. This crossing replaced the 1794 to 1855 bridge from Cedar Point, and it remained until the construction of the General Sullivan Bridge.

The alternatives involving the General Sullivan Bridge were presented in the rational report. On the Dover side, alternatives 2 and 3 differ primarily in the Spur Road area. The attempt was to minimize impacts to Hilton Park. It was noted that the section of the park between the General Sullivan Bridge and the turnpike is eligible for the National Register, but the remainder appears to have undergone considerable change through the years and is probably not eligible. One of the design challenges is to connect the turnpike to the General Sullivan. Currently, the connection could not be made very directly.

Alternatives 10, 11, and 12 are being examined more closely in Newington. Alternative 10 consolidates the exits to Exit 3. It maintains the existing Pease railroad spur from the Portsmouth-Dover line and one ramp at Exit 4. Alternative 11 is similar to alternative 10, but it moves the railroad spur over to the Patterson Road area. Its intersection has a tri-level connection: the railroad, turnpike, and Woodbury Avenue. And, the difference between alternatives 11 and 12 is the diamond or loop interchange respectively. L. Wilson and H. Kinter inquired about the potential sound and visual impacts of alternative 11 on the Dow House and Dover Village. H. Kinter indicated that while this alternative would not take property for the interchange, it could still result in a constructive use of the historic properties, a 4(f). C. Waszczuk stated that while the interchange would be depressed, it may still be visible from this site, and agreed to determine how visible it would be by developing a three-dimensional model. This effect can include the view of the Dow House and the view from the Dow House, e.g., would the interchange obstruct the view of the Blue Hills in the distance? Its foreground has already been considerably altered.

E. Feighner noted that there was a potential burial site at the northwest corner of the intersection of Patterson Road and the railroad tracks. The location was avoided by the pipeline construction project conducted by Milner Associates. C. Waszczuk noted that while the bed of the spur would remain or be reconstructed, the project would not include laying the rails.

All alternatives widen to the west of the Little Bay Bridges. If the east edge of the existing Little Bay Bridges is kept constant, at eight lanes, the gap between the new bridge and the General Sullivan is 15 feet, and at 6 lanes, it is 39 feet.

1. Eight lanes will be needed by 2025. One alternative widens and rehabilitates the Little Bay Bridges and rehabilitates the General Sullivan Bridge.
2. A second alternative removes the General Sullivan and constructs a new bridge to carry vehicles and pedestrians.
3. A third alternative would remove the General Sullivan Bridge and construct a bridge and a separate multi-use way. This option has more impacts on private property.

In response to H. Kinter question, C. Waszczuk noted that there was now only one option that preserves the General Sullivan Bridge. If NHDOT widened to the east, the project would impact Hilton Park.

J. Garvin asked about the receptiveness of the bus providers to using the General Sullivan Bridge during construction and in the long term. C. Waszczuk stated that he had not received a definitive answer. Their primary use would be during period of traffic congestion along the Turnpike. If the turnpike were free flowing, they would not go over to the General Sullivan. Only one provider found it convenient to use it as a regular route. There were no connections that readily took and returned buses from and to the turnpike to the bridge.

C. Wasczcuk then reviewed the reasons to retain and to remove the General Sullivan Bridge. In brief, the reasons to retain the bridge include: historic preservation of one of the two highest rated historic bridges in the state (score of 30) as a unique and valued structure; its retention would address 4(f) concerns; its importance as a bike and pedestrian connector and fishing platform; providing a more satisfying recreational experience than a pathway attacked to the bridge; offering future flexibility and redundancy across a significant corridor for future management needs; and provision of the relief of traffic congestion during construction by including it as a dedicated bus lane. Reasons to remove the bridge include: the net rehabilitation costs for the General Sullivan that range between 8 to 11 million dollars; the need for inspection and maintenance of the General Sullivan; the constriction of the navigation channel; and the ability to improve the connectivity of Hilton Park and potentially expand it.

The trusses of the General Sullivan Bridge are in reasonable condition. The floor system requires replacement. The granite-faced piers site on ledge and probably require a seismic retrofit given its proximity to the proposed bridge. H. Kinter requested that a copy of the bridge rehabilitation study be provided to FHWA and Jim Garvin.

C Waszczuk asked what level of mitigation might be required if the bridge were removed. J. Garvin initially indicated that it would involve documentation and memorialization. H. Kinter stated that he thought that it should involve more than that, perhaps involving a work that celebrated truss bridges in American engineering history to foster public appreciation. He noted that a national-level program was beginning to do just that.

C. Waszczuk stated that in the end it boiled down to an 8-11 million dollar prudency argument. He requested more feed back from DHR on the matter. H. Kinter stated that its removal would be a hard sell from the perspective of 4(f). J. Garvin stated that Jim McConaha was going to

Washington, DC to deal with several matters and intended to put together a core statement about the significance of the bridge to garner support for funding its rehabilitation.

L. Wilson indicated that to determine the eligibility of the railroad spur line, contextual information on the main line would be needed. Enough of the main line may exist for it to be eligible for the National Register. If the main line is eligible, then the spur line may be. If the main line were not eligible, then the spur line would not be. To provide the necessary information on the main line, L. Wilson advised placing all the information scattered in the existing forms onto a single form, adding information from the railroad context and the *Rail Lines of Northern New England*, examining the valuation maps, and examining the existing conditions of the line between Portsmouth and Bloody Point from the current engineering study.

Orford, X-AOOO(101), 13900. Participant: Carl Schmidt and Kevin Nyhan

Overview

Carl Schmidt, a volunteer who chairs the Orford Village Transportation & Pedestrian Safety Working Group of the Orford Planning Board, said that this Transportation Enhancement project is intended to reconstruct and restore an historic pedestrian walkway along the east side of Main Street (NH Rte. 10) in the village area of Orford, near the Connecticut River. As shown on a schematic plan, which he distributed, the walkway, which in the past was known as the Orford Mall Walk, was designed by two of Orford's founders and laid out in the early 1800s. Leading south from the Town's East Common, set back from the road and lined with trees, the Mall Walk served the community as a pedestrian walkway and scenic attraction of the village for over 150 years. In the 1970s, the Mall Walk fell into disuse and grass grew over the pathway. But there are still many long-time residents of Orford who fondly remember the Mall Walk. The restoration project will be entirely within the Orford Street Historic District, which has been listed on the National Register of Historic Places since 1977.

In response to a question from Harry Kinter, C. Schmidt explained that the planned width of the restored pathway would be four feet, which would conform to the width of the original path. Authorization for this width, rather than the ADA-prescribed five feet, had been obtained as a design exception in order to maintain the historic integrity of the walkway within the Historic District. For the same reason, as well as to lower costs, the walkway is to be paved with finely crushed stone, in keeping with the original material. C. Schmidt mentioned that at some time in the 1960s, the walkway in front of two of the Orford Ridge Houses had been paved with brick, which remains in place.

Easements

C. Schmidt explained that the original intent, when the Mall Walk was laid out, was that the land owners along the way would grant to the Town the respective strips of Mall land adjacent to the east side of Main Street. For many years, it was generally understood that the Orford Mall and its Mall Walk were Town property. But according to an addendum to a history of Orford written in the 1960s ("Thanks to the Past, The Story of Orford, N.H.", by Alice Doan Hodgson), that was never done and the land remains privately owned. The restoration project is predicated on property owners granting no-fee easements to the Town for their respective sections of land over which the Mall Walk traverses. A request to NH DOT has been approved to utilize the value of these donated easements as a "soft match" toward the Town's contribution to the project.

Harry Kinter asked if all of the property owners had agreed to grant the necessary easements. C. Schmidt explained that the project was conceptualized as restoring the Mall Walk starting at the north end of the Town's East Common, running across the western end of properties belonging to Orford's seven Ridge Houses plus another smaller residence, continuing along the western end of a conserved eight-acre parcel of agricultural land owned by the new Rivendell Interstate School District, and ending at an access road to the 19th century Orford Academy and the Rivendell school grounds. At the present time, three of the property owners have not given their consent to granting easements. Two of these have not yet made a decision; the first, with about 125 feet of frontage, owns one of the two sections already paved in brick, whereas the second owns the southernmost piece measuring about 45 feet. The owners of the third section, with about 400 feet of frontage, had signed a Statement of Intent to grant an easement, along with seven other property owners, in the spring of 2001 prior to the Orford Selectboard's submission of its application for a Transportation Enhancement grant. However, in 2004, they informed the Selectboard that they had changed their minds. Considerable efforts were then made to satisfy their concerns, but they ultimately were not successful. Then TE Project Manager Michael Pillsbury visited the site and encouraged the Selectboard to go forward with the project with the understanding that, even without all sections included, pedestrian safety would be significantly enhanced, and that perhaps the reluctant property owners might decide to comply subsequently. H. Kinter asked whether this raised a question of pedestrians trespassing over the un-included sections. Linda Wilson said she was quite certain pedestrians were already doing that for many years. She asked whether the concept of adverse possession might be invoked in this situation.

Right-of-Way (ROW)

C. Schmidt said that, based on detailed plans of a relevant section of Main Street prepared by the DOT in conjunction with the recent project which resulted in the rehabilitation of Bridge Street (NH 25a) and the Orford-Fairlee bridge over the Connecticut River, it was understood that the Mall Walk had been located just to the east of the eastern edge of the state's right of way. Evidence of the walkway's location could be seen in the present bricked sections, remaining granite marker posts, 19th century photographs, and indentations in the ground. The walkway is to be restored in the same location. Kevin Nyhan presented a DOT plan from 1973 of a section of Main Street just to the south of the area under consideration, on which was noted the approximate Right of Way boundaries. James Garvin noted that when roads were first being laid out in the state, especially in areas such as along the Connecticut River, it was often the practice to create very wide roadways. Kinter said that the width of the ROW should be verified for this section; it might turn out that the walkway is within the state ROW. In response, Schmidt said that he strongly hoped that any investigation would show that the historic location of the Mall Walk is not within the ROW. If it is, he said, it will mean that the entire Transportation Enhancement project "will be out the window" because the "soft match" portion of the project is predicated on using the value of the donated easements. As a result, the positive vote at Orford Town Meeting in March 2003 to raise and advance the necessary funds for the project was based on the understanding that the Town would be fully reimbursed for its expenditures as a result of the "soft match". If that cannot be done, he said, the project would be dead. Following some additional discussion, it was agreed that the project sponsor will investigate further the established width and location of the state ROW along this portion of roadway.

H. Kinter said that, because the project will require easements from historic 4(f) resources to the Town of Orford, a Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation would be necessary. He also said some consideration should be given to the overall continuity of the project in light of anticipated breaks in the walkway. While this probably will not be a problem, it should be considered in the statement.

Environmental Considerations

In response to a question relating to archaeological considerations from J. McKay, C. Schmidt said that the project called for an excavation of no more than 12 inches in depth in the same location of the original Mall Walk. The covering grass, topsoil, and old walkway material would be removed to that depth and would then be replaced with 8 inches of gravel fill, a layer of geotextile material, and 3 inches of hard pack composed of finely crushed slate or ledge material. Water would be applied to the hard pack as it was put down and then rolled in order to create a firm and stable surface layer.

There was some discussion of Native American materials that had been found several years ago at the edge of the Connecticut River in connection with the rehabilitation of the Orford-Fairlee bridge on NH Route 25A, and also of the topography of the land adjacent to the Mall Walk project. E. Feighner said that, in practice, contractors would always exceed the specified excavation depth in such work. She indicated that she would like to see a profile of the original Mall Walk. It was agreed that Kevin Nyhan would arrange for an on-site investigation, which would include soil core samples to retrieve a stratigraphic profile, as soon as permitted by weather and the condition of the ground. In response to a question, C. Schmidt said that the site is essentially level and there were no wetlands which the walkway would cross. There is a small swale in one area near a driveway cut in which water sometimes collects and which probably would require some fill and grading at the sides of the walkway. No excavation would be required other than that required for the substructure of the pathway itself.

At the end of the meeting, C. Schmidt quickly projected a number of 35 mm slides of the area of Orford's Main Street in which the Mall Walk is to be restored. They included several 19th century photographs of the street and the original Mall Walk and present-day views of the bricked portion of the walkway, the Mall area, and the East Common. In conclusion, he said that the project is intended to rehabilitate the walkway in its exact historic location while using materials, which are to be as close to the original as possible. It will improve pedestrian safety while, at the same time, restoring an important historic resource within the village.

Plymouth, 14038 (no federal number): Participant: Michael Croteau, SEA (Michael.Croteau@seacon.com).

The Town of Plymouth would like to replace the two existing metal pipe culverts that carry Old Hebron Road over Clay Brook (110/092) with a new clear span bridge. Old Hebron road is a two-lane gravel road. It would be closed for traffic during the construction of the new bridge, and a detour would be established. The horizontal alignment will be maintained with minor modifications and the profile will be raised slightly to improve hydraulic capacity. The town intends to replace this bridge using town forces. Old Hebron Road Bridge is about one mile upstream from New Hebron Road Bridge, which was reconstructed by the town under the NHDOT Municipal Bridge Program in 2002.

There is no formal bridge inspection report for this “bridge” as the individual span is less than 10 feet. We are not aware of any historical significance of this “bridge” or of any seemingly historical structures in the area.

Comments:
Mr. Croteau mentioned that the road class of Old Hebron Road is a" scenic" road and that the culverts were originally constructed in about 1965. NHDHR has no concerns in replacing the existing bridge because of its recent construction date. The Cultural Resource Memorandum of Effect should be filled out by Mr. Croteau and returned stating that: "No Historic or Archeological Properties will be affected".

Bradford, 14127 (no federal number): Participant: Michael Croteau, SEA.

The Town of Bradford would like to replace existing bridge No. 141/137, which carries Jones Road over Hoyt Brook in Bradford, New Hampshire. The existing 1940's bridge is a 17-foot single span structure with a concrete deck supported by multiple steel stringers on concrete abutments. Jones Road is a local road that serves present residents and future development in the Jones Road/Cheney Hill Road area. The new bridge and 700' approach roadway will be constructed off-line, downstream from the existing bridge, with an improved vertical profile. Jones road will be closed for traffic during construction. He noted that the project will also flatten a curve, requiring the removal of a small knoll.

The latest bridge inspection report dated 10/18/2002 indicates that the bridge is not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Bement Covered Bridge is located approximately ¾ of a mile from the Jones Road Bridge and is on the National Register. The construction of the new bridge will have no adverse effect on the Bement Bridge.

Comments:
J. Garvin stated that the bridge would not score sufficiently high to be eligible for the National Register. Edna Feighner stated that the knoll, which would need to be remove from the northwest corner of the bridge, may be archaeologically sensitive. She will look into this area and respond. Should she find verify that archaeological sites have not been found in the general area, the Cultural Resource Memorandum of Effect should be filled out by Mr. Croteau and returned stating that "No Historic or Archeological Properties will be affected".

Native American Consultation: Participants: Dick Boisvert and Bill Hauser.

J. McKay wanted to verify whether the level of consultation with the Abenaki for projects that potentially impact Native American resources was currently sufficient. She now transmits archaeological reports to Debra Bergeron. Dick Boisvert indicated that other potentially interested parties included Paul Poullio and Charlie True. H. Kinter stated that when FHWA and NHDOT met with Donna and John Moody, they had also notified them. Paul deferred to the judgment of Donna and John. H. Kinter indicated that since the later no longer represented the Abenaki in Swanton he would send a letter to April Rushlow inquiring about the desired level or threshold of communication and manner of notification. Since the Abenaki are not yet federally recognized, they are contacted as consulting parties. D. Boisvert observed that the group has been working toward this status.

Alton, X-AOOO(243), 14215. Participants: Kevin Nyhan and Kevin Prince.

Kevin Nyhan discussed this project, which is a federal resurfacing project located along NH Route 11 in Alton, from Butler Road, north 4 miles to Minge Cove Road. The project involves pavement rehabilitation, guardrail, drainage, ledge work, the expansion of the Mount Major parking lot and the relocation of Minge Cove Road north 200 feet. There are no architectural properties within the project limits that will be impacted. All work will remain within the limits of existing right-of-way.

Edna Feighner asked about the limits of work on the ledge and at the Mount Major parking lot as the area is relatively sensitive for archaeology. Ledge will be scaled; there is no blasting proposed and the Mount Major parking area is fairly ledgy. As such, E. Feighner did not think that the project would affect archaeologically sensitive areas. A memorandum of "No Historic Properties Affected" will be signed next month.

Clarksville-Pittsburg, BRO-X-093(001), 13028. Participants: Kevin Nyhan, Pete Stamnas, and Mark Whittemore.

Kevin Nyhan reviewed the easements necessary for construction of the bridge that carries NH Route 145 over the Connecticut River. Temporary easements are required on the Baldwin Mill Complex, greater that what was originally proposed in September. The Department proposes to document the dam remnants and complete all remaining phases of archaeology on the Connecticut River terrace. E. Feighner requested that the Department include testing at the dam area if the previous archaeological work was not adequate in doing so. *The Department has subsequently agreed to complete this work near the dam and at the hydrant project area prior to work in the area.* She added that the Department could move forward with design under that assumption. Any data contained in the area could be recovered and would be significant for the information it contained and not for preservation in place, barring any unforeseen circumstances.

Claremont (no numbers). Participants: Russ Rohloff (rrohloff@dubois-king.com; 802-728-3376).

The following items were discussed:

1. The project involves a municipal sewer extension in order to serve the Pleasant Valley Estates Manufactured Housing Park accessed off Paddy Hollow Road. Through a combination of gravity sewer and force main, the residential sewage will be transported to the influent sewer entering the City of Claremont WWTF.

2. A portion of the project is along the north road frontage of NH State Routes 12/103 between Dustin Heights Road and Clay Hill Road. Two points were raised about this alignment. First, the state has a highway project in this area. The Environmental Coordinator is Kevin Nyhan and the project Claremont 13333. Second, there is part of the old Claremont Railway line along NH Route 12 in this area. This is discussed further below.

3. The Claremont Railway is characterized as an 8.3-mile single rail line using electric engines. Most of the line is currently buried within the asphalt. The state's project will remove the tracks and memorialize the railway through a historical marker. In addition, the NHDOT is putting

together a notebook about the rail line, which is currently available in the Bureau of Environment. There was a brief comment about a buried trestle in the vicinity of the project, but it was decided that this was outside the project limits described above.

4. The committee requested the completion of a Phase 1A archaeological investigation in three areas: (1) along the NH State Routes 12/103 corridor, (2) at the Coy Paper Property site, and (3) in a field immediately south of the manufactured housing park that will be crossed by the gravity sewer alignment. After evaluating the sensitivity of the area and completing the literature search, the archaeological firm should continue and complete the Phase IB investigations. The firm should follow the NHDOT archaeological guidelines. This assessment would be completed by Hartgen Associates and will be completed once snow cover is gone.

5. The project is going to be primarily funded through a Community Block Development Grant, through a State Revolving Loan Fund/Grant and through private financing.

Conway, HDPPE-9117(1), 11339A: Participant: Kevin Nyhan.

Kevin Nyhan presented photographs of a portion of stonewall that would be impacted by the construction of the Conway, 11339J project. It is not associated with a historic resource and has been mortared. The agencies felt a formal review was not necessary and the Department can move forward with the project without the need to rebuild the wall.

Whitefield, HP-STP-F-X-0351(8), P2953: Participant: Marc Laurin and Alex Vogt.

The drainage impacts for the project were reviewed. The swales in the agricultural fields toward the south end of the project, principally on the Bean property, were not deemed archaeologically sensitive and did not result in an impact to the contributing property or district. The drainage at the base of the hill just north of the foundation remains of the creamery may involve the remains of the office building associated with the creamery and will go onto the Bobbin Mill property. However, although close, the drainage would not impact known buildings associated with the Bobbin Mill. E. Feighner requested the NHDOT conduct a Phase IB along the drainage corridor and any access route that may be needed outside the drainage area, focusing on the area north of the creamery and the area associated with the Bobbin mill, to document buildings and any activity in the later area. The two other drainage areas at the base of the hill will not affect potentially archaeologically sensitive areas.

Laconia, X-AOOO(096), 13895. Participant: Mark Hemmerlein.

The state has made an agreement with the town to complete a sidewalk project near the Weirs along US Route 3 and on NH Route 11B. It will incorporate existing sidewalks. The section on NH Route 11B includes a short gap along the north side of the road near Lucern Avenue. The remainder will stretch 1600 feet from the approximately the intersection of US Route 3 and NH 11B west along both sides of the road to Tower Street. The sidewalks are in the right-of-way, but there will be some drainage work outside it and to the north of the road. M. Hemmerlein noted that the Department intended to clean off the top 4-5 inches or somewhat more to construct the sidewalks.

L. Wilson noted that a Native American site had been located under the adjacent drive-in. The laying of streets in this area did not necessarily impact the archaeological deposits, which are extensive, but were laid down on top of them. E. Feighner requested that a combined Phase IA and IB investigation be completed beginning at the railroad tracks and heading west through the drainage swale. Systematic soil coring along the shoulder and in the drainage areas should be followed by testing at 8-meter intervals if intact soils are found. If archaeological deposits are found, then testing should include a 4-meter array.

Andover 13348 (no federal #). Participant: Cathy Goodmen.

The district project re-constructs a portion of NH Route 11 at the intersection of Flaghole Road and makes the curve of Route 11 less acute. The project is next to Highland Lake and Lakeview Cemetery. A landowner on the south side of Route 11 will donate a portion of the agricultural field to the town to enlarge the cemetery if the NHDOT donates the original roadway to the town for the same purpose. At the same time, the property owner will donate land to the NHDOT to ease the curve on Route 11 and make the roadway safer. Also, the intersection with Flaghole road will be reconstructed to intersect Route 11 at a safer angle. There is an old shed on the property that will be demolished for roadway construction and an old building that appears to have been built in the mid-20th century for possible logging work. Neither building was determined to be historic. The new construction will be moving away from the cemetery and the lake, so it was determined to have no archaeological impacts. The agricultural field, which sits on a ridge, was not viewed as archaeologically sensitive.

Laconia (Lake Shore Spur Line - part of the Concord and Montreal). Participant: Russ St. Pierre.

R. St. Pierre reviewed the State's proposal to abandon and discontinue railroad service over a small portion of the Lakeport Spur Railroad in Laconia, NH. This property located adjacent to this section, which is at the westerly end of the line this section of the spur line, is private property. James R Irwin & Sons from the Boston and Maine Railroad acquired it in the 1940s and 1950s. The State acquired the right to operate a railroad over said property from the B & M Railroad through condemnation proceedings in 1975, as amended in 1980. This action will not transfer any real property acquired by the State during the same condemnation proceedings.

After review, it was determined that there were no objections to the proposed abandonment and discontinuation of service.

Manchester, X-AOOO(073), 13873: Participants: Ram Maddali and Jim Robinson (644-5200-214), Rick Stuart, and Mike Hansen.

The 3.3-miles bicycle trail begins south of Beech Street, passes Precourt Park, and ends at Goff Falls Road. In future phases of the project, connections will be made to the airport. The path is 12' wide and paved and, for the most part, parallels the railroad tracks. Thus, much of the line will remain intact. Surviving rail sidings and switches will remain. J. Robinson noted that Fort Stark was located at the park and icehouses stood in the vicinity, but both were located off the railroad right-of-way. Ground preparation will require leveling and smoothing the project area with a backhoe. There will be a few areas of drainage improvement. Over the stone and rail

culvert at Station 73, the fill will be removed and replaced over a geo-tech mat without impact to the structure.

E. Feighner stated that the railroad corridor had archaeological sensitivity because of its proximity to the Merrimack River. The existing Phase IA report simply identifies existing sites. She requested more information on the integrity of the area through examination of systematic soil profiles. Rail lines were often laid on top of the ground surface, simply burying the archaeological sites. This information should be added to the existing report. L. Wilson indicated that the line had not been examined for National Register eligibility. Depending on the extent of the future projects, the whole line may need to be examined to provide a contextual view. The project area form submitted will be reviewed on February 23. Whether or not the line or this portion of the line is determined eligible, the archaeological study will need to be done. [On February 23, it was determined that this portion of the project would not adversely impact the structures along the railroad bed and that future project along the corridor should include a study of the whole line.]

****Memos:** Bristol 14336; Orford 13900; Sutton 14328A; Pittsfield-Laconia 13853.

Submitted by Joyce McKay, Cultural Resources Manager

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

S:\MEETINGS\SHPO\05minutes\2-3-22.doc