BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT

CONFERENCE REPORT

DATE OF CONFERENCES: March 1 and 8, 2007

LOCATION OF CONFERENCES: J.O. Morton Building

ATTENDED BY: Den Danna, Bill Hauser, Nadine Peterson, Charles Hood, Tim Boodey, Kevin Nyhan, Cathy Goodmen, Jon Evans, Christine Perron, Dave Scott, Tim Boodey, Dave Powelson, Don Lyford, Alex Vogt, and Ram Maddali, NHDOT; Jim Garvin, Linda Wilson, and Edna Feighner, NHDHR; Bill O'Donnell, FHWA; Rich Roach, ACOE; D. Scott Osgood and Jim Haggett and Michelle Juliano, Public Works; Janet Eclud, State Library; Rich Roberts, Foley Buhl Roberts & Associates; Carl Hegstrom, Jaffrey; Tom Levins, Holden Engineering; Kathy Hersh, City of Nashua; Marty Bowers, Louis Berger Group; Marty Dudek and Mike Roberts, John Milner; Michael Mates, Kimbell Chase; and Matt Low, HTA. Michael Leach,Vollmer Associates; Carl and Scott Hagstrom, Monadnock Septic Design; Ben Gary, Marshall Gary; Rick Sawyer, City of Nashua ; Matt Walsh, City of Concord; and Chris Carley, CN Carley Associates.

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

Thursday, March 1, 2007

Rollinsford Bridge 069/046. Participant: Tim Boodey and Dave Powelson.

NHDOT Bridge Maintenance is planning to rehabilitate Oak Street Bridge over the B&M Railroad in Rollinsford (069/046). The bridge is an 1890/1928 riveted, low Warren Truss bridge that was rescored at 17 points on July 7, 1999. Rated at a 6-ton weight limit, this bridge is currently in poor condition. To continue use of the bridge and bring it back to the 6-ton rating, Bridge Maintenance is proposing to replace the timber deck, replace the stringers and clips, clean the steel, and weld some plates to the floor beams. The work will not replace the floor beams. Any replacements will be in-kind. A no adverse effect memo will be signed at the next meeting.

Londonderry, X-A000(072), 13872. Participant: Kevin Nyhan and Michael Leach, Vollmer Associates.

M. Leach reviewed the design of the project, confirming that the location of the path in front of the Londonderry Historical Society would not impact the archaeological site at the Morrison House. A no adverse effect memo was signed and will be placed in the document.

Conway, HP-STP-NHS-DPI-MGS-TX-0153(001), 11339B. Participant: Joyce McKay.

J. McKay reviewed the covenant for the Burtis House in North Conway with Linda Wilson. For current purposes, the wording is appropriate.

Jaffrey Stone Culverts. Participant: Carl Hagstrom and Scott Hagstrom, Monadnock Septic Design.

C. Hegstrom is re-designing an existing 3X3 foot stone box culvert under Redgate Road, a class 6 road in the Town of Jaffrey. The culvert possesses adequate flow capacity. He proposed sliding a plastic sleeve through the culvert to extend it. The road carries logging trucks and would be used by the owners of new residences in the area. This approach to re-using the culverts would be reversible. E. Feighner will send a letter approving the project. She requested a copy of the dredge and fill permit, USGS mapping, and town tax map for documentation.

The Hagstroms are also re-designing a culvert on Middle Hancock Road in the Town of Hancock. The proposed steel-stringer bridge will be placed over the top of the stone culvert and bury the culvert. Jersey barriers will function as the abutments. This bridge is designed to carry heavy loads. Information regarding this project will also be sent to NHDHR for approval.

Rye, MGS-BRF-S221(10), 13269. Participants: Cathy Goodmen and Alex Vogt.

Cathy Goodmen requested information about whether NHDOT could apply the Programmatic 4(f) to the historic bridge over Seavey Creek and apply the DeMinimis 4(f) to the acquisition of an easement at Odiorne Point State Park, both eligible properties. After the meeting, Bill O'Donnell checked with Marlys Osterhues, and she said there is no restriction in the De Minimis provision and there is no reason why we could not apply these two programmatic agreements to this project. The adverse effect memo for the bridge would note the three viable alternatives being examined. They include replacement in kind, prefabricated timber, and a hybrid bridge with steel and concrete piers and wood deck and rail. The town eliminated the all concrete alternative.

North Hampton, STP-TE-X-000S(418), 13501. Participant: Jon Evans

This project is located along a 0.5-mile stretch of NH Route 111 between US Route 1 and Hobbs Road in North Hampton, NH. The current travel way is approximately 20-21 feet in width (10-10.5 foot lanes) and does not include paved shoulders for bicycle and pedestrian traffic. This project was initiated at the request of the Town of North Hampton and involves the installation of 4-foot paved shoulders to allow for safe bicycle and pedestrian travel as well as increased vehicle safety. Both sides of the roadway contain buildings, which are potentially eligible, including a blacksmith shop constructed in 1888. Given the limited funding and historic nature of the neighborhood, efforts have been made to limit the footprint of this project. All work will be contained within the existing right-of-way and will not require deep excavation.

J. Evans explained the existing conditions and intentions of the project. J. Evans indicated that the North Hampton Historical Society (specifically Priscilla Leavitt) requested to be a consulting

party to the Section 106 process for this project. P. Leavitt was notified of the Cultural Resource Agencies Meeting and declined to attend but requested a copy of the minutes. J. McKay and J. Evans indicated that the Historical Society had informed the Department of four potential areas of concern, the Albert Locke Blacksmith Shop, the Charles Seavey Blacksmith Shop site, the Town Pound site, and the John Warner Carriage Shop site. Because all impacts will be contained within the existing ROW, L. Wilson concurred again that this project would not have an adverse effect on buildings adjacent to the ROW.

The Albert Locke Blacksmith Shop had been previously identified as a potential archaeological site, and it was requested that an archaeological study be conducted prior to construction. J. Evans and J. McKay performed a field review of the project area on February 15, 2007, and were able to locate the approximate locations of the remaining three resources noted by the Historical Society. J. McKay, J. Garvin, and E. Feighner agreed that it appeared that the Carriage Shop had been removed and replaced by the structure located on Parcel 6 (M. Lords Hairstyling) and remains are unlikely.

E. Feighner indicated that when archaeological investigations in the area of the Albert Locke Blacksmith Shop are performed, some minor investigations should be conducted in the areas of the Seavey Blacksmith Shop and the Town Pound. J. Evans noted that funding for this project is extremely limited and requested that these investigations be included in the limited project wide investigation/literature search, which will be conducted in conjunction with the limited site investigation of the Locke Blacksmith Shop site. E. Feighner was given a topographic map of the project area and agreed to send the Kathy Wheeler, IAC the results of a literature search at NHDHR.

Wilmot, 14621A: Participant: Tom Levins (hes@holdenengineering.com).

Tom Levins presented the proposed plan for the bridge replacement (204/112). The plan includes constructing a new pre-cast concrete rigid frame in place of the temporary Bailey bridge along Kearsarge Valley Road. The Bailey bridge was constructed in June 2006 when flooding caused the existing metal pipe arch structure to collapse. The metal pipe arch was constructed in 1950. The bridge and roadway will be constructed on the current alignment, and the road will be closed during construction. Traffic will be detoured during construction. The roadway will be widened to 24 feet through the bridge area and will taper back to match the existing pavement width on the approaches. The abutments will be retained, and there will be no disturbance to the stream banks. Most of the work will be within the existing right-of-way, except for some areas of slope work. The Town will secure easements from the property owners prior to construction. The Town of Wilmot is expecting FEMA to participate in paying up to 75% of the construction cost.

It was determined that there were no historic properties affected by the project.

Claremont: Monadnock Mills Training Wall. Participant: D. Scott Osgood and Mark Whittemore, Public Works; Rich Roberts, Foley Buhl Roberts & Associates.

History:
Monadnock Mills is a 150-year-old mill building that was renovated to house State Offices in the 1980's. The building is on the Sugar River, with the North foundation wall bordering the River. The foundation wall is constructed of dry laid stone masonry, comprised of relatively small, loose

stones. The wall is 4 to 6 feet thick and 10 to 16 feet in height. Extensive damage has occurred on the foundation wall over the years due to ice and river debris hitting the wall.

The Department of Administrative Services requested the Bureau of Public Works to provide a solution to repair the damage and prevent future damage. Public Works contracted with Foley Buhl Roberts of Manchester, NH, to provide a design for this work.

The solution presented was a concrete facing wall, which would run the entire length and height of the existing stonewall. This design was presented at the Cultural Resources Meeting on July 13, 2006. Since the mill is a listed property, the NHDHR determined that the current appearance of the wall is historically significant and requested that NHDAS investigate alternative repair approaches that would preserve, at least in part, the current aesthetic of the wall. Public Works was asked to provide options, which would not conceal the existing wall from the public view.

Alternatives:

Numerous alternative solutions were investigated. The first alternative investigated was to not run the wall up the entire height of the stone. After reviewing structural considerations, the designers concluded that this would not provide the stability necessary.

Various websites were investigated for options. One, the Association for Preservation Technology, provided data for preservation, but nothing of this scope. Another is the National Center for Preservation Technology. No options were found. Websites dealing with Masonry restoration did not deal with this situation. Various resources available from the American Society of Civil Engineers were reviewed, but appropriate alternatives were not found.

Traditional Wall building techniques were considered. BPW initiated a search for artisans who would rebuild the wall to the required standards. One International Group, "The Stone Foundation" (named sounded perfect), listed stonemasons across the country. Calls to locals did not yield any with necessary expertise, or desire, to undertake the effort.

National material suppliers were contacted for material we could inject, which would bind the stones in place. Tremco Inc, Dupont, GE were all researched, but no material was found. Local masons were contacted to see if they would apply typical masonry grouting techniques to the wall. Mas-Con of Laconia, one of the more experienced firms in the state, did not feel the work would be possible with traditional masonry techniques.

Research was done on cement grouting techniques, with a report on restoring masonry bridges as a guide. Efforts to find a contractor to do this in our situation yielded no contractors. We questioned also if this technique would provide the necessary stability.

A search for local grouting companies was done. One, Pico Pressure Grouting, was found. They did not express any interest in the work. National Grouting Firms were contacted. One of the largest is Hayward Baker. In discussing this with their representative, they didn't feel their techniques were suitable for this work. A second one, Nicholson Company, expressed no interest in considering the work. Local Concrete companies were contacted, both for material, which they could provide, and contractors who might have been able to perform the work. One, Carroll Concrete of Newport, NH, was willing to investigate the situation, and try to find a solution. They conducted a site tour, but reported that their system and materials would not provide the results we are looking for.

A call was made to an international geotechnical engineering firm, with a new option recommended. A small company out of Mars Pennsylvania ("Sub-Technical, Inc.") specializes in mining and rock stability issues. This firm has a variety of chemical grouts and techniques, one of which looks to be applicable to this project. It involves injection of a rapid set, high strength polyurethane grout mix, injected under low pressure, into the masonry voids. NHDAS and FBRA do have concerns with grout containment, grout leakage and the final appearance, but we do feel this solution provides potential for a long-term aesthetically acceptable look and strength. NHDAS and FBRA have reviewed the on-site conditions with Sub-Technical, Inc. representatives. Based on these discussions, it appears that this approach would be cost-competitive with the original concrete training wall solution. However, this approach does have some limitations. This material and technique are used primarily in mining applications and have had only limited prior use on building structures. We have had continuing discussions with Sub-Technical on the subject of grout leakage and the final appearance of the wall. Also, we have been unable to find any contractors other than Sub-Technical, Inc. who have experience with these materials and techniques. While this approach appears to have potential, there are concerns that this grouting technique is a relatively unproven "sole-source" solution.

Options that are not viable include:

Provide a new steel column and beam structural system, and replace the wall as aesthetic filler. This would eliminate the current viability of the existing stone wall, and provide a "false" stone foundation, but approximate the original look. This is very labor intensive, with a concrete foundation in the River, extensive demolition and shoring, an extensive stonemason project, and new steel work. Cost considerations alone would make this is an unacceptable alternative. We would not expect this solution to meet the Secretary of the Interiors Guidelines for Historic Preservation.

Provide a concrete wall with an applied stone face. This approach is deemed unacceptable due to the face becomes an artificial wall, and would violate the requirements of the Secretary of the Interiors guidelines.

Other than the original design, no other options are under consideration at this time.

Because this is a sole source solution, Public Works would need to bid both the concrete wall and grouting alternatives and select the low bid. The grout alternative would involve some addition expense, which includes pointing the wall to contain the grout. The Army Corps will need to provide a wetlands permit for the project, thus involving Section 106. The grouting treatment would avoid an adverse effect.

J. Garvin requested that the concrete alternative include a scaled documentation of the wall. This alternative is adverse, since the stone foundation will be covered and turned into a monolithic structure. J. Garvin agreed to find the cost of photogrammetry as well as acquiring the image through laser scanning so that a scaled image could be made. For both alternatives, NHDHR requested large format photographs of the wall. Although Public Works looked into a sole source bid, it was later found that this approach was not possible.

Thursday, March 8, 2007

Statewide, X-A000(535), 14802. Participants: Dave Scott and Christine Perron.

D. Scott described the three bridges to be repaired under this project. The bridges are located on NH Route 1B (2 in New Castle and 1 in Portsmouth). The bridges have steel piles that were encased with concrete over 20 years ago and the concrete is now in very poor condition. This project will remove the old concrete and re-encase the steel piles with new concrete. J. Garvin determined that this project would not impact the historic or potentially historic bridges.

This work should be completed either from a barge or from platforms erected at each bridge pier. No fill will be utilized. Ground disturbance around the bridges is unlikely, although staging areas could potentially cause some soil disturbance. Since these bridges are in an archeologically sensitive area and the locations of staging areas will not be known until after the contract is awarded, the staging areas will need to be reviewed at a Cultural Resources Meeting prior to the start of work and phased archaeological survey might be needed. C. Perron will provide appropriate wording to be added to the prosecution of work.

Nashua 11057. Participants: Ben Gary, Marshall Gary; Rick Sawyer, City of Nashua; Marty Bowers, Berger; Marty Dudek and Mike Roberts, John Milner; and Don Lyford.

On March 8, 2007, representatives of City of Nashua, Marshall Gary, and the Louis Berger Group, Inc. met with representatives from NHDOT and NHDHR at the latter agencies' bi-monthly inter-agency cultural resources meeting to review historical or archaeological resource concerns regarding the proposed Rotary Commons park in Nashua. Joyce McKay had also invited representatives from John Milner Associates, the firm responsible for the archaeological investigations that have taken place on the project site to date.

Ben Gary presented an overview of the project and a graphic showing areas of the site proposed for filling and grading. Areas shaded in gray on the graphic would be filled (one to three feet) or not "touched". Colored areas would receive some cutting; many of these areas are in the 100-year floodplain, and cutting/filling may be necessary for flood storage. He indicated that project design would be at the 60% mark within a few weeks.

Discussion initiated by Edna Feighner focused primarily on the need for further archaeological investigations, and the extent to which the project will affect both known and yet-to-be-identified archaeological deposits and features. She indicated that even prep work prior to stripping (preparatory to filling) could impact resources, and that sensitive areas must be recorded and/or tested.

Joyce McKay requested that the Milner team prepared a phase II scope of services based on the 60% plans. They would be funded with the University of Massachusetts under the service agreement. The scope would be based on the team's knowledge of the site and the nature and extent of anticipated construction disturbance. Those recommendations would be incorporated into an MOA specifying the steps, procedures and treatments to be undertaken at appropriate stages to resolve adverse effects of construction. The open foundations of the 1923 building will also require HAER documentation.

The potential need for a Corps permit mandates a "by the book" approach to Section 106, to ensure the Corps has the information and assurances it needs to approve a permit.

It was also noted that the further archaeological investigations and recordation would provide more information about the site's history and used to inform subsequent site interpretation to the public.

The 60% plans will provide information on drainage, tree locations, walls and other park elements needed to begin development of a staged "work plan" for recordation and archaeological investigations.

Programmatic Agreement Among NHDOT, NHDHR, and FHWA. Participants: Nadine Peterson and Joyce McKay.

The draft PA was reviewed. Comments made by Bill O'Donnell had already been incorporated into the document. The only comment NHDHR had on the draft was in Section 2.D. Instead of reading "construction of sidewalks, curbing, and lighting improvements," this section was changed to read "Construction of sidewalks and curbing, and lighting improvements outside historic districts or individually eligible properties."

Subsequently, NHDOT staff completed a full draft version of the PA and forwarded a copy to DHR and FHWA for review and comment at the April 12, 2007 meeting.

Concord, X-A000(090), 13889. Participant: Matthew Walsh (mwalsh@onconcord.com) and Chris Carley, CN Carley Associates.

Matt Walsh, City of Concord, and Chris Carley, CN Carley Associates (Architect for the City), attended the Cultural Resources Meeting to discuss construction of two new bus shelters in Downtown Concord.

Mr. Carley noted that the purpose of the meeting was to review alternative concepts recently prepared for the project. The new concepts were generated because the Concord City Council did not support construction of a bus shelter on the State House Plaza, although said structure has previously been approved by at the NH DOT Cultural Resources meeting. The City Council was concerned that any shelter at that location would detract from monuments at the plaza.

Mr. Carley presented two conceptual site plans. Both plans called for relocation of bus stops from their current Eagle Square / State House Plaza locations to that portion of North Main Street, between Park and Centre Streets. Both concepts proposed construction of "bump outs" adjacent to existing sidewalks. The shelters would be placed on these bump outs.

The only difference between the two site concepts was the placement of the bump outs. "Scheme A" showed bump outs adjacent to crosswalk, while the alternative scheme showed the bump out / shelter location on the east side of the street placed to the north towards Centre Street.

Mr. Walsh explained that the City would use the previously approved design for the Eagle Square shelter for both locations. This design was modified to include a tempered glass side panel.

NHDHR and FHWA indicated that the proposed modification to the shelter design (glass end panels) was acceptable. They also agreed that the final location of sidewalk "bump outs" should be left to the City of Concord. The agencies noted that both concepts were acceptable, however Concept B might have negative impacts on vehicular traffic since the proposal for the east side of N. Main Street would interfere with an existing right turn "slip" lane. It was noted that Scheme A would have less impact on vehicular traffic. Further, the bump out placement would improve pedestrian safety for the existing cross walk. The agencies also noted that impacts on abutting properties for the easterly side of the street were comparable for both concepts.

Hillsborough, X-A000(094), 13893. Participants: Michael Mates, Kimbell Chase (mmates@kimballchase.com); Matt Low, HTA; Matt Taylor, Town Planner of Hillsborough; and Ram Maddali.

Michael Mates presented an overview of the changes to the rehabilitation of the stone arch bridge since the design team presented the project at the 1/11/07 Cultural Resources Meeting. These changes included the removal of the bridge parapet walls down to a six-inch reveal and the removal of the concrete caps at each end of the bridge. The concrete caps would be replaced with the stone removed from the parapet walls.

These changes were made in an effort to replicate the original design of the stone arch bridge. After review of photograph provided by the Hillsborough Historical Society, it was noted that the original construction of the bridge did not include the parapets or caps. Dates of the photographs ranged between pre 1900 to 1938. The parapets and concrete caps first showed up in a photograph dated 1927, after the bridge had been widened. The committee indicated parapets and concrete caps were added in an effort to strengthen the structure as methods of transportation evolved.

Discussion then ensued regarding the implications to the historic nature of the structure and if there was an adverse impact to property protected by Section 4(f) of the 1966 USDOT Act. The agencies agreed the project would not have an adverse effect on historical or archaeological properties. The suggested design in fact honored the original design intent. However, the committee requested the team to provide documentation of the current condition of the bridge by large format photographs of the east and west bridge fascias. A map showing the direction of the views and a description of the views should accompany the photographs. In regards to Section 4(f) of the 1966 USDOT Act, the committee made a finding of de minimis impact. At that time, the Cultural Resource Memorandum of Effect was executed.

Matt Taylor then presented the proposed landscaping plan, which included the installation of disease resistant elms as previously requested by the agencies.

The last item of discussion related to the pointing of the bridge proposed by the design team. It was agreed that any mortar required for the rehabilitation of the bridge would be recessed within the stones in an effort to replicate the original look of the bridge. It would be better to avoid pointing if possible.

Londergan and Johnson Halls, Concord. Participant: Jim Haggett.

The goal of the project is to replace all 263 of the windows at Londergan Hall. The current design shows aluminum-clad windows with aluminum trim. Existing trim would be replicated. The project was reviewed several years ago, but no update was ever presented. J. Garvin observed that, at that time, discussion focus on retaining the original sash. No agreement was reached concerning the windows at the meeting.

Similarly, at Johnson Hall, Public Works has replaced some of the windows. J. Garvin noted that these windows had not been altered and retained their character-defining features. Again, the original object was to retain and rehabilitate them. J. Garvin asked if there was federal funds involved, and noted that under RSA 227C, state agencies were still supposed to coordinate their projects with NHDHR. The replacements are to be double-glazed windows with muntins to match the current profile. J. Garvin requested that a rehabilitation alternative be bid out along with the replacement alternative. He requested that these projects for historic state buildings be brought to NHDHR early in the design phase so that alternatives could be examined.

State Library, Concord. Participant: D. Scott Osgood and Michelle Juliano, Public Works; and Janet Eclud, State Library.

In survey of the windows along the State Library, Public Works found the following:
The building was built in the 1890's. The original use was as the State Library and Supreme Court Building. The Court occupied the West side, and Library on the East. The Building has 164 windows, with over 270 individual sashes.

The majority of the windows are original. There are a variety of styles of the windows throughout the building; most units are large, single pane windows, double hung. Those on the lowest level are a hopper type, hinged at the bottom, with a radius top. There are a many ½ rounds, operable, throughout the building.

There are two styles of double hung windows. The better quality window is in the former Court area on the west side. These have sashes, which are 2 ¼ "thick with recessed hardware and chain in the counterweight assembly. The second major style has face mounted pulls, strap hinges, and 1 5/8 "thick sills.

The great majority of the windows are in good shape. This can be credited to the fact that the walls of the Library are very thick, with deep stone jambs and sills, which has protected the windows from the elements. Some of the windows are damaged, with some rotted sills and jambs, but the count is very low. While we haven't determined for certain that the glass is original, it is in good shape. A small number of breaks were found. The panes are ¼ " thick, not safety glass.

<u>Issues with the Windows:</u>

In conducting our study, we found the following issues needed to be addressed. The major issue, which must take precedence, is the exterior finish, particularly on the South and West elevations. The paint is peeling and the wood is exposed to deterioration from the weather. A contract to scrape and repaint exterior frames would need to be part of any contract we put together.

The Addition of Weather Striping

The second major issue is the comfort of the occupants in the building. Many of the rooms are occupied all day, and the occupants experience discomfort with the amount of air infiltration through the units. Some of the units are performing relatively well, some very poorly. Occupants have taken measures to mitigate these drafts, all sub-standard to the design function of the windows. Some have stapled plastic sheeting over the windows. In many instances, a vinyl weather strip has been applied to the sills and jambs to reduce the infiltration of cold air.

The cause of this infiltration is possibly simply the original design, coupled with the fact that over time, the windows have shrunk, as will all wood in the dry cold winter season, and thus become looser. A solution to this can be to add a historically accurate type of bronze weather striping to the sills, jambs, and heads. Other steps could be considered, with the application of felt, or brush type weather striping. This work will probably require the sashes to be trimmed to accommodate the thickness of the weather striping. The firm performing this work would need to be qualified as a profession, experienced finish carpentry contractor.

Evaluation of Glass Replacement

A great deal of consideration and discussion was involved in evaluating whether the glass should be upgraded. The current glass is not safety glass, and will break in to large, dangerous pieces when broken. The current system also does not provide the best R-value insulating system. Consideration could be given to upgrading the glass in some of the units.

The question of replacing the glass can be quantified. We can calculate the area of the glass, relative to the stone, and the total area and quantify the difference in R-value of an insulated unit from that of the existing ¼ inch-thick units. This will give us an energy cost, or savings, with the change. To make the change however, we need to consider the following:

The units would need to be routed to receive a glass unit of possibly 1/2” to ¾”. This will change the profile of the 2 ¼” thick sashes. The existing unit is ¼”. The second floor units are 1 5/8. Increasing the glass thickness will greatly compromise the original design profile of these units. Additionally, and perhaps of greater impact, is that the majority of the units are operable with balanced counterweights. Increasing the glazing will at a minimum double the weight of the glass. The counterweight will need to be modified. We really do not know the impact of increasing the counterweight. They may be able to be added to; or additional weight may not fit. At a minimum, all jambs will need to be opened, and new weights added.

The cost for this will challenge our budget. The return may not justify it. The fact that the current widows are probably original, and the glass and sash has held up well should serve as a good reason to stay with the current, original design. If more thermal treatment is warranted after weather stripping has been applied, new curtains or blinds could be considered.

Replacement of Glass Beading

The third issue is the glazing beads. In many cases it has shrunk and curled. This has left the glass loose, with voids letting-in drafts. The glazing needs to be redone. The question here would be to consider providing wood stops or new glazing putty. Research has not been done to see what would be appropriate. In the research we have done, all new glazing is with modern glazing putty.

Stripping and Repainting

In many cases, the operable units have been painted shut and are no long operable. A proper system of paint removal and proper repainting would solve this problem. Recommendations have been made to remove the sashes and have them dipped in a chemical bath to soften and allow easy removal of the paint. They would then be repainted and re-glazed with their original glass in a shop, and reinstalled.

Temporary units would need to be installed for a week or so, and the frames would need to be done in place. Issues of lead paint remediation would need to be addressed, but would not make the project too onerous to undertake.

Replacement of Pulley Rope Support

The side support of the windows contains three types of support. There are chains attached to counterweights, some have metal straps, and some have rope. A large percentage of the rope on the pulleys has failed. Priority action should be to replace all the rope with chain.

Removal of Additions Blocking Light

Some of the windows have been amateurishly modified. In many cases the top ½ round sections have been blocked-off, which prevent light from coming in. We cannot speculate on why this was done. To return the windows to their original look and function, consideration should be given to removing these additions.

Summary and Recommendations

Scrape and repaint exterior frames.
Remove, dip, and repaint sashes.
Trim sash as required to accommodate new weather-striping
Provide new bronze weather striping in offices and all operable windows.
Repaint interior trim to match
Add new putty glazing bead
Perform necessary miscellaneous repair
    Replace deteriorated wood
    Replace broken glass
    Replace all rope pulleys with chain
Remove additions from all windows

NHDHR concurred with these repair recommendations.

Claremont: Monadnock Mills Training Wall. Participants: D. Scott Osgood and Michelle Juliano, Public Works; Richard Roberts, Foley Buhl, Roberts and Associates; and Rich Roach, ACOE.

D. Scott Osgood confirmed that a clear, plastic, rapid-set coating had been located that could be injected into the voids within the mill foundation walls and provide sufficient support for stability. However, Public Works could find only a single source for this material and its application, and procurement of such services cannot be sole source. The only option was to bid

out two options, the concrete training wall option and the above option. If the concrete training wall option were utilized, then the stone foundation wall would require detailed documentation. Photogrammetry and a system that laser-scanned the wall were suggested. In either case, smaller-scale, 5X7 large format photographs should be taken of the wall prior to treatment. J. Garvin agreed to define the scope of work for documentation for both treatment options.

Lebanon, X-A000(141), 13951. Participants: Nadine Peterson and Jim Garvin.

It was agreed that the US Route 4 Bridge over the Mascoma River (188/126) would be treated as eligible for the National Register and a state-level HAER document will be completed. Additionally, the project area will need to be reviewed for archaeological sensitivity.

Bedford 13527 (no federal number). Participants: Nadine Peterson and Jim Garvin.

It was agreed that the US Route 3 Bridge over the FE Everett Turnpike (189/121) would be eligible only as a contributing resource in a district area that encompassed the FE Everett Turnpike. While NHDHR would agree to the bridge's replacement, NHDHR requested a project area form for the turnpike. The project should also be reviewed for archaeological sensitivity.

****Memos**: Londonderry, X-A000(072), 13872; Rye 13269; Rollingsford Bridge

Submitted by Joyce McKay, Cultural Resources Manager