

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT

CONFERENCE REPORT

DATE OF CONFERENCES: March 3 and 10, 2005

LOCATION OF CONFERENCES: JO Morton Building

ATTENDED BY: Jon Evans, Kevin Nyhan, Mark Hemmerlein, Marc Laurin, Russ St. Pierre, Charlie Hood, Charles Willeke (District 4), Bob Juliano, John Butler, Bob Barry, Chris Waszczuk, Ram Maddali, NHDOT; Jim Garvin, Linda Wilson, and Edna Feighner, NHDHR; Harry Kinter, FHWA; Rich Roach, ACOE; Jamie Paine and Roch Larschelle, CLD; Philip MacDonald, Underwood Engineers; Epsom Town Representatives; Johanna Lyons, DRED; Arlene Johns, Jane Waters, Coralie Hansen, Gary Sparks, Jim Marvin, Abby Raud, Leo Lamper, Jim Petropolis, and Chistine Chadwick, Town of Hillsborough; John Theriault, and John Merchant, Walmart; Wade Brown, SEA; Barbara Lucas, Town of New Hampton; Robert Veloski, Fred Smith, Bob Kurrey, Police Chief Sawyer, Town of Bristol; Rev. James Smith, Derry.

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

NOTES ON CONFERENCE

Thursday, March 3, 2005

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

The replacement of the timber with a concrete deck on the railroad bridge will require the preparation of a 4(f) statement. The replacement of the deck is an adverse effect on the bridge, which is an element of the Eastern Railroad Historic District. H. Kinter thought that the use of the historic bridge 4(f) programmatic would be appropriate.

Clarksville-Pittsburg, BRO-X0093(001), 13028. Participant: Kevin Nyhan.

K. Nyhan asked H. Kinter whether he could use the programmatic 4(f) for historic bridges for this project. H. Kinter stated that he could. The dwelling associated with the Baldwin Mill Complex would not require a full 4(f).

Sutton, AOOO(322), 14328/A. Participant: Joyce McKay.

Don Davis sent a letter to the Department expressing concern about the impact of the blasting along I-89 on two potentially historic houses at 7 and 115 Shadow Hill Road, the Shadow Hill House and Reuben Gile house respectively. At the time of the meeting, their location was unclear. The photographs seem to indicate that they have a timber frame construction. J. McKay agreed to determine their location and photograph them.

Chichester, 14081(no federal #). Participant: Jamie Paine, CLD .

Jamie Paine from CLD Consulting Engineers presented a bridge replacement project in the Town of Chichester. The town proposes to replace a steel girder bridge with concrete abutments (No. 152/144) that carries Webster Mills Road over Sanborn Brook with a pre-cast concrete arch. Webster Mills Road is a rural, residential road with relatively low traffic volumes. The steel girder bridge is 24 feet wide and has a 24-foot single span with reinforced concrete abutments and wing walls. It does not meet current loading standards. The roadway at the bridge is 20 feet from guardrail to guardrail. The structure is located at the bottom of a deep roadway dip causing drainage issues that have resulted in erosion of the backfill behind the wing walls and deterioration of the wing walls themselves. Driver site distance is also a problem due to of the roadway geometry.

The project would require the existing road to be raised approximately six feet in the vicinity of the bridge to accommodate storm water flows, which collect at the bridge, the low point in the road. The proposed roadway section will include two 10-foot travel lanes to match the existing but will add two 2-foot paved shoulders to provide a 24-foot paved travel way over the bridge and through the extents of the proposed guardrail. The project would slightly enlarge the stream opening, reducing stream velocities, and maintain a natural bottom within the river.

NH Division of Historical Resources determined that No Historic or Archaeological Properties would be Affected. No further coordination is required, and a memo can be prepared.

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

It was agreed that the effect memo for Conway did not need to be revised to indicate that there was no additional effect created by the Schiavi property conversion to a recreational parcel in lieu of another parcel. H. Kinter and L. Wilson agreed that NHDOT would not have an effect on the parcel.

Conway, STP-TE-X-OOOS(322), 13078. Participant: Joyce McKay and Charles Hood.

J. McKay and C. Hood reviewed the right-of-way boundary in front of 51 River Road, an eligible property. C. Hood noted that the right-of-way was shifting slightly toward the house, but the pavement would be shifted away from the house. L. Wilson agreed that the adjustment of the right-of-way did not create a 4(f), and H. Kinter indicated that it does create a programmatic 4(f).

Windham Rail Trail. Participants: Mark Samsel and John Mangan, Windham Rail to Trail Alliance and Tom Jameson, Bureau of Rails.

Project Scope

The scope of the development of the Windham Section of the planned 4.1-mile Rockingham Rail-to-Trail Project on the former Manchester to Lawrence Railroad primarily occurs on the existing rail bed that ranges in width of approximately 12 to 20 feet at different sections. The surface today is a combination of gravel and a fine sandy material, so it is anticipated that there is

minimal replacement of substructure material. Since there are no drainage issues, the grade will remain the same. The rail and ties have been removed from the trail. Private monies are funding the project.

It will be a 10' wide paved trail with stone dust shoulders. The surface will undergo some grading. The maximum depth of excavation will be 9".

Historical Resources

Several historical resources are within the area of physical scope of this project. We do not anticipate any impact to these structures or items during or after construction because they are not in close proximity to trail construction or retain sufficient structural integrity so that they do not require strengthening. Surface and fencing improvements are required to one of the bridges as noted.

The rehabilitation of the Windham Depot Buildings, which are in a local historic district, and parking lot are part of a separate project. However, they are deemed important to the success and vision of this rail-to-trail project. We anticipate a walk through of the trail to view these items in order to inventory them and assess their current condition. Since these structures play a significant role in the community and to the historical nature of this former rail line, we would plan to include these properties in the trail literature and website and to include signage along the trail.

The historical resources along the trail include:

1. The Windham Depot Station and Freight Buildings: No impact by this project, but possible rehabilitation of buildings as part of separate effort resulting from recommendations developed by the Windham Depot Advisory Committee. The two buildings are owned by NHDOT. There is some interest in conveying these two buildings to the Town of Derry.
2. Drainage culverts - 5 (Granite culverts under trail): No anticipated impact to them but must maintain drainage capability.
3. Stone mile marker: No impact
4. Stone Arch Bridge at Dinsmoor Rd (discontinued road): No impact
5. I-Beam Bridge Overpass on stone abutments at Dinsmoor Rd (discontinued road): We anticipate replacing planking with similar material as recommend by the consulting engineer. We anticipate replacing present unsafe fencing with material as recommended.
6. The ashlar and rubble stone sheep fold under trail passage (300 ft. from "Bridge Overpass"): No impact
7. Freight dock foundation: No impact

Sanbornton-Belmont, 14150: Participant: Russ St. Pierre.

Russ St.Pierre presented a project to replace the deck of the bridge carrying US Route 3 over Lake Winnisquam in the towns of Sanbornton, Tilton, and Belmont. The existing bridge contains 4-spans and is 474 feet long. It consists of a concrete deck on I-beams and was constructed in 1973. The bridge is not eligible for the National Register. The proposal is to replace the deck in-kind, and it will include general rehabilitation work on abutment backwalls and wingcaps. Some work may require the use of a barge. At this time, the intent is to replace the deck in two phases while maintaining traffic and eliminating the need for a temporary bridge.

After review, it was determined that no historic resources will be affected in the project area and that no further survey work was needed. It was further decided that if a temporary bridge were determined to be necessary, NHDOT would conduct all appropriate phases of archaeological investigation including terrestrial and underwater archaeology.

Milton, X-AOOO(074), 13874. Participants: Ram Maddali and Philip MacDonald, Underwood Engineers (pmac@underwoodeng.com)

A set of construction plans, photographs, and figures were provided by Underwood Engineers Inc. (UEI) to show the School Street Area Sidewalk Improvements in Milton. Approximately 2,600 feet (total) of sidewalks are proposed on School Street, Elm Street, Dawson Street, Mill, and Steeple Street.

The need for sidewalks to connect existing resources, including Nute High School, the library, Milton Elementary School, Community Church, VFW facility, and high residential areas, was reviewed. It was represented that there are no existing sidewalks on School Street between the schools and library and that all sidewalk and drainage construction would be contained within the existing Rights-of-Way (R-O-W). Sidewalks on Elm Street and Dawson Street will be reconstructed at their existing locations. A "Draft" copy of the Environmental Review Documentation was submitted for review.

Discussion

Property impacts are not anticipated since all work will be completed within existing R-O-W. Signs and telephone poles will be set back within the right-of-way. The head walls of some culverts will require repair. No stone walls are impacted. Environmental issues include Blanding's Turtle reportedly found in general area, although the exact location was not specified. The NH Fish & Game is requesting a low profile or sloped curb on Steeple Street, which is the area of the stream, to facilitate their migration. It was concluded that the project would not impact historical resources and a "No Historical Properties Affected Memo" can be signed.

Action

1. Underwood Engineers, Inc. will prepare meeting notes for distribution.
2. The Cultural Resources Memorandum of Effect needs to be executed by NH Division of Historical Resources (Ms. Linda Wilson), Federal Highway Administration (Mr. Harry Kinter), and UEI (Philip MacDonald). UEI will complete it and forward the Cultural Resources Memorandum of Effect to Joyce McKay. She will obtain the appropriate

signatures and mail to UEI for their signature. UEI will include a copy of original in Final Environmental Review document to be submitted.

3. The “Draft” copy of the Environmental Review Documentation will be reviewed by the State, and review comments to be forwarded to UEI.

Once signed, the Cultural Resources Memorandum of Effect will be included in the Environmental Document along with the meeting notes. When it is completed, all documentation will be forwarded to Ram Maddali for approval.

Epsom Surplus Land: Participants: Phil Miles and Town Representatives.

The Town of Epsom agreed to the conditions of the property covenant prepared for the old town hall and the library. Rather than signing it as part of the deed transferring the surplus land to the town, the town will sign it as a separate document. L. Wilson requested that the covenant be registered with the Register of Deeds of the county. And, the town representatives agreed to this step.

Surplus Lands: Participant: Jon Evans.

Concord/Planchet-Haley-Taylor-Cohen Surplus Land, SP-P4191

This property is located on the western side of Nashua Street in the town of Concord. The property was originally acquired for the reconstruction of the I-93 exit 13 project. There are several dwellings in the vicinity of this property, which may be potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, however these properties are also surrounded by a large amount of industrial activity. Due to the movement of the area towards further industrial activity, it was determined by the committee that the property could be released without concern for cultural resources.

Bridgewater/ MacDonald Surplus Land, SP-P2288, Original Federal #: TLR 14187

This property is located on the eastern side of NH Route 3A in the town of Bridgewater, NH. The property was originally acquired in 1952 for the widening of NH Route 3A through the area. A portion of one of the abutters dwellings is actually located on the parcel of state owned land. Due to the small size and heavily wooded nature of the property, it was determined by the committee that the property could be released without concern for cultural resources.

Merrimack/Steele Surplus Land, SP-P1054, Original Federal #: F-051-1(14)

This property is located on the corner of Greeley Street and Whitney Street, east of the F.E. Everett Turnpike, Exit 11 interchange. The parcel is 7,690 square feet and was acquired in 1969 for the reconstruction of US Route 3 through the area. The parcel was leased since 1970 to the former owners of the Hannah Jack Restaurant for use as a parking lot. The new owners would like to either purchase or lease the property for parking. Based upon the face the property had been used for parking in the past, it was determined by the committee that the property could be released without concern for cultural resources.

Thursday, March 10, 2005

Derry, GS-STP-X-5119(007), 13249: Participants: Kevin Nyhan and Bob Barry.

Bob Barry presented this project, which involves the upgrade of the intersection of NH Route 102, Birch Street and Crystal Avenue, NH Route 28 in Derry. Testimony at the Public Hearing and subsequent letters written to the transcript requested that the Department seek to shift the Birch Street improvements from the west side to the east side of the road. The current proposal reduces the front yards of seven parcels on the west side of Birch Street, and eliminates several off street parking spaces. The suggested shift would reduce impacts to the Birch Street Residential Historic District (BSRHD), and eliminate the off-street parking concern, especially at the O'Neil residence. It would also however, require the acquisition of the Central Commons Office Building and result in the relocation of the several businesses that it houses.

At a previous agency meeting, H. Kinter stated that the Department must show that its proposal is the most prudent, based on the financial considerations of acquiring the Central Commons building, even though it uses more Section 4(f) historic resources. B. Barry showed a chart that lays out the potential Right of Way (ROW) acquisition costs for several alternatives. In summary, all options acquire the Mesiti parcel. Option #1 (Public Hearing Layout) ROW cost would total approximately \$750,000. For option #2, which demolishes the Central Commons with land remaining in private hands, ROW cost would be approximately three (3) times as expensive as Option #1. The Option #3, which involves partial acquisition and demolition of Central Commons, results in ROW cost approximately two (2) times as expensive as Option #1.

B. Barry stated that there is a municipal parking lot behind the west side of Birch Street. There is a possibility that spaces in this lot can be reserved for use by residences and businesses along Birch Street who have lost parking. L. Wilson felt that this would be a great solution, and stated that this could be mitigation for impacts. It would help maintain the economic viability of these businesses. *(Subsequent to this meeting, B. Barry met with Derry Public Works regarding the possibility of reserved (permit) parking in a town parking lot for Ms. O'Neil's tenants. They believe its achievable but what was thought to be a public parking lot behind the O'Neil residence is really a private lot for a restaurant. However since the Mesiti property is being converted to a public lot and is diagonally across the street from O'Neil's, the Derry Public Works Department and DOT feel that this is a viable solution. Michael Fowler, Public Works Director, will discuss the issue with the Town Administrator and have him approach the Town Council for their approval.)* Mr. Lampes stated that parking on the street is critical for the downtown area. B. Barry clarified that the project would maintain on-street parking, but the concern is for the loss of off street parking.

H. Kinter stated that the business expenses portions and relocation expenses that DOT can pay out have been increased by the legislature and requested that the table be updated to accurately reflect these changes. H. Kinter added that the onus now lies with the Department to prove that the proposed action meets the prudency argument under Section 4(f). K. Nyhan will need to make this argument in a revised ES/4(f) document. H. Kinter noted that the relocation of the parking should be noted in the MOA. Since it is an adverse effect, the Advisory Council will need to be notified. He requested that the bureau check to see if notification has already occurred.

Hillsborough, NH Routes 9 and 31 (Wal-Mart): Participants: Charlie Hood and Charles Willeke; Johanna Lyons, Dred; Arlene Johns, Jane Waters, Coralie C. Hansen, Gary Sparks, Jim Marvin, Abby Raud, Leo Lamper, Jim Petropolis, and Christine Chadwick, Hillsborough and John Theriault and John Merchant, Walmart.

The meeting was held to determine if the improvements proposed by Walmart along NH Route 31 at its intersection with NH Route 9 were acceptable to the NHDHR and interested parties, which included representatives from the town planning board and historical society and from DRED. The intersection is close to the Franklin Pierce Homestead, a National Historic Landmark.

C.R. Willeke from District 4 reviewed the proposal. Walmart is conducting improvements along Main Street as a requirement of a driveway permit onto West Main St. that would be issued by the town. Because of the rise in traffic volume affecting state roads 31 and 9, the state requested that Walmart complete some improvements in this area. Walmart conducted a traffic study to project the traffic numbers at the time of opening the store and ten years' out. It looked at the level of service that needs to be maintained to accommodate the increased traffic to and from Walmart. Currently, one lane carries traffic in each direction along NH Route 31 and 9. Walmart has proposed minor widening to accommodate a right turn lane from Route 9 onto Route 31 and minor widening on both sides and stripping along Route 31 to permit storage of traffic turning left from Route 31 onto Route 9 in one lane and a right turn and forward movement in the other lane onto Route 9. The widening goes back about 150' from the intersection and ends prior to the entrance to the Franklin Pierce Homestead. It also runs along property associated with it, once the site of Pierce's daughter's house. The historical society has planned some future construction of walks and plantings in this area. Sixteen percent of the traffic for Walmart would come from this intersection, a rise of 15 cars per hour on Route 31 and 30 along Route 9.

Discussion of the impacts from the widening by representatives from the Historical Society and other local groups followed. It was noted that the widening brings traffic right up to where visitors enter the homestead. The greatest concern was that the road is incrementally encroaching on the Franklin Pierce Homestead property, a National Historic Landmark, and will continue to do so in the future as other businesses locate adjacent to the Walmart on North Main. It was noted that the Pierce Homestead and the adjacent dwelling to the southeast are relatively close to the road. The rising level of traffic and the associated rise in noise level does harm to the feeling of the property, and the level of traffic at the intersection is already a problem. J. Garvin agreed with this concern about the threat to the visual impact to the feeling of the property. NHDHR also expressed concern about the rising level of traffic caused by the opening of Walmart to the Lower Village Historic District. Walmart's current traffic model does not account for the traffic from other box stores that are likely to locate in the area. Participants from the town requested that NHDOT take a careful look at this intersection in the future, discussing such solutions as a rotary.

CR stated that NHDOT was willing to compromise the standards to minimize impacts. The Department is willing to look at different concepts at the intersection, but this effort is larger than the resolution to the current efforts to accommodate the additional traffic caused by the opening of Walmart. Traffic increases within the next ten years related to this event do not warrant a traffic light. CR noted that NHDOT wants to preserve NH Route 9 as a free-flowing highway. Inserting a traffic light or rotary would likely introduce rear end collisions when stopping at the intersection.

The Walmart representative suggested that for now it could shorten the stacking for traffic traveling from Route 31 to Route 9 to three instead of six vehicles and narrow the lane width from 12 to 11 and perhaps narrow the shoulders. To resolve the immediate issues, it was concluded that Walmart would try to reduce its impacts to the intersection.

Durham-Newmarket, STP-TE-X-5133(009), 13080: Participants: Kevin Nyhan and Chris Waszczuk.

It was noted that the consulting parties did not attend the meeting. The discussion focused on the architectural history resources. Kevin Nyhan noted that the purpose of this meeting was to provide an overview of historic resources that have been documented in the project area on the general project plan. Although specific impacts to historic resources have not yet been quantified, a generalization of impacts was discussed. K. Nyhan added that there are two (2) listed National Register Districts in the project area and one eligible district area. There are also individually eligible and potentially eligible properties within the project area. *Some areas noted as potentially eligible were not surveyed because of the limited impact proposed during the initial public informational meetings. It was decided at a prior CRA meeting that surveys were not required if the level of impact did not change at these parcels.* The listed and eligible properties consist of the following (surveys completed by Liz Hengen) with the parcel numbers that contribute in the project area:

DURHAM NATIONAL REGISTER HISTORIC DISTRICT – Parcel #'s 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 55, 53, 52, 68, 69, 67, 66, 65, 63, 62, 60? & 59. (Non-contributing – Parcel #'s 64 & 54).

DOE-MOONEY-DAME-STEVENS FARMS HISTORIC DISTRICT AREA – Parcel #'s 79, 80, 81, 35, 34, 82, 33, 83, 31, 84, 85, 30 & 27.

NEWMARKET NATIONAL REGISTER HISTORIC DISTRICT EXTENSION – Contributing parcel #'s 110 & 111, and potentially parcel #'s 2 & 95.

INDIVIDUALLY ELIGIBLE PROPERTIES – Parcel 99.

POTENTIALLY HISTORIC – Parcel #'s 72, 75, 10, 100, 5, 102, 103, 104 & 1.

John Butler presented the design of the project, beginning in Durham and proceeding to Newmarket. In general, the project begins at the Oyster River Bridge in Durham and proceeds south approximately 3.4 miles to Bay Road in Newmarket. The proposed typical section uses 11 ft. travel lanes with 4 ft. shoulders. Sidewalks in addition to the shoulders are proposed on both sides of NH 108 in Newmarket due to the dense development.

For most of the project length, the existing alignment will be utilized with equal widening on either side. There are 3 areas where the alignment will be shifted to hold one edge of pavement to minimize impacts to existing houses, which are very close to the roadway. The three areas are all in Durham: one just south of Durham Point Road to avoid several houses on the east side within the historic district and the second and third areas are approximately 0.5 miles and 0.9 miles south of Durham Point Road to avoid individual houses on the east side.

Durham Point Road Intersection

At the March 2004 Public Informational Meetings, alternative designs were presented for the Durham Point Road intersection (left turn lane option, bypass shoulder option, and a minimal alternative or 4-foot shoulder option), with mixed comments. Generally the bicycle advocates favored the left turn lane concept for its safety benefits, while others felt that minimizing impacts in this historically sensitive area was most important. Subsequent to the meetings, the Durham Town Administrator submitted a letter stating that the Town Council recommended the minimized 4-foot shoulder alternative. John Butler noted that the left turn lane warrant is strongly met. This alternative does have limited impacts to the triangle.

The Department also showed a proposed drainage treatment area in the vicinity of Durham Point Road. H. Kinter suggested that the Department look at alternatives to its location within the Durham Historic District. J. Butler noted that its location is not very flexible. It needs to be adjacent to the natural drainage channel.

Bennett Road Intersection

Alternatives at the Bennett Road intersection included two (2) relocation layouts and one with minor improvements to the existing intersection throat. It was noted that this area is in an eligible district. The Durham Town Administrator submitted a letter stating that the Town Council recommended a relocation alternative at Bennett Road (C. Waszczuk is following up on which alternative specifically).

To determine the effect, L. Wilson requested that the Department photograph the existing and proposed alignments digitally. She asked about the alignment of the old NH Route 108 and if the old intersection with Bennett Road was significant enough to preserve the “view,” as similarly done in Andover. H. Kinter stated that since there has been no public comment expressed specifically to this, and due to the severe hill on Bennett Road, it was not a concern. It was agreed that this area could still not constitute an adverse effect. It was a matter of treatment. Much of the realignment is shielded by topography. This may also be a potential Wildcat Transit bus stop.

Bypass Shoulder Layout

John Butler noted that there are 2 locations where bypass shoulders are proposed: Stagecoach Road and Longmarsh Road. At Longmarsh Road, the 10-foot wide bypass shoulder would extend southerly for approximately 350 feet, becoming a right turn deceleration shoulder for Bennett Road. The length of the bypass shoulder at Stagecoach Road has been minimized to the extent possible, approximately 125 feet long.

Wildcat Transit Bus Stops

John Butler noted that there are currently 18 bus stops (9 pairs NB/SB) for Wildcat Transit within the project limits. Most are informal gravel pullouts. The Department intends to formalize some of the pullouts to improve safety where this can be done without additional property impacts.

Simon's Lane

There are two identified drainage areas near Simon's Lane, which require easements. A photograph of this area would be helpful since there is an individually eligible property nearby. The other drainage easements will not be identified until later.

Newmarket

The impacts in the Newmarket Historic District Extension are very minimal including some temporary slope easements. The small park at Bay Road has no recreational uses, so any impacts here will not create a 4(f). The monument will not be impacted.

Comments

It was noted that the only other possible impact might be for drainage easements. They have not been completed determined.

H. Kinter said that he did not see an adverse effect for this project based on the limited design. He stated that the Department has mitigated through design. L. Wilson agreed. If this were the case, the project would qualify for a Programmatic 4(f) evaluation due to the acquisitions in the districts. C. Waszczuk noted that the Department had decided to rebuild affected stonewalls, where feasible on a project-wide basis. They would be rebuilt on the right-of-way line. H. Kinter strongly supported this commitment and stated that, if that were the case, then a stonewall review per the stonewall policy was unnecessary. The only place that these walls need to be protected by a covenant is when they must be rebuilt on private property. Further research into actual impacts will be necessary before a memo can be signed. Mitigation of impacts includes: mitigation through design and rebuilding stonewalls.

Rochester 14350: Participant: Jamie Paine, CLD.

Jamie Paine and Roch Larochelle from CLD Consulting Engineers presented a project to reconfigure roadway lanes and traffic signals along NH Route 11. The proposed project would accommodate a private project to expand an existing Wal-Mart in Rochester. The roadway work is being overseen by the City of Rochester's Public Works Department. The proposed project would widen roadway along NH Route 11/Farmington Road, between approximately Little Falls Bridge Road and the Wal-Mart driveway, in the northwest quadrant of the city, a distance of approximately 3,900 feet. The roadway widening will accommodate a full five-lane section along this segment of NH Route 11. This work is a continuation of the signal design plan CLD recently prepared for the City at the Little Falls Bridge Road intersection. Coordinated timings between the two signalized intersections will be updated to reflect the improved geometry.

NH Division of Historical Resources (NHDHR) stated that the project must stay 25 feet from a small cemetery located near the eastern limits of the project. As long as the cemetery is not so affected, NHDHR determined that No Historic or Archaeological Properties will be Effected, and a memo can be signed. No further coordination is required.

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

Residents of the area have expressed concern about the effects of the projects on the dwellings at 7 and 115 Shadow Hill Lane. The first, the Shadow Hill House, is far enough removed that vibrations from blasting would not impact it. The second, known as the Reuben Gile House and built in the late 18th century, stands quite close to I-89 and may be affected. It was agreed that NHDOT would do a pre-construction survey to determine what elements would be vulnerable to blasting. Adjacent to the property, blasting will be controlled to remain within limits that will not impact the stability of the dwelling. Vibration monitoring will occur during the work.

Stonewalls: Participants: Russ St. Pierre, Charles Hood, Mark Hemmerlein, Marc Laurin, and Jonathan Evans

Meredith

The project level evaluation and the individual walls did not qualify for reconstruction under the stone wall policy.

Windham-Salem

The project level analysis determined that the project does not qualify on the project level. Ten individual walls were then reviewed. It was determined that only one wall located on North Broadway on the Castricone property would qualify for restoration. Additionally, J. Garvin stated that as the Lindholm/Battle walls on Roulston Road were very close to the cut-off. They would qualify if the owners expressed an interest in their being retained. M. Laurin stated that there would be some constructability issues with the majority of these wall, due the relocation of Roulston Road, though a short segment near the entrance to the property would most likely be able to be reconstructed.

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

It was noted that Rich Roach, USACE Regulatory Division was not present. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss minimization and mitigation options in accordance with the Section 106 Process. As stated in the March 4, 2005 letter from Frank Delgiudice of USACE Regulatory Division, the process has moved beyond the phase to avoid or rehabilitate and is now to proceed with the phase to evaluate minimization and mitigation. Ultimately, agreed upon stipulations aimed at minimization and/or mitigation will be incorporated into a memorandum of agreement or MOA.

The following paraphrased questions, comments, and discussions ensued. They do not appear in the exact order that the issues arose.

It was recognized at the start of the meeting and throughout that Rich Roach is the person to direct the process because USACE is the responsible federal agency for the Section 106 process

on this project. In Rich's absence the group proceeded as well as they could following an agenda prepared by S E A and Jim Garvin's lead.

Jim Garvin explained, in general, the next steps of the Section 106 process, which includes minimization and mitigation of the effects of the project on the historic bridge. Since the bridge needs to be removed, mitigation efforts might include moving the bridge to another site, recordation, and memorialization. A required element of mitigation, recordation will include a HAER document (Historic American Engineering Record). HAER documentation is performed by a qualified professional according to HAER standards which include large format black and white photograph negatives and contact prints, photographic reproduction of construction drawings through large format photography, and written documentation. W. Brown confirmed that plans of the existing bridge, which can be used for the HAER document, are available.

J. Garvin stated that mitigating impacts by relocating the bridge is relatively costly. The need to remove the bridge without dropping it in the river or cutting members adds to the cost. Rivets will need to be burned out in order to disassemble the bridge without damage. An estimate of the costs to relocate the structure will be needed to fully evaluate this alternative. J. Garvin asked if there were any costs available at the time of the meeting?

W. Brown stated that during the engineering study phase S E A met with bridge contractor Ed Swett and discussed the costs to remove the bridge. The ballpark cost using temporary pier supports in the river was estimated at approximately \$200,000. The cost to remove the bridge carefully, disassembling by burning out rivets, would be above and beyond this cost. The cost from Ed Swett to remove the bridge by dropping it in the river without temporary pier supports, was approximately \$100,000.

W. Brown stated that Rich Roach had indicated in an earlier phone conversation that he visited a temporary site, a flood control staging area, for relocation on Corps land recently and met with the base manager. They identified a potential storage location on federal land about ½ mile down Coolidge Woods Road where the site "opens up".

B. Lucas stated that the town of New Hampton has serious concerns about using that location for storage of the bridge. It is a common hangout for kids and may result in vandalism etc. Not secondary to this concern is the financial expense to dismantle and store the bridge in a field where it will not be maintained and therefore deteriorate.

J. Garvin indicated that it would not be beneficial to store the bridge only to have it deteriorate. However, NHDHR is interested in working with NHDOT to further explore a storage site on state property for historic steel bridges. And, L. Wilson inquired whether the method used in the town of Shelburne be used for this bridge? J. Garvin stated that the Shelburne method involved lifting entire spans of the multi-span truss bridge and placing them on land without the need to disassemble.

After some discussion, all agreed this method could not be done for the Central Street Bridge due to its large size, limited existing space at the bridge, and lack of permanent storage area on the steep banks. The Central Street Bridge would need to be disassembled in pieces and moved to an offsite storage location.

J. Garvin stated that the old railroad bed downstream of the bridge on the Bristol side below the Newfound River could be a potential area of storage. NHDHR recognizes the costs could be significant to explore the various options and it is not their intent to require unnecessary evaluation, but it is important to obtain certain facts necessary to reach a conclusion according to the Section 106 Process.

Wade Brown asked whether a maintenance agreement needed to be one of the stipulations of this form of mitigation, and if maintenance cannot be provided would this mitigation option be abandoned?

J. Garvin stated that maintaining the bridge would be ideal and is a consideration but not necessarily required. The likely scenario would be to disassemble and store it in pieces. We need to explore what is fair and reasonable, and the towns can't be liable for all eternity to maintain the bridge. There needs to be an end to an obligation. W. Brown asked whether it would be acceptable to disassemble it and store in pieces instead of requiring reassembly.

J. Garvin stated that unless a permanent site is found for the bridge it could be disassembled and stored. It would be asking too much to assemble it just to have to disassemble it to move it at a later date. If reassembly were to occur, bolts would be used instead of rivets, which are no longer in use.

Bob Curdie stated that the Town of Bristol had a devil of a time gaining approval at the town meeting the night before for the cost of the next phase to design the bridge. The project has been a real sore spot for voters due to the time lag and reoccurring costs. The bridge has little benefit to Bristol, but they are trying to be good neighbors. The point being, if costs are too high for mitigation, the voters will not pass it. Every time the town goes back to the people for more money, the tougher it gets.

J. Garvin responded that it might not be necessary to save the floor system including the stringers and floor beams of the bridge since it may be too badly rusted, and it probably is not made from original members. W. Brown confirmed that the floor system has been replaced in the past and is not of original members.

Bob Veloski asked whether it is possible that NHDOT would not pay for mitigation? J. Garvin stated that the NHDOT would have a contractual obligation to pay their share (80%). The NHDOT's responsibilities will be included in the MOA.

J. Garvin stated that advertisement of the bridge for sale would be the last step to offer the orphan bridge to the broader public. It is very unlikely there would be any takers especially because of its large size and the maintenance responsibility associated with this option. Barbara Lucas asked why it would this be the last step and not the first step. J. Garvin stated that it could be first step, but if there were no interested parties, then the towns would need to take other steps to pursue potential internal takers. We can talk about the ordering of these steps. Barbara Lucas asked whether cutting and dropping the bridge in the river as a means of removal were still on the table? This method of removal would be much less costly. J. Garvin stated that it was still on table if other mitigation efforts fail. We need to explore possibilities without everything being linked to cost. We can't legally just consider cost.

Nathaniel Sawyer asked whether the towns could re-use a partial section of the bridge and not its whole length. The Smith River Bridge site (#4 on agenda) previously discussed with the Army Corp at June 2004 meeting has a much shorter span than 240'. J. Garvin responded that NHDHR would consider doing such an approach by cutting out the center section then piecing the ends together. Another option could be to have a longer bridge by pushing the abutments farther back onto land. NHDHR is anxious to find out more about this location as a potential site as it would be best to reuse the bridge as a bridge.

Wade Brown asked whether there were any other ideas for potential mitigation besides those listed on the agenda or already discussed? J. Garvin indicated that there were none. It might be possible to retain a piece of bridge on the site as part of the exhibit but that approach would not work well with this single long truss. It would be ideal if a history provided at a kiosk type exhibit included a history of the original bridge from the 1800's, followed by the covered bridge,

and the existing truss bridge. Discussion on the history of the entire site including the means of transportation via the river and the railroad would also be great.

Barbara Lucas asked where the HAER documentation is deposited. J. McKay stated that it would be stored in NHDHR's office, and with the towns, among others. Washington would probably not need a copy. Four or five copies total would be required. The cost for the HAER documentation would probably run between \$13,000 and \$16,000. The HAER documentation could be started in the near future since this document would definitely be needed.

Wade Brown asked what else is needed to memorialize the bridge? J. Garvin stated that memorialization could be of a lesser degree if the bridge is preserved through minimization.

J. McKay asked that depending on the form of mitigation, could a lesser degree of memorialization such as a state historical marker be used. It costs \$1300. J. Garvin thought that an outside kiosk with more historical information would be preferred. He stated that NHDHR is not concerned with preservation of the existing stone abutment in simulated form. NHDHR finds that this would compromise the new bridge design and not be fair to the designers or to the towns if they wish to pursue the proposed signature type bridge made of today's modern materials. Someday someone may be trying to preserve the new bridge so it should have its own unique design and not be compromised with stone from the existing bridge. The towns can use the existing stone in any fashion they wish, for example riprap, disposal, or other civil uses.

J. Garvin stated that Edna Feighner of the NHDHR is not present at this meeting, and she will need to weigh-in on the project impacts related to any potential archeological resources. J. McKay stated that she would need to know the impact limits of the project including temporary impacts for construction equipment. It is recommended that archaeological investigations were done early because it may have some affect on design and construction decisions. W. Brown stated that the proposed location of the bridge might change slightly by about 5 degrees from where it is shown on the engineering study in order to reduce costs and improve roadway alignment. Should we get E. Feighner the information before the location is modified? J. McKay that if only changes are limited, then it would probably be best to have her look at it soon before those changes are made. Barbara Lucas stated that during the meeting with PSNH about the Ayers Island Dam and with USACE about the Franklin Falls Dam in June 2004, it was made clear that there had already been a detailed gathering of archaeological information. We would like to reuse this information and not perform additional research. J. McKay pointed out that E. Feighner very likely has that information in her files and will use it as the basis of any requests for investigations. B. Lucas asked if the archaeological survey work needed to be finalized before the MOA is completed? Harry Kinter stated that it did not. The MOA would be drafted with the contingency that archaeological requirements would need to be fulfilled. J. McKay stated that it would still better to get the initial archaeological studies started early as it may affect the design decisions. H. Kinter stated that the USACE has an archaeological professional, Kate Atwood, who should be involved in the process as well.

J. Garvin asked whether asked whether there were different level of permitting required if the bridge is removed in pieces while supported on piers versus cutting and dropping in the river. Wade Brown indicated that he did not believe so based on previous discussions with the Army Corp including the meeting in June of 2004. S E A will prepare the meeting minutes for Rich Roach to review and give direction.

Action Items:

1. Rich Roach will need to review the minutes and provide direction, which could include the following next steps:
 - a. Investigate various minimization/mitigation options.

- b. Begin HAER documentation.
- c. Begin Archaeological evaluation of the project areas. Provide project impact limits to E. Feighner of NHDHR, and Kate Atwood of USACE.
- d. Provide construction cost estimates to remove, disassemble, and relocate bridge to potential storage sites.
- e. Schedule the next Cultural Resource Meeting for April or May.

****Memos:** Statewide (culverts), IM-X-OOOS(397), 13408; Conway, STP-TE-X-OOOS(322),13078; Conway, STP-TE-X-OOOS(322), 13078

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	

S:\MEETINGS\SHPO\05minutes\3-3-10.doc