

**BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT  
CONFERENCE REPORT**

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

**DATE OF CONFERENCES:** February 14, 2019

**LOCATION OF CONFERENCE:** John O. Morton Building

**ATTENDED BY:**

**NHDOT**

Sheila Charles  
Ron Crickard  
Jill Edelmann  
Bob Juliano  
Marc Laurin  
Jennifer Reczek

**NHDHR**

Laura Black  
David Trubey

**FHI**

Stephanie Dyer-Carroll

**DNCR**

Alexis Rudko

**Consulting/Interested  
Parties**

Gary Bashline  
Kate Bashline

**FHWA**

Jamie Sikora

**HDR**

Jim Murphy

**PROJECTS/PRESENTATIONS REVIEWED THIS MONTH:**

*(minutes on subsequent pages)*

DNCR- Recreational Trails Program (RTP) Projects 2019 .....	1
Seabrook-Hampton 15904, X-A001(026) .....	3

**DNCR- Recreational Trails Program (RTP) Projects 2019**

Participants: Alexis Rudko, DNCR

The following summarizes the yearly review of 2019 projected DNCR Recreational Trails Program projects for cultural and historical impacts.

## 2 AGENDA

In preparation for this meeting, Alexis Rudko delivered summaries, photos, maps & NHB reviews of all applicable 2019 RTP projects to the State Historical Preservation Office for review of cultural and historical impacts. Dave Trubey, Laura Black and Jillian Edelmann reviewed all 2019 RTP projects and gave determination as to whether or not the projects needed further reviews.

## 3 POST MEETING ACTION ITEMS

At the February 14, 2019 meeting, twelve 2019 RTP projects were determined to need further review and were discussed for potential impacts to cultural resources. All project sponsors for the twelve RTP projects were contacted for further clarification on the projects' scope. The Ossipee Valley SMC was determined to need a Phase 1A study but the club decided to rescind their application for funding bring the total number down to eleven. These responses were submitted to the Division of Historic Resources. Historic Resources reviewed the responses and provided status updates to all of the eleven projects. All projects on the attached spreadsheet were cleared by SHPO except for the following:

Project	Project Organization	CR Program Comments/Action
RTP 19-09	Milan Trail Huggers	Phase 1A study needed
RTP 19-24	City of Rochester	Phase 1B study needed
RTP 19-12	The Monadnock Conservancy	Consultation with DHR for bridge work if needed
RTP 19-16	Friends of Concord Lake Sunapee Rail Trail	Consultation with DES for culvert work. Outcome will be reported to DHR.
RTP 19-TB9	Bureau of Trails (DNCR)	Consultation with Bureau of Rails and Transit
RTP 19-TB15	Bureau of Trails (DNCR)	Consultation with DHR after snowmelt photos
RTP 19-TB16	Bureau of Trails (DNCR)	Consultation with DHR and DOT

- 1) Milan Trail Huggers has submitted their request for historical review for their project to obtain guidelines from the Division of Historic Resources prior to any work being completed.
- 2) The City of Rochester has submitted their request for historical review for their project to obtain guidelines from the Division of Historic Resources prior to any work being completed.
- 3) The Monadnock Conservancy is actively consulting with Division of Historical Resources (DHR) in order to work on the east side bridge. There is anticipated damage to the bridge which the extent will not be known until the project commences. The Monadnock Conservancy will continue to consult the DHR as they work on the bridge to keep the bridge as preserved as possible without compromising public safety. Any railing to be added to the bridge will be submitted for approval to DHR prior to installation.
  - a. On April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2019 the RTP coordinator and Bureau of Trails district 3 supervisor walked this project to document the current condition of the bridges and ice house with this

- project area. Photos of this walk were submitted to the Division of Historic Resources. Once this project is complete, the project will be visited again to document changes.
- 4) On March 17, 2019, The Friends of Concord Lake Sunapee Rail Trail (FCLSRT) participated in a field survey with the RTP coordinator in order to search for historical objects using 1914 Valuation (VAL) maps from DOT. Several objects listed on the VAL maps were located in the field survey but some were not. It was concluded that the missing objects have been destroyed over time. The found objects are known to the project administrator and will be observing the contractor to ensure these objects are not impacted.
    - a. One stone box culvert will be impacted due to the capstone falling into the brook. The FCLSRT will have to obtain Department of Environmental Services permitting for their project. This stone box culvert in particular will require some repair in order to ensure public safety on the trail. Once the FCLSRT have obtained their wetland permit for this location, they will consult with DHR for the box culvert's repair to best preserve the wetland from experiencing more erosion while preserving the culvert as a historical object to the best of their abilities.
  - 5) The Department of Natural and Cultural Resources through the Division of Parks and Recreation (Bureau of Trails) has been actively consulting with the Department of Transportation (Bureau of rail & transit) and NH Division of Historical Resources to complete an action plan for any and all historical resources pertaining to the seven mile section of abandoned Ammonoosuc rail line from Littleton, NH to Bethlehem, NH. No work will commence until action plan is in place and all parties have been consulted for potential impacts.

## **Seabrook-Hampton 15904, X-A001(026)**

Participants: Stephanie Dyer-Carroll, FHI; James Murphy, HDR; Ron Crickard, Bob Juliano, Marc Laurin, Jennifer Reczek, NHDOT; Kate and Gary Bashline, Consulting Parties

Continued consultation and updates on the NHRT 1A over Hampton River (Neil R. Underwood Memorial Bridge) project and discussion of alternatives analysis.

The second coordination meeting with New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources (NHDHR) and Consulting Parties on the Hampton Harbor Bridge Project was held on February 14, 2019 at the offices of the New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NHDOT). Jennifer Reczek, NHDOT's Project Manager, opened the meeting by welcoming participants and running through the agenda. She explained that the focus of the meeting would be the alternatives that have been developed. Jim Murphy, HDR's Project Manager, then provided a brief project update. He said they completed an assessment of the existing conditions of the bridge in the fall of 2018. They also prepared a Traffic Study, a Rehabilitation Study, and an Alignment Study. He explained that the project team has undertaken extensive coordination with stakeholders, including meetings with the project's Public Advisory Committee (PAC), abutters, vessel users, and two meetings with the public, one in September and the second in January.

Stephanie Dyer-Carroll, Cultural Resources Specialist with Fitzgerald & Halliday (FHI), then summarized the cultural resources investigations and documentation that had been undertaken since their last meeting in July 2018. She explained that a Phase 1A Archaeological Assessment had been completed and reviewed by NHDHR, and that their recommendations included the development of a maritime context for Hampton Harbor, and potential additional survey and documentation if the project results in disturbance to several potentially sensitive areas in the vicinity of the bridge. Ms. Dyer-Carroll said the project team also submitted an Individual Inventory Form for the bridge which recommended eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places and that NHDHR concurred with this finding. A Project Area Form was also prepared and submitted to NHDHR and a follow-up site visit was undertaken with NHDOT, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), NHDHR, members of the project team, and consulting parties to review the project area and properties recommended for additional study.

Mr. Murphy then explained the purpose and need for the project. He said the purpose of the project is to provide a reliable and structurally sound crossing, and to improve mobility for the traveling public, including bicyclists and pedestrians, and vessel users. He said the project is necessary because the bridge is structurally deficient and functionally obsolete. Its shoulders and sidewalks do not meet current standards.

Mr. Murphy then turned the discussion to the Traffic Study. He said the study evaluated how pedestrian, bicyclists and vehicles are using the roadway, and projected future traffic volumes at key intersections. As part of the data collection effort, the project team also coordinated with local and regional planning commissions and they worked closely with the PAC in the development of the roadway profile. He said the Traffic Study concluded that two lanes are sufficient for current and future volumes. In addition, eight-foot shoulders should be a part of the roadway profile in order to allow emergency vehicles to pass and to provide space for bicyclists. Six-foot sidewalks on both sides of the bridge are proposed to safely accommodate pedestrians.

Jennifer Reczek explained that when there's traffic on the bridge Hampton's emergency vehicles have trouble getting across to serve the portion of the town that lies south of the bridge. Ms. Laura Black with NHDHR asked whether Hampton and Seabrook coordinate on emergency response. Gary Bashline, an abutter, said the towns have a reciprocal agreement and that both towns usually respond to emergencies. Kate Bashline, a Consulting Party, said Hampton often gets there first because the Seabrook Firehouse is three miles away. She also said emergency equipment can currently pass down the middle of the bridge.

Mr. Murphy said a 50-foot roadway cross-section was reviewed with the PAC and then applied to each of the three alternatives, rehabilitation, replacement with a fixed bridge, and replacement with a bascule bridge. He said there are different alignment options and heights for the two replacement alternatives.

Mr. Murphy then shared the findings of the Rehabilitation Study. He said multiples rehabilitation options are under consideration and that one will be carried through into the Type, Size and Location Study. Mr. Murphy said the bridge is number one on the state's Red List as well as the Rehabilitation and Replacement Priority List. He shared photographs of deteriorated steel and corrosion holes. He also said there are scour issues on the substructure. Ms. Reczek stated that the bridge is also fracture critical; there's no redundancy to carry the load in the event of a fracture. Mr. Murphy said the bridge plates are being pulled apart due to the salt water environment.

Mr. Murphy said the project team also assessed a 38-foot roadway profile which was the bare minimum to meet the standards. However, even using the minimum width, all of the steel elements would need to be replaced. He explained that the bascule pier restricts widening, and that while a centered alignment which would widen the bridge on either side would balance the land impacts, it would affect the operator's house, a key design feature of the bridge. If the bridge were widened to the east it would allow for the operator's house to be maintained. The project team has heard from the community that a western alignment is preferable for replacement alternatives and any required temporary bridges. Mr. Murphy said that a temporary bridge would be required under the Rehabilitation Alternative and that it would cost on the order of \$20 million.

Mr. Murphy said another option is to construct a twin bridge alongside the existing one. A substantial rehabilitation of the existing bridge would still be required, but not a widening. Ms. Reczek clarified that a twin bridge would be constructed as a movable span to meet the US Coast Guard requirements for the channel. Mr. Murphy said the project team would like input from NHDHR and consulting parties about whether this is an option they should study further. Jill Edelmann, NHDOT's Cultural Resources Manager, said one of the Department's primary concerns is the long-term maintenance of the bridge. They want to be sure they don't have another situation like they have on the General Sullivan Bridge. Ms. Laura Black with NHDHR said any alternative that lessens the impact is preferable under Section 106, but it wouldn't be helpful to commit to an alternative that won't be upheld/maintained in the long run. Ms. Reczek said that it could be challenging to find a funding source if one of the bridges is dedicated to bicyclists and pedestrians. Jamie Sikora with FHWA said the Town of Hampton would have to take it over. Ms. Reczek pointed out that the bridge would need to be opened so it likely couldn't be owned and operated by the Town. Ms. Reczek then asked participants if they could think of other options. Mr. David Trubey with NHDHR asked if the twin bridge would be movable. Ms. Reczek said it would have to be and that coordinating the opening of the two bridges could be challenging. Mr. Murphy pointed out that a bascule bridge would be more costly to construct than a fixed bridge. Mr. Bashline asked whether fishermen would be able to pass under a twin bridge. Ms. Reczek said they have heard from fisherman that it's currently challenging to get under the bridge due to cross-currents. Ms. Bashline said it's a good idea to separate bicyclists and pedestrians from cars for safety. Mr. Murphy asked if NHDHR could provide any further comments on the Rehabilitation Alternative in writing.

Mr. Murphy then moved forward to discuss potential replacement alternatives. He said the first question is where the bridge should be going, to the east or to the west of the existing span. The vertical profile of the bridge is also important because of vessels. Other key variables include roadway slope, impacts to roadway approaches to the east and the west, constructability and cost. He explained that the project team met with vessel users and they heard widening the channel is important. The channel width is posted at 40' but it's actually 51' wide. He said the proposed width for the bascule is 80' and that it would clear the US Army Corps of Engineers' dredging equipment. The proposed height is 34' which would eliminate a portion of the current lifts. The width under the Replacement with Fixed Bridge Alternative is proposed to be 150' which matches the full width of the channel east and west of the bridge. The height would be 44' which would clear greater than 90% of the current users. He said the additional 10% couldn't be reached. He said the project team is preparing

an initial report to the US Coast Guard to get their input. He also said the project team initially considered a height of 59', but then eliminated it because of the approach impacts. Mr. Murphy indicated the team is using the New Hampshire Coastal Risk Report to assess sea level rise.

Mr. Murphy then moved on to discuss the alignment options. He said the project team has considered online, east and west options. He stated that an online option would require a lengthy closure and detour. They've considered a temporary bridge but that it would cost \$20 million. An eastern alignment would result in impacts to up to four properties located immediately southeast of the current bridge. Ms. Black asked if takings would be required or if it could be accomplished with a permanent easement. Ms. Reczek said that a retaining wall would minimize or eliminate impacts to three of the properties, but that a direct impact would still occur to the northernmost house. Ms. Reczek said they would have to look at acquisition of the property. She said the community has not been supportive of an eastern alignment due to the potential property impacts. Mr. Murphy said that with an eastern alignment there wouldn't be direct impacts to the Parks Maintenance Building on the northeast side of the bridge, and there wouldn't be direct impacts to the businesses or the access driveway on the northeast side of the bridge.

Mr. Murphy said a western alignment would eliminate land impacts to the homes southeast of the bridge, but that there would be increased impacts to the conservation area southwest of the bridge. He said a western alignment would minimize impacts to the State Park. It also wouldn't directly impact the businesses northwest of the bridge if a retaining wall were employed, but there would be impacts to the driveway and the pump station would need to be relocated. In summary, Mr. Murphy said both the eastern and western alignments would impact utilities and navigational channels. Both options would also impact sensitive habitat, though there would be greater impacts with a western alignment. Ms. Bashline asked whether with an eastern alignment beach access would be lost. Mr. Murphy said they would look at relocating access if the bridge was placed on an eastern alignment. Ms. Bashline said there would also be beach access issues on the southwest side of the bridge.

Mr. Murphy provided a summary of key elements of the Replacement with Bascule Alternative and then showed a conceptual rendering of a replacement bridge. He explained that the horizontal clearance would be 80' in order to accommodate the USACE dredging equipment. There would be less frequent lifts due to the increased height of the bridge and the slope would be desirable for bicyclists and pedestrians. He said the impacts to the approaches would be less than a fixed bridge but that a bascule bridge would have substantially higher capital and maintenance costs.

Mr. Murphy then provided a summary of the key elements of the Replacement with Fixed Bridge Alternative. He explained that the underclearance would be 44' which would accommodate the vessels that regularly request lifts. The channel width would be increased to 150'. These dimensions would clear the USACE dredging equipment at low tide. It would also allow the utilities which are currently run under the channel to be carried on the bridge.

Mr. Murphy closed the presentation by outlining next steps. He said the project team plans to submit Individual Inventory Forms for four properties that lie within the Area of Potential Effect, as well as a District Area Form for a potential historic district northeast of the bridge. He said they plan to submit an addendum to the Phase 1A Archaeological Assessment to provide additional information on the use of Hampton Harbor. The project team plans to return to the March Cultural Resources Coordination Meeting to discuss these resources and potential effects. They are continuing to develop the Type, Size and Location Study and will be holding additional meetings with the PAC and public in the spring and summer.

Mr. Trubey asked if the channel would be shifted if a fixed bridge were selected. Ms. Reczek said that if the bridge were constructed on a western alignment it would impact the Hampton Harbor Channel and that they plan to coordinate with USACE on this. Mr. Trubey said that underwater archaeology will need to be

undertaken if dredging is a component of the project. He suggested the project team coordinate the underwater survey and documentation of the sensitive areas immediately south of the bridge with the areas to be dredged. He also suggested the survey be undertaken before the USACE dredge project.

Ms. Black asked that NHDOT provide the effects forms in advance of the effects discussion. Ms. Edelmann explained that the project team wants to narrow the range of alternatives to a single Rehabilitation Alternative. Mr. Sikora said that the twin bridge option needs to be considered in the Section 4(f) evaluation. Ms. Black asked if they've looked at a two-barrel option that would have the northbound and southbound traffic carried on separate structures. This would ensure that the maintenance of both bridges are funded. Ms. Reczek said that this may cause challenges for pedestrians and bicyclists crossing from one side to the other. Ms. Reczek again asked if there's an option the project team hasn't thought of. Ms. Black suggested they look at the character defining features of the bridge as outlined in the Individual Inventory Form to help define the Rehabilitation Alternative. Ms. Edelmann provided a copy of the PowerPoint presentation to NHDHR to share with others in their office. Ms. Black said she would get back to Ms. Edelmann to let her know when NHDHR can provide any additional comments.

Submitted by: Sheila Charles and Jill Edelmann, Cultural Resources

# New Hampshire Department of Transportation Cultural Resources Agency Coordination Meeting

Date February 14, 2019

Please initial next to your name.      Guests: Please use reverse side to sign in.

Initial	Name	Agency	Email Address
<i>LB</i>	Laura Black	NH Division of Historical Resources	<u>Laura.Black@dncr.nh.gov</u>
	Sheila Charles	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	<u>Sheila.Charles@dot.nh.gov</u>
<i>SC</i>	Victoria Chase	NHDOT – Highway Design	<u>Victoria.Chase@dot.nh.gov</u>
<i>KCC</i>	Ronald Crickard	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	<u>Ronald.Crickard@dot.nh.gov</u>
	Mark Doperalski	NH Division of Historical Resources	<u>Mark.Doperalski@dncr.nh.gov</u>
	Michael Dugas	NHDOT – Highway Design	<u>Michael.Dugas@dot.nh.gov</u>
<i>JE</i>	Jill Edelmann	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	<u>Jillian.Edelmann@dot.nh.gov</u>
	Ron Grandmaison	NHDOT – Highway Design	<u>Ronald.Grandmaison@dot.nh.gov</u>
	Bob Landry	NHDOT – Bridge Design	<u>Robert.Landry@dot.nh.gov</u>
<i>ML</i>	Marc Laurin	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	<u>Marc.Laurin@dot.nh.gov</u>
	Leigh Levine	Federal Highway Administration	<u>Leigh.Levine@dot.gov</u>
	Don Lyford	NHDOT – Highway Design	<u>Donald.Lyford@dot.nh.gov</u>
	Rebecca Martin	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	<u>Rebecca.Martin@dot.nh.gov</u>
	Beth Muzzey	NH Division of Historical Resources	<u>Elizabeth.Muzzey@dncr.nh.gov</u>
	Kevin Nyhan	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	<u>Kevin.Nyhan@dot.nh.gov</u>
<i>JR</i>	Jennifer Reczek	NHDOT - Highway Design	<u>Jennifer.Reczek@dot.nh.gov</u>
<i>JSS</i>	Jamie Sikora	Federal Highway Administration	<u>Jamie.Sikora@fhwa.dot.gov</u>
	Pete Stannas	NHDOT – Highway Design	<u>Peter.Stannas@dot.nh.gov</u>
<i>DT</i>	David Trubey	NH Division of Historical Resources	<u>David.Trubey@dncr.nh.gov</u>
	Cindy Vigue	Federal Highway Administration	<u>Cindy.Vigue@dot.gov</u>
	CR Willeke	NHDOT – Planning	<u>Charles.Willeke@dot.nh.gov</u>

