

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT CONFERENCE REPORT

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

DATE OF CONFERENCES: February 10, 2022

LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: Zoom Meeting

ATTENDED BY:

<p>NHDOT Sheila Charles Tim Dunn Jill Edelmann Jon Evans Patrick Herlihy Ron Kleiner Marc Laurin Rebecca Martin John Sargent Jason Tremblay Hans Weber Shelley Winters Trent Zanes</p>	<p>David Trubey</p> <p>FHWA Jamie Sikora</p> <p>FTA Eric Papetti</p> <p>AECOM Dan Cassedy David Derrig Jay Doyle Joel Dworsky Emily Everett</p>	<p>Friends of the Northern Rail Trail Kent Hackmann</p> <p>Greenman-Pederson, Inc (GPI) Stephen Langevin</p> <p>HEB Christopher Fournier</p> <p>LM Preservation Lisa Mausolf</p> <p>Normandeau William McCloy</p>
<p>NHDHR/NHDNCR Laura Black</p>	<p>Civil Solutions Burr Phillips</p>	

PROJECTS/PRESENTATIONS REVIEWED THIS MONTH:

(minutes on subsequent pages)

Jackson 40808 (no federal number).....	1
Laconia 26706, X-A005(214).....	3
Nashua-Manchester 40818.....	5
Andover 20650, X-A002(084).....	7

Jackson 40808 (no federal number)

Participants: William McCloy, Normandeau; Burr Phillips, Civil Solutions; Stephen Langevin, GPI; Lisa Mausolf, LM Preservation; Jon Evans, Ron Kleiner, NHDOT

Consultation and effects discussion for the proposed Jackson Bridge (153/066) project on Valley Cross Road over Wildcat Brook, which seeks to reuse the current pony truss. The Valley Cross Road bridge currently has 1905 low Parker trusses attached to the existing bridge. The form of mitigation chosen by the Town was to reuse the trusses by refurbishing and reattaching them onto the proposed bridge superstructure. The purpose of this project on the agenda was to present the proposed form of mitigation for review, consultation, and effects discussion.

Stephen Langevin presented the project’s main topics:

- Project Team and General Purpose of Meeting
- Existing Bridge
- Truss information
- Project Purpose and Need
- Proposed Bridge Rehabilitation
- Proposed Truss Mitigation
- Bridge Plan, Elevation and Section

Following are the major points that were discussed during the meeting.

1. Laura Black commented that for the existing bridge, the delicate truss and sidewalk handrail are featured. With the proposed bridge, the truss features do not shine as much with the other proposed features around, which creates a different feel to the bridge.
2. Laura Black asked if the sidewalk rail is original.
 - a. The response was that the 1905 handrail is intended to be replaced in-kind with new handrail that meets current safety standards. The existing handrail has openings greater than 4", which presents a safety hazard. The existing handrail is not long enough anyway because the existing sidewalk is straight, whereas the proposed sidewalk is curved.
 - b. Mike Hicks said he does not think the handrail can be reused.
3. What are the community's thoughts on the beefier bridge?
 - a. It was pointed out that when the State elected not to participate in reuse the trusses, GPI presented the Town with an illustration showing stone veneer pilasters and that it was popular with the Town. The intension of the stone parapets is to add a historic looking element to the bridge. The stone veneer would be made from the existing stone wingwalls currently on-site and would match the current environment, meeting requirements for the Wild and Scenic Wildcat River.
4. Laura Black noted that the proposed guardrail is very beefy and asked if it can be minimized.
 - a. The proposed bridge rail is T-101, which is similar in appearance to the guardrail used by DOT in the White Mountain notches. Steel bridge rail may be a little slenderer, however, a Town preference was to avoid urban characteristics and the T-101 was considered to have a more rustic appearance. It was noted that the photograph perspective is off, and that the safety guardrail won't be as substantial in relation to the trusses as it seems.
5. The sidewalk will be painted to look similar to the timber decking on the existing bridge.
 - a. Jillian Edelmann asked how the stamped concrete will age.
6. Laura Black stated that under preservation best practices, you want to avoid a faux history [Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation Standard 3]. Also, added pieces to decorate aren't needed to make the bridge nostalgic.
7. Jillian Edelmann stated that she liked the appearance of the natural stone. The trusses are still being used as decoration. She asked if the guardrail will be painted and what color will the trusses be?
 - a. Steve Langevin said that the guardrail is currently proposed to be black, and the trusses and it is assumed the handrail will be green to match its current color.
 - b. Input by the Town on colors will be pursued.

8. Steve Langevin questioned if the Town may have a use for the existing handrail, to display/preserve.
 - a. Burr Phillips agreed that the Town should have the handrail.
9. Burr Phillips added that he doesn't like the guardrail, but it may be necessary.
 - a. Mike Hicks agreed, safety is necessary
10. Laura Black thinks the project as proposed will have adverse effects because the handrail is being removed so the bridge is losing 1/3 of its historic fabric
 - a. Steve Langevin asked if portions of the existing handrail can be reused, would the project still be considered to have adverse effects? The question is based on concern for the amount of time that would be required for adverse effect documentation.
 - b. Laura Black responded that the handrail will still lose a lot of its original fabric and still be adverse.
 - c. Laura Black added that having an adverse effect is not a negative thing and it could still be a good project with an adverse effect.
 - d. Mike Hicks added that it may be cost-prohibitive to reuse components of the existing handrail in with the new.
 - e. Mike Hicks said that reuse of handrail would remove the adverse effect. Laura Black agreed.
11. Burr Phillips felt that the proposed handrail retained the character of the bridge. He expressed that the Town is anxious to proceed with the project.
12. Mike Hicks stated that the decision on the mitigation could be expedited.
13. There is still work to do on the MOA.
14. Jamie Sikora noted there was no Federal Highway involvement.
15. Laura Black noted that the DHR is providing comments based upon what has been shared to date. It would be standard to include the original railing as contributing to the historic resource (in this case consisting of the 3 remaining elements of the 1905 truss bridge). Therefore, using the Criteria of Adverse Effect, it would appear that removing one third of the historic fabric would result in an Adverse Effect finding regardless of the reasoning *why* that choice was proposed. DHR is open to reviewing any information/justification provided that argues otherwise.
16. Jillian Edelmann said that the reuse of handrail can be evaluated and a response to ACOE will be provided.
 - a. Burr Phillips added that the Jackson Board of Selectmen may be resistant.
17. Jillian Edelmann said that she will meet with Burr Phillips and Steve Langevin for next steps.

Laconia 26706, X-A005(214)

Participants: Christopher Fournier, HEB; Jon Evans, Ron Kleiner, NHDOT

Consultation to present preferred alternative and preliminary design of the bridge replacement project on Academy Street over Durkee Brook (121/037 under the NHDOT State Bridge Aid Program. Discussion also to determine if there are impacts to adjacent properties that will require compilations of individual inventory forms, and initial discussion of opportunities for mitigating any adverse impacts.

Chris Fournier (HEB) presented an introduction and overview for the project including the location, existing features. Through previous communication from RPR submissions (aided by the Preservation Company) and responses, NHDOT and NHDHR have concurred that the bridge “is individually eligible for listing in the National Register under Criteria A&C.” Additionally, “it is not contributing to the larger South End Neighborhood District.” The goal of the meeting was to present impacts of the project in order to determine if inventory of adjacent properties is necessary and discuss mitigation for the adverse effect of the bridge’s removal. Preliminary Design of the project was recently completed.

The existing bridge was built in 1912 and carries two-lane of Academy Street over Durkee Brook. There is additionally 20 feet of bridge which supports an adjacent grassed area and a third lane which accommodates parking on the bridge and pedestrians.

The proposed bridge largely results in an in-kind replacement with a precast concrete box culvert, although the bridge under the grassed area will not be replaced. Along the eastern edge of the road a raised sidewalk is proposed to provide protection to pedestrians.

Site Photos and characteristics of the adjacent properties were presented.

165 Academy Street are the Meadowbrook Townhomes and are of late 20th century construction. A stone wall is present on the ROW. Temporary easements are proposed to accommodate contractor access to downstream construction and for installation of sedimentation controls. No trees are intended to be cut and the wall is proposed to remain as-is. Disturbed grassed areas will be restored in-kind.

Tax Lot 465/2/15 is the Union Cemetery ca. 1860. Modern granite stone monuments delineate the cemetery entrance closest to the bridge. One monument is directly adjacent to the bridge and will be removed to accommodate construction. It will be placed back in its location abutting the bridge rail similar to its current configuration. Temporary and permanent easements are proposed to accommodate contractor access to the upstream construction and for future maintenance of scour protection installed outside of the ROW. Two small trees growing in the bank will be removed. It is understood that an archaeologist is needed to monitor all excavation within 25 feet of the cemetery. David Trubey (NHDHR) noted that the archeologist will need to have experience with 19th century graves. C. Fournier stated this will be included as a project commitment. The construction engineer will sub consult the archeologist during construction.

Laura Black (NHDHR) requested that the ages of the headstones nearest to the bridge construction be identified, so that the need for an inventory of the cemetery can be determined. If no potentially historic headstones are near the construction, an inventory is likely not necessary. C. Fournier committed to providing this information shortly to NHDOT and NHDHR. L. Black also advised that due to the proposed permanent easement 4(f) consultation will be needed with FHWA. Jamie Sikora (FHWA) will also need the information about the nearby headstones to determine if there are contributing features to the potentially historic cemetery. From the presentation, it appears the impacts from the permanent easement will likely be de-minimus.

135 Academy Street is a private residence ca. 1920. A stone wall is present on the ROW. Temporary easements are proposed to accommodate contractor access to downstream construction and for installation of sedimentation controls. No trees are intended to be cut and the wall is proposed to remain as-is.

150 Academy Street is the Laconia Monument Company ca. 1900. Temporary and permanent easements are proposed to incorporate the proposed raised sidewalk with the existing building entrance, accommodate contractor access to the upstream construction, and for future maintenance of scour protection installed outside of the ROW.

138 Academy Street is a private residence ca. 1930. No easements are needed to accommodate construction. Raised sidewalk will be constructed within the ROW in front of the property. C. Fournier turned the focus of the meeting to discussion of mitigation of the adverse impact to the historic bridge. Jill Edelmann (NHDOT) explained that a sister project, the Court Street Bridge, was progressing in parallel to this project, before the two project timeframes diverged. Mitigation for the Court Street Bridge was the preparation of a guide to the historic bridges of Laconia. C. Fournier briefly displayed the latest iteration of the guide prepared by the Preservation Company. J. Edelman clarified while the original intent was for the two bridges be mitigated by this action, the documents were not linked. C. Fournier explained that the Court Street Bridge mitigation ended up being a more significant document than was expected and Lynne Monroe had suggested it be published. C. Fournier proposed that physical publishing (beyond inclusion on the City's website as part of the Court Street Bridge scope) could act as mitigation for the Academy Street Bridge and re-link the projects' mitigation. C. Fournier also proposed that a presentation of the guide could be presented upon release of the published guide. L. Black commented that the proposed mitigation is well received.

C. Fournier again committed to providing information regarding the dates of the nearby cemetery headstones and coordinating the scope of mitigation with NHDOT.

Following the meeting, Chris Fournier indicated the nearest headstone to the project area is approximately 50 feet east of the edge of the Academy Street Bridge and that headstones in this vicinity date from the mid to late 1900s.

Nashua-Manchester 40818

Participants: Dan Cassedy, Joel Dworsky, Emily Everett, Jay Doyle, David Derrig, AECOM; Patrick Herlihy, Rebecca Martin, Shelley Winters, NHDOT; Eric Papetti, FTA

Continued consultation to discuss the Capitol Corridor Rail and Transit Study (formerly NHDOT 16317 & 63037-A), which was previously reviewed on January 15, 2015. The topics will include the NHDHR response (1/4/2022) to the RPR regarding finalizing the Area of Potential Effect.

The project involves the extension of MBTA commuter rail services from Lowell, MA to Manchester, NH. The project corridor is approximately 30 miles long and crosses through Lowell, Chelmsford, and Tyngsborough, MA, and Nashua, Merrimack, Bedford, and Manchester, NH. It

includes 9 miles in Massachusetts and 21 miles in New Hampshire. The route follows an existing rail line that currently handles only freight. The project was formerly referred to as the Capitol Corridor Rail Project. A Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) service-level NEPA Environmental Assessment was completed in 2014. The current project involves extending MBTA commuter rail service from Lowell to Manchester. Tasks include preliminary design (30%) engineering, completion of a Federal Transit Administration (FTA) NEPA Environmental Assessment (EA), and development of a financial plan. Final design and permitting would be part of a future contract.

Dan Cassidy, AECOM's cultural resources lead for the project, introduced his team, which includes archaeologist Joel Dworsky, who is also managing the GIS spatial data for cultural resources, and preservation planner Emily Everett. Kaitlin Pluskota, an architectural historian, is also supporting the project but was not at the meeting. This team prepared a Request for Project Review Form for submittal to the NHDHR in November 2021, and after review of the form, Dave Trubey recommended that a meeting be held to discuss definition of the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Cultural Resources.

Joel Dworsky presented an overview of the project cultural resources work completed to date and reviewed the APE as preliminarily defined. Development of the APE for this project considered potential visual effects, auditory effects, beneficial and adverse effects, direct and indirect physical effects, and changes in the use of land or historic properties. The delineation of the APE took into consideration the location and appearance of the existing railroad line; the character and condition of the built environment; and the qualities of the natural environment and how it would be affected by the construction of four passenger rail stations, a layover yard, bridge improvements and upgrades, and the reintroduction of areas of double-tracking along the rail corridor between Lowell, Massachusetts and Manchester, New Hampshire.

The proposed APE is confined mostly to existing RR ROW because the second rail line will largely be laid within a corridor that was previously double tracked. The APE was expanded around station locations and bridges where additional construction impacts may occur outside the existing ROW. These expanded areas were defined with a 250-foot buffer for planning purposes but will be refined as project plans are developed.

Dave Trubey commented that overall, the current APE makes sense, but we need to make sure to consider the depth of vertical impacts within the existing ROW, since intact ground surfaces could exist underneath railroad bed fill and these might need survey or monitoring if impacts below the RR grade are contemplated.

Eric Papetti noted that once the FTA starts the clock on the Environmental Assessment (EA), they will only have one year to complete the process and FONSI, so Section 106 needs to be completed approximately 6 months from now, so he wanted to make sure we were ready to go.

Joel Dworsky commented that for a project such as this where completion of the Section 106 requirements will be ongoing through the design and implementation process, a Memorandum of Agreement or a Project Programmatic Agreement might be the way to go to be able to demonstrate cultural resources compliance for the EA

Dave Trubey reminded the group that there will likely be multiple Native American groups with an interest in this project given its location.

Eric Papetti noted that FTA does not include non-federally recognized tribes unless they are required to by State law and he will need to check with their Federal Preservation Officer on this topic.

Dave Trubey stated that there are no federally recognized tribes resident in NH, but there are federally recognized tribes from other states that have an interest in this region.

Dan Cassidy pointed out that non-federally recognized tribes might not require same level of consultation but could still be considered interested parties under Section 106 regulations.

Laura Black asked about development of the proposed APE and wanted to know if other types of impacts and effects were incorporated such as auditory and vibratory effects, as well as issues like parking in adjacent neighborhoods, etc. There are a lot of vegetated buffers, make sure they would still be around.

Emily Everett explained that the above ground- APE definition focused on station locations and visual effects, and that they were comfortable with the 250' buffer based on conceptual plans from the design team. The APE includes tax parcels adjacent or those that intersect with the APE- so in many cases APE includes buffer outside of 250'.

Joel Dworsky commented that it is important to note this is not a situation where the current use is dissimilar to the proposed. This is still an active rail line with regular train use. Pan Am operates trains as existing condition. Vegetative screens are not planned to be removed. Apart from station locations, the bulk of the work is track replacement and maintenance. Not expanding width, was reduced to one in the 1960s and now being expanded back to previous state, so viewshed will remain largely the same, with exception of station locations.

Eric Papetti asked if the NH cultural resources representatives would be interested in participating in discussions of impacts on the Massachusetts side of the border and noted that he would like to convene a similar meeting for Mass officials

Laura Black and Dave Trubey indicated they would be interested in this.

Joel Dworsky noted that the team followed the same methodology for APE definition in both NH and Massachusetts for consistency. AECOM is drafting a Project Notification Form for submittal to the Massachusetts Historical Commission, which should be ready for FTA review in March.

Andover 20650, X-A002(084)

Participants: Tim Dunn, Marc Laurin, John Sargent, Jason Tremblay, Hans Weber, Trent Zanes, NHDOT; Alex Bernhard, Kent Hackmann, Friends of the Northern Rail Trail in Merrimack County

Hans Weber presented the project that consists of roadway and bridge improvements to NH Route 11 at its crossing over the Northern Rail Trail (former Northern Railroad corridor) and over Sucker Brook, in Andover. The bridges were constructed in 1929. The bridge over the rail trail is an I-Beam with a concrete deck (IBC) and the bridge over Sucker Brook is a concrete arch. The NH 11 alignment over the bridges forms an S-curve and was widened in 2006 to provide 11 foot lanes with 4 foot shoulders over Sucker Brook. However the bridge over the rail trail was not widened at that time and has slightly narrower shoulders. Inspections of the bridges have identified both bridges as deficient, with the Sucker Brook bridge being placed on the State

Redlist in 2021. NH 11's horizontal and vertical geometries do not meet modern design standards for the posted speed.

An RPR was submitted in 2014 and updated in 2020. No archeological concerns were identified. The NH 11 bridge has been identified as contributing to the Northern Railroad Historic District and is Eligible for the National Register. The Sucker Brook bridge and the Koron parcel (Halcyon Hills Farm property) located south of NH 11 have both been identified as Eligible for the National Register. A rail trail bridge spanning Sucker Brook east of the NH 11 bridge contributes to the Historic District and is within the project area but will not be impacted by the any of the alternatives. A tell-tale is present along the rail trail west of the NH 11 bridge and would be impacted by the Northern Alternative, but not likely impacted by the Southern Alternative. No impacts to the Koron parcel would occur with the Northern Alternative.

Hans summarized the two alternatives that have been evaluated. The Northern Alternative would shift NH 11 to the north, would remove the bridge over the rail trail and replace the bridge over Sucker Brook in the same location. The new NH 11 bridge would be a precast concrete arched frame (similar to Potter's Place, also in Andover) and a temporary detour would be required to replace the Sucker Brook bridge. This alternative is less desirable due to having a greater cost, requiring a temporary bridge over the brook, having a longer construction duration and causing greater wetland impacts. The Southern Alternative would shift NH 11 to the south and consist of one IBC structure that would span both the rail trail and Sucker Brook. The abutments would be built outside the trail surface, though still located within the Historic District. The existing Sucker Brook bridge would be removed, and the brook's banks reestablished. The coping on the IBC could be stamped with "Northern Railroad" similar to other recent projects. A portion of the approximate 75-acre Koron parcel would be impacted by the roadway realignment. This impacted area would be to a wooded, undeveloped portion of the parcel located along the northern property line. The impacted area is removed from the developed portion, which is located off Emery Road. Total impacts to the property are estimated at 1.85 acres, consisting of 1.45 acres of permanent acquisition and 0.4 acres of slope easement. A woods road connects to NH 11 and a modern maple sugaring operation is evident off the wood's road in this impacted area, although it is not known if this area was historically used for a sugaring operation.

Laura Black stated that there was another concrete arch bridge over Sucker Brook that was constructed in 1929 just east of the project limits that may be a "paired structure" with the project's Sucker Brook bridge. She wondered if removing one of these might be an effect. DOT will further investigate the other structure and its possible relationship to the one to be impacted. Laura provided clarification on the historic boundaries of the Koron property that conveys the history of the property: it would be the current tax map parcel, which was identified in the presentation. Hans informed her that the impacts identified were based on the tax map and would therefore be what he identified in the presentation.

Regarding the Northern Railroad Historic District, Laura detailed that the retaining walls, ditches and other railroad features along the corridor are contributing to the Historic District and impacts to these will need to be identified and evaluated. Jill Edelmann inquired about the retaining walls located along the trail and asked if their construction date was known. John Sargent

replied that they would likely be of newer construction. Laura added that the period of significance for the Northern Railroad would need to be confirmed to determine if they contribute, it could be 50 year historic cut off or from when the railroad ceased to operate. Jill stated that this information is available, and DOT would coordinate on the contributing structure impacts. Laura added that Effect Tables will need to be completed for the three resources. Evaluating them with both alternatives would help to layout the different environmental concerns in regard to the cultural resource impacts.

Hans will work with Jill on these issues and noted that the Southern Alternative is preferred by the Department, though the DOT will need to meet with the Town to get their input to justify it as the proposed action. Jamie Sikora stated that further information needs to be gathered for the Section 4(f) evaluation. The Department needs to look at avoidance and rehabilitation alternatives to see if they are appropriate. Improving the geometry of the road may not necessarily be an important factor in developing the proposed action.

Kent Hackmann confirmed that there is another tell-tale east of the NH 11 bridge that is no longer standing. Kent agrees with the concrete stamping that was presented and asked that the Friends of the Northern Rail Trail (FNRT) be consulted on it. Similar to other recent projects, he would like any rail trail surfacing work to utilize the appropriate stone dust surfacing material. Kent liked the historic panel being furnished for the Danbury 16303 project and would like to see something similar in Andover be developed with consultation by the FNRT. He requested that the FNRT be a party to the Memorandum of Agreement as it is developed. Jill replied that DOT's consultant, who is putting together the panel for Danbury project, has a lot of material on the Northern Railroad that could be used for a panel.

Kent also requested that Alex Bernhard, who was unable to attend the meeting, remain involved in the project development. Jill stated that Alex would continue to be involved. Jamie inquired if there was a need for a consulting party request. Marc Laurin answered that a consulting party request was confirmed in 2012.