

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT CONFERENCE REPORT

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

DATE OF CONFERENCES: October 11, 2018

LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building

ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT

Sheila Charles
Ron Crickard
Jill Edelmann
Trent Zanes

NHDHR

Laura Black
Dave Trubey

VHB

Nicole Benjamin-Ma
Greg Goodrich
Frank Koczalka
Pete Walker

IAC

Kathleen Wheeler

FHWA

Jamie Sikora
(via phone)

PROJECTS/PRESENTATIONS REVIEWED THIS MONTH:

(minutes on subsequent pages)

Newington-Dover 11238S, NHS-027-1(037)	1
Manchester 16099 (no federal number)	3

Newington-Dover 11238S, NHS-027-1(037)

Participants: Nicole Benjamin-Ma, Greg Goodrich, Pete Walker, VHB; Ron Crickard, NHDOT

Update on screening of alternatives for inclusion in the supplemental draft of the EIS, and summary of input from September 5, 2018 public information meeting. G. Goodrich provided an update and details regarding the emergency closure of the General Sullivan Bridge:

- Inspections were conducted by VHB on September 26 and 27, 2018, which included checks to known “trouble spots” previously observed during the 2014 and 2016 inspections. Spans 7 and 8 showed deterioration rates and types sufficient to warrant immediate safety concerns. VHB contacted Keith Cota of NHDOT. Nick Goulas of NHDOT visited the bridge to inspect the problem areas first-hand and confirmed VHB’s concerns. NHDOT closed the bridge on September 28, 2018, and a shuttle is currently being utilized to transport pedestrian and bicycle traffic across the Little Bay, via the NH 16 Little Bay Bridge.
- Deterioration on the Span 7 bottom chord was observed and showed minor advancement compared to the previous inspections.
- Deterioration on the north end floor beam on Span 8 was observed and appeared to be advancing. Out-of-plane bending was observed on both the top flange and web of the floor beam. The beam also appears to be wracking (leaning) to the north. Large spalls were observed on the bottom of the concrete bridge deck in the vicinity of the floor beam, and longitudinal cracking was observed between stringers. VHB and DOT have considered the potential of a temporary fix to carry the load, while long-term planning for the crossing progresses. However, there are two major complications:
 - Access in this area is a challenge. There are significant costs and logistical challenges for a contractor to access the bridge with the necessary equipment to carry out repairs. The bridge does not have sufficient load carrying capacity to

support construction access due to the severe deterioration of numerous primary load carrying members.

- The detailing and condition of the affected members present several concerns and challenges relative to the safety, logistics, and costs of performing repairs to the bridge.

With the above considerations in-mind, the decision was made to close the bridge.

- G. Goodrich confirmed that VHB has been working with DOT to advance the potential bike/pedestrian detour on the Northbound Little Bay Bridge. A site walk was conducted with the State and the current contractor working on the project on October 1 to review the route.
- N. Benjamin-Ma provided an update on the updated Project Area Form (PAF), a draft of which is currently under review by NHDOT. She presented the draft PAF maps to discuss the methodology used to identify the Area of Potential Effects (APE), conduct the survey, report previous eligibility determinations, and capture changes to the built environment since the 2005 PAF was submitted.

L. Black suggested that the maps could be improved by indicating when a previously-recorded property was determined eligible in a DOE, and the associated eligible property boundary. VHB will adjust the PAF maps accordingly.

- P. Walker noted that based on feedback and input received during the September 13, 2018 coordination meeting, Alternative 3c, a partial rehabilitation of the General Sullivan Bridge that retains the arched center spans, will be carried forward for full impacts analysis in the SEIS.
- Some general discussion regarding mitigation of potential adverse effects to the General Sullivan Bridge took place, including the various factors used to identify appropriate levels and types of mitigation.
 - P. Walker and N. Benjamin-Ma noted that Sen. Watters requested that the potential costs of mitigation be factored into the estimates used in the alternatives analysis, and that Section 4(f) requires discussion of future conditions after mitigation has been conducted. It is understood that Section 106 is a process that is still at the identification of historic properties stage, but it would be helpful to visualize what mitigation for the partial or full loss of a nationally-significant structure might look like.
 - L. Black said that the extensive coordination needed to identify mitigation in a scenario like this precludes the ability to use a high-medium-low framework for mitigation costs - it is a simplistic representation. J. Sikora noted that it may some mitigation applies to all alternatives, but other mitigation may only be applicable to specific alternatives. L. Black suggested looking at other bridge projects of this type or complexity for examples of mitigation costs and measures.
 - P. Walker asked if potential adverse effects resulting from the replacement alternatives could be minimized through design. L. Black reported that using contextual design of the bridge to minimize impacts to historic resources only comes into play when there are impacts to historic properties outside of the bridge; i.e., ensuring that a new bridge complements the historic setting/district of which the original bridge was a part. In this case, the crossing contains both modern and historic bridges, so minimizing adverse effects through design may not be applicable. However, there may be comments provided by the public about contextual design outside of Section 106.
 - L. Black asked if there had been discussion regarding potential mitigation among the other consulting parties. J. Edelman confirmed that some preliminary

discussion about mitigation had occurred, but only on a high, general level, so as to encourage local-level input. NHDOT has considered the possibility of a mitigation banking system, but the logistics are a challenge; similar systems at other DOTs tend to be bridge-specific, identifying which particular bridges will benefit from the mitigation bank. L. Black indicated that DHR could be supportive of a feasibility study for a bridge mitigation bank. Other potential mitigation ideas discussed by DOT have included a bridge maintenance plan, and pursuing additional stewardship opportunities for the Newington Toll House and Depot property.

Manchester 16099 (no federal number)

Participants: Nicole Benjamin-MA, Frank Koczalka, Pete Walker, VHB; Kathy Wheeler, IAC; Trent Zanes, Ron Crickard, NHDOT

Project updates pertaining to improvements to I-293 (F.E. Everett Turnpike Exits 6 & 7), potential impacts to cultural resources, results of the Phase IB archaeological investigations, and public information meeting comments.

P. Walker and N. Benjamin-Ma provided an overview of the draft adverse effects memo prepared for the project, including the nature of effects to historic properties and identified mitigation. The proposed action would affect three historic properties, with adverse effects anticipated to two of the historic properties.

- The Amoskeag Millyard Historic District was certified as an eligible district in 2012. Approximately 20,500 square feet will be taken from the area around the American Cotton Duck and Stark Mills Cotton Storehouse buildings. Taking of the property for the project will not impact the use of the storehouse buildings. However, the project would result in the removal of the Valve House, which was relocated *c.* 2000 at the request of the Manchester Heritage Commission when it was threatened with demolition. Therefore, mitigation for the removal of the structure includes a similar strategy of relocating the Valve House near its current location but outside the project area.
- Adverse visual effects are anticipated to the eligible property at 737 Coolidge Avenue due to the removal of trees from the wooded slope behind the property that separates the residential neighborhood from the Exit 6 interchange, for the erection of a retaining wall. Mitigation consists of replanting trees along the retaining wall, in consultation with the property owner.
- Although indirect visual effects are anticipated to the Amoskeag School due to the reconstruction of the Exit 6 interchange overlooked by the property, the setting of the property was previously severely altered. The visual impact is not considered an adverse effect.

K. Wheeler gave an update on the Phase IB archaeology efforts. Fifteen sites have been identified, and data recovery and analysis is underway to determine whether identified sites are eligible. Fieldwork will continue as long as the weather allows, and IAC is coordinating with VHB and NHDOT to determine the vertical disturbance levels associated with the project.

P. Walker reported that the draft EA is being prepared prior to a public hearing, which may occur as soon as this winter. He noted that while an executed MOA is not required for the draft EA, a

draft MOA should be in place prior to the public hearing so that there will be an opportunity to receive input on the MOA.

L. Black asked about the inventory and evaluation status of additional properties recommended for further survey in the Project Area Form (PAF). VHB and DOT reported that under the proposed action, potential impacts are not anticipated to the other properties discussed in the PAF. L. Black responded that documentation to this effect should be provided to NHDHR. VHB and NHDOT will provide the requested documentation.

L. Black also noted that based on the information presented, it is not clear there will be an adverse effect to the property at 737 Coolidge Avenue. Additional information about the setting, supplemented by photographs if necessary, will help NHDHR to understand details regarding the impact of the proposed work. VHB and NHDOT will provide additional information regarding the setting and impacts in the adverse effects memo. Suggested content included a list of resources with explanation why certain properties weren't surveyed, a list of identified resources moving to the effects evaluation step, and effects evaluations.

On a procedural note, L. Black suggested that providing interim documentation (such as the impacts discussion) will help facilitate timely input from NHDR during the agency coordination meetings. Allowing for more time between the NHDHR DOE meetings and the agency coordination meetings, when elements of a specific project will be discussed at both, would be beneficial as well.

Submitted by: Sheila Charles and Jill Edelmann, Cultural Resources

New Hampshire Department of Transportation Cultural Resources Agency Coordination Meeting

Date October 11, 2018

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>
<i>SC</i>	Sheila Charles	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	<u>Sheila.Charles@dot.nh.gov</u>
<i>VC</i>	Victoria Chase	NHDOT – Highway Design	<u>Victoria.Chase@dot.nh.gov</u>
<i>RC</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>
	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>
	Jennifer Reczek	NHDOT - Highway Design	<u>Jennifer.Reczek@dot.nh.gov</u>
	Jamie Sikora	Federal Highway Administration	<u>Jamie.Sikora@fhwa.dot.gov</u>
<i>PS</i>	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>

on phone

Please fill in all of the requested information.

October 11, 2018

Name	Agency	Phone #	Email Address
Peter Walker	VHB	603-391-3900	pwalker@vhb.com
Greg Goodrich	VHB	603-391-3992	ggoodrich@vhb.com
Nicole Benjamin-Ma	VHB	617-607-2057	benjamin-ma@vhb.com
Kathleen Wheeler	FAC	603-498-7698	kwheeler@iac-llc.net
FRANK KOZACKA	VHB	603-391-3952	FRANKOZACKA@VHB.COM
TRENT ZAMES	NHDOT	603-271-7423	trent.zames@dot.nh.gov