

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT CONFERENCE REPORT

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

DATE OF CONFERENCES: July 14, 2022

LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: Zoom Meeting

ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT

Jill Edelmann
Jon Evans
C.R. Willeke

NHDHR/NHDNCR

Laura Black
David Trubey

ACOE

Mike Hicks

Civil Solutions

Burr Phillips

GPI

Stephen Langevin

QUANTUM

Jim Bouchard
Samuel Cheney
Anna Giraldi

Town of Antrim

Russell McAllister

Town of Jackson

Julie Hoyt

LM Preservation

Lisa Mausolf

Preservation Co.

Lynne Monroe
Reagan Ruedig

Normandeau

William McCloy

PROJECTS/PRESENTATIONS REVIEWED THIS MONTH:

(minutes on subsequent pages)

Antrim #14942 (No federal number) - High Street over Great Brook (174/040).....	1
Jackson 40808 (No federal number).....	4

Antrim #14942 (No federal number) - High Street over Great Brook (174/040)

Participants: Jim Bouchard, Samuel Cheney, Quantum Construction Consultants, LLC; Reagan Ruedig, Preservation Company; Russell McAllister, Town of Antrim; Mike Hicks, ACOE.

The meeting focused on a presentation summarizing the Great Brook Industrial District Report by Preservation Company, dated June 16, 2022. This meeting continues the consultation, following previous Cultural Resource Agency meetings occurred on October 14, 2021 and November 18, 2021.

Jim Bouchard provided an overview of the project, which proposes to rehabilitate/replace the High Street Bridge over Great Brook. As discussed at the previous Cultural Resource Agency Coordination Meetings, the existing bridge is a 13-foot span Metal Pipe Arch (MPA) founded on stone abutments, with a precast concrete deck on the upstream side founded on concrete stem walls for sidewalk. The purpose of this project is to correct structural deficiencies of the existing bridge crossing and provide safe, year-round, vehicular passage on High Street over Great Brook. The bridge is currently on the NHDOT Municipal Redlist and needs rehabilitation or replacement.

Jim presented the Short Overview Report (report) prepared by Preservation Company that discusses the historical significance of the High Street Bridge within the Great Brook Industrial District (GBID). It was determined in the report that the High Street Bridge is one of two bridges of sufficient age and integrity to contribute to the historic district. Preservation Company enlisted the assistance of Martha Pinello, archaeologist and Antrim resident who serves on the Antrim Historical Society, Conservation Commission and Planning Board, for the development of recommendations in the report.

Preservation Company and Martha reviewed other bridges within the GBID to make recommendations for the High Street Bridge structure. Jim shared pictures of the bridges that Preservation Company reviewed for everyone's reference. The report identifies that the preferred model for the High Street Bridge replacement would be that of the Water Street Bridge, constructed in 2010. The Water Street Bridge was originally founded on stone abutments. The stones were preserved and utilized as facing for the concrete wingwalls and abutments. Simple aluminum guardrails were used to avoid having the guardrails detract from the view of the scenic millpond. Reagan Ruedig, Preservation Company, explained that work relative to the survey of the GBID is ongoing. The survey took place along the entire length of Great Brook, with Martha joining Preservation Company to assist in determining what structures to survey. Preservation Company has determined that the High Street Bridge contributes to the GBID despite being constructed in the 1960's, as it is an important structure for controlling/utilizing waterpower from Great Brook. Great Brook is essentially the "spine" of Antrim, as the Town's ability to utilize waterpower has been instrumental to its continued development.

Laura Black stated that the 1981 inter-department communications letter discussed during the previous meeting identified the potential for a smaller historical district within the overarching Antrim Village Historical District (AVHD). Laura inquired if the GBID is a smaller district located within the AVHD, and asked how the inventory discussed in the GBID survey relates to what was discussed in the previous meeting.

Reagan replied that the GBID is part of a larger AVHD as the AVHD focuses on industry and resources connected to waterpower. There are also a large number of buildings that still exist along Great Brook that would contribute to an overarching AVHD.

Laura questioned how this information could be included on one inventory form. She inquired if the bridge was located within the greater AVHD, and if it had been determined how the bridge would impact this greater historic district. Laura inquired of Mike Hicks if ACOE concurs that the bridge contributes to the AVHD, and if so, what impacts to resources may occur if the bridge is altered.

Mike Hicks was attending the meeting via telephone and was unable to view the materials being shared during the Zoom meeting. Mike said that in order to provide his input and recommendations, he would need to review project plans to determine an APE for the project.

Laura reiterated that for NHDHR to make a Determination of Effect (DOE) the boundaries of the AVHD outlined in the 1981 inter-department communication letter need to be clearly defined. Reagan replied that while the boundaries outlined in the 1981 inter-department communication

letter aren't definitive, the bridge would most likely be within the AVHD. Laura followed up by inquiring what the proposed scope is supposed to clarify.

Jill Edelman had spoken with Lynne Monroe, Preservation Company regarding the scope of work for the survey. Lynne had stated that the bridge alone does not tell the whole story of the GBID, and by confining the bridge to a small area of historical significance, you are doing a disservice to its historical relevancy. By analyzing the bridge's significance to a smaller district than the GBID, which encompasses the entire Great Brook, you don't get an idea of the "whole picture". This is the reason Martha was brought in to assist with industrial archaeology, identifying all historical structures worth surveying.

Laura clarified that NHDHR wants to know how the High Street Bridge is significant to both the GBID and the AVHD as separate districts. The GBID should remain separate from the historic AVHD. She reiterated that the boundaries of the AVHD should be clearly defined, and it should be determined whether the AVHD encompasses the High Street Bridge. While Preservation Company believes the bridge clearly contributes to the GBID, it is less clear how it contributes to the AVHD, if at all. This is still an outstanding question.

David Trubey asked if Preservation Company had discussed the potential for archaeological sensitive areas within the vicinity of the bridge with Martha during their survey. Both Sheila Charles (NHDOT) and David had expressed during the previous meetings that it was unlikely the project would cause adverse archaeological impacts. Reagan explained that Martha did not believe the project would impact any archaeological sensitive areas/structures but stated that the existing stone walls within the raceway should be preserved and maintained, and native plantings could be provided along the walls.

Jim asked if the scope of work needed to be further revised to fully determine the limits of the historical AVHD, and how best to proceed from here. Reagan replied that Preservation Company will continue to finalize the GBID Form, and how the bridge relates to this historical district. Laura stated that she would still like to see if the bridge contributes to the greater AVHD, in addition to the GBID. The scope of work would need to be revised to include delineation of the AVHD boundaries and Period of Significance, which would inform determination of whether the bridge contributes to it. Laura asked Mike for ACOE input relative to determining a defined scope of work moving forward.

Mike inquired as to the boundaries of the AVDH to which Laura reconfirmed that the boundaries have not been defined. Mike noted that some boundaries must be defined. Laura noted the intent is to determine broad boundaries for the AVHD. Mike identified that the Applicant can concede that the determination of boundaries is within the scope of the current survey. Mike reiterated that for the ACOE to make a determination relative to potential historical impacts under Section 106, the AVHD has to have a delineated boundary so it can be compared with the ACOE's area of responsibility.

Jill asked Reagan if Preservation Company could determine whether the High Street Bridge is within the AVHD and summarize the findings in a memo. Reagan noted that the current discussion

for the form is how the bridge fits into the GBID. They could extrapolate how it may fit into the AVHD.

Laura said multiple recommendations should not be included in the same document because it causes the Determination of Effect (DOE) committee problems during their project review. The project ultimately needs to meet the needs and requirements of the lead federal agency, which in this case is ACOE.

Jill asked Mike if separate technical memos need to be prepared for both the AVHD and the GBID, and whether each required an official DOE to meet Section 106 requirements for the proposed project. The intent is to revise the GBID technical memo to incorporate information on how the High Street Bridge falls within the greater AVHD. Mike responded that he would like to discuss the project offline with Laura, to determine the best course of action moving forward, and define clear cut requirements to avoid spending money to complete tasks that may not be required. To this end Mike needs to review project plans and current information. [LB and MH spoke on 7/22/22 regarding DHR's recommendations regarding scope. On July 14, 2022 LB also provided to MH a 10/21/21 email regarding DHR's early recommendations. Note that DHR's recommendations have included both determining need for forms and suggested methodology.]

QCC will upload all RPR submission materials, draft conceptual engineering plans, and previous conference report meeting minutes for Mike's retrieval and review.

**Following review of the meeting minutes Laura Black asked that consultation on the scope moving forward include NHDHR, as portions of the recap of the meeting minutes did not match NHDHR notes.

Jackson 40808 (No federal number)

Participants: Burr Phillips, Civil Solutions; William McCloy, Normandeau; Stephen Langevin, GPI; Lisa Mausolf, LM Preservation; Julie Atwell, Julie Hoyt, Town of Jackson; Michael Hicks, ACOE; CR Willeke, Jon Evans, NHDOT

Continuing consultation on the bridge rehabilitation and discussion of effects for Jackson Bridge (153/066) on Valley Cross Road over Wildcat Brook. 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 main purpose of this project on the agenda was to obtain an update on status of the Effects Memo, e106, and MOA.

Jill Edelmann provided a summary of the status of the Effects Memo, e106, and MOA.

Stephen Langevin provided answers to questions raised in the last meeting:

- The expected duration of the stamped concrete is equal to that of non-stamped concrete
- The color of the trusses, handrail, guardrail and beams will be dark green as decided by the Town

- Steve will reach out to C.R. Willeke to offer to talk about the project to help get him familiar with the history.

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

1. Jill Edelman is working on the Adverse Effect Memo.
2. Mike Hicks has not worked on the e106 yet but Lyndsey has sent letters. Mike needs Adverse Effects Memo and a permit area drawing.
3. Jill will work with Bill McCloy and Steve on the e106 material and send it to Mike.
4. Laura Black asked what the new plaque will look like. Steve responded that the plaque will look exactly like the existing plaque but with the date of construction and the current Board of Selectmen at that time.
5. Jill asked Laura if DHR would need to review the plaque design. Laura responded that she doesn't think a review by DHR is necessary. Jill also asked if a rail mockup would be necessary. Laura responded that the handrail and plaque do not require a DHR review.
6. It was discussed that the deliverables after construction will include new bridge pics for the inventory. Laura asked if there is an inventory form. Lisa replied that she has not done one. If there is an existing inventory form, it will be updated. If there is not one, a new one will be compiled.
7. Jill indicated that she would complete the e106 and MOA since it is not in any of the consultants' scope of work.
8. Burr asked about the timing and schedule of the project progress and review and discussed the notes from the Feb. 2, 2022 meeting.
 - a. Bill indicated that he needs to update the Environmental Document and the Wetlands Plan. Steve added that all updates to the Wetlands Plan regarding the changes made to accommodate placing the trusses back on the bridge have been completed.
 - b. Jon stated that both documents require e106 and MOA completed.
 - c. Jill said that she can have the Effects Memo and MOA ready in the next two weeks, ACOE then has 15 days to review.
 - d. The DES needs e106 for the Wetlands Permit review.
 - e. Bill will then need two weeks to submit the Wetlands Plan. The Wetlands review takes longer than the Environmental Document review.
 - f. When the MOA goes to the ACOE, it does not need to be attached to the Wetlands Permit application or the Environmental Documents.
 - g. The schedule then becomes
 1. Mid-August for the MOA. Bill will need to get signatures from the Town.

2. The Wetlands Permit will take four months to review, which would be December 2022.
9. Burr asked if GPI has anything that is still needed to be done. Steve replied there is not and asked if anyone has any opposition to GPI submitting the revised PS&E to the Town and to DOT within the next two weeks. This will give DOT at least three and a half months to review before the Wetlands Permit review is completed.
10. It was asked if there is a clearing window for the Northern Long Eared bat. Bill replied that he did not think it would be any time more than time of year.
11. The Effects Memo is needed for the MOA.
12. The e106 document may be submitted separately after the Advisory Council response.