REVIEW AND COMPLIANCE
FEDERAL

Project Name: RANDOLPH BRS 01/47 (14)

Town: RANDOLPH
County: ORANGE

Project #: AOT DHP # OR 90-003 Map # 476

Photo I.D. Sheet

Contact Person/Phone Number

Known Archeological Sites:

Standing Buildings or Structures (give name/ID #, property type, etc.):

1930 concrete T-beam with cable guard rail bridge not one in historic bridge survey or town survey

Listed on Vermont Historic Sites & Structure Survey, State Register, or National Register (identify source and # of buildings/structures):

No

Eligible for State or National Register (identify source and # of buildings-structures):

Comments:

SEE ALSO OR 85-003 -diff bridge on 2nd branch of White R. s. of N. Rand Village

Reviewed by
(Initial/Date)

Bridge is not NEC eligible
Documentation is adequate
PJM 5-14-91
VERMONT DIVISION FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Review & Compliance Data Form

Last Data Entry: 4/1/91

Project Name: Randolph

Town: Randolph

County: Orange

Local Review

State Agency

State No.

Federal Agency: NOT

Federal No.

Act 250 No.

Management Concerns: Structures [XX] Landscapes [ ] Archeology [X]

Date in: 7/5/90

Date due: 7/6/90

Date out: 1/6/91

Date in: 5/10/91

Date due: 6/10/91

Date out: 5/14/91

Date in: 7/4/91

Date due: 8/9/91

Date out: 8/20/91

Project Description:

Kre. 14 - replace bridge #39 on survey [SEE also OR85-003]

Comments:

OSiF/Archeo-sensi. bridge should be photodocumented before destruction

Preliminary Comments Sent: 1.9.91

Site Visit Conducted: 5.30.91

Additional Comments Sent: 8/20/91

Request Additional Info.:

Survey Requested:

Phase I [ ] Phase II [ ] Phase III [ ]

Technical Assis. Provided: 4-12-91

Contains No Properties: [ ]

Listed on the NR: Yes [ ] No [X]

Federal Fiscal Year of Finding [ ]

(Property Information/Status Sub-table)

DHP No [ ] Resource Name [ ]

Location [ ] HS Survey/VAI Site Number [ ]

1st Context [ ] Property Type [ ] Property Code [ ]

2nd Context [ ]

3rd Context [ ] NR Criterion A [ ] Insufficient Information [ ]

4th Context [ ] NR Criterion B [ ] Not NR Eligible [ ]

5th Context [ ] NR Criterion C [ ] NR Eligible [ ]

6th Context [ ] NR Criterion D [ ] Not SR Eligible [ ]

State Register Eligible [ ]

Listed on the SR: Yes [ ] No [ ]

Date Opinion Made [ ]

April 1991
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Variable</th>
<th>Proximity</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Assigned Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Distance to Existing or Relict River or Permanent Stream</td>
<td>0-60 m</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-120 m</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120-180 m</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Distance to Pond or Lake</td>
<td>0-60 m</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-120 m</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120-180 m</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Distance to Intermittent Stream</td>
<td>0-60 m</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-120 m</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120-180 m</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Distance to Wetland (wetlands &gt; one acre in size)</td>
<td>0-60 m</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-120 m</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120-180 m</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Confluence of River/River or River/Brook</td>
<td>0-60 m</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-120 m</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120-180 m</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Confluence of Intermittent Streams</td>
<td>0-60 m</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-120 m</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120-180 m</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Falls or Rapids</td>
<td>0-60 m</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-120 m</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120-180 m</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Transportation Corridor/ Drainage Link</td>
<td>0-60 m</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-120 m</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Head of Draw</td>
<td>0-60 m</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Isolated Spring</td>
<td>0-60 m</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-120 m</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Major Floodplain/Alluvial Terrace</td>
<td>0-60 m</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-120 m</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Lithic Outcrop</td>
<td>0-180 m</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Knoll Top/Ridge Crest/Promontory</td>
<td>0-60 m</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Kame/Outwash Terrace (valley edge features)</td>
<td>0-60 m</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Other Major Topographic Break</td>
<td>0-60 m</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Relict Beach or Shore Line</td>
<td>0-60 m</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Caves/Rockshelters</td>
<td>0-60 m</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) Excessive Slope (&gt;15%) or Steep Erosional Slope (&gt;20%)</td>
<td>0-60 m</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) Very Poorly Drained Soils</td>
<td>0-60 m</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) Excessively Disturbed</td>
<td>0-60 m</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Score** [ ]

0-18 = Archeologically Non-Sensitive  
20+ = Archeologically Sensitive
Vermont Division for Historic Preservation
Archeological Survey Report Evaluation Form

Project Title: Phase I Survey, Randolph Bridge Improvement

Conducted by: [Blank]

Field Work Dates: November 1991

Town(s): Randolph

DHP No.: 0890-003

Study Phase: [Blank]

(Scope of Work/Research Design of Report)

I. Statement of Objectives
   A) Description of proposed development
      1) Project map(s)
   B) Survey or research goals
   C) Acres surveyed or researched
      1) Types of properties expected
      2) Boundaries of survey area

II. Methodology (data collection techniques)
   A) Background research (to develop historic context)
      1) Environmental sources
      2) Cultural sources
         a) Archival
         b) Informant
   B) Level of Study
      1) Phase I Identification Survey
      2) Phase II Evaluation Study
      3) Phase III Data Recovery Documentation
      4) Method and extent of data collection techniques
         a) Surface survey (% covered)
            i) acreage sampled
         b) Subsurface test pit interval and layout
            i) estimated number of test pits dug
            ii) size and depth of test pits
            iii) screen mesh size
            iv) acres sampled
         c) Other data collection methods
         d) Treatment of features, etc.

III. Anticipated results
   A) Number of properties expected
   B) Condition of properties expected
   C) Specific properties expected
   D) Rational for sampling strategy
   E) Limitations or biases of sampling strategy
   F) Information categories expected
   G) Proposed curation facility
   H) How the study may relate to or refine the historic context(s)

IV. Time Frame
   A) Dates of Field Work
   B) Anticipated submission of final report

February 1991

-(over)-
REPORT RESULTS

V. Results (how the results met the objectives)

A) Survey area boundaries
B) Types of properties examined
C) Number of properties examined
D) Precise location & extent of properties examined
E) Site maps and photographs
F) Areas examined that did not contain properties
G) Location of field records and artifacts
H) Context and integrity of each property to evaluate significance (if applicable)
I) Threats to properties
J) Synthesis of results
   1) Historic context(s) of properties identified
      a) significance of properties with respect historic context
      b) integrity of properties that represent the historic context(s)
      c) results able to refine historic context

VI. Conclusions

A) Statement of Significance
B) Recommendations for further work
   1) Additional information required for the next phase of study
      a) additional archival research
      b) additional field work
      c) additional laboratory analyses
      e) other
   2) Management Recommendations

DHP Staff: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Date report filed 2/15 (revised) DHP reviewer RSD Date reviewed 2/10/91
Federal Agency and/or Sponsor UTAH
36CFR61 Qualified [X] yes [ ] no Report meets Sec. Standards [X] yes [ ] no
Survey Subgrant [ ] Federal Project [X] State Project [ ] Act 250 [ ]
Act 248 [ ] Other [ ] explain
Site Survey Forms: [X] yes [ ] no
List Site No's
Soil Profiles: [X] yes [ ] no
Artifact Catalog: [X] yes [ ] no
Other Data: [X] yes [ ] no List

Recommended Follow-up:
[X] none
[ ] needed for NR evaluation
[ ] ready to prepare NR evaluation
[ ] requires next phase of study
[ ] threats to property(ies)
[ ] long-term protection
[ ] other

Comments Report processed as part of planning evaluation appears to meet

February 1991
TO: Eric Gilbertson, Director, Division of Historic Preservation
FROM: William E. Sargent, Location & Environmental Engineer
DATE: February 2, 1990
SUBJECT: Randolph BRS 0147(14)

This project has been exempted from review by the VICS, by agreement of the AOT, FHWA, and State Clearinghouse as it is included among the categories of projects likely to be classified as Categorical Exclusions in the AOT Action Plan. Would you kindly advise as to this project's potential for impact on historic and archaeological resources. In order to maintain our project development schedule, receipt of this review is requested within three weeks. Plans are attached.

Project Randolph BRS 0147(14) begins in the Town of Randolph on VT Rte. 14, 6.645 miles north of the Bethel-Randolph Town Line and extends northerly 0.219 mile on VT Rte. 14.

Work will consist of replacement of BR 39 over the White River and related roadway and channel work.

The existing structure is Bridge No. 39, a concrete T-beam not listed on the Historic Bridge Inventory.

Through traffic during construction will be maintained.

If you need more information, please contact us.

Attachments

WES:RHT:km

c: Central Files via PRP:GBM
Location Files via RFS
Chrono File
Bridge replacement, road and channel work to be conducted along second branch of White River. Present bridge grade is above natural river-erosion terraces. West side of bridge is largely disturbed by old abandoned roadbed/bridge and concrete bridge construction. East side is more intact and hence archaeologically sensitive. Site is very shallow. Excavation should be discussed w/ AOT designers. If only fill will be placed, elevated grade to match present level, then no impact anticipated.

Question 1: Where staging area will be?

Update: 12/14/80

- Temporary road should utilize old road bed
- Staging area should be established on west side of road where disturbance from old road bed construction is anticipated.

- Filling on E side of road if a problem because they will remove Ap horizon present on terrace. The two terraces on E side of road considered arch. sensitive. Removal of Ap horizon is an undue adverse effect (tangible)]
January 9, 1991

William Sargent
Agency of Transportation
133 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05602

Re: Randolph BRS0147(14). AOT.

Dear Mr. Sargent:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above-referenced project. We apologize for our long delay in sending you these comments.

The Division for Historic Preservation has reviewed this undertaking according to the standards set forth in 36 C.F.R. 800, regulations established by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to implement Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Project review consists of identifying the project's potential impacts to historic buildings, structures and historic districts and to known or potential archeological resources. Please consider these comments preliminary.

The proposed project involves construction of a new bridge and related roadway and channel work as well as the demolition of the existing structure, Bridge # 39. This bridge on VT Rte. 14 spans the Second Branch of the White River. It is a concrete T-beam bridge constructed in 1930 which may be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under Criteria A and C. Because the proposed project will have an adverse effect upon this historic resource, it will be necessary to photodocument the bridge prior to demolition. We would also request that any existing construction drawings of this bridge be submitted to the Division.

The project area is located adjacent to the Second Branch of the White River. The environmental characteristics of this location are similar to other areas where prehistoric native american archeological sites have been found. The project area is thus considered to be archeologically sensitive. That is, it has a high potential for containing as-yet-unidentified prehistoric archeological sites.
David Skinas, on my staff, conducted a field inspection of the project area during the summer of 1990. The field inspection indicated that the east side of the existing bridge, in particular, is archeologically sensitive. We recommend that your archeological consultant conduct a Phase I archeological study to determine if any sites may be impacted by the project. If any sites are found, evaluation of their eligibility for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places may be necessary. If any sites are determined to be eligible for the National Register, it will be necessary to implement an impact mitigation program.

All studies must meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and the Division's Guidelines for Conducting Archeological Studies in Vermont.

Although the west side of the project area -- west of the existing bridge -- appears to be extensively disturbed from prior road and bridge building, your consulting archeologist should confirm that in fact there is no potential for archeological sites on the west side of the existing bridge within the project area.

Your consulting archeologist should also make appropriate recommendations for locating staging areas that are either disturbed or not sensitive.

Please call if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Eric Gilbertson
Director/State Historic Preservation Officer
EG/SCJ

cc: Randolph Planning Commission
FHWA
Two Rivers-Ottauquechee Regional Planning and Development Commission
May 14, 1991

William Sargent
Agency of Transportation
133 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05602

Re: Randolph BRS 0147 (14). AOT.

Dear Mr. Sargent:

This letter will supplement the comments in our letter of January 9, 1991 regarding the historic nature of Bridge #39 which is scheduled for demolition.

As you know, this bridge, built in 1930, is a concrete T-beam. We have reviewed the photographs of this bridge which your office provided us, and have determined that the bridge is not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Therefore, we do not have any further concerns with this structure in relation to this project.

We will await the results of your archeological consultant's Phase I study before making final comments on this project.

Sincerely,

Eric Gilbertson
Director/State Historic Preservation Officer

EG/SCJ

cc: Randolph Planning Commission
Two Rivers-Ottawaquechee Regional Planning & Development Commission