

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT CONFERENCE REPORT

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

DATE OF CONFERENCES: September 14, 2023

LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: Zoom Meeting

ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT

Sheila Charles
Mark Dooley
Loretta Doughty
Tim Dunn
Jill Edelman
Jon Evans
Ron Grandmaison
Tony King
Dzijeme Lazares
Marc Laurin
Arin Mills
Dan Prehemo
Anthony Puntin
Tobey Reynolds
David Scott
Hans Weber
Trent Zanes

NHDHR/NHDNCR

Laura Black
Marika Labash

FHWA

Jamie Sikora

ACOE

Mike Hicks

Town of Boscawen

Katie Phelps

Town of Sugar Hill

Red McCarthy

FHI

Susan Bemis
Stephanie Dyer-Carroll
Laura Nagle

HDR

Audrey Beaulac
Roch Laroche

Hoyle Tanner

Josif Bicja
Deb Coon
Kimberly Peace

**Friends of the Northern
Rail Trail**

Alex Bernhard
Kent Hackmann
Don Moyer

NH Rail Trails Coalition

Dave Topham

**Hampton Beach Area
Commission**

Nancy Stiles

**Hampton Heritage
Commission**

Ann Carnaby

**Hampton Historical
Society**

Betty Moore

PROJECTS/PRESENTATIONS REVIEWED THIS MONTH:

(minutes on subsequent pages)

Alstead 44101, RPR # 15294.....	2
Sugar Hill 24218, X-A004(971), RPR 7577.....	3
Boscawen 15281, RPR 906.....	4
Andover 20650, X-A002(084), RPR 5434.....	5
Hampton 40797, X-A004(490), RPR 12929.....	7

Alstead 44101, RPR # 15294

Participants:

- NHDOT: Mark Dooley, Jon Evans, Ron Grandmaison, Arin Mills, Dan Prehemo
- Interested Party: Dave Topham

Initial consultation for project to address safety concerns for the traveling public due to a failing retaining wall along NH-12A in the center of Alstead. Goal of the meeting is to discuss next steps for the retaining wall and adjacent residential structure (circa 1850) 10 Summer St (Map 11, Lot 57).

The purpose and need for the project is to address safety concerns from the failing retaining wall along NH 12A. The project is located at 10 Summer St in Alstead (Map 11, Lot 57) and is 100% state funded. Arin showed the project location and photos of the existing conditions of the parcel and surrounding landscape. Based on an EMMIT review the house is located within the identified Alstead historic district (ALS-A 2008) and the circa 1850 house is considered contributing to the historic district.

Photos depict the failing retaining wall in which the existing house is immediate adjacent, making the house unsafe for habitation. A map of the Area of Potential Effect (APE) was shown, which includes both areas of physical and visual impact from the proposed project. The parcel/house was purchased in November 2021 due to safety concerns of the owner and with the intent of demo, Fall of 2022 the project was added to DOT's Advertising schedule and Spring 2023 DOT began coordinating work on the project.

Mark D described the following alternatives considered:

- Do nothing. Not an option as retaining wall/NH 12A would eventually collapse, causing damage to the Summer St house and property. Safety concerns for public.
- Wall reconstruction. Types evaluated- Cantilever wall and Rockery wall types. This provides safety of NH 12A. Full house demo required for construction and long-term maintenance. Will not replicate existing look of wall, possible concrete stamp, high construction cost.
- Stable soil slope (Preferred alternative). Full house demo for construction and long-term maintenance. Maintains safety of NH 12A, lower construction cost, easier long-term maintenance. Construction footprint covers much of property with 2:1 slope.

Cross sections for the stable soil slope, Cantilever wall and rockery wall were shown with respect to house, edge of pavement, travel way and guardrail face. The timeline for the project is Advertise late fall 2023 with begin demo and slope stabilization work in summer 2024. Letters were sent to Alstead town department and commissions, including the Historical Society. Bruce Bellows of the Alstead Historical society requested photos of the interior prior to demolition and had no other particular concerns for demolition. Matt Saxton of the Selectmen's office requested salvage of materials, although it was unclear if this is for personal or official town use of the material.

Sheila C asked about request for salvage of materials and if it is for personal or official town purpose. Jill believes it was for personal use. Sheila suggested priority be given to public use.

Laura B commented it appears no alternative to allow house to be saved while maintaining safety of NH 12A, therefore project will have an Adverse Effect (AE). Steps to minimize AE to historic district with both what is removed and what is being put back as both are important to the effect evaluation. House is likely not an individually eligible house, so no individual inventory form required, although is recommended as it clarifies files ahead of demo and documents the house. This could be part of mitigation package. Comments from town requested photos, so could photos be incorporated into inventory form and provide to historical society. Individual inventory could also help DOT make informed decision on features within house, and what may be important to salvage for public use by the town. Design of final landscape is important in AE determination and how effect can be minimized. Laura suggested to get public input, including surrounding community members. A DHR review, in conjunction with DOT, for archeology did not determine any concerns for this resource. Jill mentioned that Design looked to minimize impacts by removing a portion of the house and determined this was not feasible.

Sugar Hill 24218, X-A004(971), RPR 7577

Participants:

- NHDOT: Jon Evans, Ron Grandmaison, Anthony Puntin
- Town of Sugar Hill: Red McCarthy
- Hoyle Tanner: Kimberly Peace, Josif Bicja, Deb Coon
- Interested Party: Dave Topham

Continued consultation following the previous June 15, 2023, this meeting was held to continue consultation for the proposed off-line replacement of the Crane Hill Road Bridge (NHDOT Bridge No. 202/128) over the Gale River at the intersection of Streeter Pond Road in the Town of Sugar Hill. The National Register-eligible steel Warren Truss bridge was constructed in 1928 and rehabilitated in 1960 and 1976.

Kimberly Peace presented an overview of the project and review of steps taken to date to identify historic/archaeological resources and make an effect determination. Despite all efforts to avoid and minimize impacts, removal of the bridge will adversely affect both the Crane Hill Road Bridge (SUG0004), that is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places as determined in 2015, and the Gale River Cultural Landscape (ZWT-GRCL) that was determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places in 2017. The focus of this meeting and presentation was to discuss mitigation. The following options were presented:

- Advertise the bridge for sale.
- Slide show / photo documentation / PDF of replacement of bridge and relevance to CL for posting on the Town website and Historic Museum.
- Re-use of existing bridge steel into guardrail for observation site at western abutment location.
- New plaque recording construction date/manufacturer of new bridge.
- Removal and preservation of the current plaque and/or pieces of bridge steel at Historic Museum or Town building, with interpretation- potential outdoor display.

Laura Black led the discussion on the proposed mitigation items. She stated that advertising the bridge for sale is an FWHA requirement and NHDHR does not generally consider it a form of

mitigation as the outcome is optimistic but usually not successful. Laura also stated that reuse of bridge parts, while encouraged, NHDHR does not recognize this as a form of preservation mitigation but does appreciate the effort and the art it creates. Laura stated the idea of preservation of the existing bridge plaque and some pieces of the steel truss to possibly be used with an interpretive panel could be a good mitigation project. The context of the panel could elaborate on the flood relief program, which was the reason this bridge was installed as a replacement in this location and how this fits within the Cultural Landscape and other bridges of this time. This is a previously used form of mitigation, and she stated that a new plaque on the new bridge, while a nice idea, is not a form of mitigation.

Josif Bicja asked Laura what her thoughts were regarding the slide show / photo documentation. Laura stated that NHDHR tends to move away from things like this as they have a tendency to “sit on the shelf” [and as HAER documentation simply ends up at the Library of Congress] and asked someone to expand upon what this product would be and the benefit of it. Jill Edelman stated this would be something for the Town and/or the Historic Museum and could be in the form of an article that could be posted on the Town website or social media to get it out to the public. Laura stated this could be valuable, but it would need to be something of substance. She also stated that mitigation options can be over-lapped. If an interpretative panel is developed, then that image can be used on the Town website and other public outreach efforts like social media.

Red McCarthy stated that he has been talking with the local school district and that he believes there is interest in developing a program where students would build a replica of the bridge on a smaller scale. This will allow the students to learn about the history of the bridge and the flooding, the cultural landscape, and give them insight into engineering. He suggested the replica once completed could be put on display at the Museum or another Town Owned property. Red also stated that this type of project could involve multiple towns as the school receives students from Bethlehem, Easton, Franconia, and Sugar Hill. Laura responded that this would be considered a good form of mitigation if advance coordination with the local school district indicated that there was teacher buy-in to the project in light of the many other pressures on school time and resources. Red stated that he has already spoken directly with one teacher who is interested and in support of a lesson plan like this. Jill Edelman suggested that Kimberly and Josif work directly with Red to have a lesson plan developed. Laura stated if this was the direction that Town would like to take, this would be considered a form of mitigation however the replica, or some other permanent informational display, would need to be developed that could be viewed by wide range of the public.

Kimberly Peace asked for some clarification as to what would be included for Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) in the 4(f) document. Jamie Sikora said a draft form of the MOA is acceptable.

Boscawen 15281, RPR 906

Participants:

- Town of Boscawen: Katie Phelps
- NHDOT: Jon Evans
- Interested Party: Dave Topham

Continued consultation regarding the outstanding public education aspect of mitigation for the removal of the Depot Street truss bridge. Boscawen Town Administrator Katie Phelps requested discussion of the 2010 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for the Boscawen Canterbury Bridge Project #15281. Ms. Edelmann discussed the historical involvement of the NH Army Corps of Engineers. The educational piece for Boscawen to close out this project is still outstanding. Canterbury has completed theirs. Ms. Phelps noted that the Town is considering a covered pavilion with educational piece built in. She requested guidance from the members of the meeting if this was a feasible option. It was noted that the MOA is vague but that the history of the structure and its importance to the community should be included in the educational piece. Ms. Phelps inquired about the location of the educational piece. The Town is considering a location within 200 feet (+/-) of the former bridge location. Members recommended that it be in the vicinity of the former bridge location. There is no deadline for completion of the project on the MOA. Advantage Signs was noted as having worked with NHDOT on other project interpretive panels.

Andover 20650, X-A002(084), RPR 5434

Participants:

- NHDOT: Tim Dunn, Ron Grandmaison, Dzijeme Lazares, Marc Laurin, David Scott, Hans Weber, Trent Zanes
- FNRT: Kent Hackmann, Alex Bernhard, Don Moyer
- Interested Party: Dave Topham

Continued consultation, following the previous February 9, 2023 meeting, on the proposed 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 purpose of the meeting was consultation to discuss and finalize the mitigation measures that would be stipulated in the MOA due to the proposed impacts and adverse effects to the Northern Railroad Historic District and the NH Route 11 bridge spanning Sucker Brook. There is no adverse effect to the Halcyon Farm #1 property (Koron parcel). Impacts to the contributing elements of the rail trail corridor will be discussed, including: the concrete crib wall, the granite block retaining wall, the tell tales, the rail trail bridge, and the change in the character of the landscape.

Jill Edelmann stated that the signed Effects memo has been received from DHR. There will be adverse effects to the Northern Railroad Historic District and to the NH Route 11 bridge spanning Sucker Brook, due to its removal. There is no adverse effect to the Halcyon Farm #1 property (Koron parcel).

Hans Weber gave a presentation updating the impacts of the project to the contributing elements of the Historic District, including: the concrete crib wall, the granite block retaining wall, the tell tales, the rail trail bridge, and the change in the character of the landscape. Approximately 110 feet of the concrete crib wall will be removed to accommodate the wing wall of the new bridge. Approximately 250 feet of the concrete crib wall will remain. Approximately 200 feet of the granite block retaining wall will be removed, with 130 feet remaining. The ditch along the granite block wall will be regraded to maintain ditch connectivity and flow and it is anticipated that more of the face of the wall would be exposed. The tell tales will not be impacted and they will remain as is in their existing location. The change in the landscape will be due to the

removal of the existing NH Route 11 bridge spanning the rail corridor, a new larger bridge spanning both the rail corridor and Sucker Brook with the introduction of new abutments and a MSE wall within the corridor. There will not be any impacts to the Rail Trail bridge over Sucker Brook.

Hans brought up the concerns of the Friends of the Northern Rail Trail (FNRT) had previously expressed. DOT will stamp the concrete coping of the new bridge with “Northern Railroad”. The scattered granite blocks located southwest of the rail trail bridge would not be impacted, although those northeast of the bridge would be impacted due to the new bridge and required access to construct the new bridge. Drainage improvements with the regrading of the ditch along the north side of the trail and east of Sucker Brook would accommodate for 100-year flows. And the trail surface that would be disturbed by reworking of the drainage and/or by construction activities would be resurfaced with stone dust.

Alex Bernhard inquired as to the specifics of the ditch regrading and commented about the original drainage features that the railroad constructed that keeps runoff off the trail surface, such as the interceptor ditch along the top of the concrete crib wall that drains to Sucker Brook and possibly a French drain, with underdrain, 3 to 6 feet under the ditch along the trail. He commented that the trail has remained dry and is concerned that the impacts to the ditches would be designed to ensure that the trail remains dry. He suggested that the ditch be 3 feet deep and 6 feet wide if possible.

Laura Black inquired if the FNRT would have plans of the historic level of the ditch available for DOT to review and possibly help to design the reconstruction. Hans stated that an intercept ditch would be constructed between the new retaining wall and wing wall, connecting to the existing interceptor ditch above the remaining concrete crib wall, and the drainage would be directed to Sucker Brook similar to what now occurs. The proposed regrading of the ditch will be assessed to ensure that the project does not negatively impact the trail drainage. There would not be enough room to create a 3-foot deep, 6-foot-wide ditch without having substantial impacts into the trail surface. Tim Dunn stated that if there is a French drain under the existing ditch it would probably not be working as such anymore, but the existing ditch is still conveying water away from the trail surface.

Don Moyer inquired about how the runoff from NH Route 11 is being handled. Hans answered that curbing and closed drainage will capture roadway runoff and the water will be discharged to treatment swales and will be directed away from the trail to the brook.

Alex inquired as to the possible mitigation of the historic drainage features. Tim replied that there will be no new ditching west of the new bridge. On the east side the ditch will have a 1% grade and the trail will be regraded. DOT does not plan on restoring the historic drainage components as the impacts would narrow the trail width. Alex suggested that the drainage elements could be discussed in a separate meeting. Tim concurred and will set up a meeting with the FNRT to present the drainage in more details. Laura stated that restoring the historic drainage could be mitigation, but she would defer to the engineers and FNRT on what is appropriate, or feasible.

Jamie Sikora inquired if anything was done with the drainage when the rail trail was established. Alex responded only that the ballast was graded, and 4 inches of stone dust was added. He reiterated that the concern in having lateral flow across the trail can have impacts and damage the trail, and it was important to keep water off the trail. Tim stated that DOT will schedule a future meeting with the FNRT to discuss the details of the proposed drainage. Alex also wondered what would be done with the granite blocks that are to be removed and if ditching would continue down the 130 remaining feet that would expose more of these blocks.

Due to time constraint Jill stated that the impacts and mitigation to the contributing elements to the Historic District would need to be discussed at another time. Laura suggested it would be appropriate to schedule an hour meeting, which could be outside the monthly meeting. All agreed, Jill will coordinate this mitigation discussion meeting to be held prior to the October 2023 Cultural Resource meeting.

Hampton 40797, X-A004(490), RPR 12929

Participants:

- NHDOT: Loretta Doughty, Jon Evans, Ron Grandmaison, Tony King, Marc Laurin, Tobey Reynolds, Trent Zanes
- FHI: Susan Bemis, Stephanie Dyer-Carroll, Laura Nagle
- HDR: Roch LaRoche, Audrey Beaulac
- Consulting Parties: Hampton Beach Area Commission (Nancy Stiles), the Hampton Historical Society (Betty Moore), and the Hampton Heritage Commission (Ann Carnaby).
- Interested Party/NH Rail Trails Coalition: Dave Topham

Continued consultation regarding the NH RT 101 Ocean Boulevard project design, alternatives, and potential effects. Discussion will include recommendations for investigation and documentation (including Individual and District Forms).

Jill Edelman (NHDOT) welcomed everyone, asked them to introduce themselves and provided a meeting overview.

Stephanie Dyer-Carroll (FHI Studio) then introduced the Ocean Boulevard project and reviewed the meeting agenda. She stated the project purpose is to improve pedestrian and bicyclist connectivity, safety, and traffic operations through enhanced multimodal accommodations, and to improve overall function of the NH Route 1A transportation corridor while addressing climate change resiliency. She described the project limits as running along Ocean Boulevard from the State Park driveway on the southern end to High Street on the northern end.

Ms. Dyer-Carroll explained that the project team has completed data collection, including a Phase 1A Archaeological Assessment that identified areas of potential archeological sensitivity: one north of the Seabrook-Hampton bridge; one along Church Street (Pre-Contact sensitivity); one along Winnacunnet Road (Pre-Contact sensitivity); and one-off Ocean Boulevard near High Street where fish houses were located (Post-Contact sensitivity).

Ms. Dyer-Carroll said the project team also conducted a site walk in December 2021 where participants identified individual properties and areas along the length of the corridor that could warrant investigation in the event that the design could potentially affect them. In the southern segment, two areas were identified for evaluation as districts: one at Haverhill Street and one in the vicinity of the Casino. In the center segment, a number of individual properties and an area at Church Street were identified. In the northern segment, several individual properties were also identified.

Ms. Dyer-Carroll said NHDHR suggested on the site walk that the team investigate the development history of Church Street if there was the potential for effects. Since NHDOT is considering widening the intersection of Ocean Boulevard and Church Street, the team prepared a memo documenting the development history of the street and evaluating the integrity of its properties. She shared that the assessment identified two properties that could warrant additional documentation if there is a potential for effects (10 and 15 Church Street). Ms. Dyer-Carroll stated that 2 Cole Street was not recommended for individual evaluation due to alterations to the main entrance and windows.

Ms. Audrey Beaulac (HDR) described the current corridor and intersection options from a high-level perspective. She showed the corridor components on a plan, noting that the yellow represented proposed travel lanes, green represented bike lanes, orange represented parking, and purple noted sidewalks. She described the segment components and typical sections, including widths of the sidewalks, drive lanes, bike lanes, and parking. Ms. Beaulac said that each segment contains these elements, but the configuration of parking, the location of parking and sidewalk, and the bike lane widths vary. She said that the I Street to Ashworth Avenue segment includes an option for a pedestrian barrier in the right-of-way (ROW). Between Highland Avenue and Church Street, and between Church Street and Boars Head, parking is being considered between the two travel lanes. Between Boars Head and Dumas Avenue, the team is proposing two drive lanes, sidewalks, and bike lanes separated by a six-foot median. The Dumas Avenue to Winnacunnet Road segment has two options that look at travel lanes together with parking elevated along the seawall, or travel lanes separated by a median with parking along the seawall. The Winnacunnet Road to 5th Street segment includes two travel lanes and bike lanes, a median, angled parking and a sidewalk. The segment from 5th Street to High Street matches existing conditions.

Audrey Beaulac also described intersection options:

- At State Park Road, a roundabout and an unsignalized intersection are under consideration.
- At Ashworth Avenue (south), the existing U-turn is being maintained with a revised raised median to discourage crossing from Ashworth to Dover Avenue, which is a high crash location.
- At Ashworth Avenue (north), a reverse U-turn is proposed.
- At Highland Avenue and Church Street, signalized intersections are proposed to improve safety.
- At Dumas Avenue, a single lane roundabout is under consideration.
- At Winnacunnet Road, a single lane roundabout is proposed.
- At High Street, the roadway would tie into the existing signalized intersection.

Ms. Dyer-Carroll then discussed potential effects of the proposed improvements and their relationship to the potential resources. She also made recommendations for further evaluation to be discussed by the group. For archaeology, she said there is a potential to go outside of the ROW at the State Park entrance. She explained that as the design advances and the team better understands the area of disturbance, they will consult with NHDHR and NHDOT on potential next steps. At the area of potential archaeological sensitivity at Winnacunnet Road, there is the potential for work on the culvert. The drainage design is still being developed; the team will consult with NHDHR and NHDOT on next steps once the design is advanced.

For above ground resources, the team identified project elements with potential visual impacts. Ms. Dyer-Carroll described the pedestrian barrier alignment near the Casino, noting the concept design is still being developed. The team is recommending documentation in the area adjacent to the pedestrian barrier since it would be a permanent change and there is the potential for effects.

In the center segment, there are proposed roadside barriers, the potential Church Street widening, and a potential retaining wall. Ms. Dyer-Carroll described the roadside barriers and how they would compare to the existing condition, noting that the barriers would replace the existing guardrail. She said that an Individual Inventory Form isn't recommended for the NH Marine Memorial since the barrier is replacing an existing guardrail and the memorial would be over 100 feet from the barrier. In addition, the views of the ocean would be maintained.

Moving north along the corridor, Ms. Dyer-Carroll said that the Church Street widening would require the removal of either 359 or 365 Ocean Boulevard, depending on the alignment. Neither property was identified for further evaluation due to a lack of integrity and changes to both structures over time. She said that Individual Inventory Forms for 10 and 15 Church Street are not recommended due to the distance from the improvements.

The proposed retaining wall north of Boars Head would address a grade change in the median. Ms. Dyer-Carroll said that under both the existing and proposed conditions there would be a barrier in the median. She said an Individual Inventory Form isn't proposed for 555 Ocean Boulevard because a guardrail already exists in the median and the views to the ocean wouldn't change.

Ms. Dyer-Carroll then discussed next steps. She said the team would like to identify which properties and areas require additional documentation during this meeting. In the next several months, the team would further refine the alternatives with a focus on drainage. She said the next Cultural Resources Agency Meeting is planned for the winter to discuss effects and determine if additional evaluations are necessary due to drainage improvements.

Ms. Edelman began the discussion by noting that the presentation information was sent to NHDHR in advance and asked if NHDHR had input and/or agrees with the recommendations made at the meeting. Laura Black from NHDHR stated that she appreciated seeing the materials in advance.

She noted that 169 Ocean Boulevard (the Casino) was not recommended for survey individually due to integrity, but its significance hinges on National Register Criterion A so its integrity is less critical. She recommended an Individual Inventory Form for that reason. Ms. Edelman asked if a

District Area Form would pick up on the property's interplay with the rest of the block since the history of the block was key. Ms. Black noted that she wasn't on the site visit, so she couldn't speak to conversations that occurred then. She asked how integral the Casino is to the rest of the block from the perspective of history. If the potential district is determined not eligible, the Casino itself could have a different history and a different impact on the community. On a broader level, additional consideration should be given to how connected it is to other properties. It could be connected as well as individually significant. She explained that the group may need to have a further conversation to determine how to treat the building as a resource.

Ms. Black also asked about the Church Street area. She noted a lot of information was provided about the individual buildings and agreed with those individual recommendations. However, she said it seemed like the area should also be considered as a historic district, but the attachment doesn't talk about the area except to say the sum of the individual parts have lost integrity. She recommended the team expand on the explanation that there is not a potential historic district considering form, massing, street layout, and physical elements, and justify why it isn't being considered as a district.

Ms. Black asked FHWA if an inventory form may be needed for Section 4(f) purposes if a property is being demolished. She also requested that other participants share information on properties that may be significant but that may not appear so from the outside or have been altered but are still significant to the community.

Dave Topham (NH Rail Trails Coalition) asked about the overall project plan by the Hampton Beach State Park roundabout. He asked if there would be impacts to the State Pier and the connectivity into the roundabout area and the new bridge. Ms. Beaulac responded that the layout of the roundabout takes into consideration the new bridge. Mr. Topham asked about the timeframe for both projects. Ms. Beaulac clarified that the bridge will be constructed first and tie into existing conditions, but Ocean Boulevard would then tie into the new bridge's existing condition. Jamie Sikora (FHWA) explained that the Ocean Boulevard project would likely be built in phases. Tobey Reynolds, NHDOT Project Manager, noted that the team has a preliminary schedule for the Ocean Boulevard Project, but there is still a lot of work to do, including a public hearing and then discussion of how to build the projects from a contracting perspective. He also noted that NHDOT needs to look for more funding, as only about one third of the dollars are available right now.

Ms. Edelman asked if anyone from Hampton had comments and thoughts on the overall project and what needs to be inventoried. Ann Carnaby (Hampton Heritage Commission) responded that her input is less from the perspective of her role on the Heritage Commission and instead her Town Planning Board and Regional Planning Commission positions. She explained that one of the things to consider is the Casino Ballroom, which was owned for many years by the same family but was recently purchased by someone from out of town with resources and time to invest. Ms. Carnaby explained that she has heard plans are forthcoming for the building but haven't been shared yet. She requested the group evaluate and prepare for what should be preserved in the structure noting it is unique and evokes another time. She explained that she feels similarly about the Marine Memorial. She said the prevailing attitude from the town is that if it isn't broken, don't fix it – keep the parking to the west so people can walk and view. Ms. Carnaby noted that the Hampton

Historical Society doesn't believe that the Hampton Beach Cottage Historic District exists. She also noted that the Hampton Historical Society wasn't able to attend the meeting.

Ms. Black followed up about the Casino, explaining that interiors aren't usually considered for the purposes of review and compliance, but the Casino is one property where interiors should be considered if access to the interior could be accommodated. If the interior has character defining features, it could play into the significance of the property.

Nancy Stiles (Hampton Beach Area Commission) asked if any of the Hampton projects have an end date. Mr. Sikora responded that the team is working on the schedule. For the bridge project there is an end date, but not for Ocean Boulevard yet. Mr. Reynolds noted that all projects have end dates associated from a financial standpoint. The Ocean Boulevard project funding is scheduled in FY 2026, which would put the end of construction and final audits in 2029. However, end dates are not set in stone and can be adjusted and are routinely updated.

Ms. Stiles suggested that the project team talk to the person who owns the Casino because there are plans for it. It should be done before the owner comes forward with their proposal. Ms. Edelmann noted that the project would not be impacting the Casino physically but would be addressing pedestrian safety on the sidewalk. The owner would be invited to the public meeting. She explained that the team would also contact the owner about taking photos for the inventory.

Mr. Reynolds noted that there may be confusion about what NHDOT does versus a private developer for a historic project. Mr. Sikora said local zoning would dictate what the developer can do. Ms. Edelmann noted that the project would just need to determine the property's eligibility for the National Register, which does not typically look at interiors, however the project team can request access to the interiors for this property. She clarified that all of the required inventory work can be done from the public way and does not put restrictions on the property.

Mr. Sikora noted that Section 4(f) doesn't inform what should be surveyed. Section 106 informs the 4(f) process, depending on the potential for adverse effects. Ms. Edelmann clarified that the Cultural Resources Agency Meeting review of what should be documented and what doesn't have integrity will be sufficient for the 4(f) review. Ms. Edelmann stated that if participants all look at it and say there aren't documentation needs, that it should be sufficient for the process.

Ms. Edelmann asked for any additional comments, then thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.