



## NEW HAMPSHIRE DIVISION OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES

State of New Hampshire, Department of Cultural Resources  
19 Pillsbury Street, Concord, NH 03301-3570  
TDD Access: Relay NH 1-800-735-2964  
[www.nh.gov/mhdhr](http://www.nh.gov/mhdhr)

603-271-3483  
603-271-3558  
FAX 603-271-3433  
[preservation@dcr.nh.gov](mailto:preservation@dcr.nh.gov)

April 5, 2016

Brian Mills  
US Department of Energy  
1000 Independence Ave. SW, OE-20  
Washington, DC 20585

Re: Northern Pass Transmission Project; White Mountains Project Area Form (RPR 4680)

Dear Mr. Mills,

Thank you for submitting a Project Area Form for the White Mountains of the Northern Pass Project. As requested, the Division of Historical Resources' Determination of Eligibility Committee has reviewed the *Project Area Form*; based on the information available, the DHR's comments are:

TOWN/CITY	PROPERTY	DETERMINATION
Multi-town	Northern Pass, White Mountains Project Project Area Form (ZMT_NPLR)	additional survey or evaluation required;

A copy of the DHR evaluation form is attached for your use.

Please contact me at 271-6628 or [nadine.miller@dcr.nh.gov](mailto:nadine.miller@dcr.nh.gov) if you have questions.

Sincerely,

Nadine Miller  
Preservation Project Reviewer

Enclosures

cc: Caitlin Callaghan, Dept. of Energy  
Catherine Finneran, Eversource  
SEARCH



NH Division of Historical Resources  
Determination of Eligibility (DOE)

Date received: 3/2/16; 3/6/10/15                      Inventory #:

Date of group review: 3/9/16; 4/30/15              Area: ZMT-NPWW

DHR staff: Nadine

Property Name: Northern Pass White Mountains Region      Town/City: Multi-town

Address: Bethlehem, Campton, Dalton, Easton, Franconia,      County: Grafton and Coos  
Landaff, Lincoln, Lisbon, Sugar Hill, Thornton, Whitefield, and Woodstock

Reviewed for:       R&C    PTI    NR    SR    Survey    Other  
Agency, if appropriate: US Dept. of Energy

**Individual Properties**

NR      SR  
       Not evaluated for individual eligibility  
       Eligible  
       Eligible, also in district  
       Eligible, in district  
       Not eligible  
       Incomplete information or evaluation

**Districts**

NR      SR  
       Not evaluated @ district  
       Eligible  
       Not eligible  
       Incomplete information or evaluation

Integrity:    ALL ASPECTS       Location       Design       Setting       Materials  
                  Workmanship       Feeling       Association

Criteria:     A. Event               B. Person       C. Architecture/Engineering  
                  D. Archaeology       E. Exception

Level:    Local       State       National  
 IF THIS PROPERTY IS REVIEWED IN THE FUTURE, ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION IS NEEDED.

**STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

3/9/16: The Project Area Form was revised to include additional information on historic contexts as requested on 4/30/15.

4/30/15: The Project Area Form for the Northern Pass - White Mountains region is centered on an Area of Potential Effects that encompasses a two-mile wide, 57.47 mile long corridor that originates near the borders of Jefferson, Whitefield, and Lancaster; extends southward through Whitefield, Dalton, Bethlehem, Franconia, Sugar Hill, Lisbon, Landaff, Easton, Lincoln, Woodstock, and Thornton, before crossing into the Lakes Region at the southern border of Campton. The area is characterized by rural farmlands and undeveloped forests as well as residential properties, small town centers and villages, and small and large-scale tourism enterprises. The White Mountain National Forest covers a large portion of the area.

The Project Area Form's methods and purpose section defines the methodology process and breaks it down into descriptions of key elements - how background research, field survey, viewshed analysis, and consultant recommendations for further inventory and evaluation were made. The geographical context and historical background sections provide a solid foundation on which decisions regarding further inventory and evaluation can begin to be generated.

Among the most important historic contexts that influenced development in this area during the historic period include agriculture, the settlement and development of towns and villages, and industry (lumber, sawmills, potato starch production, wool carding, and the manufacture of potash). Recreation was also important during the early years well into the present day. Trails and other amenities were constructed for recreational use. Other historic contexts are noted on pages 33-47 of the document.

An architectural description section notes a wide variety of resource types and styles. Resources include those designed in the Federal, Georgian, Greek Revival, Gothic Revival, French Second Empire, Queen Anne, and Colonial Revival styles. Many of the residential buildings take the form of Cape Cod residences and connected farmhouses. Meetinghouses, churches, schools, libraries, town halls, and other public buildings are centered within a number of historic village/town centers. Grand hotels, seasonal summer estates and other modest summer cottages were constructed near lakes or on promontories with scenic vistas.

ENTERED INTO DATABASE

ACREAGE: 76,322.2 acres

PERIOD OF SIGNIFICANCE: N/A

AREA OF SIGNIFICANCE: N/A

BOUNDARY: N/A

SURVEYOR: Jenna Higgins, Stefan Claesson, Jacob Freedman, Jessica Fish and Tricia Peone

---

FOLLOW-UP: Notify appropriate parties.

3/9/16: DHR staff reviewed the revised Project Area Form and confirms that revisions requested on 7/22/15 have been incorporated into the revised document. The DHR agrees with the methodology outlined in the document. Although not highlighted in the Project Area Form, the DHR does not recommend for further survey the transmission line itself due to continual upgrades on the line.

The following resources are recommended for evaluation on New Hampshire historic district area forms:

- Pemigewasset River Valley (discussions will be necessary to determine scope of work required)
- Boston, Concord & Montreal RR (survey required if setting is a character-defining feature of rr)
- Pemigewasset Valley Branch RR/logging (survey required if setting is a character-defining feature of rr)
- White Mountain RR (survey required if setting is a character-defining feature of the rr)
- Maine Central RR (survey required if setting is a character-defining feature of the rr)
- Burns Pond
- King's Square
  - McIntyre School (Individual Form not required unless District recommended not eligible)
  - Church of the Configuration (Individual Form not required unless District recommended not eligible)
  - Darling Block, Fish House, Whitefield Station (Individual Form not required unless District recommended not eligible)
- Page Hill
- Streeter Pond
  - 392 Streeter Pond Rd (Individual Form not required unless District recommended not eligible)
  - Crane Hill Road Farm (Individual Form not required unless District recommended not eligible)
- Sugar Hill
  - Sugar Hill Meeting House (Individual Form not required unless District recommended not eligible)
  - Ski Hearth Farm (Individual Form not required unless District recommended not eligible)
  - Crane Hill Road Farm (Individual Form not required unless District recommended not eligible)
  - Sunnyside Cemetery (Individual Form not required unless District recommended not eligible)
  - Sunset Hill Golf Course (Individual Form not required unless District recommended not eligible)
- Easton Village
  - Easton Town Hall (Individual Form not required unless District recommended not eligible)
- Appalachian National Scenic Trail (Please coordinate with DHR regarding scope of identification efforts)
- Reel Brook Trail
- Jericho Road Trail
- Georgiana Falls Trail
- Gordon Pond Trail
- North Woodstock Village
- Beebe River/ Draper Corp Mill Village (discussions required to address archaeological features)
- Campton Hollow
- Campton Lower Village
  - NH DOT Bridge #153/147 (Individual Form not required unless District recommended not eligible)
- Campton Upper Village
  - 1354 NH Route 75 (Individual Form not required unless District recommended not eligible)
- Kimball Hill Road Historic District (if it is determined to be located within the ZVI)

The following resources are recommended for evaluation on New Hampshire Individual inventory forms:

Littleton Road Cabins (FID-4313-4314)  
Forest Lake Cottage (FID-1301)  
Parker Road Farm 1 (FID-1327)  
Parker Road Farm 2 (FID-1331)  
Turnpike Road Farm (FID-1892)  
Hearthside Village Cottage Motel (FID-1874-1875)  
Baker Brook Motel and assoc. properties (FID-1261 et al)  
Blaney Road Farm (FID-1284-1286)  
Cherry Valley Road Farm (FID-1290)  
Brookside Farm (FID-6433-6434)  
North Country Cottages (FID-1245, 1248, 6491)  
Martland Farm (FID-1177)  
Five Corners Farm (FID-1185))  
C. Stewart Farm (FID-1188-1868)  
Maplehurst Farm (FID-1870-1871)  
Kinsman Cemetery (EAS0001)  
S. Kendell Farm (FID-1131-1133)  
W. Hall Farm (FID-1140-1141)  
A. Cooley Farm (FID-1164-6503)  
Maple Haven Campground (WDS0006)  
Meadow Lark Motor Court (FID-1093-1094)  
Montaup Cabins (FID-1099-1100)  
Woodstock Cemetery (FID-1074)  
Colonial Revival Residence (FID-1092)  
Craftsman-style Residence (FID-4784)  
NH DOT Bridge #177/148 (WDS0001)  
NH DOT Bridge #185/104 (THO0001)  
Steel Bridge Road Farm (FID-1009)  
Colonel Spencer Inn (FID-904)

4/30/15: At this time, the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources cannot concur on the recommendations of the Project Area Form until the following issues are addressed:

**Towns:** Does the White Mountains region Project Area Form include areas of Jefferson and Lancaster? These are not listed in the list of towns on page 2 nor are they listed on page 2 of the Great North Woods Project Area Form.

**Maps:**

- 1) A map showing the location of all four Project Area forms is need to show the proximity to each other and the overall extent of the project location.
- 2) The Location Map and corresponding Sketch Maps should note the towns in letters large enough to read. Also, please depict the boundaries of the White Mountain National Forest.
- 3) All Sketch Maps should use the same terminology as the Location Map. For example, the Location Map notes them as 16A not Sketch Map A.
- 4) The Direct APE on the sketch maps is noted in the legend as white, but is shown in maroon and other colors on the maps to represent the number of "structures" visible from that location. A less confusing way to depict the Direct APE is needed.
- 5) The "Project Area" on the key should be called the Indirect APE (this should also be reflected in the written methodology).
- 6) All previously surveyed properties should be identified within the Indirect APE, not just those located within the Zone of Visual Influence.

**Methods and Purpose (page 28):**

- 1) Please provide an explanation as to how the direct/indirect Areas of Potential Effects were defined.
- 2) The DHR is aware that the Department of Energy solicited information from consulting parties early in the Section 106 process. This information included a request that consulting parties provide locational information of properties of local importance. Please explain how this information was utilized in the evaluation methodology. A table listing all properties provided by consulting parties placed in the body of the report or as an appendix would be useful.

Viewshed Analysis (pages 29-30):

- 1) How was the 50 m buffer zone arrived at?
- 2) Was the 50 m GPS point taken at the center of the developed area of a property?
- 3) How did the methodology account for large acreage properties such as farms and recreational areas at the edge of the indirect APE?

Flow Chart (page 31). The following methodology is based on the DHR's understanding of its discussions with the Department of Energy and its consultants:

- 1) The DHR agrees with the first three decision-making steps in the flow-chart.
- 2) Step 4 must consider whether aspects such as setting, landscape or viewshed are potentially character-defining features of the property.
- 3) Step 5 must recommend whether the property is sufficiently intact to warrant further inventory.
- 4) The 6th step is premature: Determinations as to whether or not the property retains historical significance is completed during the next inventory phase.
- 5) The final step highlighted in green, Visual Impact Assessments, are not part of the Project Area Form process. Project Area Forms recommend if additional inventory is required and in what type of format. Visual Impact Assessments may be used after resources have been identified during the assessment of effects phase of the undertaking.

Village Development (page 34):

Town and village centers are often inventoried for these types of projects. Please provide a discussion under the significance statement (and associated Table) as to whether or not any of the villages noted in this section warrant the preparation of historic district area forms.

Agriculture (page 39):

1) Please refer to more recent studies that have shown agriculture to be on an up-swing in New Hampshire and revise your statement at the end of this section (Jager 2004, 44, and others). Agriculture in NH begins to change and decline in the mid-to-late nineteenth century. However, studies are indicating an increase in production in the early twenty-first century.

2) Is there a potential for encountering rural historic districts under the agricultural context?

Recreation (page 43):

1) The DHR recommends a separate historic context be culled out of Recreation to include Land Conservation (White Mountain National Forest, Weeks Act, the environmental movement, etc.).

2) Are there other trails in the area besides the Appalachian Trail that should be inventoried as part of this context? Either in or outside of the WMNF? Please review and incorporate materials available at the WMNF.

3) Page 45 has a repeated paragraph - please remove the first full paragraph on this page.

Section 22. Statement of Significance (page 56):

There are differences between identifying properties that should be inventoried due to the potential importance of setting, landscape or viewshed to their significance, and the later step of evaluating setting under the National Register's definition of integrity.

The second paragraph of this section ends with several statements that are premature and need to be clarified. Please refer back to the comments under the Flow Chart above to revise this paragraph.

In addition, it is premature within a Project Area Form to discuss the need for assessment of effects. Please remove any statements that refer to this phase of Section 106.

For the reasons noted above, the DHR disagrees with evaluation methodologies and cannot concur with survey recommendations at this time.

---

Final DOE approved by:

