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Draft Project Area Form
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This draft Project Area Form (PAF) was reviewed by the NH Division of Historical Resources (NH DHR) Determination of Eligibility Committee at its June 10, 2015 meeting. This review focused on the methodology underlying the PAF. NH DHR’s comments are available online at: http://www.northernpasses.us/consultations/section106/.

The NH DHR comments will be addressed and a revised version posted after submission to NH DHR.

A hard copy of the PAF is available at the NH DHR office by appointment only at the DHR, 19 Pillsbury Street, Concord, NH 03301. Appointments between the hours of 8:30am-4:00pm Monday through Friday are available by contacting Tanya Krajcik at Tanya.krajcik@dcr.nh.gov or 603-271-3483. The area forms are not available without an appointment, and access may be limited due to ongoing review by DHR staff.
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AREA FORM

AREA NAME: NORTHERN PASS – WHITE MOUNTAINS

1. Type of Area Form
   - Town-wide: □
   - Historic District: □
   - Project Area: ☑

2. Name of area: Northern Pass Transmission Project – White Mountains

3. Location: See Attached

4. City or town: See Attached

5. County: See Attached

6. USGS quadrangle name(s): See Attached

7. USGS scale: See Attached

8. UTM/SP reference: See Attached

9. Inventory numbers in this area:
   See Attached

10. Setting: See Attached

11. Acreage: See Attached

12. Preparer(s): See Attached

13. Organization: See Attached

14. Date(s) of field survey: See Attached

15. Location map
   See Attached
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AREA FORM

AREA NAME: NORTHERN PASS – WHITE MOUNTAINS

3. Location: Central and north Grafton County and southwestern Coos County

4. City or Town: Bethlehem, Campton, Dalton, Easton, Franconia, Landaff, Lincoln, Lisbon, Sugar Hill, Thornton, Whitefield, and Woodstock

5. County: Grafton and Coos

6. USGS quadrangle name(s): Lancaster, Twin Mountain, Bethlehem, Littleton, Sugar Hill, Mount Moosilauke, Lincoln, Woodstock, Plymouth

7. USGS scale: 1:24,000

8. UTM/SP reference: Zone 19, UTM, Meters, WGS84
   A: 295530.18E 4923352.00N
   B: 299206.12E 4925025.03N
   C: 273231.66E 4901099.73N
   D: 276670.16E 4900129.16N
   E: 284498.22E 4851187.90N
   F: 287777.95E 4851440.93N

9. Inventory numbers in this area: 84003197, BET0019, BET0020, CAM0002, CAM0003, CAM0004, CAM0005, CAM0007, CAM0008, CAM0010, EAS0001, EAS0003, King’s Square Historic District, LIN0004, SUG0002, THO0001, THO0002, WDS0001, WDS0003, WDS0005, WDS0006, WHI0001, WHI0002, WHI0003, WHI0004, WHI0010, WHI0005, WHI0007, WHI0008, WHI0009, WHI0012, WHI0013

10. Setting:
    The White Mountains project area is a two-mile wide corridor originating near the borders of Jefferson, Whitefield and Lancaster. It extends southward winding 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 total length of the White Mountains project area is 95.2 km.

    The project area passes through predominately rural farmlands and undeveloped forests. The somewhat circuitous route of the project is dictated by the rugged, natural landscape of the White Mountains, thus avoiding most mountaintops for valleys and lower elevations. Significant peaks that are within the project area include Cole Hill (Easton), the foothills of Kinsman Mountain (Easton and Lincoln), and Mount Wolf (Lincoln). The project area also crosses several significant waterways, including the Johns River and the Ammonoosuc River. In Woodstock, the project intersects and closely follows the course of the Pemigewasset River south through the region.
A significant portion of the project is encompassed by the White Mountain National Forest (WMNF), which covers the majority of Woodstock, Lincoln, and Easton, as well as sections of Campton, Holderness, and Bethlehem. In addition, the area is dominated by single-family dwellings and scattered farmsteads, as well as small- and large-scale tourism enterprises. Forestry and tourism have long been the principal economic drivers in the White Mountains. Centers of development are clustered generally near the banks of rivers, such as the Pemigewasset River in Woodstock, Thornton, and Campton, and the Johns River in Whitefield. Although the areas near these major rivers provide a fertile landscape of sandy, well-drained soils, the area is more typically defined by mountainous, uneven terrain with stony soils, visible bedrock and scenic landscapes.

11. Acreage: 76,377.2 acres

12. Preparer(s): Jenna Higgins, Stefan Claesson, Jacob Freedman, Jessica Fish, Tricia Peone


14. Date(s) of field survey: 9/12/13 – 9/14/13; 10/27/14-10/31/14

15. Location Map:

The attached location map shows the extents of the indirect APE for the project and a key to the sketch map series (A-R) referred to in the following sections. The overall length of the entire proposed project is approximately 187 mi (300 km). This Project Area Form (PAF) covers 60 mi (96.5 km) of the indirect APE for the project area between mileposts (MPs) 62.6 and 122.8. The graticule and coordinates provided on the map borders are based on the WGS84 datum and UTM (Zone 19) coordinate system (in meters). Six coordinate points (A-F) indicate the project area boundaries that correspond to the coordinates in item 8. The project area map and data are presented over USGS topographic map data (USGS The National Map Topo Base Map - Small Scale).
16. Sketch map:
The attached sketch maps identify the boundaries of the project area on USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle maps. The sketch map series (A-R) identify the location of all New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources (NHDHR) previously inventoried and National-Register listed and eligible and undetermined properties (and districts), as well as properties identified by SEARCH during field work that are located within the Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI) and the project area boundaries. The setting of these properties may be indirectly (i.e., visually) affected by the proposed project (see Methods and Purpose section below for a description of viewshed analysis). Individual properties and districts or areas recommended for further documentation on NHDHR Individual Inventory and/or Historic District Area Forms are indicated on these maps. Photograph identifiers and the directions of photographs are also illustrated on the sketch map series.
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17. Methods and Purpose:

This study was conducted to obtain information that supports the U.S. Department of Energy’s (DOE’s) compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), as amended, and its implementing regulations at 36 CFR Part 800. This information will be included in the DOE’s Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Northern Pass Transmission (NPT) project, prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of this investigation is to identify above-ground and architectural resources within the study area and provide recommendations for additional investigations. The project is identified further by the NHDHR Project Review Number RPR-4860. SEARCH completed the architectural history survey for the entire proposed NPT project, on behalf of the DOE and SE Group (Frisco, CO), between August 2013 and August 2014.

The purpose of this investigation is to identify above-ground architectural or built resources within the area of potential effects (APE) and provide recommendations for further documentation on NHDHR Individual Inventory and/or Historic District Area Forms within what is referred to herein as the “indirect APE.” The indirect APE consists of a one-mile (1.6 km) area on each side of the centerline of the proposed NPT line for an indirect APE that is two miles wide. The overall length of the entire proposed project is approximately 187 mi (300 km). It includes 147 mi (236.6 km) of existing overhead transmission line rights-of-way (ROW) owned by the Public Service of New Hampshire (PSNH), which extends from Dummer to Deerfield, NH. It also includes 40 mi (64.4 km) of new transmission line corridor, proposed by NPT, from the US-Canada border in Pittsburg south to Dummer, NH.

The indirect APE passes through 47 towns and five counties, which includes (from north to south) Coos, Grafton, Belknap, Merrimack, and Rockingham counties. In addition, the APE passes through four of seven regions delineated by the New Hampshire Department of Resources and Economic Development (DRED). These regions, based roughly on unique or notable features of New Hampshire’s geography as well as political and socioeconomic boundaries include (from north to south) the Great North Woods, White Mountains, Lakes Region, and Merrimack Valley (State of New Hampshire 2012; Environmental Protection Agency 2012). A Project Area Form, or PAF, has been developed for each of these four regions. This PAF is developed for the White Mountains DRED region.

Background Research

Background research focused on developing historic contexts to identify significant themes that are reflected in or represented by above-ground resources. Research was conducted through all phases of the project, including before and during fieldwork, and throughout data analysis. Research included a review of previous cultural resources investigations and relevant architectural history studies within each respective DRED region. SEARCH staff conducted a review of documents and databases held at NHDHR, as well as federal, state and local libraries and archives. Examples of documents examined include historic building inventory forms and files, previous architectural history reports, historic maps and documents, census records, and
secondary source materials. A variety of digital resources were also utilized including the Library of Congress American Memory Collection, University of New Hampshire and Plymouth State University Digital Collections, and online property records.

The PAFs also incorporate Geographic Information System (GIS) data such as, U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) topographic maps, geo-referenced historic maps, aerial photography, and National Register Information System (NRIS) data, to facilitate the identification of architectural resources within each project area. SEARCH developed a GIS that includes these data as well as NHDHR previously surveyed or identified above-ground resources on file with NHDHR. Spatial data points and GIS data layers were created for previously identified NHDHR properties and districts within the indirect APE; their locations were verified further by geo-coding with ESRI World Geocoding Service, digital aerial photographs and field observations.

Field Survey
Field methods were designed to examine the indirect APE to: 1) re-locate previously recorded above-ground architectural or built resources, 2) identify previously undocumented architectural or built resources, and 3) recognize visual aspects of the setting of these resources. Field work was conducted by Geoffrey Mohlmann (Senior Architectural Historian) and Travis Fulk (Architectural Historian) of SEARCH in September 2013 and by Jenna Higgins (Architectural Historian) and Jacob Freedman (Archaeologist) in October 2014. A driving or windshield survey covered all public roads within the indirect APE in order to examine existing buildings, structures, and other aspects of the built environment. Above-ground architectural or built resources that were potentially significant with reference to NRHP eligibility criteria were photographed and noted. The locations of these resources were documented by Global Positioning System (GPS) and noted on field maps, and described in photo logs, including physical property addresses where possible. When no physical address was clearly visible, an approximate address was recorded. Upon completion of fieldwork, the data was processed and analyzed at SEARCH offices. Field photographs were geo-tagged, GPS points examined for spatial accuracy, field logs were transcribed, and the resulting data sets were incorporated into the SEARCH architectural history GIS for the proposed project.

Viewshed Analysis
A viewshed analysis consisting of establishing a Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI) model for the proposed transmission line project was developed based on a 5-m gridded Digital Surface Model (DSM) of the study area created by TJ Boyle (Burlington, VT), a subcontractor to SE Group and DOE. The DSM data were acquired from Intermap (2012) (http://www.intermap.com). The "Surface" viewsheds for the indirect APE were processed to include the screening effects of objects over 7 ft (2.1 m) in height (leaf-on tree conditions, buildings, etc.). Additionally, the "Surface" viewshed includes areas of visibility from water surfaces (e.g., rivers, ponds and lakes). "Surface" viewsheds were created and calculated based on the visibility of all proposed project components, including existing towers that will remain in place, new and/or relocated towers, new lattice structures, and areas of vegetation clearing. The number of potentially visible structures and/or ROW within the indirect APE is based on the proposed locations of these project components.
Viewshed models were also performed for the converter station locations (the proposed Franklin location and Deerfield’s North Road location). For the converter station locations, these models assume building and/or riser structure heights of 60 ft (18.3 m), as well as a clear-cut area of 21-acres per the Northern Pass application. Additionally, each of the above-ground architectural or built resources that SEARCH identified as having potential historic significance was analyzed relative to the viewshed model parameters using a 164 ft (50 m) buffer zone in order to encompass a reasonable portion of an identified property. This buffer zone was centered on the approximate center point of the resource as identified in the field using GPS technology and checked for accuracy against GRANIT 2011 aerial imagery. If any portion of the buffer zone intersected the ZVI for the indirect APE, the architectural or built resource was treated as having a view of the proposed project.

**Recommendations**

SEARCH used the findings of the background research, field work, and viewshed analysis to make recommendations for the second phase of architectural surveys within the indirect APE, which consists of recordation on the NHDHR Individual Inventory and Historic District Area Forms. Recommendations for architectural surveys consider National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility for those architectural or built resources that are 1) considered representative of regional historic contexts, 2) located within the indirect APE and ZVI, and 3) whose historic setting may be impacted by the proposed project. While architectural or built resources may be historically significant under National Register Criteria A, B, C and/or D, recommendation for additional documentation on NHDHR Individual Inventory and/or Historic District Area Forms is limited to those architectural resources where setting is a character-defining feature of a resource and that are representative of a relevant historic context.
Decision-making flowchart to recommend resources for visual impact assessment and NHDHR Individual Inventory or Historic District Area Form recordation.
18. Geographical Context:
The White Mountains project area is dominated by mountainous, rugged terrain sculpted during the last glacial maximum, which began approximately 21,000 years ago (Shaw et al. 2006, 2066). The retreat of glaciers scoured the landscape, and left behind rolling hills and low mountains. Few major lakes are located in this area, but there are numerous small rivers and streams. Glacial till, comprised of poorly sorted clay, silt, sand, pebbles and cobbles characterizes predominantly the soils of the White Mountains.

Two ecoregions dominate the NPT project area in the White Mountains: the White Mountain Foothills and the White Mountains/Blue Mountains. A third ecoregion, the Upper Montane/Alpine Zone, represents less than 1 km of the White Mountains project area (US EPA 2012). The project area passes through the White Mountain Foothills ecoregion in Whitefield, Dalton, Bethlehem, Sugar Hill and the western half of Easton. This ecoregion is comprised of rocky hills and low mountains, with few large lakes. Near the center of Easton, the project area crosses into the White Mountains/Blue Mountains ecoregion, an area of high elevations, steep slopes, narrow valleys, and exposed bedrock. From here the project area travels southward through Lincoln, where it briefly enters the Upper Montane/Alpine Zone (a region typified by rock outcrops, shallow, acidic soils, and elevations over 760 m) before moving back into the White Mountains/Blue Mountains ecoregion and through the towns of Woodstock, Thornton and Campton. In the southwestern corner of Campton, the project area re-enters the White Mountain Foothills.

The White Mountains project area begins at the northern end of Whitefield and follows existing power corridors south through Dalton, Bethlehem, Sugar Hill, Lincoln and into the northwestern corner of Woodstock, where it meets the Pemigewasset River. Following this waterway, the project area continues south, passing through the town of Thornton terminating at the southern border of Campton. In addition to the Pemigewasset River, the White Mountains project area crosses two major waterways: the Johns River (in Dalton) and the Ammonoosuc River (in Bethlehem and Sugar Hill). Numerous named and unnamed tributaries of the Johns, Ammonoosuc and Pemigewasset Rivers cross the project area in every town of the project area. Although this region is dominated by its rivers, the project area passes by a few small lakes, including Burns Pond (in Whitefield), Forest Lake (in Dalton and Whitefield), and Streeter Pond (in Sugar Hill). The economy of the White Mountains is traditionally linked to these waterways, which facilitated the development of lumbering and industrial enterprises. Today these rivers and streams (along with scenic vistas and mountains) are vital resources of the tourism industry, which forms the backbone of the White Mountains economy. Although farming did occur in the valleys and narrow floodplains associated with rivers and streams, agriculture played a much smaller role in this region than in the Lakes Region and Merrimack Valley.

The topography of this region is mountainous, with settlement concentrating in the valleys near major water sources and floodplains. Notable elevations include Ore Hill in Sugar Hill (617 m above mean sea level [amsl]), Cole Hill (806 m amsl) and Garnet Hill (591 m amsl) in Easton. A significant portion of the project is encompassed by the White Mountain National Forest, which covers the majority of the towns of Woodstock, Lincoln, and Easton, as well as sections of
Campton, Holderness, and Bethlehem. Lumber and industrial production has impacted the landscape, most mostly through activities related to logging and the establishment of mills and factories. Soils are variable and include Dixmont very fine sandy loam, very stony (579B) and Peru fine sandy loam (79C) in the White Mountain Foothills to Becket-Skerry association, very stony (701B) and Turnbridge-Lyman-Rock outcrop complex (61E) in the White Mountains/Blue Mountains ecoregion.

19. Historical Background:

Summary

European explorers recorded their views of the White Mountains from the coastline as early as the sixteenth century (Clark 1970, 3). When English settlement began in New England, colonists established towns along the coast and, beginning in the 1640s, sporadically sent parties into the mountains to explore and to look for exploitable natural resources (Bennet 2003, 27). Originally, large land grants were issued to proprietors by the Council for New England, but these territories were often subject to competing claims. New Hampshire operated as a royal colony from 1679 until the War of Independence. Most of the White Mountains project area falls within Grafton County, which was established while New Hampshire was still a royal province. Coos County was created out of the northern part of Grafton County in 1803.

The White Mountains are also home to the Abenaki people. Warfare between English colonists and the French, along with their Abenaki allies, slowed European settlement of the area until after the conclusion of the Seven Years War in 1763 (Calloway 1991, 18). Fishing and the fur trade initially dominated the colonial economy, supplemented by inland agriculture. Timber harvesting became increasingly important and, along with fishing, tied New Hampshire to regional and Atlantic markets (Taylor 2001,175-177). Masts were cut from New Hampshire forests and exported for the construction of British ships, reaching peak production by the mid-eighteenth century (Starbuck 1994, 5).

Harsh weather and rugged terrain hampered early agricultural development in the White Mountains, which relied on arable land for subsistence farming. Lumbering was one of the earliest industries in the region, although it was not until the arrival of the railroad in the mid-nineteenth century that operations became fully successful. Tourism also played a fundamental role in the early economic development of the White Mountains; word of its natural, rugged beauty drew visitors to the area, leading to the establishment of large hotels and boarding houses by the mid-nineteenth century. By the 1830s, the White Mountains was considered a "fashionable" destination for tourists from all over the United States (Brown 1995, 41). In addition, writers and painters came to the White Mountains to be inspired by the idyllic scenery. Famous American authors who visited the mountains such as Nathaniel Hawthorne and Henry David Thoreau, as well as painters like Thomas Cole, helped to shape the cultural landscape of the region through their work.

The value of tourism grew exponentially after the Civil War, as the emerging middle class utilized their growing amount of leisure time and income for recreational activities (Carlson 1938, 255). The White Mountains were advertised as a haven for those suffering from hay fever,
and urban dwellers flocked to the rural region, often staying for months at a time (Child 1886, 159). From the nineteenth century on, the appeal of the White Mountains has depended upon its pristine setting—tourists wishing to escape the industrialized urban landscape could explore scenic mountain vistas with help from readily available guidebooks. The influx of tourists, coupled with industrialized lumber extraction, brought new wealth to the White Mountains.

The conservation movement played a significant role in the history of the White Mountains. Industrialization and unregulated timber harvesting spurred Progressive-era reformers to work towards conserving natural resources across the United States, and in New Hampshire these reformers successfully influenced policy (Jarvis 2007, 58-59). The Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests (SPNHF), founded in 1901, and the Appalachian Mountain Club (AMC), founded in 1876, were active in securing the passage of the Weeks Act in 1911. This act was introduced by Senator John Weeks of Massachusetts (born in Lancaster, NH) and it allowed the federal government to purchase land in the White Mountains for conservation. As a result, the White Mountains National Forest was established in 1918. While this limited the operations of lumber companies, it also increased the area’s revenue from tourism (Johnson 2006, 240).

By the early twentieth century, the opulence of the nineteenth-century vacation had been replaced by roadside motels, cabins, and campgrounds, as the trend of American tourism shifted from weeks-long vacations to weekend trips and getaways. Hiking clubs blazed trails through the White Mountains beginning in the late nineteenth century; some of these trails later became part of the New Hampshire section of the Appalachian Trail. The Great Depression curtailed the region’s economy during the 1930s, but public works projects like the Civilian Conservation Corps put people to work and created new recreational trails (Bennet 2003, 144). Increasing interest in winter recreation spurred the growth of ski resorts, and the attraction of northern New England’s fall foliage ensures the continuing popularity of the White Mountains as a tourist destination in the twenty-first century.

Village Development

Eighteenth-century settlement in New Hampshire was largely constrained by reliable water sources and arable soils. Undeveloped tracts of land were granted to proprietors anxious to invest in frontier settlements, although the terms of such grants often went unfulfilled and were subsequently re-granted. The first settlers to northern New Hampshire farmed and logged the valleys and floodplains of rivers such as the Connecticut, Pemigewasset, and Ammonoosuc, relying on subsistence agriculture and timber harvesting to survive the often bitter winters. Early settlements required self-sufficiency, which often entailed the construction of a sawmill and gristmill, and a resident blacksmith and minister (Hamilton 1951, 30). Rivers and brooks powered the mills, and the earliest clusters of settlement were often located near these waterways (Hamilton 1951, 30). As the population of these areas grew, transportation routes (such as turnpikes, and later, railroads) linked early communities, and town centers began to develop in response to the diversifying economy (Black 1950, 237).

The town of Jefferson, originally granted in 1765 as Dartmouth, re-granted in 1772, and incorporated in 1796 as Jefferson, was named for Thomas Jefferson (Fogg 1874, 207; Davis 1888, 399; Town of Jefferson 2015, 1). The first settlers arrived in 1773, and by 1800 the town
boasted a population of 112 (Coolidge and Mansfield 159, 86; Davis 1888, 403). Mountains prevented development of the northwest and southern corners of the town, but settlers filled the Israel River floodplain at the foot of Starr King Mountain (Hurd 1892; Walling 1861). Several small villages developed over the course of the town’s history (Jefferson Mills, Jefferson Highlands, and Meadows) with Jefferson Center being the largest (Davis 1888, 419; Walling 1861).

Strategically situated at the confluence of the Johns and Connecticut Rivers, Dalton was first granted in 1764 under the name of Chiswick (Switser 1979, 34). Re-granted as Apthorp in 1770, the town achieved its present shape and name when Apthorp was divided into the towns of Littleton and Dalton in 1784 (Kilbourne 1916, 57). Throughout much of the nineteenth century, the population of Dalton was spread along the banks of its two major waterways, the Connecticut and the Johns Rivers. A small village center grew south of the junction of these rivers, but the economy remained focused on agriculture, timber harvesting, and sheep farming until the arrival of timber magnates James and David Summer c. 1820 (Merrill 1888a, 527; Switster 1979, 35; Townshend 1979, 11). A second village developed along the Johns River and the railroad, which exists today as a small cluster of residences and businesses.

The town of Whitefield was chartered in 1774 and incorporated in 1804, although settlement of the area did not begin until shortly before 1810, when the census shows a population of 51 (Burns 1984, 21; Merrill 1888c, 447). Agriculture was the primary employment, although the town also boasted at least one sawmill and gristmill, a potash factory, a store, and an inn within a few decades of settlement (Merrill 1888c, 461-463). Whitefield Village, near the western border with Dalton and conveniently situated on the banks of the Johns River, developed as the primary economic center and continues in this role today. Littleton was originally granted in 1764 under the name Chiswick and also included what would become the town of Dalton. It was re-granted in 1770 as Apthorp, then divided in 1784 and incorporated (along with Dalton) under its present name (Child 1886, 460; Fogg 1874, 23). Settlement commenced c. 1774, and concentrated along the Ammonoosuc and Connecticut Rivers (Fogg 1874, 230). The fertile soil and abundant water power of Littleton led to rapid population growth and the establishment of industrial and residential villages, including Littleton Center, Scythe Factory Village, Pattenville, Willowdale, and Glynville (Coolidge and Mansfield 1859, 91; Hurd 1892; Walling 1860).

The town of Bethlehem was first chartered as Lloyd Hills in 1774, but was never settled under that name (NHES 2014a, 1). The first settlers arrived in 1790, and the town was officially incorporated as Bethlehem in December of 1799 (Kilbourne 1916, 60). Despite the rocky, unforgiving terrain, Bethlehem grew rapidly, achieving a population of 171 by 1800 (NHES 2014a, 1; Sweetser 1876, 165-166). Additional land was annexed to the town in 1849 and 1873 (Child 1886, 157). As in other New Hampshire towns, subsistence farming was the first occupation of Bethlehem’s earliest residents, who largely settled in an area near Mt. Agassiz known as Bethlehem Village. Other villages in Bethlehem included Maplewood, Pierce’s Bridge, and Wing Road (Hurd 1892).

Franconia was chartered twice – first as the town of Franconia in 1764, and again as Morristown in 1772 (Coolidge and Mansfield 1859, 496; Fogg 1874, 160; Kilbourne 1916, 58).
Although the first settlement commenced in 1774, competing legal claims between the two groups of proprietors hampered early development. In 1782, the claim of the original grantees was recognized, and the town was officially incorporated as Franconia (Child 1886, 269; Julyan and Julyan 1993, 56). The rugged nature of the territory prohibited early growth, and the first census in 1790 listed only 72 residents (Child 1886, 269; Julyan and Julyan 1993, 56; NHES 2014b, 1). Settlement concentrated in the eastern portion of the village, with two clusters of homesteads and businesses springing up around early iron ore mining operations.

**Sugar Hill** is New Hampshire’s youngest town, incorporated in 1962 from the larger town of Lisbon. Until its incorporation, Sugar Hill was a major village within Lisbon known for its maple sugar production and iron mining (Child 1888, 439; Sweetser 1876, 256). The separation of Lisbon and Sugar Hill in 1962 was undertaken on the basis that the town center of Lisbon and the village of Sugar Hill were sufficiently distant and had conflicting (but unspecified) economic interests (Wescott et al. 1962, 1). Sugar Hill Village, now the town center, is located just north of Mt. Lookoff and Ore Hill, with more rural settlement occurring along the South Branch of the Ammonoosuc River.

**Lisbon** was first granted in 1763 as the town of Concord, then again the following year as the town of Chiswick. Failure to settle the land led to a third granting, this time as the town of Gunthwaite (Child 1886, 434-435). Settlement began at various stages according to the three separate grants, leading to a legal controversy in 1787 which resulted in the name being changed a fourth time, again to Concord. This led to problems of identification with the capital of New Hampshire, and the name was finally changed in 1824 to Lisbon (Child 1886, 435; Fogg 1874, 228). Early settlement concentrated in the eastern part of town along the Ammonoosuc River and its numerous tributaries, with a second, significant development centered around Sugar Hill in the west (Fogg 1874, 227). The current boundaries of Lisbon were largely created by the annexation of a portion of Landaff in 1859 and the separation of the Sugar Hill community as its own town in 1962 (Child 1886, 435; Wescott et al. 1962, 1).

The first grant for **Landaff** was made in 1764, but forfeited when the terms of the charter were not met. It was re-granted to Dartmouth College in 1770, at which point settlement began to arrive in the area; however, after the end of the War of Independence, the original grantees claimed that their forfeiture had been illegal. This claim was sustained in court, and the town was re-granted to the original grantees (Child 1886, 396-397; Fogg 1874, 219). Settlement in Landaff was divided along Mill Brook in the west and the Ham Branch River in the east, with two corresponding town centers. In 1876, the town was formally split, with the village of Eastern Landaff becoming Easton (Child 1886, 397). A second small village, Whitcherville, developed in the southeastern corner of town following the split with Easton (Hurd 1892).

**Easton** was formed from the town of Landaff in 1876; previously the land was part of a disputed area between Landaff and neighboring Lincoln claimed under competing 1764 grants (Child 1886, 240). Lincoln Gore, the earliest settlement in modern Easton, was established in 1782 and originally part of Lincoln. When this area became part of Landaff in 1816, the village was renamed Eastern Landaff, from which the name Easton was later derived (Child 1886, 396). This village, and other early settlement in Easton, concentrated along the Ham Branch River east of
Cole Hill, with a second village, Wildwood, developing in the late nineteenth century near the southwest corner along the Wild Ammonoosuc River.

The town of Lincoln was granted in 1764 and named for the Earl of Lincoln; incorporation followed in 1782 (Lloyd 2014). The "extremely rough and mountainous character" of Lincoln inhibited early attempts at settlement, and by 1790, the first village of Lincoln, Lincoln Gore, had attained a population of only 22 (Child 1886, 433; Town of Lincoln 1964, 4). In 1816, this village was determined to be part of the town of Landaff and the town government of Lincoln was dissolved, leaving the area virtually uninhabited (Lloyd 2014, 3). Following the loss of its town center, Lincoln remained only sparsely settled for the majority of the nineteenth century. In 1892, the industrialist J. E. Henry bought up most of the town and built mills, houses, and railroads for his logging (and later paper) business (Heffernan and Stecker 1996, 160). The rugged landscape hampered early agriculture, although historic accounts describe it as a "fine field for the sportsman" (Coolidge and Mansfield 1859, 90). Early tourism to the area fueled the growth of a small community along the banks of the Pemigewasset, which still exists today.

Woodstock was first chartered as Peeling in 1763. It was re-granted in 1771 as Fairfield, and granted a third time as Peeling in 1773, when the first settlers arrived to the new town (Fogg 1874, 380; Parker 1985, 10). It achieved its current name in 1840 (Kilbourne 1916, 62). Early settlement concentrated in the northeast corner of the town in the more fertile soils along Pemigewasset River, particularly near confluences with Moosilauke Brook, Glover Brook, Beaver Brook, and Hubbard Brook (Hurd 1892). The western part of the town has remained largely undeveloped, and today is part of the White Mountain National Forest.

Thornton was granted twice, in 1763 and again in 1768, although the first settlers did not arrive until 1770 (Child 1886, 625). The boundaries of Thornton were repeatedly altered until 1867, with Woodstock and Campton both annexing significant portions of the township and Thornton adding the territories of Blanchard’s Gore and Waterville Gore (Child 1886, 826). Settlement in Thornton concentrated along several river valleys, including the Pemigewasset River, Mill Brook, Mad River, and Eastman Brook. Development in Thornton concentrates around loosely connected farming communities, which included Thornton Street, Thornton Center, West Thornton, Thornton Gore, Knocker’s Hole, Millbrook, Ghost Hollow, Groggy Harbor, Mad River, Good Hollow, Chickenboro, and Sandwich Notch (Kilbourne 1916, 66; Town of Thornton 2013, 3). Settlement patterns in Thornton have remained largely unchanged since the nineteenth century, and the same river valleys are home to the majority of inhabitants.

The first settlers to Campton arrived in 1762, and the town was incorporated in 1767. The fertile floodplains of the Pemigewasset, Beebe and Mad Rivers aided early population growth, which reached 396 in 1790 (Child 1886, 198-200). In addition to agricultural fields, the nearby rivers provided an important source of power for local industry. By the mid-nineteenth century, villages had grown up around early mill sites, including Campton Village, West Campton, Livermore Falls, and Campton Hollow. These villages continue to a lesser extent today, with most of the population concentrated near historic Campton Village and the confluence of the Mad and Pemigewasset Rivers (now also the intersection of NH Rte 49 and I-93).
Transportation

The earliest reliable transportation routes in the White Mountains were the region’s rivers: the Johns, Ammonoosuc, Gale, and Pemigewasset. Natural corridors through the mountains, long utilized by the Abenaki, also served as routes into the interior for the first settlers (Garvin and Garvin 1988, 39). Modern routes 3, 49, 116, and 302 in the White Mountains at least partially follow portions of regional trails as recorded by Price (1958). The discovery of Crawford’s Notch by Timothy Nash and Benjamin Sawyer in 1771 was a landmark find which provided a navigable land route to the picturesque and fertile Ammonoosuc River Valley (Bennett 2003, 41).

In addition to settling families and clearing land, building a road was a common requirement for early town grants. Often this project was undertaken by the settlers themselves, assisted by government surveyors who blazed trails through the wilderness between each settlement (Garvin and Garvin 1988, 40). Natural impediments to road construction – mountainous terrain, weather, wetlands, rivers, etc. – meant such projects could take years to complete (Garvin and Garvin 1988, 39). Contemporary records noted the collection of taxes for the maintenance of these routes and the construction of bridges to replace the early ferries (e.g. Child 1886; Hurd 1885). The earliest bridges were temporary and constructed of wood; population growth and increased commerce led to more permanent, covered bridges. Later types in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries included metal truss and suspension bridges (Knoblock 2012, 2).

The turnpike system in New Hampshire was established by an act of the legislature in 1796 which incorporated the First New Hampshire Turnpike, connecting the seacoast with Concord (Lyford 1896, 299-300). Turnpike charters required a road to be 66 feet wide and permitted the collection of tolls based on distance. After a specified amount of time (which varied by charter) a turnpike could then be bought by the state or other public agency for use as a public road (Garvin and Garvin 1988, 53). These turnpikes were typically an improvement over town roads in that they were usually more direct and better maintained. Eighty-one more turnpikes were commissioned in New Hampshire, including eight in the White Mountains: the Tenth New Hampshire Turnpike, Pemigewasset Middle Branch Turnpike, Pemigewasset Turnpike, Upper Coos Turnpike, Franconia Turnpike, Coos in New Hampshire Turnpike, White Mountains Turnpike, and Lincoln Turnpike (Wood 1919). Most notable among these is the Tenth New Hampshire Turnpike, an ambitious project undertaken in 1803 to connect the city of Portland, Maine and the state of Vermont. The turnpike famously led through Crawford’s Notch and Nash and Sawyer’s Location (later part of Carroll) (Farmer et al. 1823, 16). The establishment of this road facilitated access to the picturesque and rugged scenery of the White Mountains, directly leading to the development of tourism in the region (Wood 1919, 225).

Although canals were a popular means of transportation in the southern reaches of the state by the early nineteenth century, major canal-building was neither popular nor practical in the White Mountains (Garvin and Garvin 1988, 60). Mill owners likely built canals to serve their individual purposes, but no substantial routes connecting major cities were ever constructed. Already afforded with numerous rivers and streams, the natural waterways of the White Mountains were sufficient for the purposes of local lumber and industrial companies.
The arrival of the railroad to the White Mountains in the mid-nineteenth century effected substantial changes in the region. Tourism flourished, with travelers now afforded an easy way to access the region, without having to rely on muddy, uncomfortable roads. Goods, such as lumber and minerals, flowed quickly to markets in the south. Economic prosperity for nineteenth-century towns was tied (at least partially) to railroad access. The White Mountain Railroad (1853) was the first rail line to serve the White Mountain region, but by 1874 it was leased by the Boston, Concord and Montreal (BC&M) Railroad network (Heald 2007, 49; Hostutler 1996; Mausolf 2002, 3). The end of the Civil War stimulated railroad development and spurs of larger lines (such as the Whitefield and Jefferson branch) spread out to connect smaller communities, factories, tourist attractions, and industrialized areas (Hurd 1892; Mausolf 2002, 3).

The end of the nineteenth century marked a tumultuous period in railroad history; although lines continued to spread across the state, ownership regularly changed hands. In 1889 the BC&M merged with the Concord Railroad; in 1895, it consolidated with the Boston and Maine (B&M) (Hostutler 1996, 8; Mausolf 2002, 4). Although railroads continued their dominance into the twentieth century, the Great Depression, coupled with the invention of the automobile led to a steady decline in both freight shipments and passenger service (Wallace and Mausolf 2001, 50-51). Passenger rail service to the White Mountains ceased by the 1960s, and freight service ended in the 1980s (Hostutler 1996, 9).

The rise of the automobile and airplane travel again revolutionized transportation in the White Mountain region. Historic roadways were adapted to handle the heavier flow of traffic, and new routes were constructed. By the 1930s, the automobile had firmly established itself as the transportation mode of choice, and this is reflected in the growing number of motels, motor courts, and rental cabins (Ewald 2003). The modern New Hampshire interstate system was born in the mid-twentieth century, following the National Interstate and Defense Highways Act of 1956 which established a national road system (Weingroff 2011).

Small-scale aviation in the White Mountains is primarily recreation- or tourism-based, with no major airports in the area. The Mount Washington Regional Airport was originally a converted polo field in Whitefield. The land was donated in 1947 by Frank Dodge, an operator for one of the Grand Hotels (AirNAV 2015; Mount Washington Airport 2012). The Franconia Airport was established in 1946 for the purpose of providing air transport for a nearby defense production plant (Atlantic Flyer 2013). Although the plant is no longer in existence, the airport survives as home to the Franconia Soaring Association, which offers seasonal rides, introductory lessons, and rentals (AirNAV 2015; Franconia Soaring Association 2015).

**Agriculture**

The first European settlers in the White Mountains were primarily focused on subsistence agriculture, constructing homesteads in the fertile river valleys of the Connecticut, Ammonoosuc, and Pemigewasset Rivers in areas historically known as intervales (Lawson 2006, 107). As the population grew, so did the prevalence of agriculture, with New Hampshire reaching a peak of over 300,000 farms by the mid-nineteenth century (Collins 1990, 1). Production varied by town, and principal crops in the project area included Indian corn, potatoes, hay, wool, maple sugar, and buckwheat (Hayward 1849).
Unlike other parts of New Hampshire where agriculture remained the primary economic force for much of the nineteenth century, the rugged nature of the White Mountains offered other opportunities for employment, such as lumbering and tourism. This is reflected in Fogg’s (1874) gazetteer of New Hampshire which lists at least three towns in the project area (Franconia, Lincoln, and Whitefield) whose economies were more reliant on tourism and industry than they were on agriculture. Not coincidentally, these towns feature more mountainous terrain than other towns in the White Mountains.

The development of the railroad system after the Civil War led to a national east-west shift in agricultural production. The speed of trains allowed for products such as hay and corn to be shipped from a greater distance without spoiling. New Hampshire farmers adapted, focusing their efforts on dairying and poultry production, which could not be so easily transported (Jager 2004, 34; Townsend 1979, 12). By the late nineteenth century and into the early twentieth century, creameries were springing up all over the region, such as the Portland Creamery Company in Jefferson (Evans 1927, 276). However, the demise of agriculture in New Hampshire had begun; by 1930, barely eleven percent of the state’s residents were still employed in the farming industry. This decline has continued, and today agricultural production in the state has been relegated to the economic margins (Jager 2004, 44).

Industry

Manufacturing in Jefferson centered on the lumber industry. Jefferson’s numerous waterways and natural forests offered dozens of sites for the conversion of raw timber into boards and shingles. At least twelve sawmills operated there in the nineteenth century, most of them owned by local men (Evans 1927, 261-267). The Brown Lumber Company, although based in Whitefield, operated a large sawmill in Jefferson as well as a combination rail station, store, and post office (Evans 1927, 273). In the 1870s, the production of Jefferson’s sawmills was valued at about $46,500, by far the most lucrative exported product in town (Fogg 1874, 207). Other industrial endeavors included the manufacture of potato starch and dairy products, with a creamery established in 1910 by the Portland Creamery Company. (Evans 1927, 276; Fogg 1874, 207).

As in Jefferson, the lumber industry formed the backbone of Whitefield’s economy throughout the nineteenth century. The 1840s and 1850s saw a number of lumber companies established, including the White Mountain Lumber Co. (c. 1852) and G. W. & N. W. Libbey (c. 1840) (Merrill 1888c, 486-487). The most prominent of these corporations was A. L. & G. W. Brown Company, which grew to be the largest lumber establishment in the state by the 1870s (Fogg 1874, 369). In 1873, the sawmills of Whitefield produced approximately 19.9 million feet of long timber, of which 60 percent was produced by the Brown Company. Smaller industries included potato starch production, wool carding, gristmills, and the company of Snow & Baker, who produced the “celebrated” Whitefield railroad overalls (Merrill 1888c, 488).

Industry in Dalton consisted of a few private lumbering enterprises and sawmills concentrated along the Johns River and a couple of small streams (e.g. Cushman Brook), while agriculture persisted as the economic backbone of the town. Small-scale milling operations included Cushman’s sawmill and gristmill, a sawmill owned by Hare and Murray, and Wilder’s fulling
mill (Merrill 1888a, 53). Although Dalton was not home to any major lumbering enterprise (see Whitefield), in 1873, it did produce over 3.5 million feet of lumber (Fogg 1874, 123). Additionally, the town manufactured 125 tons of potato starch, a common product in northern New Hampshire (Fogg 1874, 123).

One of the earliest industries in Littleton was the manufacture of potash from the acres of forest cut down and burned during the establishment of homesteads in the late eighteenth century (Child 1886, 465-466). Small-scale sawmill and gristmill operations satisfied local needs for lumber and flour; however, industry in Littleton remained primarily at the subsistence level until the arrival of the railroad in 1853 (Child 1886, 466; Town of Littleton 2004, 53). Industrial activity concentrated along the Concord & Montreal railroad line, which paralleled the Ammonoosuc River. In addition to several lumbering enterprises, factories and mills in Littleton produced paper boxes, scythes, carriage and sleighs, gloves, stone products, bobbins, stereoscopic views, woolens, shoes, furniture, washing machines, sashes, doors, and blinds (Child 1886, 469-470; Fogg 1874, 229). By the late nineteenth century, 33 industrial establishments were located in Littleton and it was ranked third in Grafton County for the value of its manufactures (Child 1886, 470; Fogg 1874, 229).

Industry in Bethlehem concentrated in the northern half of the town, within the valley formed by the Ammonoosuc River. Sawmills and gristmills lined the river banks and employed 100 residents (Fogg 1874, 68). By the mid-nineteenth century, Bethlehem was the most industrially productive town in the project area, with exports valued at approximately $68,300 (Hayward 1849, 35). Timber was the town’s most lucrative business, with over 1.3 million clapboards, 1.9 million shingles and 8.8 million feet of boards produced in 1873 (Fogg 1874, 68). Child, writing in 1886 (1886, 162-163), also lists a cider mill and carriage shop among Bethlehem’s industrial enterprises.

The catalyst for early population growth in the town of Franconia was the discovery of a major vein of iron ore (in nearby Lisbon, later Sugar Hill) and the subsequent establishment of the New Hampshire Iron Factory in 1805 along the Ham Branch River (Coolidge and Mansfield 1859, 497; Garvin 2009b, 1; Hayward 1839). This was joined by a second foundry, the Haverhill and Franconia Iron Works, in 1808 (Garvin 2009b, 2). At peak production, the two foundries produced about 250 tons of pig iron and 200 to 300 tons of bar iron, employed between 20 and 30 men (Coolidge and Mansfield 1859, 497; Fogg 1874, 160). Although both foundries were closed by 1865, Franconia had other industrial enterprises, such as Stephen Eaton & Co.’s bobbin factory and sawmill (c. 1875), W. A. Brooks’ saw and shingle-mill, Brooks & Whitney’s gristmill (c. 1857) and Kendall’s steam gristmill (c. 1855) (Child 1886, 269; Garvin 2009b, 14-15).

Historical industrial activity in Sugar Hill mostly concerned the vein of iron discovered in Ore Hill during the late eighteenth century, which was exploited by the New Hampshire Iron Factory in Franconia (Garvin 2009b, 1; Russack 2011). In addition to the extraction of iron ore, timber in the Sugar Hill area was cut and shipped to more industrial centers in Franconia and Lisbon Village for processing, with few mills constructed within the boundaries of modern Sugar Hill (Fogg 1874, 227). A few shoe shops, a blacksmith, and carriage shop were located in the village
of Sugar Hill in the 1870s, but agriculture and tourism remained the driving forces in its economy (Fogg 1874, 227).

Most manufacturing in Lisbon took place in Lisbon Village, located on the Ammonoosuc River and conveniently accessed by the Boston, Concord & Montreal Railroad (Fogg 1874, 226). In addition to traditional sawmills and gristmills, Lisbon was home to a variety of factories, including the Parker & Young Manufacturing Company (the world’s largest manufacturer of piano sounding boards), Charles Mindt (shoe pegs), and the Lisbon marble works (Child 1886, 442; Town of Lisbon 2015). J. K. Atwood and Company (c. 1854), also based in Lisbon, was the most prolific bobbin company in New England, producing 16 million bobbins every year (Child 1886, 442). Lisbon also had a small mining industry; in addition to iron ore (see Sugar Hill and Franconia), Lisbon’s hills were mined for gold, quartz and limestone (Fogg 1874, 226). One particular type of quartz was pulverized for use as a nineteenth-century plant fertilizer known as “Stevens’ Mineral Fertilizer” (Fogg 1874, 226).

Landaff’s industrial output was largely relegated to lumbering, the production of potato starch, and bobbin manufacture (Fogg 1874, 219; Lobdell 2015). With the exception of lumber mills, most of the factories and mills in Landaff were established in the 1880s or later, such as the Cogswell Brothers chair-stock and bobbin factory (c. 1872), Edson E. Merrill’s spruce oil distillery (c. 1884) or H. D. Burbank’s bobbin factory (c. 1883) (Child 1886, 398). Although Landaff is crossed by several small streams (most notably Mill Brook in the north), agriculture remained the most lucrative business.

Easton, a part of Landaff until 1876, developed slowly until the arrival of the railroad, which facilitated extraction of its vast natural timber resources (Town of Easton 2010, 27). By the late nineteenth century, lumbering was the sole industrial enterprise, although at least two sawmills also produced bobbins (Child 1886, 241). Two village centers developed around the sawmills: Easton Village on the Ham Branch River and Wildwood along the Wild Ammonoosuc River (Child 1886, 240, Hurd 1892). Child (1886, 240-241) lists seven sawmills in Easton, which altogether produced approximately 2.8 million feet of lumber annually. The largest of these mills, Easton Lumber Company, was located at Wildwood and produced over half of the lumber manufactured in Easton (Child 1886, 240).

Industry in Lincoln was relatively limited throughout the nineteenth century, hampered by a low population (66 in 1880) and no railroad access before 1892 (Child 1886, 443; Hurd 1892). No village center existed, and the only company listed by Child (1886, 434) is the Dolloff & Hanson Brothers bobbin and chair stock factory, which manufactured approximately 600,000 bobbins annually. Lincoln's lumber industry did not truly begin until the arrival of timber magnate J. E. Henry in 1892 (Lloyd 2014, 5). Under Henry’s supervision, Lincoln grew from a town of disconnected homesteads to a town of 541 residents in 1900 with a company store, barn, blacksmith shop, harness shop, and railroad (Lloyd 2014, 8; Taylor 1993, 7). The economic boom was fueled by the establishment by Henry of the largest mill in the state of New Hampshire, which operated in some capacity until 1980 (Taylor 1993, 31).
Lumbering was the primary industrial endeavor in Woodstock. The town’s naturally hilly terrain prevented significant agricultural development, and residents naturally turned to logging as a lucrative alternative (Child 1886, 641; Fogg 1874, 381). Small-scale sawmills sprung up along at least 15 of its 25 streams and included the mills of J. M & W. N. Moulton (c. 1870), Curtis L. Parker (c. 1854), and Enoch M. Gordon (c. 1866) (Child 1886, 642; Parker 1985, 10). Other local industries included Joseph W. Campbell’s tannery (c. 1854), a starch mill, textile production, and lead mining (Brown 1975, 9). The arrival of the Pemigewasset Valley Railroad in 1883 facilitated the extraction of raw timber, which was used by Norcross Saunders & Company and The New Hampshire Land Company (Russack 2014). Logging in Woodstock continued into the twentieth century until the emergence of the conservation movement, which resulted in large tracts of Woodstock being purchased by the White Mountain National Forest (Russack 2014). A major forest fire in 1915 further depleted the available timber resources in Woodstock, leading to the bankruptcy of the Woodstock Lumber Company (Russack 2014).

Agriculture formed the backbone of Thornton’s economy; the population concentrated along the banks of the Pemigewasset and Mad Rivers, but these were valued for their fertile soils, not as a power source for industrial pursuits. Small sawmills and gristmills, necessary for subsistence in the nineteenth century, were constructed on some of the smaller streams, but no large businesses ever really took root in Thornton. Local mills included one gristmill, two sawmills and a single bobbin shop (Child 1886, 627-628). Large-scale lumber extraction activities in the twentieth century did impact Thornton, and a substantial amount of local timber was cut and shipped on log drives to mills in Massachusetts, although this was quickly curtailed when the White Mountain National Forest bought approximately half of the land in Thornton after its establishment in 1918 (Gengras 1988, 8).

Campton’s numerous waterways, including the Pemigewasset and Mad Rivers, facilitated a bustling and diverse industrial sector in the nineteenth century. These included the Mad River or Dole Woolen Mill, Winnipesaukee Paper Company (c. 1890s), a fish hatchery, tannery, several shingle mills, gristmills, a furniture factory, bobbin mill, and the Campton Electric Light Company by 1899 (Child 1886, 199, Federal Writers Project 1938, 321, State of New Hampshire 1907, 83, Stockwell 2010, 2). The Dole Woolen Mill was particularly famous for its Campton Pants, known for their durability (Fogg 1874, 80, Russack 2014). By 1917, the Parker Young Company of Boston had built New Hampshire’s second-largest timber mill in Campton along the Beebe River, which lasted until 1942 (Campton Historical Society nd, 1).

Recreation

Recreation and tourism in the White Mountain region developed much sooner than in other areas of New Hampshire. The earliest tavern licenses are recorded in 1811 (Franconia) and 1828 (Thornton) (Bennett 2003, 81, Child 1886, 401, 489). As word of the White Mountains’ natural beauty spread and the first tourists arrived, roadside taverns gave way to hotels. The dual discoveries of natural formations such as the Old Man in the Mountain (1805) and the Flume (1808) in Franconia sparked the first waves of tourism to the White Mountains. Other notable attractions in the area included Profile Lake, the Basin (a natural stone formation), the Notch (also known as Crawford’s Notch), and Mt. Washington (Kilbourne 1916, 122). In addition to
these natural wonders, the region eventually became known as a haven for those suffering from hay fever. Bethlehem, in particular, was referred to as a “sneezer’s paradise” (Child 1886, 159).

The 1830s marked the birth of New Hampshire’s Grand Resort Hotels. Although most of these would not reach their full potential until the second half of the nineteenth century, at least two were built at this time: the Mount Lafayette House in Franconia (1835) and the Mount Washington (later Fabyan) House in nearby Carroll (1837), which replaced a teamster inn of 1803 (Coolidge and Mansfield 1859, 683; Child 1886, 269; Julyan and Julyan 1993, 52). The emergence of the middle class following the Civil War and the construction of railroads deep into the White Mountains facilitated the boom of tourism in the late nineteenth century. Hotels are recorded in nearly every town in the project area, most constructed between 1850 and 1900 and ranging anywhere in size from 25 to 500 in guest capacity (Child 1886; Merrill 1888b). Other Grand Resort Hotels include the Profile House (1852; Franconia) and the Mountain View House (1866; Whitefield) (Bennet 2003, 94; Kilbourne 1916, 162). A small number of the very rich built private estates, such as The Rocks (NR 84003197) and Felsengarten (NR 73002296), both in Bethlehem, and both listed on the National Register of Historic Places (Garvin 1984, 8-1; Schulze 1973, 7-1). In particular, tourism became an especially vital economic force for Bethlehem, Franconia, and Lincoln; in 1873, the tourism revenue for each of these towns outpaced agricultural output (Fogg 1874).

The tourism industry grew exponentially in the nineteenth century at the same time as industrialized timber harvesting was increasing its reach across the White Mountains (Jarvis 2007, 62). As a result, the conservation movement sought to preserve forests in the White Mountains and the White Mountains National Forest was established in 1918. The preservation of New Hampshire’s natural resources ensured the survival of the growing tourism and recreation based economy.

The Appalachian Trail, a National Scenic Trail, extends 2,174 miles from Georgia to Maine. The New Hampshire portion of the trail runs approximately 161 miles, mostly through the White Mountains. The Appalachian Mountain Club (AMC), founded in 1876, constructed a system of trails and huts through the White Mountains which later became part of the Appalachian Trail. In 1921, Benton MacKaye published a proposal for the Appalachian Trail project in the *Journal of the American Institute of Architects* (King 2000, 3). Finding numerous supporters, MacKaye organized an Appalachian Trail Conference (ATC) in 1925 to begin to coordinate the completion of the monumental task, which culminated with the opening of the trail in 1937 (King 2000, 6 and 11). At its initial 1925 meeting, the ATC chose New Hampshire’s Mount Washington as the northern terminus for the Appalachian Trail, although the trail terminus later expanded northward to Mount Katahdin in Maine (King 2000, 7). In 1932, the New Hampshire trail became the first completed portion of the Appalachian Trail in any state (Macinko 1971, 3). In 1968, the trail came under the authority of the National Park Service and was designated a National Scenic Trail (Olmstead Center 2008, 3). The Trail is used for a number of recreational activities including hiking, camping, and educational programs.

The Great Depression, the construction of roads (and later highways), the advent of the automobile, and the resultant decline of passenger rail service changed tourism in the White
Mountains. Rather than spend weeks or even months at private estates, resorts, or boarding houses, visitors to the White Mountains were more likely to patronize smaller hotels and the growing recreation industry than in decades past. Affordable roadside cabins, motels, and campgrounds were quickly constructed throughout the region (Ewald 2003).

The Appalachian Trail, a National Scenic Trail, extends 2,174 miles from Georgia to Maine. The New Hampshire portion of the trail runs approximately 161 miles, mostly through the White Mountains. The Appalachian Mountain Club (AMC), founded in 1876, constructed a system of trails and huts through the White Mountains which later became part of the Appalachian Trail. In 1921, Benton McKaye published a proposal for the Appalachian Trail project in the Journal of the American Institute of Architects (King 2000, 3). Finding numerous supporters, MacKaye organized an Appalachian Trail Conference (ATC) in 1925 to begin to coordinate the completion of the monumental task, which culminated with the opening of the trail in 1937 (King 2000, 6 and 11). At its initial 1925 meeting, the ATC chose New Hampshire’s Mount Washington as the northern terminus for the Appalachian Trail, although the trail terminus later expanded northward to Mount Katahdin in Maine (King 2000, 7). In 1932, the New Hampshire trail became the first completed portion of the Appalachian Trail in any state (Macinko 1971, 3). In 1968, the trail came under the authority of the National Park Service and was designated a National Scenic Trail (Olmstead Center 2008, 3). The Trail is used for a number of recreational activities including hiking, camping, and educational programs.

A growing national interest in winter sports, particularly skiing, helped the White Mountains transition from the glory days of the Grand Resort Hotels. Although summer sports such as hiking, boating, and fishing remain important staples of White Mountain tourism, small resorts achieved success and staved off closure by offering winter recreational activities such as bob-sledding, snowshoeing, tobogganing, and skiing. The first American ski-school was established in 1929 in Sugar Hill by Robert and Kate Peckett, proprietors of the Peckett’s-on-Sugar-Hill resort (March 2007, 81, 83-84). Other ski resorts in operation today include the Loon Mountain Ski Resort in Lincoln, Sunset Hill Nordic Center in Sugar Hill, Franconia Village Cross Country Ski Center, and Cannon Ski Resort in Franconia (SkiNH 2015).

Public and Educational Institutions
In addition to setting lots for homesteads, early town surveyors in New Hampshire would set aside one additional lot to be developed for public buildings, such as a meetinghouse. Often the first civil building in a town, meetinghouses were multi-functional, serving as churches, social gathering spaces, and locations for town meetings. As settlement increased, the need for more specialized buildings developed, and churches, libraries, and schools were constructed. Church services were typically held in homesteads or barns until the congregation had reached sufficient size that it could afford to construct a church. In some cases, land or materials might be donated. For example, in Bethlehem, a wealthy Boston benefactor donated the land for the Congregationalists’ church, as long as they funded the actual construction (Child 1886, 168).

The construction of dedicated school buildings generally began in the early nineteenth century, as settlers became sufficiently established to move beyond basic subsistence needs. The number and size of schoolhouses grew with the size of the population and varied according to the
physical size of the township. In the White Mountains, the number of common schools in the late nineteenth century ranged from one in Lincoln to fourteen in Campton (Fogg 1874, 81, 226). The length of the school year ranged from seven weeks (Dalton) to 22 weeks (Lincoln) (Fogg 1874, 86, 226). Notable institutions of secondary education within the region were the Landaff High School, Littleton Graded School, and the Dow Academy, which served as Franconia’s high school from 1884 to 1958 (Child 1886, 268, Crosby 1982, 8, Fogg 1874, 520).

The first libraries were usually housed in private residences and maintained by local library associations, such as the Whitefield library, which opened in 1873 (Child 1886, 489). As interest and collections grew, libraries typically expanded to separate buildings. This was the case for the Lisbon Library Association, which housed its 1,570-volume collection in a two story building. Within the project area, this was one of the first libraries to offer free use to town residents (Child 1886, 441).

20. Applicable NHDHR Historic Context(s)

4. The granting of land and towns, 1623-1835.
22. Logging, lumbering and saw mills, 1620-present.
28. Iron smelting and founding, 1715-present.
29. Mineral mining, 1770-present.
44. Machine tool manufacture, 1840-present.
51. Mixed agriculture and the family farm, 1630-present.
53. Grain farming and grist milling, 1650-present.
56. Local-scale dairy farming, 1800-present.
57. Potato farming, 1800-present.
61. Cattle raising and summer pasturing in New Hampshire, c.1850-present.
63. Creamery operations, 1860-present.
70. Summer resort/grand hotel tourism, 1840-1940.
71. New Hampshire as artists’ colony, 1870-present.
73. Summer and vacation home tourism, 1880-present.
76. Winter recreation and the ski industry, 1890-present.
78. Outdoor recreation in New Hampshire.
82. Pre-automobile land travel, 1630-1920.
83. Taverns, inns, hotels, motels, motor courts and bed and breakfasts, 1623-present.
86. The railroads in NH, 1842-1960.
88. Automobile highways and culture, 1900-present.
105. Elementary and secondary education, 1770-present.
107. Local government, 1630-present.
Fighting the Depression in New Hampshire: The CCC, WPA, and other public works programs, 1929-1940.

Social organizations in New Hampshire.

The Grange in New Hampshire, 1870-present.

Cultural and community traditions, practices, arts, and crafts.

Religion in New Hampshire, 1623-present.

Commerce, industry and trade in New Hampshire village and town centers, 1630-present.

Suburban/community growth in New Hampshire, c.1850-present.

The land conservation movement in New Hampshire.

Public and private cemeteries and burials.

Architectural Description and Comparative Evaluation

This section provides a discussion of representative property types identified in the project area and, broadly, an examination of architectural development and landscape changes over time in the White Mountains. It highlights further key architectural and historic above-ground resources that may be affected by the proposed project. Properties discussed in this report are identified by their SEARCH-assigned field numbers (FID-#, e.g., FID-1361, or by previously assigned NHDHR or NRHP numbers (e.g., WHI0007, NR84003197). Photograph or image references in the following sections provide reference to photograph continuation sheets (e.g., Photograph #1).

Residential Resources

No early- to mid-eighteenth century built resources were identified in this investigation. Buildings from this period would have been built of hewn logs and, if extant, would likely have been incorporated in or re-used in renovations (McAlester 1984, 75). However, probable late-eighteenth century, Federal-period buildings were identified within the project area. The Federal, or Adams style, typically features a symmetrical façade, low-pitched gable or hipped roof, and often included a Palladian window centered on the façade. Additionally, semi-circular or elliptical fanlight and sidelights typically framed the entry (Historic New England 2014). One brick Federal style example was located at 951 Highway 175 in Woodstock (FID-1023, Photograph #1). The building has paired end chimneys, a side gable roof, and an infilled fanlight above the centered entryways. Another residential example of the Federal style is located at 388 Highway 175 in Campton (FID-853, Photograph #2). The building has a side gable roof, center brick chimney, a façade that is five bays wide with a centered entry. This entry has an infilled fanlight and sidelights; it is more likely that these lights were open in the original design.

In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, homes were generally timber framed with horizontal exterior clapboards. The fireplace chimney was centered or offset from the center of the building, and the most common of these was the center hall form. Standing two stories tall with a side gable or hipped roof, examples in the White Mountains are typically five or three bays in width and retain some Georgian- or Federal-style architectural details. Georgian architecture in northern New England, similar to the Federal style, often has a symmetrical façade and a side-gabled or hipped roof (Historic New England 2014). Georgian architecture typically does not include a Palladian window, as often seen in Federal examples. Instead this architectural style features decorative entablatures and pilasters that surround the entry. In
addition, Georgian entries more commonly have rectangular transom lights rather than a fanlight. Examples include the Colonel Spencer Inn in Campton (FID-904, Photograph #3), and the residences at 862 Livermore Road in Campton (FID-889, Photograph #4) and 468 Pearl Lake Road in Sugar Hill (FID-1181, Photograph #5). The Pearl Lake Road dwelling is constructed of granite block, a feature that was more commonly seen in Georgian architecture in the mid-Atlantic states (McAlester, 1984, 144). Georgian details on this building include granite lintels over the windows and centered entry, and a simple entablature consisting of a transom and sidelights.

A common building type in New Hampshire from the early nineteenth century through the present is the Cape Cod form (NHDHR Area Form Survey Manual Appendix E, accessed 9/25/2014). These buildings were typically one or one-and-one-half stories in height with a side gabled roof, central or side brick chimneys, and have multi-paned double-hung sash windows. Contemporary examples of the Cape are discussed in following sections of this report. Early nineteenth century examples of the Cape in the project area include the residences at 1842 Highway 175 in Thornton (FID-996, Photograph #6), 293 Daniel Webster Highway in Woodstock (FID-1090, Photograph #7), and 1809 Easton Valley Road in Easton (FID-1130, Photograph #8). A number of early Cape dwellings have been altered, typically with later additions, porches, or dormers. Examples of the varying alterations are seen in 1301 Highway 175 in Campton (FID-955, Photograph #9) and 129 Upper Mad River Road in Thornton (FID-978, Photograph #10). The Campton example has a side porch added, as well as a rear addition. The Thornton residence has been altered with a front porch and one-story addition to the side. Both buildings are further altered with vinyl siding and replacement vinyl windows.

Greek Revival was the dominant style of American domestic architecture from 1830 to 1850 (McAlester 1984, 182). Buildings constructed in this style were typically one-and-one-half story, and most commonly had a front-gabled roof, although a side-gable roof was not uncommon. Hallmark decorative details include cornice returns, wide bands of trim beneath the roof line, corner boards, and entablatures at entryways with a transom or sidelights. Greek Revival dwellings were recorded in nearly every town within the project area, but high-style examples were not observed.

During the 1840s, gable-front residences became synonymous with the Greek Revival style, as they mimicked the façade of a Greek temple. These forms varied in height from either one-and-one-half to two-stories, and typically had centered entries. A residential example, located at 138 Perch Pond Road in Campton (FID-869, Photograph #11), features a closed gable on the façade, which perfectly illustrates the Greek temple that the Greek Revival style tries to replicate. Other vernacular examples of the Greek Revival style include the residences at 54 Highway 175 in Campton (FID-844, Photograph #12), and 72 Elm Street in Whitefield (FID-1363, Photograph #13). Both buildings have gable fronts, mimicking a Greek temple. The residences also feature corner boards along the roofline and sidelights that flank the center entry. The residence at 72 Elm Street in Whitefield has vinyl siding applied, replacing or covering its original wood clapboards.
By the 1850s, the Italianate style of architecture gained popularity in America (McAlester 1984, 211), but this style does not appear to be as prevalent within the project area as the Greek Revival style. Characteristics of this style include a low-pitched or flat roof with widely overhanging eaves and decorative brackets, as well as windows with decorative crowns. Hallmarks of the Italianate style include a square tower and a paired window centered on the upper story of the façade. Examples within the project area include those at 268 Profile Road in Sugar Hill (FID-1231, Photograph #14) and at 1322 Highway 175 in Campton (FID-959, Photograph #15). Both residences have widely overhanging eaves, wide trim in the eaves, and decorative corner boards. Both buildings also feature the characteristic paired window centered on the main façade. The residence in Sugar Hill also has a door hood with decorative drop pendants over the entry, a common decorative feature of the Italianate style.

Residential buildings with gabled fronts and wings began to appear in the mid-nineteenth century. They reflect popular architectural styles from the mid-nineteenth century, often a combination of styles, such as Greek Revival and Italianate (NHDHR Area Form Survey Manual Appendix E, accessed 9/25/2014). Typically, they were one-and-one-half stories to two-stories in height, with either a side hall entrance on the gable façade, or an entry way located on the wing. The wing was typically not an addition, but an integral piece of the design. A porch located on the wing section of the house was also a popular feature, and an example of this form is seen at 26 Prospect Street in Whitefield (FID-1386, Photograph #16).

The Gothic Revival style, which gained popularity between 1840 and 1870, is more visible within the project area than the Italianate style. Identifying features of this style include steeply pitched roofs, often with cross gables, decorative vergeboards, one-story porches, and pointed arch windows (Historic New England Architectural Style Guide 2014, accessed 9/26/2014). This architectural style was expressly promoted for rural settings, and it appears to be almost as popular in the region as the Greek Revival style. Examples of Gothic Revival domestic architecture include the residences along Highway 175 in Campton (FID-969, Photograph #17; FID-939, Photograph #18; and FID-980, Photograph #19). These buildings are classic examples of the Gothic Revival style, with steep cross gables and decorative vergeboards located in the eaves. Two of these residences also feature a steeply pitched cross gable located on the wing addition, a common element of the Gothic Revival style.

As architectural styles changed through the mid-nineteenth century, it is common for buildings to embody characteristics of one or more styles from this period. An example of this is the residence located at 12 Gooden Road in Whitefield (FID-1350, Photograph #20). This one-and-one-half story, cross-front building has a connected wing with steeply pitched cross gables that embody the Gothic Revival style. The building also features corner boards, wide eaves, and cornice returns that are characteristic of the Italianate style. Even the decorative window hoods, a hallmark of the Italianate style, feature unique triangular window hoods that are reminiscent of the Gothic pointed arch.

The late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries also brought the French Second Empire style to the White Mountains, particularly within town centers. The primary characteristic of the style is the mansard roof, which often included dormers. This roof shape was popular as well as
functional, in that it allowed for a full upper story, rather than a half story seen in gable-roof designs. Decorative details are similar to the Italianate style, and include brackets beneath the eaves, bay windows, and elaborate window surrounds (Historic New England Architectural Style Guide 2014, accessed 12/15/2014). A number of examples exist within the project area, although most are modest with minimal decorative elements. The residence at 33 Jefferson Road in Whitefield (FID-1435, Photograph #21) contains all the hallmarks of the style, including decorative brackets beneath the mansard roof, and a bay window. A vernacular example of the style is located at 575 Brook Road in Bethlehem (FID-1280, Photograph #22). This two-story building has a mansard roof with shed-roof dormers, and a one-story entry porch with turned posts. The application of vinyl siding and replacement windows have likely concealed other decorative details.

In the late nineteenth century, the Queen Anne style dominated domestic architecture in many parts of the country (Historic New England Architectural Style Guide 2014, accessed 9/26/2014). The style typically features cross-gable or asymmetrical rooflines, patterned shingles or masonry, and one-story porches that span the length of one or more elevations. These porches often have turned balustrades, posts, and spindlework ornamentation. There are a handful of residences located within the project area that are constructed in the Queen Anne style, such as a vernacular example located at 65 Mad River Road in Thornton (FID-973, Photograph #23). This residence has decorative vergeboards on the cross gables and turned posts on the entry porch. Other examples of this type were also found in Whitefield (FID-1339, Photograph #24; FID-1410 Photograph #25; FID-1883, Photograph #26). These residences feature key Queen Anne elements such as bay windows, towers, decorative shingles, porches with turned posts and decorative spindles.

One of the most common styles of domestic architecture from the early twentieth century is Colonial Revival (McAlester 1984, 324). The style was influenced by a renewed interest in the Georgian and Federal architecture styles of the original colonies. Multiple forms and features fall within the Colonial Revival style, including hipped or gambrel roofs, twentieth-century capes, and side-gable, center-hall plan homes. Typically, the façade features a centered entry, often emphasised with decorative pediment with pilasters, or an entry porch. A common type of Colonial Revival is seen at 15 School Street in Woodstock (FID-1859, Photograph #27). The building has a gambrel roof with a continuous shed-roof dormer, and a pedimented entry porch, although the latter may be a more contemporary addition. A similar example includes the residence at 124 Brook Road in Bethlehem (FID-1275, Photograph #28), which has a full-width, shed-roofed dormer, a pedimented entry porch, and a one-story addition. Both buildings have been altered with the application of vinyl siding.

A sub-form of the Colonial Revival style is the Foursquare, which was also popular in the early twentieth century. Buildings in this style feature a simple box shape topped with a hipped roof. Often with a centered dormer, this style could include architectural detailing not only from the Colonial Revival, but also Queen Anne or Craftsman styles (McAlester 1984, 439). A Colonial Revival foursquare building is located at 25 Owl Street in Campton (FID-987, Photograph #29). This two-story residence has a hipped roof and a first-story porch with hipped roof and turned porch supports.
The Craftsman style was popular in the early twentieth century, and a few examples were identified within the project area. This residential type is generally one-and-one-half stories, with a low pitched gabled roof that has a wide overhang. This overhang allowed for exposed roof rafters or decorative braces under the gable. Craftsman houses often had full-width porches supported by tapered square columns. Examples within the project area include residences along Lancaster Road in Whitefield (FID-1388, Photograph #30) and Forest Lake Road in Whitefield (FID-1304, Photograph #31).

The suburban residential developments that followed World War II included common dwelling types such as the cape, ranch and raised ranch (NHDHR Area Form Survey Manual Appendix E, accessed 9/25/2014). The twentieth-century cape commonly includes a pair of dormer windows on the façade, and Colonial Revival detailing at the entrance (see e.g., FID-1038, Photograph #32; FID-1035, Photograph #33). Other twentieth-century capes lack the paired dormers, and other examples have side elevation additions (see e.g., FID-1216, Photograph #34; FID-1196, Photograph #35).

Suburban developments (or sub-divisions) of the post-war era include residences with ranch, raised ranch, and split-level styles. All of these building types became increasingly popular in the 1960s, and are still in use today (NHDHR Area Form Survey Manual Appendix E, accessed 9/25/2014). The ranch is a one-story dwelling with a low-pitched roof, and often includes a picture window and attached garage (see e.g., FID-898, Photograph #36; FID-1449, Photograph #37). Examples of the raised ranch and split-level were minimally observed during the field survey.

Agricultural Resources
Due to the rugged terrain and higher elevations of the White Mountains, the area was not as agrarian-focused as other rural areas of New Hampshire in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In response to the early twentieth-century increase in summer tourism, many large farms were sold and subdivided for the development of vacation homes and summer camps. As a result, many nineteenth-century examples of White Mountain farmsteads were lost; however, some nineteenth-century farm buildings, including barns and associated outbuildings survive within the project area.

The most common dwelling type from this period is the connected farmhouse. The farmhouse has been a major architectural form in New Hampshire since the late eighteenth century. Highly functional, with minimal ornamentation and few stylistic features, farmhouses developed through the building traditions of the Colonial period (Garvin 2001, 96-97). Building materials may vary, but in this area they are primarily wood-frame construction with wood clapboarding. Farmhouses are typically grouped with barns, sheds, and other buildings and structures that supported the various agricultural activities of the farm. These buildings were connected, as is often the case in New Hampshire, creating a “connected farm” that typically consisted of the living quarters, or “big house”; a smaller building or ell containing the kitchen area; the “back house” (traditionally a craft-shop or carriage house); and a barn (Hubka 1984, 5-6).
Some connected farmhouses are described above in the discussion of residential buildings. Additional representative examples from the nineteenth century include those at 82 Highway 175 in Campton (FID-843, Photograph #38), and 7 Osgood Road in Campton (FID-964, Photograph #39). Connected barns in the project area have also been adapted to other uses, including expansion of living quarters (FID-965, Photograph #40), or conversion to business uses (FID-953, Photograph #41). Many of these altered buildings underwent other changes to their original appearance, including the application of vinyl siding, replacement windows, and additions that detract from the original features of the building.

During the early nineteenth century, gable-front barns were commonplace, and by 1850, the bank barn appeared on the rural landscape. This latter barn was typically built on a slope, or banked to one side to allow for a basement beneath the stable. Examples of this type are seen at 711 Easton Road in Sugar Hill (FID-1868, Photograph #42) and 1180 Highway 175 in Campton (FID-935, Photograph #43).

In the early- to mid-nineteenth century, lighting and ventilation became important features in barns for both livestock and crop storage (Visser 1997, 46-48). Farmers installed transom lights over the main barn doors, and windows were incorporated into the elevations of barns (FID-1285, Photograph #44; FID-1132, Photograph #45). By the mid-nineteenth century, cupolas and ventilators became common features; these were typically located on the roof ridge of the barn (FID-1892, Photograph #46; and FID-1290, Photograph #47).

With the advent of the automobile and decline in agriculture in the mid-twentieth century, barns and stables were often repurposed for vehicle storage. For example, the connected barns at 1337 Highway 175 in Campton (FID-962, Photograph #48), 219 Owl Street in Campton (FID-984, Photograph #49), and 16 Post Road in Sugar Hill (FID-1177, Photograph #50) have all been converted to garages.

**Industrial Resources**

A few examples of industrial architecture have survived in the project area. The Beebe and Mad Rivers have provided waterpower for various industries in Campton since the nineteenth century. The largest industrial complex is the former Village of Beebe River (FID-886, 887, Photograph #51 and #52), which is located in the town of Campton. It operated as a sawmill in the nineteenth century, and it was subsequently purchased by the Draper Corporation in 1925 (Campton Historical Society, n.d.). At its height, the factory was the largest manufacturer of bobbins in the world, and was in operation until 1980. A few abandoned factory buildings and worker housing remain (Photograph #51 and #52). The uniform housing consists of a group of residences that are one-and-one-half stories in height, front gable, with one-story hipped-roof porches on the façade. Each house also includes a detached front-gable garage, with one garage bay and centered window in the gable peak.

Another industrial resource located in Campton is the Campton Pond and Dam, located on the Mad River (FID-945, Photograph #53). Mad River had been utilized by several mills during the nineteenth century, including the Dole Mill. A woolen mill operated there from 1820 until 1965 (Campton Historical Society, n.d.). A dam was built at this location in the 1890s by the
Winnpiseogee Paper Company (Campton Historical Society, n.d.). However, the existing concrete dam was constructed in 1935 by the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) as part of the US Army Corps of Engineers flood control program (Campton Historical Society, n.d.). Today, the man-made pond is owned by the USFS and is part of the WMNF.

Civic and Public Resources

In the late eighteenth century, communities in the White Mountains began to build meeting-houses, churches, develop town centers, and contract clustered buildings to support the local population with education, religion, and public services. One of the earliest public buildings identified within the project area is the Thornton Town House (THO0002, Photograph #54). This building was constructed in 1789, but it underwent significant changes in 1861 (Krieble, Perron, Hengen 2006). At that time, the roof was lowered to its present one-and-one-half story height and two entrances were added. The front-gable building has wood clapboard siding and a cut-granite block foundation.

In Sugar Hill, the Sugar Hill Meeting House (SUG0002, Photograph #55), built in 1830, underwent renovations in 1880 and 1898, including the replacement of the steeple and removal of the original centered entrance to the east bay (Aldrich and Vincent 2002, 1). The building features a closed front gable, and it is three bays wide on each elevation. The closed gable, wide frieze below the roof line, and corner boards likely date to the original 1830 construction. The bracketed window hoods, pedimented entry porch with bracketed support posts, and flared eaves on the steeple are dated to the 1880 and 1898 alterations.

Another example of a public building, located in Campton, is a Greek Revival former Town Hall that now houses the Campton Historical Society (CAM0001, Photograph #56). Constructed in 1855, the one-and-one-half-story front gable building features Greek Revival elements such as corner boards, cornice returns, and a symmetrical façade.

With the increase in summer residents, some towns constructed buildings specifically for the seasonal needs of tourists. This includes the Church of the Transfiguration in Whitefield (WHI0007, Photograph #57). Built in 1901, the chapel served guests staying at one of three grand Victorian hotels within proximity to Whitefield: Waumbek Hotel, Mountain View House, and Twin Mountain House. The church features a small chapel with a symmetrical façade and pointed arch windows that flank a center pointed arch entry. Above the entry is a diamond shaped window.

The Whitefield Public Library (WHI0013, Photograph #58) was constructed in 1904 in the Neoclassical style — a style commonly used for public buildings. The library has all the characteristics of this style: hipped roof, full story entry porch with elaborate surrounds, and classical columns. The library is constructed of brick with limestone classical details. Similar in design is the Easton Town Hall (EAS0003, Photograph #59), which was constructed in 1934. The building is one-and-one-half stories in height with a side-gable roof; the side-gable roof was more common in a later phase of the Neoclassical style 1925-1950s (McAlester 1984, 34). The building has a full-height entry with gable roof. Centered on the façade is an enclosed entry way
with front-gable roof. It is likely that the Neoclassical details of the building were removed or have been obscured with the application of vinyl siding.

**Educational Resources**

The establishment of organized public school systems in the early nineteenth century and the appearance of schoolhouses is perhaps reflective of population growth and periods of civic organization within the project area. One existing former schoolhouse was noted in the project area at 1365 Daniel Webster Highway in Campton (FID-902, Photograph #60). It has a front gable roof, centered entry, and corner boards. A large-pane window on the façade is likely a later addition, and the building is now used as a private residence.

The McIntyre School, located in Whitefield (WHI0009, Photograph #61), was also built in in the Neoclassical style in 1934. Constructed of brick, it consists of two wings with a centered entrance under a pediment with applied Ionic pilasters. The building is not only a prime example of Neoclassical architecture, but it was also constructed by the Public Works Administration, a Federal program of the Great Depression that supported community development and infrastructure (WHI0009 1994, 6).

**Cemeteries**

Cemeteries dating from the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries were typically small family plots or town cemeteries surrounded by low stone walls or cut granite blocks. Examples within the project area include Kinsman Cemetery (EAS0001, Photograph #62), and the Burns Cemetery in Whitefield (FID-1336, Photograph #63). Markers within these early cemeteries are primarily slate or marblestone.

Cemeteries established in the mid- to late-nineteenth century include the Pine Grove Cemetery (FID-1001, Photograph #64) and Woodstock Cemetery (FID-1072, Photograph #65). Both cemeteries contain marble and granite markers, including a number of mid-sized obelisks. Paved drives provide travel routes within the cemetery.

Early twentieth-century cemeteries include the Riverton Cemetery in Jefferson (FID-1486, Photograph #66), Sunnyside Cemetery in Sugar Hill (FID-1208, Photograph #67), and Blair Cemetery in Campton (FID-855, Photograph #68). Containing mostly granite markers with some larger family stones, the cemeteries have roads or paths to accommodate pedestrians as well as automobiles. Riverton and Sunnyside cemeteries have iron fences around most of their perimeters, while Blair Cemetery is enclosed by a wood-picket fence.

**Recreational Resources**

With the growth of summer tourism in the late nineteenth century through the present day, a number of facilities, amenities and buildings have been built for seasonal residents in the White Mountains. Notable historic grand hotels (e.g., Mountain View House [Whitefield], Waumbeck Hotel [Jefferson]) are generally located outside of the project area; however, seasonal summer estates (e.g., Rocks Estate [Bethlehem]) are situated within the project area, as are a number of other modest summer cottages that were constructed near lakes or on promontories with scenic...
Summer cottages in the region are typically one-and-one-half stories in height, with minimal decorative elements, and often included porches on the first stories. Log cabins, constructed in the late nineteenth through early twentieth centuries, are also present within the project area. These buildings were typically one story in height, with exposed logs comprising both the support structures and architectural details (see e.g. FID-1217, Photograph #72). During the post-war period of the 1950s and 1960s, a popular vacation home style included the A-frame, as seen in the tourist cottages in Campton (FID-4931, Photograph #73). As its name implies, the building consists of a steeply pitched roof that extends to ground level.

With ubiquitous use of the automobile, Americans in the twentieth century had the opportunity to travel further distances for vacations. Some motor courts and motels located along major transportation routes were constructed in the early twentieth century, but were more prevalent in the years following World War II. With the White Mountains touted as a prime natural vacation destination, many motor courts are located within the project area, some of which remain in use today. Motor courts generally included a main building with an office and other guest amenities. Smaller one- or two-room cottages would be found around the property. Usually, these motor court cabins embodied little decorative detail and were vernacular in design (see e.g. FID-1245, Photograph #74, FID-1037, Photograph #75, FID-4813, Photograph #76). However, some motor courts encapsulated details from other architectural styles, such as the multi-gabled fronts and exterior stone chimney reminiscent of the Tudor style seen at the Hearthside Village Cottage Motel in Bethlehem (FID-1875, Photograph #77). Motels were also common along well traveled routes. Similar to motor courts, motels often had a main office building; however, instead of small individual cabins, motels utilized rows of one-story rooms, connected via an exterior porch or walkway (see e.g. FID-1274, Photograph #78).

Transportation Resources

Transportation resources or properties within the project area include historic bridges, railroads, roadways and all their associated structures. Historic bridges in the region include the Blair Bridge in Campton – a covered two-span wood bridge that carries Blair Road over the Pemigewasset River that was erected in 1870 (CAM0007, Photograph #79). The bridge was constructed on existing stone piers from an earlier bridge that dates to 1829 (Garvin 2009, 3). In stark contrast in design and materials, the Campton Bridge (NHDOT #144/092) is a steel reinforced concrete arch that carries Route 175 over the Beebe River. The bridge was constructed by the Civilian Conservation Corps in 1935 (CAM0004, Photograph #80) (Campton Historical Society, accessed 12/14/2014).

Railroad-related resources in the project area include rail beds and lines, whistle posts, mile markers, bridges and culverts. A number of railroad bridges exist within the project area, including an example of a Pratt truss bridge in Campton (FID-918, Photograph #81), a plate girder bridge in Whitefield (FID-1366, Photograph #82), and a wood pier bridge in Whitefield (FID-1456, Photograph #83).
With the growth of the automobile industry, garages became a ubiquitous part of the single-family home, and the industry necessitated the construction of maintenance garages and stations to repair and service vehicles. One example of a garage within the project area appears to be a renovated agricultural building. The garage, located at 102 Lost River Road in Woodstock, has a gable roof and double-bay garage (FID-1113, Photograph #84). Two service stations that may date to the mid-twentieth century are located on Union Street in Whitefield (FID-1432, Photograph #85). One service station consists of a cross-gable building with office and service bay, while the other building has a sloping roof that covers two services bays.

22. Statement of Significance

All properties discussed in this section are shown on sketch maps A-R.

Built resources convey their significance through integrity of setting, location, design, materials, workmanship, association and feeling (NPS 1995, 2). The following sections discuss those properties that are or could be considered significant for their ‘setting.’ As defined by the National Park Service, setting involves how a property is situated and its relationship with surrounding features and/or open space (NPS 1995, 45). For a property to be considered significant for its setting, key elements of setting, such as stonewalls, fencing, scenic views, or the relationships between buildings and open space must be intact. Panoramic or scenic vistas may also be important elements of a property’s setting and association with open space. For example, an architect or landscape designer may purposefully incorporate and take into consideration the viewshed and natural surroundings of a property.

Setting is considered significant when the integrity of setting is retained, allowing for understanding or appreciation of the resource. A visual impact may diminish a property’s integrity if setting is integral to conveying historical significance (VA DHR 2010, 4). If a property is significant for its architecture alone, the introduction of a new structure, such as an electrical tower, would not diminish the property’s integrity of design, materials, or workmanship. Likewise, if a resource is already surrounded by modern development, the construction of a new facility within the property’s viewshed is likely to have less of an impact on the integrity of setting. However, if a property’s setting is determined critical to its integrity, viewing a new facility or structure from the property might diminish the key characteristics of its setting, and therefore its historical integrity and significance. Detailed visual impact analysis would be necessary in order to determine any adverse visual effects and the impact on the property’s integrity.

Previously Identified Historic Properties or Resources that Intersect the ZVI

A total of 24 previously identified resources that intersect the ZVI were located within the project area (Table 1). Of these, nine are either listed or eligible for the State or National Register of Historic Places, the status of 13 properties is undetermined or more information is needed to make a determination, and two properties have been determined not eligible for Register listing.

This section identifies all the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) listed properties and all previously inventoried NHDHR historic properties within the project area viewed (or ZVI) that are potentially eligible for Register listing. However, listed and eligible properties in the ZVI
that do not identify setting as a character-defining feature are not included in this assessment nor are they recommended for additional inventory or visual impact assessment. Because the setting of these historic properties is not essential to their historic or architectural significance, viewshed impacts are unlikely to diminish the integrity of these properties. This section also discusses properties that NHDHR has not provided a determination of eligibility (i.e., undetermined), but where setting may be a key characteristic of a property.
### Table 1. Previously Identified Historic Properties or Resources that Intersect the ZVI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRHP/NHDHR ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Integrity Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84003197/</td>
<td>Rocks Estate</td>
<td>113 Glessner Road</td>
<td>Bethlehem</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR Listed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Retains all aspects of integrity. Setting is critical to understanding the property's significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BET0019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAM0001</td>
<td>Campton Town House</td>
<td>529 HWY 175</td>
<td>Campton</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SR listed; NR eligible, individual; 8/8/2001</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Retains all aspects of integrity. The property is considered significant for its architecture and its association with the history of government in Campton, but setting is not integral to the significance of the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAM0002</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1354 NH Route 175</td>
<td>Campton</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Undetermined, more info needed; 2/12/2003</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Appears to retain all aspects of integrity, and only minor alterations are noticeable. Setting could be a defining characteristic of the property, both as a farmstead and for its association with seasonal tourism in the White Mountains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAM0005</td>
<td>NHDOT Bridge #124/129</td>
<td>Route 49, across Pemigewasset River</td>
<td>Campton</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Undetermined, No form; No DOE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The bridge retains original design, materials, workmanship, feeling, association, and setting. However, setting is not a character-defining aspect of the bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAM0007</td>
<td>Blair Covered Bridge</td>
<td>Blair Road, across Pemigewasset River</td>
<td>Campton</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SR listed; NR eligible; 3/11/2009</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The Blair Covered Bridge is considered SR and NR eligible under Criterion A for transportation and association with Lt. Stephen Long's truss patent, and under Criterion C for engineering. Setting is not a character-defining aspect of the bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAS0003</td>
<td>Easton Town Hall</td>
<td>Easton Valley Road</td>
<td>Easton</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Easton Town Hall has had alterations, including the application of vinyl siding and replacement windows. No longer retains integrity of design, materials, or workmanship, and is not considered NRHP eligible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Previously Identified Historic Properties or Resources that Intersect the ZVI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRHP/NHDHR ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Integrity Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King's Square</td>
<td>King's Square Historic District</td>
<td>King's Square</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td>King's Square</td>
<td>NR eligible; district; 9/27/1995</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The potential district retains most aspects of integrity, including a mix of residential, commercial, and industrial buildings from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Setting is likely character-defining aspect of the district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH-AT</td>
<td>Appalachian National Scenic Trail</td>
<td>No Address</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>Appalachian National Scenic Trail</td>
<td>NR eligible; no NHDHR determination</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The NH-AT was determined to be NR eligible in 2008 in a cultural landscape document for the NPS. It was determined to be eligible under Criterion A for its association with early regional planning. Setting is likely a character-defining feature of the district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIN0004</td>
<td>Eliza Brook Shelter, FS4-050</td>
<td>No Address</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Undetermined, No form; No DOE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The shelter was rebuilt in the early 2000s, therefore it does not meet the age criteria for consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUG0002</td>
<td>Sugar Hill Meetinghouse</td>
<td>1448 SUGAR HILL RD</td>
<td>Sugar Hill</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SR eligible; not NR eligible; 1/8/2003</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The Sugar Hill Meetinghouse is considered SR-eligible under Criterion A as a place of worship. Its setting is not an integral part of this Criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THO0001</td>
<td>NHDOT Bridge #185/104</td>
<td>Steele Road over Mill Brook</td>
<td>Thornton</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Undetermined, No form; No DOE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The bridge was reconstructed in 2003 and no longer meets the age criteria for NR consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDS0001</td>
<td>NHDOT Bridge #177/148</td>
<td>Route 175 over Pemigewasset</td>
<td>Woodstock</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Undetermined, No form; No DOE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The bridge retains original design, materials, workmanship, feeling, association, and setting. However, setting is generally not considered a character-defining aspect of a bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDS0003</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>124 Paradise Rd</td>
<td>Woodstock</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not eligible; 12/6/1995</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Previously determined not eligible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1. Previously Identified Historic Properties or Resources that Intersect the ZVI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRHP/NHDHR ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Integrity Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WDS0006</td>
<td>Maple Haven Campground</td>
<td>109 Lost River Rd (Rt. 112)</td>
<td>Woodstock</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SR eligible; 8/11/1999</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Retains all aspects of integrity. There are minimal modern intrusions in the area, and the retention of original building design and materials further invokes the feeling and setting of an early twentieth-century campground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHI0001</td>
<td>Jesse Smith House</td>
<td>70 Union Street</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR eligible, individual; 10/4/2000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Retains all aspects of integrity. It is considered NR-eligible for its architecture; therefore changes to the setting will not affect the property's significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHI0002</td>
<td>George W. Libbey House</td>
<td>34 Jefferson Road</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SR listed; NR eligible, individual; 12/12/2001</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Retains most aspects of integrity, with some minor alterations to original materials. It is considered SR and NR-eligible for its association with George W. Libbey and for its architecture. Changes to the setting will not affect these aspects of significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHI0003</td>
<td>(Dwelling)</td>
<td>3 Snow Street</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not eligible, 10/22/1997</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Previously determined not eligible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHI0004/WHI0010</td>
<td>Darling Block/ Fiske House/ Whitefield Station</td>
<td>12 Kings Square</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td>King's Square</td>
<td>NR eligible, district: 7/19/1995</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Retains most aspects of integrity, with some minor alterations to original materials. Would be considered a contributing resource to the potential King's Square Historic District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHI0005</td>
<td>Johns River Dam</td>
<td>Johns River, just west of US Route 3</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td>King's Square</td>
<td>NR eligible, district: 11/23/2005</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Retains all aspects of integrity, and is considered significant for its association with the industrial development of King's Square and Whitefield, as well as under Criterion C for its engineering. It is likely a contributing resource to the King's Square Historic District.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1. Previously Identified Historic Properties or Resources that Intersect the ZVI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRHP/NHDHR ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Integrity Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHI0007</td>
<td>Church of the Transfiguration</td>
<td>28 Elm Street</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Undetermined, more info needed 2/25/2009</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Appears to retain all aspects of integrity, with no alterations noticeable. The property would be considered eligible for its association with religion in Whitefield. Impact to setting would not affect its eligibility, but it is located adjacent to the potential King's Square Historic District. When this district's boundaries are further examined, this property might be included within the district boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHI0008</td>
<td>Whitefield Town Hall</td>
<td>7 Jefferson Road</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SR eligible; more info needed for NR; 4/8/2009</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The Town Hall was demolished in 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHI0009</td>
<td>McIntyre School</td>
<td>21 Highland Street</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Undetermined, more info needed 6/22/1994</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The church retains all aspects of integrity, and may be considered significant for its association with religion. Impact to setting would not affect its eligibility. It is located adjacent to the potential King's Square Historic District. When this district's boundaries are determined, this property may be included within the district boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHI0012</td>
<td>Morrison Nursing Home</td>
<td>Corner of Highland and Terrace Street</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR eligible, individual; 4/22/1992</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The nursing home retains all aspects of integrity, with alterations made during the period of significance. It is significant for its association with Dr. George H. Morrison, and for its association with the development of hospitals and schools in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Impact to setting would not affect significance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Previously Identified Historic Properties or Resources that Intersect the ZVI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRHP/NHDHR ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Integrity Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHI0013</td>
<td>Whitefield Library</td>
<td>8 Lancaster Road</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The library appears to retain all aspects of integrity. Setting is not a character-defining characteristic of the library. However, it is located adjacent to the potential King's Square Historic District. When this district's boundaries are determined, this property might be included within the district boundaries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Previously Identified Historic Properties Recommended for Inventory and/or Visual Impact Assessment

Recommendations for intensive-level inventory and/or visual impact assessment are provided for those properties where setting is essential to historical significance and may be visually impacted by the proposed project. In the White Mountains, buildings and structures that are associated with outdoor recreational activities, farm complexes, and the development and/or settlement of an area generally retain integrity of setting. Historic districts recommended for additional survey may include inventory and visual impact assessments of multiple individual properties within a district including National Register and NHDHR inventoried properties.

Of the 24 previously identified historic properties that intersect the ZVI and are listed, potentially eligible, or undetermined for listing on the NRHP, NHL or NH State Register, two districts, and six properties identify setting as a key characteristic or character-defining feature. However, one of these properties, Eliza Brook Shelter (LIN0004), does not meet the age eligibility criterion. The remaining properties include the NRHP listed property the Rocks Estate (NR 84003197 and BET0019). Two individual properties, the Darling Block/Fiske House/Whitefield Station (WHI0004/WHI0010) and John’s River Dam (WHI0005) are recommended because they are located within the potentially eligible King’s Square Historic District. An additional two properties (1354 NH Route 175 [CAM0002], Maple Haven Campground [WDS0006]) do not have a NHDHR determination of eligibility, but setting may be a character-defining feature of these properties. In total, one previously identified historic district and five individual properties are recommended for inventory and/or visual impact assessment (Table 2).
**AREA NAME: NORTHERN PASS – WHITE MOUNTAINS**

Table 2. Previously Identified Historic Properties or Districts in the White Mountains that Intersect the ZVI Recommended for Inventory and/or Visual Impact Assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRHP/ NHDHR ID</th>
<th>Street Address/ Property Name</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Historic Context</th>
<th>Photograph #</th>
<th>Integrity Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NR84003197/ BET0019</td>
<td>113 Glessner Road/The Rocks Estate</td>
<td>Bethlehem</td>
<td>Late nineteenth century estate and farm complex</td>
<td>51. Mixed Agriculture and the Family Farm, 1630-present; 73. Summer and vacation home tourism, 1880-present; 98. Architecture in NH, 1623-present; 134. Landscapes and their designs in NH; 135. The land conservation movement in NH.</td>
<td>90, 91</td>
<td>Retains all aspects of integrity. The integrity of setting is critical to the Rocks Estate’s ability to convey its significance of agriculture and landscape. A visual impact assessment is recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s Square Historic District</td>
<td>King’s Square Historic District (Elm Street, Main Street, High Street, and Route 3)</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td>Residences, Municipal, and Commercial Buildings</td>
<td>130. Commerce, Industry, and Trade in New Hampshire Village and Town Centers 1630-present</td>
<td>86, 87, 88, 89</td>
<td>The potential district retains most aspects of integrity, including a mix of residential, commercial, and industrial buildings from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Setting would be considered vital to the district. A Historic District Area form is recommended to determine boundaries, NR-criteria, and contributing buildings. A visual impact assessment is also recommended.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 2. Previously Identified Historic Properties or Districts in the White Mountains that Intersect the ZVI Recommended for Inventory and/or Visual Impact Assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRHP/NHDHR ID</th>
<th>Street Address/Property Name</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Historic Context</th>
<th>Photograph #</th>
<th>Integrity Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NH-AT</td>
<td>Appalachian National Scenic Trail</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>2,174 mile long hiking trail (161 miles within NH), including huts, bridges, shelters, and forested land</td>
<td>78. Outdoor recreation in NH; 81. NH State Parks, Sites, and Forests; 111. Fighting the Depression in NH: The CCC, WPA, and other public works programs, 1929-1940; 134. Landscapes and their designs in NH.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The trail retains integrity as a continuous corridor spanning from Georgia to Maine. The section in NH, encompassing 161 miles, has not yet been evaluated by NHDHR for NR-eligibility. A Historic District Area Form, which would document the trail and associated structures, is recommended. As the proposed project will include the installation of new landscape features that will be visible from the trail, a visual impact assessment is also recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHI0004/WHI0010</td>
<td>12 King's Square/Darling Block/Fiske House/Whitefield Station</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td>Late nineteenth century mixed use commercial/residential building</td>
<td>130. Commerce, Industry, and Trade in New Hampshire Village and Town Centers 1630-present</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Retains most aspects of integrity, with some minor alterations to original materials. Would be considered a contributing resource to the potential King's Square Historic District. Inclusion in Historic District Area Form, update Individual Inventory Form, and visual impact assessment recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHI0005</td>
<td>Johns River, just west of US Route 3/Johns River Dam</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td>Late nineteenth to mid-twentieth century dam site</td>
<td>130. Commerce, Industry, and Trade in New Hampshire Village and Town Centers 1630-present</td>
<td>88, 89</td>
<td>Retains all aspects of integrity, and is considered significant for its association with the industrial development of King's Square and Whitefield, as well as under Criterion C for its engineering. It is likely a contributing resource to the King's Square Historic District. Inclusion in Historic District Area Form, update Individual Inventory Form, and visual impact assessment recommended.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2. Previously Identified Historic Properties or Districts in the White Mountains that Intersect the ZVI Recommended for Inventory and/or Visual Impact Assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRHP/NHDHR ID</th>
<th>Street Address/Property Name</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Historic Context</th>
<th>Photograph #</th>
<th>Integrity Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAM0002</td>
<td>1354 NH Route 175</td>
<td>Campton</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>51. Mixed Agriculture and the Family Farm, 1630–present; 73. Summer and vacation home tourism; 1880–present</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Appears to retain all aspects of integrity, and only minor alterations are noticeable. Setting could be a defining characteristic of the property, both as a farmstead and for its association with seasonal tourism in the White Mountains. Updated Individual Inventory Form and visual impact assessment is recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDS0006</td>
<td>109 Lost River Road/Maple Haven Cottages</td>
<td>Woodstock</td>
<td>Cluster of tourist cabins and associated buildings</td>
<td>83. Taverns, inns, hotels, motels, motor courts and bed and breakfasts, 1623–present</td>
<td>93, 94</td>
<td>Retains all aspects of integrity. There are minimal modern intrusions in the area, and the retention of original building design and materials further invokes the feeling and setting of an early twentieth-century campground. Updated Individual Inventory Form and visual impact assessment is recommended.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Districts

King’s Square Historic District

The King’s Square area was determined to be a potential NR-eligible historic district in 2005; however, district boundaries are not included in the original survey. Field survey by SEARCH in 2014 suggests that preliminary district boundaries may include adjacent buildings located along King’s Square, which is the intersection of Elm Street, Main Street, High Street, and Route 3. The center of the district is a village green (Photograph #86), and the district includes an extensive group of late-nineteenth century mixed-use and commercial buildings. Individual buildings that were part of the 2005 survey are also included within the preliminary district boundaries, including the Darling Block (WHI0010, Photograph #87) and John’s River Dam (WHI0005, Photograph #88 and #89). Inventory and visual impact assessment is recommended to determine district boundaries, the number of contributing and non-contributing buildings of the district, and the potential impact the project may have on the setting of the square.

NHDHR determined that the Darling Block/Fiske House/Whitefield Station (WHI0010) and the John’s River Dam (WHI0005) are individually eligible for the National Register as contributing buildings within the King’s Square Historic District. The Darling Block is a three-story French Second Empire building with mansard roof. The first floor has been used for various commercial businesses since the building’s construction circa 1880. John’s River Dam and Mill were constructed approximately in the same time period as the Darling Block. The dam and mill were operated by Brown’s Lumber Company until 1930, when it was purchased by Gardner Table Manufacturing Company. The mix of the commercial and industrial buildings and structures, as well as some residences adjacent to the square, embodies the historic feeling of the potential historic district. Both the mill building and Darling Block retain distinctive architecture that is tied to the primary development period of the village. As these properties are contributing buildings to the district, they are recommended for evaluation as part of the inventory and intensive-level visual impact assessment of the district.

The setting of the King’s Square Historic District consists primarily of mixed use buildings, with John’s River and more commercial structures to the south. Residential neighborhoods dating from the late nineteenth through early twentieth centuries are located to the north and east. The surrounding areas of Whitefield are primarily rural agricultural lands, with King’s Square being the commercial center of the town. The existing PSNH ROW is located approximately one-half to one mile to the north of the district. As there are minimal modern intrusions on the landscape, the proposed project may have a visual impact on the setting of the late nineteenth to early twentieth century district.

Appalachian National Scenic Trail

The Appalachian National Scenic Trail is a 2,174 mile trail that was designated as a National Scenic Trail in 1968 (Olmstead Center 2008, 3). The New Hampshire section of the Appalachian Trail (NH-AT) runs approximately 161 miles. Sections of the Appalachian Trail have been determined to be National Register-eligible by other State Historic Preservation Offices, including Vermont, Massachusetts, and Connecticut. In 2008, the Olmstead Center for Landscape Preservation created a cultural landscape document for the National Park Service.
(NPS). In this document, it was determined that the entire corridor was National Register-eligible under Criterion A for its association with early regional planning. The document stated further that sections of the trail could be eligible under other Criteria. To date, the NHDHR has not made a determination of eligibility on the 161-mile section of trail that traverses New Hampshire.

In New Hampshire, the NH-AT is likely eligible for its landscape design and association with hiking clubs, the conservation movement, and the Civilian Conservation Corps. Additionally, some shelters may be individually eligible. A Historic District Area Form for the NH-AT should be completed to determine National Register eligibility, criteria, and contributing and non-contributing structures. The NH-AT crosses the existing PSNH ROW, and is also within the viewshed of the proposed project. The proposed project would introduce a new landscape feature along sections of the NH-AT, which may have an effect on the natural setting and scenic vistas. A visual impact assessment should be completed to determine what effect the proposed project will have on the NH-AT.

**Individual Properties**

The Rocks Estate (NR 84003197)

The Rocks Estate was listed in the NRHP in 1984. The property contains 1,400 acres of forests, farmland, and late-nineteenth century residences and agricultural buildings that comprised the summer resort for the Glessner Family (Photograph #90 and #91). John J. Glessner purchased the property not only as a summer retreat for his family, but also as a means of preserving the surrounding forests and wilderness (Garvin 1984, Section 8, 2). Buildings on the property are in various architectural styles including Queen Anne, Craftsman, and log cabins. The property is listed in the NRHP for its significant associations with agriculture, architecture, conservation, landscape architecture, and tourism. The property is currently owned by the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests. The integrity of setting is critical to the Rocks Estate's ability to convey its significance of agriculture and landscape. As the expansive property has the potential to be visually impacted by the proposed project, an intensive-level visual impact assessment is recommended.

1354 NH Route 175 (CAM0002)

A farmhouse and associated outbuildings located along Route 175 were documented in 2003, but lacked sufficient information for NHDHR to make a determination of eligibility. The farmhouse and outbuildings (Photograph #92) appear to date from the mid-nineteenth century, and also appear to retain integrity of design, materials, location, and workmanship. The one-and-one-half story front gable building has two one-story additions, an attached carriage house, as well as two front gable barns located on the property. Architectural details of the main house include corner boards, cornice returns, and transom lights over the entry doors. The building also appears to retain its original clapboard siding. In 1890, the property was sold to Mr. and Mrs. Warren Damon who operated the property as Damon’s Tavern (Morris and Crowe 2002, 3). The building changed hands but operated as a hotel or inn for tourists until the twenty-first century. Setting could be a defining characteristic of the property, both as a farmstead and for its association with seasonal tourism in the White Mountains. An updated individual inventory form is recommended.
in order for NHDHR to make a determination of eligibility. A visual impact assessment may be necessary to determine to what degree setting integrity would be diminished.

Maple Haven Campground (WDS0006)
The Maple Haven Campground is a cluster of tourist cabins, an office building, farmhouse and associated buildings that date to the early twentieth century. The tourist cabins (Photograph #93) vary slightly in size and are either front- or side-gabled, one-story cabins. The front-gable cabins have inset screen porches, while the side-gable cabins have cross-gable porches. The office building consists of an early twentieth-century barn with two one-story additions (Photograph #94). All buildings on the property, including the farmhouse, are vernacular and have wood clapboard siding. In addition to the cabins, farmhouse, and office buildings, the property includes landscape features including a pond, stone walls, open fields, and exterior stone fireplaces. Natural features such as Crooked Brook and Moosilauke Brook are adjacent to the south of the property. Buildings are arranged around the property so as to make best use of both the natural and built environment. There are minimal modern intrusions in the area, and the retention of original building design and materials further invokes the feeling and setting of an early twentieth-century campground. The property retains its integrity of setting, and it is associated with tourism in the White Mountains; therefore, an updated inventory and visual impact assessment is recommended.

New Identified Properties or Resources that Intersect the ZVI
SEARCH identified a total of 537 new properties or resources that intersect the ZVI. These properties include residences, schools, cemeteries, recreation facilities, tourist facilities, municipal and commercial buildings, and transportation-related structures or districts. The State and National Register eligibility of these properties is considered based on their association with specific NHDHR historic contexts (as a basis for establishing historical significance under National Register Criterion A). Additionally, for the purposes of determining the viewshed impact of the proposed NPT project, recommendations for inventory (and visual impact assessment) are based not only on historic significance (as aforementioned) but also assessments of integrity of setting.

Properties that do not retain integrity of setting, or where setting is not considered an integral aspect of the property, are not discussed except as representative examples of certain architectural styles or property types, as presented in previous sections. For example, numerous Greek Revival residences were observed in the White Mountains that retain high levels of architectural integrity. These buildings are exemplary of a specific architectural style, but the setting of these residences is not preserved, or setting is not a key component for interpreting the property’s significance. Consequently, the proposed project does not diminish the integrity and significance of a property’s historic architecture if there is no impact to integrity of setting. Based on the key criterion of setting, 37 individual properties (some of which have overlapping historic contexts) are recommended for inventory and/or visual impact assessment. A discussion of these properties is provided below with each property’s associated historic context, and a summary table of specific recommendations provided at the end of this section in Table 3.
51. Mixed Agriculture and the Family Farm, 1630–present

Resources that may be considered significant within this context generally will consist of farmsteads that must retain their original main house, barn, and associated outbuildings in order to convey the feeling of historic farming practices. Resources must also retain their design and spatial organization, and must be representative of historic farming practices. Background research should verify this association. A farmstead may use modern farming methods and equipment, but these must not detract from the overall integrity of the complex. Buildings should retain their original form, design, and materials, and retain a high degree of integrity. Alterations should have been made during a period of historical significance and not detract from the original materials of the buildings. A rural setting is imperative for a farmstead; ideally no modern developments or intrusions should be in the vicinity. The retention of historic acreage is not necessarily required, although historic boundary markers (e.g., stone walls) enhance overall integrity of setting. The integrity of setting is critical to a farmstead’s ability to convey its agricultural significance.

Farmsteads that were not selected for further inventory are those where setting has already been diminished. A number of farms have encroaching subdivisions or commercial developments that have compromised the integrity of setting. Other farms have already been impacted by modern installations on the landscape such as cell towers, transmission lines, or commercial developments; therefore installation of a new feature would not necessarily have an adverse effect on the setting of these properties. Additionally, a number of farms have lost associated acreage or outbuildings, and no longer appear as rural farms. These farmsteads lack the integrity of setting and rural character that is needed in order to be recommended for intensive-level inventory.

A total of 19 farm properties were documented within the ZVI, which are recommended for intensive-level inventory and visual impact assessment (Table 3). These properties are either farm complexes, or connected farms that not only retain their agricultural buildings and associated acreage, but also appear to have minimal intrusions on their setting. The introduction of a new landscape feature, such as a transmission tower, may disrupt the pristine setting of a rural agricultural property. Examples of these farm complexes include those on Parker Road in Whitefield (FID-1327, Photograph #95 and FID-1331, Photograph #96) and on Grandview Road in Sugar Hill (FID-1870, Photograph #97). These properties retain a high degree of integrity of design, materials, workmanship, setting, feeling, and association with rural agriculture. The Parker Road farm complex is located one half mile to the east of the existing PSNH ROW. The farmstead on Grandview Road is located nine-tenths of a mile to the east of the existing PSNH ROW. Both of these farmsteads may have new landscape features (i.e., transmission towers), that are visible as a result of the proposed project, which may have a negative impact on the relatively pristine rural setting.

73. Summer and vacation home tourism, 1880–present

Resources that are considered significant within this context will consist of buildings that must be in proximity to the natural resource or recreational opportunity that attracted tourism to this resource during its period of significance. Background research should verify this association.
Buildings within this context must be in proximity to the natural resource or recreational opportunity that attracted tourism during its period of significance. Resources must retain their original form, design, and materials, and retain a high degree of integrity; alterations should not detract from these original features. Retention of landscaping features and natural settings and/or panoramic views are imperative for these resources; ideally no modern developments or intrusions should be in the vicinity. Conversion of a property into a year-round residence does not necessarily diminish its integrity of its setting.

There are numerous properties, particularly small vernacular cabins, within the project area; however, many of these cabins lack the significance of design, workmanship, and materials, due to the application of vinyl siding, additions, and alterations. Consequently, they are no longer representative of late-nineteenth or early-twentieth century cabin architecture. For example, a one-story cabin in Woodstock (FID-4790, Photograph #98) had its original siding replaced by vinyl siding. Moreover, the original door has been replaced, and alterations have been made to the building’s fenestration. With the application of modern materials, similar buildings no longer retain the visual quality necessary to convey historic or architectural integrity. Large developments encroaching on these once rural areas have also diminished integrity of setting and feeling. Properties exhibiting modern alterations and intrusions are not recommended for inventory.

A total of eight properties within the project area are recommended for further inventory (Table 3). These properties not only retain original design, materials, and form, but also have minimal modern intrusions and retain their historical setting that originally attracted seasonal tourists at the turn of the twentieth century. The residence on Parker Ledge Road in Woodstock (FID-1092, Photograph #99) retains its original form and materials, and is situated on the crest of a knoll, taking advantage of the panoramic vista to the east. In addition, early twentieth-century cottages located on Littleton Road and Parker Road in Whitefield retain their original design and building materials, as well as unobstructed scenic vistas (FID-1310, Photograph #100). Intensive-level survey and visual impact assessment is recommended for these properties.

78. Outdoor Recreation in NH

Properties in this context must be associated with an outdoor recreational activity – hiking, golfing, skiing, etc. – and be located near these recreational opportunities in their respective periods of historical significance. Background research should verify this connection. Resources must retain their original form, design, and materials; alterations must have been made during a period of historical significance and retain a high degree of integrity. Landscape features, such as original stone walls, increase overall integrity. Setting is imperative to properties within this context as they are closely tied to their natural surroundings. Important features of setting must be intact, including both natural features and manmade structures. Modern intrusions such as commercial development and encroaching subdivisions diminish the integrity of setting of these properties.

A total of seven properties are recommended for intensive-level survey and visual impact assessment (Table 3). As this historic context is closely related to summer and vacation home tourism, these seven properties are also recommended for survey under the previous historic
context. An example from this context is the vernacular cottage on West Forest Lake Road in Whitefield (FID-1301, Photograph #101). The building appears to retain its original board and batten siding, and a one-story addition appear to have been made during the building's period of significance, although further research is needed to confirm this preliminary assessment. The scenic vista over Forest Lake is preserved without modern intrusions. The boat dock also appears to be intact, though likely not original, indicating the property has been in perpetual use for boating, swimming, and other water-related activities.

83. Taverns, inns, hotels, motels, motor courts and bed and breakfasts, 1623-present

Buildings within this context must be in proximity to the natural resource or recreational opportunity that attracted tourism during its period of significance. Significant buildings retain their original form, design, and materials, and alterations must have been made during a period of historical significance and retain a high degree of integrity. Retention of landscaping features and panoramic views also enhance overall integrity. Many of the properties within this context include multiple buildings. Motor courts or motels typically have a main office building, with motel buildings or individual cottages located in close proximity to the main office. These properties included amenities to enhance the vacation experience, including pools, tennis courts, manicured lawns and gardens, and bathhouses and boathouses. Retention of these ancillary facilities and landscapes increase the property’s integrity of design.

Most of the complexes have been significantly affected by alterations and upgrades to buildings and facilities. A notable example is the Dwarf Motor Court Association located in Woodstock (FID-1039, Photograph #102). These one-story buildings, now individually owned, have undergone various alterations, including vinyl or asbestos siding, and alterations to windows and original doorways, as well as additions. Therefore, the property has lost its cohesive appearance and characteristics definitive of a twentieth-century motor court. Throughout the project area, application of modern siding, removal or demolition of key buildings or landscape features, and encroaching developments negate the historic setting of many of these tourist locales. As such, those properties do not warrant additional intensive-level inventory.

In total, seven properties associated with this historic context are recommended for intensive-level inventory and visual impact assessment (Table 3). Despite significant renovations and setting changes to these properties, some buildings in the project area do retain their original location and setting has been minimally compromised by modern intrusions or alterations. For example, the A-frame motel on Styles Bridges Highway in Campton (FID-4931, Photograph #73) retains the main office building and surrounding cottages, all of which preserve their original board and batten siding and decorative vergeboards. The property also retains an original swimming pool in the center of the property, and many mature trees and plantings surround the perimeter. The setting does not appear to have any modern intrusions. Another example includes the cluster of cabins located on Gilmanton Hill Road and Old Franconia Road in Sugar Hill (FID-1245, Photograph #74). The vernacular one-story cottages retain their original form, design, and materials. A building located to the east may have served as an office or community building for the cottages (FID-1248, Photograph #103). The surrounding setting retains its rural character, and has not been compromised by modern features or developments.
131. Suburban/Bedroom community growth in NH, 1850-present

Resources or districts that are significant within this context will consist of buildings such as residences, garages, subdivisions, strip plazas, schools, etc., and are typically associated with patterns of community growth, such as the expansion of housing following World War II. Background research should document these connections and their uses during their period of significance. Buildings must retain their original form, design, and materials and retain a high degree of integrity; alterations must have been made during a period of historical significance. Original landscaping features, such as lawns, mature trees, sidewalks, etc., contribute to the overall integrity of the setting of a resource. A setting that retains elements of the resources’ use as a residence or other building associated with suburban/bedroom community growth is important; however, modern development or intrusions in the vicinity may not affect the overall integrity of the setting of a resource.

Several residential developments were noted within the project area, which date to the suburban development boom following World War II. One example is located along Lost River Road in Woodstock (FID-1120, Photograph #104). Architectural styles range from Colonial Revival capes and garrisons, to side-halls, and ranches. These residences retain varying degrees of integrity regarding materials and design; however, none appeared to retain significance of setting, due to other modern developments. There were no prime examples of planned suburban developments observed within the project area. Consequently no suburban developments are recommended for inventory or intensive-level survey.

However, one individual property, an early twentieth-century Craftsman style residence located on Main Street in Woodstock (FID-4784, Photograph #105), retains a high degree of original materials, design and setting (Table 3). The fenestration appears to be original, as well as the wood clapboard siding and exposed rafter tails. The property is an outstanding example of the Craftsman style, and has not been encroached by modern development. The building is recommended for intensive-level survey and visual impact assessment.

136. Public and private cemeteries and burials

Resources that may be significant within this context will consist of public and private cemeteries and burials that are linked with important events or trends. These trends would include early exploration/settlement, significant battles, mass burials associated with a disaster, or long-term trends related to social history and community planning such as the Rural Cemetery Movement. Cemeteries may also be significant if they contain distinctive artistic or architectural features, including monuments, gates, and planned landscape designs, and grave-markers. The setting of cemeteries becomes significant when the landscape plan and design is a key component to the cemetery itself. The Rural Cemetery Movement began in the early nineteenth century, and sought to create a place of rest, not only for the deceased, but for the living. The Rural Cemetery Movement introduced a new aesthetic of cemetery design. This included varied topography to create visual interest, picturesque landscapes, laid out paths and roads, and planted landscapes and vegetated spaces (Mass. Dept. of Environmental Management 2002, 8). A setting that retains elements of the resource’s association with important events or trends or artistic or architectural features is important; ideally no modern developments or intrusions should be in the
vicinity. A cemetery designed following the Rural Cemetery Movement retains significance if modern intrusions do not detract from the planned landscape design (NPS 1992, accessed 2/10/2015).

The cemetery on Streeter Pond in Sugar Hill (FID-1238, Photograph #106), Riverton Cemetery in Jefferson (FID-1486, Photograph #66), Pine Street Cemetery in Whitefield (FID-1367, Photograph #107), and the Brooks Road Cemetery in Bethlehem (FID-1278, Photograph #108) do not retain the characteristics needed to classify them as vernacular examples of the Rural Cemetery Movement. Additionally, the setting of the Civil War Cemetery on Lancaster Road in downtown Whitefield has been disrupted by adjacent modern buildings and a paved parking area to the east (FID-1409, Photograph #109). Also, the setting of the Elm Street Cemetery in Whitefield (FID-1377, Photograph #110) has been diminished by presence of an adjacent mobile home park. As the impacts of the project are limited to indirect visual effects, the setting of these cemeteries is unlikely to be adversely affected.

Two cemeteries are recommended for intensive-level inventory and visual impact assessment (Table 3). Sunnyside Cemetery in Sugar Hill (FID-1208, Photograph #67) utilizes open space, elevated topography, vegetation, and planned paths within its design. The cemetery on Daniel Webster Highway (FID-1074, Photograph #111) is exemplary of a twentieth-century cemetery with carefully planned pathways and use of open space. The setting of both these cemeteries appears to be intact with little to no modern intrusions. The existing PSNH ROW is located less than one half mile to the west of Sunnyside Cemetery and six-tenths of a mile to the east of the cemetery on Daniel Webster Highway. The proposed installation may provide a viewshed of new transmission towers that are currently not visible from either cemetery. Such new landscape features could have a visual impact on the cemeteries that detract from their current settings.

New Identified Individual Properties and Resources Recommended for Inventory and/or Visual Impact Assessment

Thirty-seven new identified individual properties (some of which have overlapping historic contexts) are recommended for intensive-level inventory and visual impact assessment (i.e., NHDHR Individual Property or Historic Area Inventory Forms) (Table 3). These properties are contained within or partially intersect the ZVI whose historical significance and integrity of setting (under Criterion A of the National Register Criteria for Evaluation) may be affected by the proposed project.
Table 3. New Identified Properties and Resources in the White Mountains that Intersect the ZVI Recommended for Inventory and/or Visual Impact Assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FID/ SEARCH ID</th>
<th>Address/ Property Name</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Historic Context</th>
<th>Photograph #</th>
<th>Integrity Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FID-4313</td>
<td>Littleton Road</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td>Mid-20th century cabins</td>
<td>83. Taverns, inns, hotels, motels, motor courts and bed and breakfasts, 1623-present</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Retains high degree of integrity of design, materials and workmanship. All other aspects of integrity appear intact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-1093</td>
<td>181 Daniel Webster Highway</td>
<td>Woodstock</td>
<td>Mid-20th century cabins</td>
<td>83. Taverns, inns, hotels, motels, motor courts and bed and breakfasts, 1623-present</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>The main office building and cabins retain all aspects of integrity, with minimal alterations. The surrounding area has minimal modern intrusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-1099</td>
<td>Montaup Drive</td>
<td>Woodstock</td>
<td>Mid-20th century cabins</td>
<td>83. Taverns, inns, hotels, motels, motor courts and bed and breakfasts, 1623-present</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Retains all aspects of integrity and scenic vista to the east appears void of modern installations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-1245</td>
<td>Gilmanton Hill Road and Old</td>
<td>Sugar Hill</td>
<td>Early-20th century cabins</td>
<td>83. Taverns, inns, hotels, motels, motor courts and bed and breakfasts, 1623-present</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Cabins and main building have not undergone any alterations, and all other aspects of integrity are intact. The scenic vista to the east appears to be pristine, with no noticeable modern installations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-1874</td>
<td>1267 Main Street</td>
<td>Bethlehem</td>
<td>Mid-20th century cabins</td>
<td>83. Taverns, inns, hotels, motels, motor courts and bed and breakfasts, 1623-present</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Excellent example of mid-century motor court, with all aspects of integrity intact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-4931</td>
<td>Styles Bridges Highway</td>
<td>Campton</td>
<td>Early 20th century cabins</td>
<td>83. Taverns, inns, hotels, motels, motor courts and bed and breakfasts, 1623-present</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>All aspects of integrity are intact, with no modern alterations to main office building and surrounding cottages. Original layout and design also appears to remain intact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. New Identified Properties and Resources in the White Mountains that Intersect the ZVI Recommended for Inventory and/or Visual Impact Assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FID/ SEARCH ID</th>
<th>Address/ Property Name</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Historic Context</th>
<th>Photograph #</th>
<th>Integrity Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FID-904</td>
<td>Styles Bridges Highway</td>
<td>Campton</td>
<td>Late 18th century, Federal</td>
<td>83. Taverns, inns, hotels, motels, motor courts and bed and breakfasts, 1623-present</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Retains high degree of all aspects of integrity, including rural setting with no modern developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-1301</td>
<td>West Forest Lake Road</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td>Early 20th century cottage</td>
<td>73. Summer and vacation home tourism, 1880-present; 78. Outdoor recreation in NH</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Retains all aspects of integrity with minimal noticeable alterations. Situated on Forest Lake, with scenic vista to the east and north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-1307</td>
<td>482 Littleton Road</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td>Late 19th century cottage</td>
<td>73. Summer and vacation home tourism, 1880-present; 78. Outdoor recreation in NH</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Retains all aspects of integrity with minimal alterations. Sited on a knoll overlooking Burns Pond with scenic vista to the west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-1308</td>
<td>469 Littleton Road</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td>Early 20th century cottage</td>
<td>73. Summer and vacation home tourism, 1880-present; 78. Outdoor recreation in NH</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Retains all aspects of integrity with minimal alterations. Sited on a knoll overlooking Burns Pond with scenic vista to the west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-1309</td>
<td>468 Littleton Road</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td>Early 20th century cottage</td>
<td>73. Summer and vacation home tourism, 1880-present; 78. Outdoor recreation in NH</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Retains all aspects of integrity with minimal alterations. Sited on a knoll overlooking Burns Pond with scenic vista to the west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-1315</td>
<td>37 Parker Road</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td>Late 19th century cottage</td>
<td>73. Summer and vacation home tourism, 1880-present; 78. Outdoor recreation in NH</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Retains all aspects of integrity with minimal alterations. Situated on Burns Pond with scenic vista to the west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-1316</td>
<td>Parker Road</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td>Late 19th century cottage</td>
<td>73. Summer and vacation home tourism, 1880-present; 78. Outdoor recreation in NH</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Retains all aspects of integrity with minimal alterations. Sited on raised topography overlooking Burns Pond with scenic vista to the west.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3. New Identified Properties and Resources in the White Mountains that Intersect the ZVI Recommended for Inventory and/or Visual Impact Assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FID/SEARCH ID</th>
<th>Address/Property Name</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Historic Context</th>
<th>Photograph #</th>
<th>Integrity Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FID-1317</td>
<td>53 Parker Road</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td>Early 20th century cottage</td>
<td>73. Summer and vacation home tourism, 1880-present; 78. Outdoor recreation in NH</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Retains all aspects of integrity with no alterations. Scenic vista of Burns Pond to the south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-1092</td>
<td>Parker Ledge Road</td>
<td>Woodstock</td>
<td>Early 20th century Colonial Revival</td>
<td>73. Summer and vacation home tourism, 1880-present</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Retains all aspects of integrity, and position on a knoll allow for a scenic vista to the east.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-1327</td>
<td>308 Parker Road</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>51. Mixed Agriculture and the Family Farm, 1630-present</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Not only does the farm complex retain all aspects of integrity, with no noticeable alterations, but also retains large tracts of pasture land and open fields to the north, south, east, and west. No noticeable modern intrusions on the landscape are noticed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-1331</td>
<td>339 Parker Road</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>51. Mixed Agriculture and the Family Farm, 1630-present</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Retains all aspects of integrity, including large open fields to the northwest and southeast. Also retains its rural character of its setting, without any modern intrusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-1361</td>
<td>58 Union Street</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>51. Mixed Agriculture and the Family Farm, 1630-present</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Retains integrity of design, materials, workmanship, setting, feeling, and association. It also retains its rural agricultural character with expansive acreage to the northeast and southeast.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. New Identified Properties and Resources in the White Mountains that Intersect the ZVI Recommended for Inventory and/or Visual Impact Assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FID/SEARCH ID</th>
<th>Address/Property Name</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Historic Context</th>
<th>Photograph #</th>
<th>Integrity Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FID-1464</td>
<td>668 Mount View Road</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>51. Mixed Agriculture and the Family Farm, 1630–present</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Appears to retain all aspects of integrity, with only minimal alterations to the windows. Also retains agricultural buildings and open fields to the north and south, with no noticeable modern intrusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-1892</td>
<td>201 Turnpike Road</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>51. Mixed Agriculture and the Family Farm, 1630–present</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Retains all aspects of integrity, multiple agricultural buildings, open fields to the north, east, and south in order to still read as an early twentieth century rural farm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-1009</td>
<td>Steele Bridge Road</td>
<td>Thornton</td>
<td>Connected Farm</td>
<td>51. Mixed Agriculture and the Family Farm, 1630–present</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Appears to retain most aspects of integrity, and expansive acreage to the south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-1131</td>
<td>1730 Easton Valley Road</td>
<td>Easton</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>51. Mixed Agriculture and the Family Farm, 1630–present</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Appears to retain all aspects of integrity, with only minimal alterations to the windows. Also retains agricultural buildings and open fields to the northeast and northwest with no visible modern intrusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-1140</td>
<td>1189 Easton Valley Road</td>
<td>Easton</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>51. Mixed Agriculture and the Family Farm, 1630–present</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Both the farmhouse and barn do not appear to have any alterations, and all other aspects of integrity. Also retains pasture fields to the north and its rural agricultural setting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. New Identified Properties and Resources in the White Mountains that Intersect the ZVI Recommended for Inventory and/or Visual Impact Assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FID/ SEARCH ID</th>
<th>Address/ Property Name</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Historic Context</th>
<th>Photograph #</th>
<th>Integrity Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FID-1163</td>
<td>657 Sugar Hill Road</td>
<td>Easton</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>51. Mixed Agriculture and the Family Farm, 1630–present</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Retains all aspects of integrity, multiple agricultural buildings, open fields to the north, east, and south. No visible modern intrusions to disrupt the rural agricultural setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-1169</td>
<td>32 Dyke Road</td>
<td>Sugar Hill</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>51. Mixed Agriculture and the Family Farm, 1630–present</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Appears to retain all aspects of integrity, pasture land to the north, and rural agricultural setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-1177</td>
<td>16 Post Road</td>
<td>Sugar Hill</td>
<td>Connected Farm</td>
<td>51. Mixed Agriculture and the Family Farm, 1630–present</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Retains all aspects of integrity and rural agricultural setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-1185</td>
<td>1570 Sugar Hill Road</td>
<td>Sugar Hill</td>
<td>Connected Farm</td>
<td>51. Mixed Agriculture and the Family Farm, 1630–present</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Only minimal alterations are noticed on the farmhouse, including the installation of a skylight. Open fields to the north and a rural agricultural setting with no noticeable modern intrusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-1236</td>
<td>392 Streeter Pond Road</td>
<td>Sugar Hill</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>51. Mixed Agriculture and the Family Farm, 1630–present</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Retains all aspects of integrity, multiple agricultural buildings, open fields to the north, east, and south. No visible modern intrusions to disrupt the rural agricultural setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-1284 and</td>
<td>633 Blaney Road</td>
<td>Bethlehem</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>51. Mixed Agriculture and the Family Farm, 1630–present</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Appears to retain all aspects of integrity, pasture land to the north and south, and rural agricultural setting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. New Identified Properties and Resources in the White Mountains that Intersect the ZVI Recommended for Inventory and/or Visual Impact Assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FID/SEARCH ID</th>
<th>Address/ Property Name</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Historic Context</th>
<th>Photograph #</th>
<th>Integrity Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FID-1286</td>
<td>650 Blaney Road</td>
<td>Bethlehem</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>51. Mixed Agriculture and the Family Farm, 1630–present</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Appears to retain all aspects of integrity, pasture land to the north and south, and rural agricultural setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-1290</td>
<td>792 Cherry Valley Road</td>
<td>Bethlehem</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>51. Mixed Agriculture and the Family Farm, 1630–present</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Appears to retain all aspects of integrity, with only minimal alterations to the windows. Also retains agricultural buildings and open fields to the north and west, with no noticeable modern intrusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-1868</td>
<td>711 Easton Road</td>
<td>Bethlehem</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>51. Mixed Agriculture and the Family Farm, 1630–present</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Despite minimal alterations to the siding and windows of the farmhouse, the farm complex retains all other aspects of integrity, including open fields and scenic vistas to the west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-1870</td>
<td>258 Grandview Road</td>
<td>Sugar Hill</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>51. Mixed Agriculture and the Family Farm, 1630–present</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Expansive farm complex with all aspects of integrity intact and vast acreage to the south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-1872</td>
<td>827 Crane Hill Road</td>
<td>Sugar Hill</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>51. Mixed Agriculture and the Family Farm, 1630–present</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Retains all aspects of integrity, expansive acreage, and a rural agricultural setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-1074</td>
<td>Daniel Webster Highway</td>
<td>Woodstock</td>
<td>Mid-19th century cemetery</td>
<td>136. Public and private cemeteries and burials</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Carefully planned pathways and use of open space within the design of the cemetery. No modern intrusions noticeable within the rural setting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. New Identified Properties and Resources in the White Mountains that Intersect the ZVI Recommended for Inventory and/or Visual Impact Assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FID/ SEARCH ID</th>
<th>Address/ Property Name</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Historic Context</th>
<th>Photograph #</th>
<th>Integrity Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FID-1208</td>
<td>Sunnyside Cemetery</td>
<td>Sugar Hill</td>
<td>19th-century cemetery</td>
<td>136. Public and private cemeteries and burials</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Utilizes open space, elevated topography, vegetation, and planned paths within its design. No modern intrusions noticeable within the rural setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID-4784</td>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>Woodstock</td>
<td>Early 20th century Craftsman</td>
<td>131. Suburban/Bedroom community growth in NH, 1850-present</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Retains all aspects of integrity, with no modern developments in the surrounding area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. Periods(s) of Significance
N/A

24. Statement of Integrity
Despite modern industrial and suburban developments, there are representative buildings and landscapes from the late-eighteenth through the mid-twentieth centuries that are preserved within the viewshed of the project area that retain architectural integrity as well as integrity of setting. The project area consists primarily of interspersed residential developments in formerly rural and agricultural areas, but there are also notable town centers and industrial areas such as Whitefield, Woodstock, and industrial mill complexes in Campton. Buildings relating to mixed agricultural uses and the family farm represent the majority of potentially eligible historic properties in the hilly and mountainous landscapes of the White Mountains. Additionally, clusters of seasonal tourist cabins and cottages are found throughout the project area. These cabins often retain a high degree of architectural integrity, but in only a handful of cases is integrity of setting also preserved. In contrast, motor courts and hotels in the region that retain integrity of setting typically have lost their architectural integrity due to modern alterations and additions.

As it has since the late nineteenth century, tourism continues to be a driving economic factor in the White Mountains. Except for the properties recommended for intensive-level inventory, the exterior of recreational buildings, tourist cabins, and residences in the White Mountains have typically been altered with vinyl siding, replacement windows, or contemporary additions. These modern intrusions minimize the ability of these properties to convey their historical and architectural significance.

Agriculture-related properties that retain setting and architectural integrity include properties located in Bethlehem, Thornton, Sugar Hill, and Whitefield, which retain much of their original design and materials, as well as their associated acreage. In most cases, however, rural agricultural properties have suffered several impacts to their integrity including but not limited to the loss of associated barns and/or outbuildings, the loss of agricultural landscapes such as of pasture, fields and woodlands to suburban or industrial development, and significant architectural alterations. The decline of agriculture in the White Mountains during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries contributed to a decline in the upkeep of many farm complexes; in several cases acreage was parceled out and sold for other uses. Within the project area, former pristine acres of farmland are now tracts of late twentieth-century residential developments and strips of commercial and retail establishments.

25. Boundary Justification
N/A

26. Boundary Description
N/A
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<td>□</td>
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[Map of the area with various landmarks and mileposts labeled, including Compton P.O., BLAIRS HOTEL, and others. The map includes a legend indicating Milepost, Project Area, Direct APE, and Town Boundary.]
Photograph 1: Residence at 951 Highway 175 in Woodstock (FID-1023). View facing northeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0519.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 2: Federal residence at 388 Highway 175 in Campton (FID-853). View facing east, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0337.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 3: The Colonel Spencer Inn in Campton (FID-904). View facing southwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0390.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 4: Residence at 862 Livermore Road in Campton (FID-889). View facing northeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0373.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 5: Granite residence at 468 Pearl Lake Road in Sugar Hill (FID-1181). View facing northwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0681.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 6: Residence at 1842 Highway 175 in Thornton (FID-996). View facing northeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0492.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 7: Residence at 293 Daniel Webster Highway in Woodstock (FID-1090). View facing northeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0588.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 8: Residence at 1809 Easton Valley Road in Easton (FID-1130). View facing southeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0630.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 9: Early cape dwelling at 1301 Highway 175 in Campton (FID-955). View facing southwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0450.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 10: Residence at 129 Upper Mad River Road in Thornton (FID-978). View facing northwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0474.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 11: Greek Revival residence at 138 Perch Pond Road in Campton (FID-869). View facing west, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0353.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 12: Residence at 54 Highway 175 in Campton (FID-844). View facing east, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0327.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 13: Residence at 72 Elm Street in Whitefield (FID-1363). View facing east, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0872.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 14: Residence at 268 Profile Road in Sugar Hill (FID-1231). View facing northeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0733.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 15: Residence at 1322 Highway 175 in Campton (FID-959). View facing north, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0454.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 16: Dwelling at 26 Prospect Street in Whitefield (FID-1386). View facing north, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0897.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 17:  Gothic Revival residence on Highway 175 in Campton (FID-969). View facing southwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0465.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 18:  Gothic Revival residence on Highway 175 in Campton (FID-939). View facing northeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0434.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 19: Gothic Revival residence on Highway 175 in Campton (FID-980). View facing northwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0476.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 20: Residence at 12 Gooden Road in Whitefield (FID-1350). View facing southwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0859.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 21: Residence at 33 Jefferson Road in Whitefield (FID-1435). View facing northeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0946.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 22: Vernacular residence at 575 Brook Road in Bethlehem (FID-1280). View facing south, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0782.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 23: Residence at 65 Mad River Road in Thornton (FID-973). View facing northwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0469.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 24: Residence at 73 Pleasant Road in Whitefield (FID-1339). View facing southeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0848.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 25: Residence at 19 Lancaster Road in Whitefield (FID-1410). View facing north, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0921.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 26: Residence at 9 Jefferson Road in Whitefield (FID-1883). View facing northeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0923.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 27: Colonial Revival residence at 15 School Street in Woodstock (FID-1859). View facing northeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0606.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 28: Residence at 124 Brook Road in Bethlehem (FID-1275). View facing northwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0777.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 29: Foursquare residence at 25 Owl Street in Campton (FID-987). View facing southwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0483.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 30: Craftsman residence at Lancaster Road in Whitefield (FID-1388). View facing east, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0899.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 31:  Craftsman residence on Forest Lake Road in Whitefield (FID-1304). View facing northeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0807.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 32:  Residence at 1432 Daniel Webster Highway in Woodstock (FID-1038). View facing southwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0534.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 33: Residence at 1294 Daniel Webster Highway in Woodstock (FID-1035). View facing north, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0531.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 34: Twentieth-century cape residence on Sugar Hill Road in Sugar Hill (FID-1216). View facing west, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0718.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 35: Residence at 1426 Sugar Hill Road in Sugar Hill (FID-1196). View facing northwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0698.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 36: Ranch residence at 1431 Daniel Webster Highway in Campton (FID-898). View facing northwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0384.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 37: Ranch residence on Liberty Drive in Whitefield (FID-1449). View facing west, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0960.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 38: Connected farmhouse at 82 Highway 175 in Campton (FID-843). View facing southeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0326.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 39: Connected farmhouse at 7 Osgood Road in Campton (FID-964). View facing northwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0460.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 40: Converted barn at 14 Osgood Road in Campton (FID-965). View facing southeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0461.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 41: Converted barn at 1294 Highway 175 in Campton (FID-953). View facing northeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0448.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 42: Bank barn at 711 Easton Road in Sugar Hill (FID-1868). View facing southwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0690.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 43: Bank barn at 1180 Highway 175 in Campton (FID-935). View facing northeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0429.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 44: Barn on Blaney Road in Bethlehem (FID-1285). View facing northwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0787.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 45: Barn at 1730 Easton Valley Road in Easton (FID-1132). View facing northwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0632.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 46: Barn at 201 Turnpike Road in Jefferson (FID-1892). View facing south, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_1004.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 47: Barn at 792 Cherry Valley Road in Bethlehem (FID-1290). View facing northwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0792.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 48: Converted barn at 1337 Highway 175 in Campton (FID-962). View facing southwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0458.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 49: Converted barn at 219 Owl Street in Campton (FID-984). View facing west, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0480.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 50: Converted barn at 16 Post Road in Sugar Hill (FID-1177). View facing west, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0677.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 51: Former Village of Beebe River (FID-886). View facing south, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0370.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 52: Former Village of Beebe River (FID-887). View facing west, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0371.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 53: Campton Pond and Dam (FID-945). View facing north, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0439.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 54: Thornton Town House (THO0002). View facing west, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0506.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 55: The Sugar Hill Meeting House (SUG0002). View facing northeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0694.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 56: Former Campton Town Hall, now the Campton Historical Society (CAM0001). View facing northwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0347.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 57: Church of the Transfiguration in Whitefield (WHI0007). View facing east, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0928.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 58: The Whitefield Public Library (WHI0013). View facing east, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0919.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 59: The Easton Town Hall (EAS0003). View facing west, October 2014. Digital file (DSC_0034.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 60: Former schoolhouse at 1365 Daniel Webster Highway in Campton (FID-902). View facing west, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0388.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 61: The McIntyre School, located in Whitefield (WHI0009). View facing northeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0934.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 62:  Kinsman Cemetery (EAS0001). View facing southeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0636.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 63:  The Burns Cemetery in Whitefield (FID-1336). View facing southeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0846.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 64: Pine Grove Cemetery (FID-1001). View facing west, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0497.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 65: Woodstock Cemetery (FID-1072). View facing west, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0572.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 67: Sunnyside Cemetery in Sugar Hill (FID-1208). View facing southeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0710.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 68: Blair Cemetery in Campton (FID-855). View facing north, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0339.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 69: Residence at 51 Livermore Road in Campton (FID-847). View facing east, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0330.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 70: Residence at 108 Upper Mad River Road in Thornton (FID-976). View facing southeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0472.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 71: Residence at 667 West Forest Lake Road in Whitefield (FID-1300). View facing southwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0802.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 72: Cabins on Sugar Hill Road in Lisbon (FID-1217). View facing southwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0719.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 74: Motor court in Sugar Hill (FID-1245). View facing west, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0747.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 75: Motor Court on Daniel Webster Highway in Woodstock (FID-1037). View facing south, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0533.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 76: Motor Court in Woodstock (FID-4813). View facing northeast, October 2014. Digital file (DSCN4813.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 77: Hearthside Village Cottage Motel in Bethlehem (FID-1875). View facing northeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0770.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 78: Motel on Main Street in Bethlehem (FID-1274). View facing northwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0776.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 79: Blair Bridge in Campton (CAM0007). View facing west, October 2014. Digital file (DSC_0047.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 80: Campton Bridge (NHDOT #144/092) over Beebe River (CAM0004). View facing southwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0441.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 81: Pratt truss railroad bridge in Campton (FID-918). View facing northwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0412.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 82: A plate girder bridge in Whitefield (FID-1366). View facing west, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0875.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 83: Railroad bridge in Whitefield (FID-1456). View facing north, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0967.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 84: Service station at 102 Lost River Road in Woodstock (FID 1113). View facing northwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0613.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 85: Service station located on Union Street in Whitefield (FID-1432). View facing southeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0943.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 86: Village green in King’s Square Historic District, Whitefield. View facing west, October 2014. Digital file (DSCN4310.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 87: The Darling Block in King’s Square Historic District, Whitefield (WHI0004/WHI0010). View facing northwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0918.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 88: John's River Dam (WHI0005). View facing southwest, October 2014. Digital file (DSC_0016.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 89: John's River Dam (WHI0005). View facing southwest, October 2014. Digital file (DSC_0017.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 90:  The Rocks Estate (NR 84003197). View facing southwest, October 2014. Digital file (DSC_0029.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 91:  The Rocks Estate (NR 84003197). View facing northeast, October 2014. Digital file (DSC_0031.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 92: Farmhouse at 1354 Route 175 in Campton (CAM0002). View facing northwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0459.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 93: Tourist cabins at Maple Haven Campground (WDS0006). View facing southwest, October 2014. Digital file (DSC_0037.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 94: Office building at Maple Haven Campground (WDS0006). View facing southwest, October 2014. Digital file (DSC_0036.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 95: Farmhouse on Parker Road in Whitefield (FID-1327). View facing southeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0830.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 96: Farm complex in Whitefield (FID-1331). View facing northwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0834.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 97: Farm complex on Grandview Road in Sugar Hill (FID-1870). View facing northeast September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0714.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 98: One-story cabin in Woodstock (FID-4790). View facing southwest, October 2014. Digital file (DSCN4790.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 99: Residence on Daniel Webster Highway in Woodstock (FID-1073). View facing south, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0570.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 100: Residence at 460 Littleton Road in Whitefield (FID-1310). View facing southwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0813.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 101: Vernacular cottage on West Forest Lake Road in Whitefield (FID-1301). View facing northwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0803.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 102: Dwarf Motor Court Association located in Woodstock (FID-1039). View facing south, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0535.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 103: Vernacular building on Profile Road in Sugar Hill (FID-1248). View facing northeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0750.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 104: Suburban development along Lost River Road in Woodstock (FID-1120). View facing south, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0620.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 105: Craftsman style residence located on Main Street in Woodstock (FID-4784). View facing southwest, October 2014. Digital file (DSC_4784.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 106: The cemetery on Streeter Pond in Sugar Hill (FID-1238). View facing northeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0740.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 107: Pine Street Cemetery in Whitefield (FID-1367). View facing northwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0876.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 108: Brooks Road Cemetery in Bethlehem (FID-1278). View facing northeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0780.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 109: Lancaster Road Cemetery in Whitefield (FID-1409). View facing east, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0920.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 110: Elm Street Cemetery in Whitefield (FID-1377). View facing west, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0886.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 111: Cemetery on Daniel Webster Highway in Woodstock (FID-1074). View facing west, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0572.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 112: Farm complex at 58 Union Street in Whitefield (FID-1361). View facing southeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0870.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 113: Farm complex at 668 Mount View Road in Whitefield (FID-1464). View facing southeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0975.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 114: Connected farm on Steele Bridge Road in Thornton (FID-1009). View facing south, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0505.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 115: Farm complex at 1730 Easton Valley Road in Easton (FID-1131). View facing north, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0631.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 116: Farm complex at 1189 Easton Valley Road in Easton (FID-1140). View facing northeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0640.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 117: Farm complex at 657 Sugar Hill Road in Easton (FID-1163). View facing north, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0663.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 118: Farm complex at 32 Dyke Road in Sugar Hill (FID-1169). View facing northwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0669.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 119: Connected farm at 1570 Sugar Hill Road in Sugar Hill (FID-1185). View facing north, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0685.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 120: Farm complex at 392 Streeter Pond Road in Sugar Hill (FID-1236). View facing northeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0738.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 121: Farm complex at 633 Blaney Road in Bethlehem (FID-1284). View facing north, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0786.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 122: Farm complex at 650 Blaney Road in Bethlehem (FID-1286). View facing northeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0788.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 123: Farm complex at 827 Crane Hill Road in Sugar Hill (FID-1872). View facing northeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0731.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 124: Colonial Revival residence on Daniel Webster Highway in Woodstock (FID-1092). View facing northwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0590.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 125: Cottage at 482 Littleton Road in Whitefield (FID-1307). View facing northwest, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0810.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 126: Cottage at 469 Littleton Road in Whitefield (FID-1308). View facing northeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0811.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 127: Cottage at 468 Littleton Road in Whitefield (FID-1309). View facing west, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0812.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 128: Cottage at 37 Parker Road in Whitefield (FID-1315). View facing west, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0818.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 129: Cottage on Parker Road in Whitefield (FID-1316). View facing west, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0819.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 130: Cottage at 53 Parker Road in Whitefield (FID-1317). View facing northeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0820.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 131: Cabins on Littleton Road in Whitefield (FID-4313). View facing north, October 2014. Digital file (DSCN4313.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 132: Cabins at 181 Daniel Webster Highway in Woodstock (FID-1093). View facing northeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0591.jpg) stored at SEARCH.

Photograph 133: Cabins on Montaup Drive in Woodstock (FID-1099). View facing northeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0597.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
Photograph 134: Cabins at 1267 Main Street in Bethlehem (FID-1874). View facing southeast, September 2013. Digital file (IMG_0770.jpg) stored at SEARCH.
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