BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT

CONFERENCE REPORT

DATE OF CONFERENCES: November 8, 2007

LOCATION OF CONFERENCES: JO Morton Building

ATTENDED BY: Jim Marshall, Kevin Nyhan, Christine Perron, Marc Laurin, Charles Hood, and Erik Paddleford, NHDOT; Jim Garvin, Edna Feighner, Beth Muzzey, and Linda Wilson, NHDHR; Bill O'Donnell and Jamie Sikora, FHWA; David Beauchesne, City of Manchester Planning Dept.; Kevin Lane, resident, Manchester; Tim Puls, Underwood Engineering; Pete Walker, VHB; Thom Marshall, SEA; Jamie Paine, CLD; and Deb Loiselle and Jeff Blaney, DES.

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

Manchester Surplus Land	1
Claremont, X-A000(418), 14494.	2
Alstead, X-A000(479), 14541K	2
Portsmouth, BHF-T-0101(015), 13678	2
Concord, 15275	2
Antrim, X-A000(556), 14828	3
Amherst Surplus Land	3
Nashua Surplus Land	4
Hinsdale Surplus Land	4
Keene-Surrey, STP-X-000S(387), 13338	4
Portsmouth, BRF-X-0182(066), 10665	4
Bedford 13527 (no federal #)	5
Pelham/Windham 13805 (no federal number)	5
Milford, X-A000(416), 14492; X-A000(565), 14837; X-A000(618), 14492A; X-A000(195), 14078	6
Exeter (no project number)	7
Bristol, NH: Upper IPC Dam (#031.03)	8

Thursday, November 8, 2007

Manchester Surplus Land.

Kevin Lane of 175 Revere Ave., Manchester and David Beauchesne, City of Manchester Planning Department (dbeauchesne@manchesternh.gov).

Kevin Lane and David Beauchesne attended the meeting to discuss the Phase IA/IB archaeological investigation requested by NHDHR as a condition of property purchase from the city. The NHDOT/FHWA required a Section 106 review of property when land within the subject railroad corridor was transferred by Manchester to another party. The perspective buyer of the .12-acre parcel (Parcel 254-40) along the Portsmouth Branch Railroad is Kevin Lane. K.

Lane indicated that he intended to use the parcel as a buffer between himself and an adjacent business. He does not intend to develop it at this time. Because of this fact, he was concerned about the financial burden of hiring an archaeological firm to conduct the survey. E. Feighner suggested that the land could be transferred without archaeological survey if a preservation easement was placed on the deed specifying that the property remain as a woodlot without ground disturbance. She did indicate that surface cleanup of the site was acceptable. D. Beauchesne indicated that he would coordinate the preparation of such an easement with J. McKay before the parcel was transferred and after the legal parcel description had been developed so that it could be referenced in the easement.

Claremont, X-A000(418), 14494.

Participant: Jim Marshall.

Jim Marshall participated in the review of a stone culvert located between 14 and 18 Maple St. near Pleasant St. on NH Routes 11/12 in Claremont to determine whether it was included in this intersection improvement project and the disposition of the culvert. He explained that the culvert is adjacent to a five-legged intersection known as Drapers Corner. The project would be construction in 2010. The current preliminary design stops short of the stone culvert. He indicated that the road agent was aware of its significance. J. McKay will try to incorporate the culvert into the current stone culvert evaluation. The survey had recorded a different culvert that lies near this location. J. Marshall indicated that the project would be brought back to the committee in the spring to review other potential impacts. There are a number of dwellings at the intersection that are more than 50 years old.

Alstead, X-A000(479), 14541K

Participant: Kevin Nyhan.

The Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for adverse effects associated with this project was reviewed, modified slightly, and signed.

Portsmouth, BHF-T-0101(015), 13678

Participant: Kevin Nyhan.

Signed and discussed the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for adverse effects. The memo will be sent to Maine for signatures.

Concord, 15275

Participant: Kevin Nyhan.

Matt Urban of NHDOT Bureau of Environment presented the Concord 15275 Hazen Dr. Project. The Department is planning pavement rehabilitation on Hazen Dr. The proposed project starts at the intersection with Loudon Rd and ends at the East Side Drive intersection. In addition to the pavement rehabilitation, the project will reconstruct approximately 30 drainage structures that are in very poor condition and construct about 1400’ of new sidewalk from the State Police warehouse to East Side Drive. There was some concern for the close proximity to the Merrimack River. After a field review, SHPO determined that there would be no adverse effects and signed a memo to that effect.

Antrim, X-A000(556), 14828

Participants: Tim Puls, Underwood Engineering (tpuls@underwoodeng.com), and Ram Maddali.

Peter Pitsas and Timothy Puls of Underwood Engineers, Inc. (UEI) are the Town's consultant for this project. P. Pitsas presented the project plan view drawings and the attached Project Narrative and site photos were handed out. P. Pitsas noted that a project walkthrough was conducted in October 2007 to present the project to area residents and town officials. The proposed sidewalk along Concord Street (Route 202) and Elm Street was painted out prior to the walkthrough to demonstrate the location of the new sidewalk. P. Pitsas also noted that along Concord Street the NHDOT District 4 has set a road width requirement of 16' from the existing centerline to the face of the curb and that the Town requires a 6' wide sidewalk to accommodate snow removal equipment. This places the back edge of pavement at 22' from the centerline. Residents along the south end of Concord Street were concerned with the loss of trees, lawn, and parking space that would occur with installation of the new sidewalk. Upon hearing concerns from the residents, Antrim Town Administrator Bill Prokop requested that UEI investigate the option of moving the sidewalk to the other (west) side of Concord Street, where there are no dwellings. The revised sidewalk location was presented. He indicated that the project would impact a few trees on that side. The major changes involved with the new proposal are as follows:

- Reduced impact to residential property along the east side of Concord Street.
- Increase in wetlands impact from 1,500 ft^2 to 2,250 ft^2. The two impact areas are along completely different sections of sidewalk.
- Utility poles will need to be moved.
- One fire hydrant will likely need to be moved.
- The existing roadside swale will be filled and a closed drainage system will be installed to maintain existing drainage patterns.

It was noted that a Standard Dredge and Fill Permit Application was submitted to NHDES in September 2007 for the original proposal. An amendment will be submitted to detail the change in sidewalk location and subsequent change in wetlands impact.

L. Wilson indicated that there was a local district in the area and this street could be part of a larger district. The committee thus was familiar with the project area and did not believe that there will be any impacts to architectural or archaeological resources. J. McKay requested a municipal No Adverse Effect memo be prepared and also asked that meeting minutes be drafted and sent over via email.

Amherst Surplus Land

Participant: Matt Urban

Matt Urban, Environmental Manager (NHDOT BOE), presented a surplus land review for a property in the Town of Amherst. The parcel is located off of Route 101 and is also accessible

from Route 122. The property abutter is requesting this six-acre parcel. This abutter owns prime farmland and has what would appear to be an old colonial barn style home.
Before meeting with SHPO, we were able to speak with the abutter to ask what their intentions were for purchasing the land. Their response was to monitor and protect the property.
It was determined by SHPO that the sale of the land to the abutter would be fine so long as a preservation covenant is included in the deed that states no excavation can occur without contacting the Department of Transportation to review archaeological survey needs and conducting all necessary phases of archaeology..

Nashua Surplus Land
Participant: Matt Urban

Matt Urban, Environmental Manager (NHDOT BOE), presented a surplus land review for a property in the Town of Nashua. The parcel is located on the easterly side of Main Street.
This .27-acre parcel was originally purchased in connection with the construction of the F.E. Everett Turnpike, exit 2 interchange, and particularly the US Route 3 interchange. This Parcel is located within .25 miles of the Merrimack River, and the reason it was brought to the meeting for review. However, it was found that this parcel has been noted as a potential asbestos location. Ultimately, due to the size of the parcel and extenuating circumstances, E. Feighner did not find that the parcel was archaeologically sensitive and did not request further review of the property.

Hinsdale Surplus Land
Participant: Christine Perron.

An abutter has requested the opportunity to purchase a 0.31-acre parcel along NH Route 119 on the prescriptive right-of-way of old Route 119. A portion of this parcel is paved. Due to its small size and history of disturbance, the parcel was not considered to be archaeologically sensitive, and its sale will not affect any adjacent historical properties. No investigations are needed.

Keene-Surrey, STP-X-000S(387), 13338
Participant: Christine Perron.

This resurfacing project is located on NH Route 12 from the NH Route 9 interchange in Keene to the Surrey/Westmoreland town line. As part of this project, ledge near the Surry/Westmoreland town line will be scaled. More information was requested about the proposed scaling, including the location of any access roads to the top of the ledge. This information will be brought to the next monthly meeting.

Portsmouth, BRF-X-0182(066), 10665
Participants: Marc Laurin and Pete Walker, VHB.

P. Walker submitted a revision of the Memo of Effect for discussion. There will be an Adverse Effect resulting from the removal of the bridge over the Eastern Railroad, which is eligible for the National Register. The impacts to the remaining historic properties are minor: 160 sq. ft. of slope impacts to the Diamond House property and acquisition of 460 sq. ft. of new ROW from

the Sherburne property. These unavoidable minor impacts were determined to have no adverse effect from the Section 106 perspective. A sentence on the archaeological investigation was added. The proposed impacts to the cemetery have been reduced, and K. Wheeler is in the process of finishing the investigation of the remaining impact areas. The Adverse Effect Memo was signed.

A discussion of the MOA, which P. Walker is the process of drafting, ensued. The MOA will specify the documentation of the bridge and the requirement that provides for a historical marker. B. Muzzey inquired as to the location and content of the proposed "plaque" for the bridge. P. Walker stated that it would most likely be the standard state historical marker. The location will be determined in consultation with DHR. J. McKay suggested that consultation with the City of Portsmouth's marker committee should also occur. B. Muzzey stated that copies of the completed documentation should be provided to the Historical Society, the City Library, and probably to the Athenaeum and City Hall.

Bedford 13527 (no federal #)

Participant: Charles Hood (1612) and Erik Paddleford.

Linda Wilson had requested a district area form for the FE Everett Turnpike for the bridge replacement project. The bridge is an I-Beam concrete structure that goes over the turnpike near its juncture with I-293. L. Wilson confirmed this request. The turnpike is at the age where resources will need to be renewed. She requested that the form cover the original extent of the turnpike, probably as far as exit 14 on the current I-93 and include background concerning how the turnpike concept was developed and its construction history.

Pelham/Windham 13805 (no federal number)

Participant: Thom Marshall, SEA (Thomas.Marshall@seacon.com).

The Towns of Windham and Pelham are interested in replacing the existing Castle Hill Road Bridge (Bridge No. 072/145) over Beaver Brook. The existing single-lane bridge consists of a single span, timber deck carried on timber stringers, which are supported on mortared rubble stone abutments. The existing bridge is approximately 27 feet in overall length and provides a traveled way of approximately 16 feet from rail-to-rail. The bridge appears on the NHDOT Red List and is currently posted "Weight Limit 3 Tons' and 'Passenger Cars Only". The bridge is currently closed due to flood damage that occurred in May 2006.

The original bridge was built in 1920, and was rebuilt in 1973. The Town of Pelham indicated that a new timber deck was installed in the early 1980's. The inspection found the existing deck to be cracked and checked with minor decay and wear. Also, the timber stringers were noted to be cracked and checked with decay on several of the top surfaces. Stringers S3 and S4 showed significant cracks and were noted to be split at the ends. The abutments were characterized as loose, with voids and cracks and missing stones and deteriorating mortar. The existing rail is substandard providing inadequate height, approach length, and end treatments. Since the width of the bridge is inadequate and does not permit opposing traffic to cross at the same time, the bridge has been listed as "functionally obsolete".

The Towns of Pelham and Windham would like to replace the entire structure with a new 24-foot wide, 2-lane structure. The new horizontal and vertical alignments will closely match that of the

existing. The Towns have decided to investigate replacing the existing bridge with a Precast Concrete Voided Deck Slab Structure on stub abutments spanning beyond the existing stone abutments. The skew of the bridge would be increased to better match the alignment of the brook. The proposed hydraulic opening will be sized so that the 100-year storm elevation is not reduced.

The following key issues, questions, comments, and discussions ensued as a result of the presented information. These do not appear in the exact order that the issues arose.

- T. Marshall stated that S E A met with representatives of the Windham Historical Committee back in 2002. The committee and other town representatives agreed that they would prefer to see improvements that would maintain a rural appearance at the site. As a result, the proposed alignment closely matches that of the existing. There were also discussions about salvaging the existing abutments if it was possible. It was explained that the proposed bridge would not necessarily require the complete removal of each existing stone abutment and that the amount of abutment to be removed would only be that which is necessary to install the new cast-in-place concrete abutments behind the existing locations and to allow the new superstructure to span over the existing abutments with adequate clearance. It was also understood that if the structural integrity of the stone abutments is compromised during excavation and partial removal is necessary that it would be prudent to remove as much of the abutment as necessary to provide safe slopes under the bridge. L. Wilson thought it would be prudent to schedule another meeting with the Windham Historical Committee because of the lapse in time. The use of weathering steel guardrail will be discussed as part of this future meeting.
- L. Wilson asked a question regarding the preservation of the trees particularly those in the SW quadrant. T. Marshall replied that only those trees that are impacted by the proposed slopes or that need to be removed to improve site distance for traveling motorists would be cleared and that it appeared that most of the trees in the SW quadrant would not be impacted.
- E. Feighner stated that the proposed roadway approach and bridge work would not necessitate archeological investigation because the footprint of the project will be pretty close to that of the existing road and bridge.
- B. Muzzey requested that the town hire a qualified architectural consultant to complete an Individual Inventory Form on the existing bridge because it is over 50 years old and has not been evaluated National Register of Historic Places eligibility. A follow up Cultural Resources meeting will be required once the form is completed and reviewed.

Milford, X-A000(416), 14492; X-A000(565), 14837; X-A000(618), 14492A; X-A000(195), 14078

Participant: Jamie Paine, CLD.

This meeting was held to receive early input from the NH Division of Historical Resources (NHDHR), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and NH Department of Transportation (NHDOT) staff regarding proposed improvements along South Street and a number of locations around the downtown square area and their associated potential to impact cultural resources, both historic and archaeological.

SOUTH STREET IMPROVEMENTS

Jamie Paine presented a project to improve South Street in Milford. The project, which has federal funds, would improve the overall safety for motorists and pedestrians along South Street from its intersection with Union Square to the railroad crossing between Clinton and Lincoln

Streets in Milford. The town is currently going through the early public input phase of the project. Improvements expected include, but may not be limited to, sidewalk reconstruction, roadway widening, and pedestrian safety enhancements, curbing and turning radius improvements, and aesthetic improvements such as lighting, undergrounding of utilities, and landscaping.

DOWNTOWN IMPROVEMENTS
Jamie also explained, that a second series of projects are being proposed to improve traffic flow along NH Route 101A (Nashua Street and Elm Street), NH Route 13 (Mont Vernon Street), and the downtown "Oval", also known as Union Square, in Milford. The exact locations of the projects have not been finalized at this time. The Town is currently also going through the early public input phase on these efforts. Improvements include, but may not be limited to, roadway improvements, new sidewalks and sidewalk reconstruction, modifications to crosswalks and pedestrian islands, relocation and undergrounding of utilities, parking improvements, traffic control, drainage, and aesthetics.

PREVIOUS HISTORIC STUDIES
It is known that a review of properties in the vicinity of Union Square occurred in 1994. It has been previously determined that there is a NRHP-eligible district around Union Square associated with the commercial development in the area.

NHDHR DETERMINATION
It was determined that a Project Area Form for the village's project boundary, encompassing the downtown and outlying areas, will be required to be completed to update the findings of the previous work, to determine what properties have been previously surveyed, and to document current conditions, determining which buildings are over 50 years of age.

Linda Wilson requested that pedestrian improvements be included as much as possible to encourage pedestrian use of the downtown, including around the metal "swinging" bridge over the Souhegan River.

Once the report is completed and project footprints are established, a return visit to the cultural resource agency meeting is required to determine what the projects' effects are on cultural resources.

Exeter (no project number)
Participant: Jamie Paine, CLD

At the October 11, 2007 Cultural Resources Agency Meeting, Jamie Paine had presented this municipal project to reconstruct a portion of Front Street in Exeter. However Ms. Feighner was unable to attend the meeting, and others at the meeting requested her input on the project.

J. Paine reminded the group of the project's scope of work. The Town of Exeter is proposing to reconstruct Front Street from its intersection with High Street/Water Street to the Court Street intersection. The project is one phase of a multi-phase effort by the Town to enhance and rehabilitate the downtown area. The scope of construction will include relocation of overhead utilities and streetscape/sidewalk/drainage improvements, to enhance corridor aesthetics, vehicular circulation, and pedestrian safety. The conceptual plans produced have been developed in collaboration with the Downtown Restoration Committee (DRC) through working meetings, as well as public comment received through the public participation process for the project.

Sidewalks and crosswalks on Front Street will be brick. Crosswalks will use a thicker brick paver that will be well suited for the wear of winter maintenance.

It is anticipated that improvements will match closely to the existing line and grade of the current street and sidewalk facilities. Work will be structured to maintain the existing back of sidewalk lines as the limits of the proposed infrastructure in order to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and easily fit the work to existing conditions. The existing bandstand will remain at its current location with improved vehicle parking and pedestrian walkways within the center of Front Street. Landscape elements included are the sidewalk and crosswalk paving, plantings, site furniture (bollards, bike racks, trash receptacles, relocated benches), and ornamental lighting. Innovative storm water collections to maintain the character of the historic district include the use of tree wells with under drains to collect and treat runoff.

The intent will be to relocate existing above-ground electrical power, telephone, cable television and/or data utilities from the intersection of Court Street and Front Street to the intersection of Water Street and Front Street to below ground installations and behind buildings on Front Street now served by the existing overhead utilities.

BUILDINGS IN FRONT STREET?
NHDHR had requested at the October meeting that we review historic maps of the area to determine whether any buildings may been located in the footprint of what is now Front Street. CLD reviewed a number of historic maps with the group.

NHDHR DETERMINATION
E. Feighner requested that a professional archaeologist conduct document and site review of the project area, completing a Phase IA review of the project area. E. Feighner also stated that she did not believe any buildings were located within the Front Street footprint and this issue would not require further study. If the research does not have significant findings, the archaeologist may complete an end-of-field letter. If the archaeologist finds that there are potential resources in the Front Street footprint, then a report should be completed.

Bristol, NH: Upper IPC Dam (#031.03)

Participants: Deb Loiselle and Jeff Blaney, NHDES-Dam Bureau, and Steve Doyon (NHDES),

D. Loiselle thanked E. Muzzey and E. Feighner for extending the already lengthy agenda in order for representatives from NHDES to present the Upper IPC Dam project. The dam is located on the Newfound River in Bristol, NH.

S. Doyon provided a brief history of the dam, consideration of repair versus removal, and ownership issues. This is a Significant Hazard dam, and in 2004 NHDES – Dam Bureau issued an Administrative Order (AO) to Freudenberg NOK General Partnership (Freudenberg), the presumed owner. There has been a question of ownership over the past several years; however, Freudenberg has been working with NHDES personnel to discuss the options of repair and removal. The proposed project has not progressed with great vigor because it has been, and continues to be, in litigation for several years. The NHDES, Attorney General's Office, and Freudenberg continue to meet on a regular basis regarding this issue. In 2006, during the Mother's Day Flood, this dam became a great concern to the Town of Bristol and the NHDES, and as a result of this; the Town evacuated several hundred people downstream of this dam due to a potential failure of the structure. In order to relieve some pressure from the dam and reduce the

potential for imminent failure, NHDES authorized an Emergency Permit to remove the upper portion of the dam. Post-flooding, Freudenberg evaluated the options of dam removal and repair and determined that they would move forward with dam removal, however, since the spring of 2007 plans had halted. The dam continues to deteriorate and has become a concern. Representatives from NHDES, Attorney General's Office, Freudenberg, and Public Service Company of NH have met recently and are working toward a resolution that could see the dam repaired or removed in as little as several weeks or during the late summer/early fall of 2008. As part of this resolution, NHDES is to prepare a Scope-of-Work to address all issues associated with dam removal. With that, a better understanding of the cultural resources and necessary surveys is needed. Due to the concern of a continuing deteriorated structure and its potential threats, NHDES is considering authorizing an Emergency Permit. This will be determined in the near future by Commissioner Burack.

D. Loiselle provided a brief history of the historical context of the dam and surroundings. She explained that the file indicates that this dam has been under consideration prior to her arrival at NHDES. She referred the participants to a letter dated June 23, 2005, from E. Feighner to P. Baril (GZA) indicating that there is an archaeological site downstream of the spillway, however, a review of the NHDHR files by D. Loiselle indicated that this is likely a site pertaining to the Ayers Island Dam which is located on the Pemigewasset River. T. Kress at the NHDHR confirmed this. Additional information was found that indicated there are two archaeological sites, one upstream and one downstream of the subject dam. The upstream site is the site of a former mill and the downstream site is the Mason-Perkins Paper Mill site. Both of these sites are outside of the proposed limits of the project, if dam removal were the chosen option. Additional information from the NHDOT and Town of Bristol multi-use path was helpful since a portion of the path was immediately adjacent to the dam and riverbanks. The project was reviewed by NHDHR in 2000 and a *No Historic Resources Affected Memo* was signed with a restriction on the area of the Mason-Perkins Paper Company Mill site, which is well downstream of the subject dam. Information in the Bristol Town-wide Project Area Form indicates that the Upper IPC Dam and powerhouse are most likely the site of the former Bristol Electric Light Company and powerhouse as noted on the 1904 map from the History of Bristol.

D. Loiselle emphasized the potential urgency of this project, and information was provided by S. Doyon relative to the current condition of the dam and the ownership issue. J. Blaney noted that the Scope-of-Work is being prepared as if the question of ownership was not in litigation. He further noted that the current removal proposal involves the entire spillway with temporary access for ingress/egress of equipment. The brick powerhouse and concrete abutments would remain, and the area would be stabilized once work has been completed. E. Feighner inquired about the side channel and if there is any bedrock in the vicinity of the dam. J. Blaney expressed that the side channel located at the right of the dam is not currently part of the removal plan and that there is no indication of any bedrock. A Scope-of –Work needs to be developed, and the attorneys will determine how to move forward and "who" the responsible party will be.

D. Loiselle noted that the question is: what historical surveys need to be done, if any, while taking into consideration that this project may be done under a Standard Wetland Permit or an Emergency Permit. E. Muzzey noted that Bristol is one of the earliest electrified towns in New England and the dam will most likely be determined eligible for National Register as a result. Following is a summary of the necessary information that would need to be completed as a result of the proposed project:

<u>Section 106 – Standard Permitting Process:</u>

- Survey the complex and its history

- Comparative evaluation (Compare the Upper IPC Dam to other related dams and how they work together)
- Determination of Eligibility (DOE) (E. Muzzey expressed that it should be assumed eligible)
- Adverse impact based on presumed eligibility and the proposed project
- Minimization of resources through retaining the concrete abutments and brick powerhouse
- Development of an MOA
    - Archival photo-documentation (before, during, and after removal)
    - Stabilization of brick powerhouse
    - Other mitigation measures to be discussed in the future
- Assign a Lead Federal Agency (D. Loiselle noted that this would most likely be the ACOE because at this point there are no federal funds)
- Consulting Parties

Section 106 – Emergency Authorization Process:

- Survey the complex and its history
- Comparative evaluation (Compare the Upper IPC Dam to other related dams and how work together)
- Determination of Eligibility (DOE) (E. Muzzey expressed that it should be assumed eligible)
- Adverse impact based on presumed eligibility and the proposed project
- Minimization of resources through retaining the concrete abutments and brick powerhouse
- Development of an MOA
    - Archival photo-documentation (Photos would be taken after the fact, however, E. Muzzey expressed that if we are aware that this dam may be removed soon, then accommodations for pre-removal photography should be done soon)
    - Stabilization of brick powerhouse
    - Other mitigation measures to be discussed in the future
- Assign a Lead Federal Agency (D. Loiselle noted that this would most likely be the ACOE because at this point there are no federal funds)
- Consulting Parties – Individuals would be consulted after the fact as part of the MOA development and inquire about their ideas for appropriate mitigation.

E. Feighner noted that FEMA completes after-the-fact documentation and provides copies to NHDHR. D. Loiselle inquired about archaeology concerns, if any. E. Feighner noted that as long as the same access point is used that has been used for previous repairs, then no survey would be needed.

****Memos/MOA's**: Alstead 14541K; Portsmouth 13678; Concord 15275; Bethlehem-Harts Location, X-A000(060) 13855; Keene-Surrey, STP-X-000S(387), 13338; Whittier Covered Bridge (no numbers); Portsmouth, BRF-X-0182(066), 10665. Covenant review: 431 Main St., Keene.

Submitted by Joyce McKay, Cultural Resources Manager