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But history is not only philosophy, teaching by example; its true purpose is, also, to illustrate the general progress of society in knowledge and the arts, and the changes of manners and pursuits of men.

There is an imperfection, both in ancient and modern histories, and those of the best masters, in this respect. While they recite public transactions, they omit, in a great degree, what belongs to the civil, social, and domestic progress of men and nations....

We want a history of firesides....We wish to see more, and to know more, of the changes which took place, down to the humblest cottage.

from "The Dignity and Importance of History" an address to the Historical Society of New York Daniel Webster, February 23, 1852
What do we mean by planning? We simply mean providing in advance for the best ways of meeting our expected future needs and avoiding potential problems.

We all make plans in arranging our own individual affairs. Those who do not plan ahead soon find themselves and their families in serious difficulties. If personal planning is necessary, it is equally important for us as individual citizens to join together in planning for our community. Indeed, it is even more important, for lack of personal planning ordinarily hurts only a single individual or family; failure of a community to plan may cause untold problems affecting all its citizens.

Acworth, NH: Town of Acworth, 1979, 1.

The business of critical intelligence is to deal with these difficulties that are invariably present in what we inherit: to consider them again in the light of new knowledge, experience and need; to attempt to distinguish what is true or universal from what is provisional, arbitrary or accidental; to understand what remains true and thus to renew its power. It is neither critical nor intelligent to discard one’s entire inheritance because it is imperfect or “not modern” or “not scientific.”

Wendell Berry, Letters.

"I realize that I can no longer be a passive person who sits and watches the news and says, 'Wow. Wish I could do something like that.' I have the chance to actually be the person making the news, and that I can really do things to help other people."

Joanna Lubkin,
Student Historic Preservation Team Member
Fairgrounds Middle School,
Nashua, New Hampshire, 1999

We shall not cease from exploration
And the end to all our exploring
Will be to arrive where we started
And know the place for the first time.
Through the unknown, remembered gate
When the last of earth left to discover
Is that which was the beginning.

T.S. Elliot, Little Gidding, 1943.
The image on the cover, and the one here, were taken by photographer Bob LaPree for the New Hampshire Union Leader. They were part of a September 12, 2006 front-page story, "A Treasure Restored," about the preservation of the famous double stone arch bridge adjacent to New Hampshire Route 9 in Stoddard, New Hampshire.

The bridge is an iconic image of the Granite State's heritage, a beloved landmark, and a reminder of our transportation history.

Its construction and survival through the years are a testament to our craft skills and traditions; they also reflect the important and growing contribution of the New Hampshire Department of Transportation to historic preservation successes in our state.

At the eastern end of the bridge is a state historical marker, where NH DOT created a wayside park so that travelers may pull off the road, learn about the bridge, take photographs, and enjoy the natural beauty of the area.

Because it is so visible, accessible, and popular, the Stoddard stone arch bridge was a significant economic and heritage tourism resource, until one of its two arches collapsed during the October 2005 flood.

What could have been a devastating loss has instead become a preservation victory, thanks to NH DOT's stewardship and the skill of its stone masonry specialists.

Now the Stoddard stone arch bridge is a engaging visual image of the power of historic preservation to honor our shared values and to transmit them to future generations.

The journalistic coverage given to the bridge and the story of its resurrection reflects a gratifying new trend: greatly increased interest and coverage of New Hampshire historic preservation topics and projects, in all media, including print, broadcast, and electronic reporting.
The legislature of New Hampshire has determined that the historical, archeological, architectural and cultural heritage of New Hampshire is among the most important environmental assets of the state and that the rapid social and economic development of contemporary society threatens the remaining vestiges of this heritage; therefore, it is hereby declared to be public policy and in the public interest of this state to engage in a comprehensive program of historic preservation to promote the use and conservation of such property for the education, inspiration, pleasure, and enrichment of the citizens of New Hampshire.

Chapter 32, Laws of 1974
(RSA 227-C:1, 1974 - 1981)
Chapter 363, Laws of 1998
(RSA 227-C:1-a, 1998)

When it established a state historic preservation program for New Hampshire, the legislature affirmed what we all intuitively know -- that New Hampshire is a unique place, different from anywhere else, and that preservation of that special character embodied in its natural and cultural resources enhances the quality of all of our lives.

While concern for our past is not new in New Hampshire, the historic preservation movement in the state, as in the nation, is relatively recent. Small groups of individuals did work to save many important structures in the early twentieth century, but it was only after the urban renewal movement in the 1960s with the resulting widespread destruction of the historic fabric of many of our cities and towns, that the preservation movement really took hold.

The passage of the National Historic Preservation Act in 1966 awoke our national consciousness to the need to protect our remaining heritage and reaffirmed the value of maintaining a strong connection with the past.

In a book published that same year, With Heritage So Rich, compiled by the Special Committee on Historic Preservation, Sidney Hyman voiced his sense of the importance of preservation when he noted that,

“a nation can be a victim of amnesia. It can lose the memories of what it was, and thereby lose the sense of what it is or wants to be. . . What we want to conserve, therefore, is the evidence of . . . where we came from and how we got to where we are, the thoughts we had along the way and what we did to express the thoughts in action. We want to know the trails that were walked, the battles that were fought, the tools that were made. We want to know the beautiful or useful things that were built and the originality that was shown, the adaptations that were made and the grace-notes to life that were sounded. We want to know the experiments in community living that were tried and the lessons that were taught by a brave failure as well as by a brave success. It is all these things and more like them that we want to keep before our eyes as part of our lived life as a people, and as connecting links between a past which millions of Americans helped [to] make and a future which we must continue to make.”
HOW WILL OUR PAST BE PRESENT IN OUR FUTURE?

Today, the call to preserve cultural resources is no less urgent. While remarkable progress has been made in the last thirty years and many tools are in place to help individuals and communities protect and preserve our built and natural heritage, tangible pieces of our past continue to disappear. Sprawl, ever-widening roads and highways, neglect, insensitive alteration, and vandalism all take their toll. And negative attitudes -- ignorance, apathy, cynicism, lack of pride, limited vision, the notion that newer is better -- can be as destructive as direct attacks.

What are New Hampshire’s cultural and historical assets? How do they connect with our daily lives? How do they enrich our communities? How do they help our economy? How can they be used to build a better future? How can we keep them? What can we do for them?

How do we plan for continued economic growth in New Hampshire that capitalizes on the special qualities of our village squares and downtowns, our farms and factories, our forestlands, scenic vistas and quiet refuges?

This plan is intended to help promote thoughtful decision-making about these challenging decisions, about the presence of our past as an important part of our everyday lives, and about ways in which sound stewardship can spark positive change and help to build a better future for everyone in New Hampshire.
The progress report for the 2001-2005 state historical preservation plan began with these observations:

**New Hampshire’s historical and archaeological resources are tangible reminders of the state’s rich past.** They connect us with the efforts and creativity of the people before us who have left these personal marks on the landscape and through them, with their stories which give meaning to place.

As these resources disappear or are diminished by changes to their settings, our connections with the past become fragile. Our ability to find meaning in our own contributions to the built world around us becomes more tentative.

The New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources focuses on the stories behind the state’s historical resources. Why were these things placed where they are? Who built them? Why? Our landscape shows the efforts of people in a myriad of ways, some obvious, and some less so. The artifacts left by the state’s earliest Native American inhabitants tell one part of the story; the stone walls, cellar holes, and mill ruins tell another; our village and cityscapes yet another.

How do we share the information we have amassed and make it meaningful to the citizens of the state and its visitors? How do we persuade others to become good stewards of these important properties?

The report went on to note,

**With this rapid growth has come economic prosperity, escalating the loss of open space and fostering a mind-set that old buildings should be replaced with something bigger and more lavish.** Industrial and commercial growth has stretched the boundaries of downtowns to the countryside, threatening agricultural lands.

The resulting growth has put pressure on the transportation infrastructure, resulting in ever wider roads, replaced bridges, new intersections, and bypasses. The positive side of all of this expansion has been the growing recognition throughout the state that New Hampshire has to work much harder to protect and preserve those special places which make the state unique.

The momentum reported in the previous plan has continued, expanding and accelerating in both breadth and depth, as detailed in other parts of this plan.

Historic preservation is becoming a respected element of public policy in New Hampshire. As the state’s economic base shifts from manufacturing to services, the value and potential of livable and sustainable communities, and of heritage tourism, is being recognized as a foundation for future prosperity. There is renewed interest in protection and care of the state’s cultural, scenic, and recreational assets. In the natural resources sector, historic preservation has become a popular component of small-scale, entrepreneurial customer and community supported agriculture. The University of New Hampshire has become the first land-grant university in the United States to develop an organic dairy research farm, headquartered at a historic farmstead. Manchester, New Hampshire’s largest city, which once used Urban Renewal programs to remove acres of Amoskeag mill buildings, now advertises itself as the city "Where history invites opportunity."

Planners often note that almost all of the master plans for New Hampshire communities share the same two goals: "revitalize the downtown" and "preserve our rural heritage." Both goals have been addressed during the last five years, as the Legislature has enacted new tax incentives to encourage preservation and maintenance of historic agricultural structures, and of historic downtown buildings.

Although funding for the Land & Community Heritage Investment Program (LCHIP) has been held to a minimum despite the popularity and effectiveness of the LCHIP program, the historic
preservation grants which LCHIP has awarded have often made the crucial difference between losing and saving historic properties.

Fortunately, the Conservation License Plate (Moose Plate) program has been very successful. The DHR's Moose Plate grants are targeted to publicly owned properties, and in addition to funding for essential preservation work, have also highlighted and broadened the availability of specialized technical expertise.

The Manchester Historic Association, with the assistance of the City of Manchester, offers loans for preservation work at historic properties in the city. Other communities have established local tax-supported trust funds for land conservation and historic preservation. With support from the DHR, the New Hampshire Preservation Alliance—the statewide non-profit preservation advocacy organization—provides small-scale "starter" consultant grants for preservation project development and barn preservation assessments. Its biennial "Old House and Barn Expo" has become the largest preservation event in the state. The Preservation Alliance is also launching a new program -- "Seven to Save" -- for recognizing and targeting attention and resources to endangered historic properties.

New Hampshire now has two "Preserve America" communities, Hooksett and Keene; and the DHR has recently been awarded New Hampshire's first "Preserve America" award, for work with the New Hampshire Division of Parks & Recreation at the five staffed state historic sites, three of which are National Historic Landmarks.

With funding from a National Park Service Challenge Cost Share Program grant for moisture and humidity control, the DHR has worked with the New Hampshire Division of Parks & Recreation to improve internal environmental conditions at the c. 1750 Wentworth-Coolidge Mansion. The mansion was the home of New Hampshire Royal Governor Benning Wentworth and is a National Historic Landmark.

"Save America's Treasures" grants have been instrumental in innovative preservation work at the Eagle Block in Newport, Cheshire Mill No. 1 at Historic Harrisville, the Belknap Mill in Laconia, the Music Hall in Portsmouth, and the White Island Light Station at the Isles of Shoals. The Meadow Bridge in Shelburne has also received a "Save America's Treasures" grant for prospective rehabilitation work.

Several HUD/EDI grants have provided substantial funding for a variety of local preservation projects throughout the state. Among the recipients is the DHR, awarded an EDI grant to undertake a comprehensive planning effort directed at finding the best and most appropriate methods of interpreting the surviving portion of the 1758 First New Hampshire State House.

The DHR has also worked with architects, consultants, and legislative committees to oversee and document the rehabilitation of Representatives' Hall in the New Hampshire State House (1819), the oldest such chamber in the United States still occupied for its original uses.

As a result of Section 106 review of a federal grant for construction of an architecturally secure residential educational facility at the Youth Development Center in Manchester, the DHR worked with consultants and the NH Division of Juvenile Justice to ensure the preservation of the campus (established in 1856) and its historic buildings. The DHR negotiated a historic preservation memorandum of understanding and DHR staff participated in the design of the new...
secure facility (to ameliorate its effect on the historic buildings and setting), and in a task force charged by legislation to develop a master plan for the campus.

During the past five years, much closer coordination between the FHWA, NH Department of Transportation, the states of Maine and Vermont, local governments and citizen groups has resulted in the preservation and rehabilitation of historic bridges of many types, materials, and periods. FHWA Transportation Enhancement grants and "Jeffords Bill" covered bridge grants are providing crucial protection for several of the state's historic wooden bridges.

New Hampshire's historic stone masonry structures (especially those constructed with dry-laid stone), including walls, culverts, bridges, and dams, are receiving greater attention and interest, and several inventory initiatives for stone structures are being planned, both at the local and regional levels.

During the last five years, the use of easements has become a reliable tool to protect historic properties. The New Hampshire Preservation Alliance has initiated a statewide easement program, and the DHR involvement with preservation easements has expanded. Under a preservation easement received by the DHR as a result of a transfer of federal property, the DHR worked closely with the University of New Hampshire and the National Park Service to develop HAER recordation and a historic structures report for Fort Point in New Castle, which embodies three centuries of New Hampshire military history. The DHR negotiated a preservation plan that will protect the Walbach Tower and Battery Farnsworth on the property, two coastal defense emplacements which had been in a state of collapse.

The DHR has also been involved in preservation of Daniel Webster’s Elm Farm in Franklin, a National Historic Landmark that was threatened by a plan to construct 130 manufactured houses on its 141 acres. The property was declared “One of America’s Eleven Most Endangered Places” by the National Trust for Historic Preservation in June 2005. Efforts to purchase the property from the developer were not completed during FY2005, but culminated in acquisition of the farm by the Trust for Public Land, as a temporary bridge owner, early in FY2006. Critical funding was provided by a major grant from the LCHIP program for acquisition of part of the property, initial stabilization of the buildings, and planning for future adaptive reuses. Funding from the USDA Farm and Ranchland Protection Program (FRPP), will insure continued agricultural use of the land, some of the richest and most productive in the state.

Throughout the state, land trusts, historic preservation organizations, citizens and communities are working together to protect other historic farms and agricultural and forest lands.

Unfortunately, the state barn preservation program created by legislation in 1999 has not been funded; but a one-time HPF allocation in 2001-2003 was used to develop a pilot program that provided grants for preservation work at eleven barns, and will serve as a model when state funding becomes available.

As part of the barn preservation effort, the DHR has developed a popular barn survey program. Of the estimated 20,000+ barns remaining in New Hampshire, close to 1000 are now documented in the DHR's barn survey. Five towns have inventoried all of their barns, the survey is underway in four more, and eight other towns are organizing their barn surveys.

With some tragic exceptions, historic properties are increasingly popular for continued or new use as public buildings,
A PROGRESS REPORT

community services, and affordable housing. In Keene, two brick mill houses scheduled for replacement with a box store were saved by a grassroots effort, and relocated to serve as administrative facilities for the local housing authority. The state’s largest utility, Public Service of New Hampshire (PSNH), left a downtown skyscraper in Manchester to create riverside corporate offices in the former Amoskeag power house. Two of New Hampshire’s historic grand hotels -- the Mountain View House in Whitefield and Wentworth-by-the-Sea have been rescued and reopened, and are once again popular destinations.

In the educational realm, the DHR and a broad range of partners and stakeholders have continued coordination with the University System of New Hampshire, to establish a post-secondary and graduate program of historic preservation and heritage studies. The first experimental course, an intensive week-long introduction to historic preservation, was offered in the summer of 2006. At the K-12 level, student historic preservation programs in Antrim, Keene, Nashua, and North Hampton have had especially notable results, raising public awareness and winning awards and accolades.

The DHR has established the nationally-known Project Archaeology as a formal program in the state; initial training sessions for teachers were well-received and successful, and steady expansion is anticipated.

The SCRAP (State Conservation & Rescue Archaeology Program) continues to attract and train a wide range of people of all ages from throughout the state. These volunteers contribute significant amounts of time and effort assisting with surveys, excavations, laboratory work, field reports, and other endeavors. Recent SCRAP summer field schools have covered a broad spatial and temporal range, from urban street-side archaeology in Manchester, the state’s largest city, to a growing number of Paleo sites in the North Country. Academic cooperation and coordination with archaeological contacts in the Province of Quebec have been developed and expanded with the cooperation of the American Canadian French Cultural Exchange Commission, an agency of the Department of Cultural Resources.

Because of the high percentage of historic buildings in New Hampshire’s building stock, preservation specialists are in strong demand and can command good pay and steady work. The Preservation Education Institute at Historic Windsor (VT), the Preservation Trades Network, the Timber framers Guild, and the Traditional Timberframing Research and Advisory Group (TTRAG) are collaborating with the DHR, the New Hampshire Preservation Alliance, and other interested groups to provide more opportunities for study, practice, and public service projects and demonstrations. Nevertheless, an enormous opportunity for training in the preservation trades, both for middle and high school students, and adults, remains to be fulfilled.

Statewide, the historic preservation community is focusing more attention and resources on local and regional historic preservation planning. Each year, the DHR and the New Hampshire Preservation Alliance present training workshops and participate in the trade shows sponsored by the Office of Energy & Planning (spring) and the New Hampshire Municipal Association (fall). The Preservation Alliance has published an expanded and updated version of the 1988 manual, Preserving Community Character: A Preservation Planning Handbook for New Hampshire, which it introduced at a two-day conference for local historic district and heritage commissioners, preservation advocates, and other local officials.

The DHR’s new Preservation Planner, in coordination with the NHPA, has developed and is presenting a “train the trainers” module for regional planning commission
staff, with plans to expand it for presentation to historic district and heritage commissions around the state; she has also inaugurated a historic district and heritage commission e-mail listserv, in partnership with Plymouth State University.

The New Hampshire Preservation Alliance, with major funding from Jane's Trust, has created the position of shared field services representative, in cooperation with the Northeast Regional Office of the National Trust, further enhancing coordination and networking for the state’s preservation community.

As the numbers of local Heritage Commission and Historic District Commissions continue to grow, there has been a corresponding increase in interest and support for nominations to the National Register and State Register, and for local cultural resource and barn surveys. However, the lack of state and federal funding for local survey, and the relatively few historic preservation consultants available for work in New Hampshire, are a continuing impediment to broad statewide survey coverage.

There have also been some significant losses of New Hampshire cultural resources during the last five years, and some substantial threats remain, both programmatic and physical.

The most dramatic loss was the collapse of the famous rock formation known as The Old Man of the Mountain in May, 2003. Although it was actually a natural resource rather than a historic property, because of its iconic role as New Hampshire’s official symbol, the Old Man’s fall enveloped the state in an intense outpouring of grief, emotion, and historical reflection.

The greatest single threats to historic properties in New Hampshire continue to be (a) the failure of state and federal agencies to have planning processes that recognize the value of historic resources; (b) the failure of federal agencies and their designees to engage in the historic preservation review procedure established by the National Historic Preservation Act; and (c) the failure of federal agencies to recognize and fulfill their preservation responsibilities required by Section 110 of the Act.

On a positive note, there is improved communication and coordination between the state and federal interagency Rivers Restoration Committee and the DHR, but even when the Section 106 procedures are followed, the end result is generally the loss of historic dams that could have been saved—had more preservation-friendly alternatives been adopted.

EPA "Brownfields" projects are another source of danger and concern for historic properties, particularly mill complexes. As a consequence of the loss of the early 19th century Pierce Shops in Chesterfield—which manufactured the town's signature industrial product, a nationally distributed accelerating spinning wheel head—a Memorandum of Agreement has been executed with EPA. It requires EPA to develop new Standard Operating Procedures for its Region I hazardous materials removal program, in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officers of Region I and the federal Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, so that historic properties will be given more thorough consideration.

To address and rectify concerns about non-compliance with Section 106, the federal Advisory Council on Historic Preservation presented its popular training course, *The Section 106 Essentials*, in New Hampshire in March 2006, with the DHR as host. This was the first time in several years that the course had been offered in New England. Places filled up so quickly that a second concurrent session had to be arranged,
and that too sold out immediately. The course was taught by Don Klima, the ACHP Director of the Office of Federal Agency Programs, Laura Henley Dean, ACHP program analyst, and Carol Legard, ACHP’s liaison to the Federal Highway Administration. Participants included Indian tribal representatives, consultants, and federal, state, municipal, and State Historic Preservation Office staff from across the United States. The results of the training are already manifest in improved Section 106 compliance, and more thoughtful approaches to avoidance, minimization and mitigation of adverse effects on historic properties.

As the DHR reviewed its Five Year Plan in 2000, we recognized that Section 106 project review procedures needed to change. A staff position of Project Review Coordinator was added, and duties were reassigned to more effectively focus expertise on improving the quality and timeliness of review. The Coordinator came on board in 2001 and one of the first tasks was to systematically reacquaint various state and federal agencies with their Section 106 responsibilities, thus achieving a higher level of compliance. One measure of success is the demonstrated increase in the number of Cultural Resource Management reports reviewed by the DHR. The chart below illustrates the effective doubling of compliance reporting.

Many of the goals and objectives established in 1996 and reaffirmed in 2001, as anticipated, continue to be key components of our new plan.

Four main themes remain key to the plan:

- Survey and Recognition
- Education and Outreach
- Planning and Protection
- Funding/Incentives

We must accelerate our efforts to preserve the state’s special places, to reinvigorate and reinvest in existing communities, to educate the public about our heritage, and to provide tools to sustain our legacy. This plan sets the direction for that effort.
Members of the Timber Framers Guild gather at the Old Allenstown Meeting House on May 21, 2005. The Guild’s Traditional Timberframing Research and Advisory Group (TTRAG) carried out their first-ever “forensic timber framing workshop,” combining physical evidence and engineering analysis in an effort to understand the original roof frame of the building. The original roof of the 1815 structure was destroyed by fire in 1985. The Town of Allenstown has been working for several years to provide the building with a new roof to replace the covering of poorly fitting prefabricated trusses that were installed after the fire. The proud community has listed the meeting house in the National Register and erected a state historical marker at the building.

The enormous stone masonry Penacook Tannery in Concord sat empty for many years, until the city and Plan NH co-sponsored a charrette to generate plans for reuse or removal of the complex. The results strongly favored preservation; the city has stabilized the site (although a historic 20th century addition was removed), supplemented grant funds with city appropriations, and is working with a developer on the reuse plans.

The Rolfe Barn, a double English barn built in the early 18th century in the Penacook section of the city by a founding family of Concord, was quietly sold to a barn salvager in 2002. Fortunately, Concord’s demolition delay ordinance required public hearings to be held before it could be removed, and public sentiment was strongly in favor of saving the barn. The City Council voted to acquire it so that it would stay in Concord, but instead the Penacook Historical Society reorganized itself, raised funds, and acquired the barn and the remainder of the

It has received assistance from both the NH Preservation Alliance barn assessment grants and the DHR barn preservation programs.
Rolfe homestead property, to be used as a museum and meeting center.

The Sewalls' Falls Bridge in Concord was the cover picture of New Hampshire’s 2001-2005 state plan. At the time, the bridge was scheduled for replacement. Responding to community concerns, NH DOT and FHWA and the City of Concord — with the concurrence of a host of other state and federal agencies — chose rehabilitation of the historic bridge as the preferred alternative. Saving the bridge will also minimize effects on the environmental and recreational resources that surround it.

The Contoocook Covered Railroad Bridge in Hopkinton, built in 1889 for the Concord and Claremont Branch of the Boston and Maine Railroad, is the oldest covered wooden railroad bridge in the world. The Contoocook Bridge was tipped off its abutments twice: by floods in 1936 and by the great hurricane of 1938, and both times it was restored to service.

The span is under the administrative care of the Division of Historical Resources, which has no capital budget for its maintenance. Over the past decade, the National Society for the Preservation of Covered Bridges, Inc., has donated repairs and provided countless hours of volunteer labor, and is now donating the cost of lifting and underpinning the four corners of the bridge. After the current work is completed, DHR will use a federal Transportation Enhancement (TE) grant to install a fire protection system and paint the exterior of the bridge.

The nearby Contoocook Depot has been restored by the Contoocook Riverway Association under the same federal Transportation Enhancement grant, in addition to a federal Scenic Byway grant and local donations.

Contoocook Bridge is one of three surviving covered bridges on the former Concord and Claremont rail line. Two others, in western Newport, are also state-owned, but are administered as trail crossings by the Department of Resources and Economic Development (DRED). Together, the three remaining Concord and Claremont Branch bridges are among the most significant of the eight covered railroad bridges that survive in the world. NHDHR is also working with the Town of Newport and the Newport Historical Society to provide fire protection for the two western bridges.

Recently moved across two runways to avoid expansion plans, the 1937 Terminal at Manchester Airport is a testament to both the state’s aviation pioneers and the tireless vision of modern day historic preservationists. Now owned by the city of Manchester, it serves as the museum and archives of the New Hampshire Aviation Historical Society.
A small spit of land jutting east at the mouth of the Piscataqua River, Fort Point in Newcastle has been the site of defensive coastal fortifications since the 17th century. The resources remaining there today document the country’s maritime and military history and evolving defensive threats and technological responses from the early 19th century through the mid-20th century. The eastern portion of the point, known as Fort Constitution, was listed on the National Register in 1973; in 2001, five and a half additional acres were protected by a historic preservation easement during the federal transfer of the land to the University of New Hampshire (UNH). Thanks to the protections of the easement, UNH has altered its plans to build a marine laboratory at the site, has documented the historic structures through the Historic American Engineering Records program, and is implementing preservation measures formulated by the National Park Service in an extensive historic structures report.

Rehabilitation of the Eagle Block in Newport, built as a hotel in 1825, was one of the most prolonged and difficult preservation projects in New Hampshire. Damaged by arson in 1993, the building stood abandoned and open to the elements for over six years. Acquired by the Economic Corporation of Newport in 1999, the Eagle Block eventually received a “Save America’s Treasures” grant, a first-round grant from the New Hampshire Land and Community Heritage Investment Program, a HUD Economic Development Initiative grant, a total of $1 million in Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds, and several other major grants. Apart from the complexity of funding the rehabilitation, challenges included the need to design and build an innovative but costly internal structural system and the rapid inflation of construction costs during project development.

In May 2006 the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests announced a lease agreement with the Shoals Marine Laboratory (SML) for the Arthur Astor Carey House at Creek Farm in Portsmouth—one of the best-preserved examples of summer home architecture in New Hampshire. In 2000, Lillian Noel, the owner and an occupant of the property, sold the estate at less than market value to the Forest Society, to honor her late husband’s wishes that the property never be developed and that it be opened to the use and enjoyment of the citizens of Portsmouth and the state of New Hampshire. Another condition of the sale included the razing or removing of the 19th century summer house within two years of Noel’s departure from the property. A situation that began by seeming to split the preservation and conservation communities in New Hampshire evolved into a template for methods to evaluate and preserve properties with multiple conservation and preservation values. SML will use the 19th century summer house as a marine biology
classroom and living quarters for students, and as a mainland base for programming conducted at the Isles of Shoals. The New Hampshire Department of Resources and Economic Development holds a conservation easement on some 30 acres, which will be open to the public and managed by the Forest Society for passive recreation.

The Creek Farm property, which includes an island and shoreline on Sagamore Creek, was once part of the 18th-century farm of royal governor Benning Wentworth. It joins the Wentworth-Coolidge Mansion as a key monument in the architectural and landscape history of the New Hampshire seacoast.

In October 2003, a 17th/18th century Portsmouth African-American cemetery and several burials were rediscovered during construction of a sewer project. The DHR was notified and activated Section 106 compliance procedures. Federal and local agencies, the DHR, and the African American community worked closely together to achieve a positive outcome that included preserving the remainder of the cemetery, reburying the recovered remains in the original cemetery, adding to the scientific and historic knowledge about the lives of African-Americans in early New Hampshire, and expanding public interest in New Hampshire's African-American history.

An 11,000 year old Paleoindian site in Randolph was discovered during the 2003 SCRAP archaeological field school, north of the Presidential Range, on a property that the landowner and abutters were seeking to preserve. Funding for a permanent easement was sought from the highly competitive LCHIP program, and the deciding factor was the presence of the ancient caribou hunter campsite. Survey work by the DHR resulted both in the discovery of an extremely important archaeological site and a significant contribution to the preservation of a larger natural area. The archaeological research brought together volunteers from all across New England as well as a large contingent from Quebec; it was featured in a National Science Foundation-funded documentary series, produced by the Maine Public Broadcasting Network. The image is the title page of the Spring 2006 issue of American Archaeology, using an October 2004 photo of Dr. Richard Boisvert plotting the location of a Paleoindian fluted point with SCRAP volunteers.
A PROGRESS REPORT

A massive 18th century stone structure, the London Bridge Causeway in Windham was discovered on the site of the new Windham High School when plans were almost complete. The Army Corps of Engineers, responsible for issuing a wetlands permit, invoked the Section 106 review procedures and determined that the project had to be redesigned to preserve the historic causeway.

Despite a good record of saves and successes, there have also been irreversible losses... The Pierce Shops buildings in Chesterfield’s Spofford Village were the last surviving industrial structures related to two categories of manufacture for which Chesterfield attained national prominence: the manufacture of bits, gimlets, and augers, and the manufacture of spinning wheel heads. New owners in the 1920s used the factory to build antique reproduction furniture, and by the 1960s it was used to produce electronic circuit boards. In the 1990s, the property was targeted as the source of contaminated drinking water and slated for cleanup by the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Environmental Services. Despite years of investigations and study, Section 106 historic preservation review was not initiated until demolition of the historic buildings was imminent. Many in the preservation community believe that involving the DHR and 106 review earlier could have saved the historic structures, either on site or in a different location. As one frustrated participant observed, “the only reason saving these buildings is not an option is because there simply is no time left to work out the necessary details.”
New Hampshire’s over 9,000 square miles of land area includes 221 towns and thirteen cities. In addition, there are 22 unincorporated places, plus two other towns (Dixville and Millsfield), which have been incorporated for voting purposes only.

New Hampshire has over 780 lakes and ponds, 1200 miles of rivers, 18 miles of coastal land, and 182 mountains over 3000 feet high. Today the state is criss-crossed by over 17,000 miles of public highways, of which approximately 4800 miles are part of the state-maintained system; 450 miles of railroad lines in public and private ownership; and 201 miles of state-owned rail corridors, including both active lines and trail uses.

Approximately 83% of the state’s land base is in forest cover, up 40% since 1850, with over 760,000 acres in the White Mountain National Forest alone. Over a million acres are protected, through federal, state, local, or private ownership or control. However, recent data indicate that forest cover, which represented 87% of the state’s land base in 1993, is declining due to fragmentation and conversion for new development. Current models predict that almost 144,000 acres (about 225 square miles) of forest cover will be lost by 2020.

According to the U.S. Census, New Hampshire’s population in 2000 was just over 1.2 million people. It is projected to rise to nearly 1.4 million by 2010, an increase of almost nine per cent.

New Hampshire is the fastest growing state in the Northeast. The state’s population has doubled since 1950 and will have tripled by 2020. If current trends continue, half of the growth would be due to the birth rate exceeding the death rate; half would be from net domestic in-migration. 85% of the growth from 1998 to 2020 is anticipated to be concentrated on 33% of the land area of the state, principally in the southeastern counties.

---

1 The cities in New Hampshire are Berlin, Claremont, Concord, Dover, Franklin, Keene, Laconia, Lebanon, Manchester, Nashua, Portsmouth, Rochester and Somersworth.

2 The unincorporated places are Atkinson and Gilman Academy Grant, Bean’s Grant, Bean’s Purchase, Cambridge, Chandler’s Purchase, Crawford’s Purchase, Cutt’s Grant, Dix’s Grant, Erving’s Location, Green’s Grant, Hadley’s Purchase, Hale’s Location, Kilkenny, Livermore, Low and Burbank’s Grant, Martin’s Location, Odell, Pinkham’s Grant, Sargent’s Purchase, Second College Grant, Success, and Thompson and Meserve’s Purchase.


5 Ibid.
New Hampshire contains an array of archaeological sites worth identifying and protecting. These sites are a non-renewable resource which, collectively, constitute a unique record of human achievement spanning at least 12,000 years, from the first human occupation after the retreat of the glaciers, through the displacement of Native American Indian cultures by European colonists, and up to the recent past.

Archaeological sites provide a tangible source of information on the culture of New Hampshire Native American Indians before the arrival of the Europeans. For the historic period of European settlement, archaeological sites have the potential to balance, expand, corroborate, and contradict the written and oral records of the past. Together with our architectural heritage, these sites provide physical reminders of the past.

Current archaeological knowledge for New Hampshire may be understood from the two different perspectives of time and space.

A temporal perspective illustrates where the record of human achievement has undergone either periods of change or eras of continuity. A spatial perspective highlights resources within a geographic/environmental context, revealing cultural patterns and identifying unusual or unique sites. Each of these perspectives facilitate identification of important archaeological survey needs and achievements.

Sites Known Through Time
The temporal perspective of New Hampshire’s archaeology divides the period before (prehistoric) and after (historic) the availability of written records in the state, with a brief period of transition labeled protohistoric. Prehistoric archaeology is coincident with the study of Native American cultures that were unaffected by 16th century (and later) Old World cultures. Historic archaeology, in practice, uses written records and studies the resources affiliated with the dominant European/Euro-American culture and minority groups. The prehistoric era is roughly subdivided into three periods - Woodland (500 to 3,000 years ago), Archaic (3,000 to 9,500 years ago), and Paleoindian (9,500 to 12,000 years ago). Due to a lack of dated materials, or to several components illustrating different periods or sub-periods, many sites cannot be firmly linked with a single prehistoric period.

Woodland sites are relatively common and are identified by the presence of ceramic artifacts. The earliest and latest expressions of the Woodland period are considered to be the most important. The early sites appear to be among the earliest ceramic bearing examples in eastern North America. Radiocarbon dated sites along the Merrimack River reveal an exceptionally early manufacture of pottery. The latest Woodland sites hold the key to the social, cultural and ethnic identity of the Native American groups that met the first Europeans. A rising awareness of Native American ancestry within today’s population fuels interest, and occasional controversy, over just who these people(s) were.

The Archaic period is the longest and the best represented in the archaeological record. Archaic sites provide an understanding of the social, cultural, and technological changes that occurred during the transition between the end of the Ice Age and the beginning of the contemporary climatic era. The middle of this era witnessed the evident overlap of two different contemporaneous Native American cultures. Sites that hold the potential to clarify this cultural confluence are highly significant. The end of the Archaic appears to blend almost seamlessly with the beginning of the Woodland period when technological innovation (particularly in ceramic production) and other changes are notable.
Our understanding of the Paleoindian period is limited, with a small but growing number of sites that can be unequivocally identified. Because they represent the first cultures present in the state and are associated with the end of the Pleistocene climatic period, Paleoindian sites are exceptionally important. Paleoindian cultures developed elsewhere, but there is no firm consensus as to where. The end of the period is enigmatic, revealing an apparent discontinuity with the succeeding Archaic period.

The Protohistoric period is the briefest and most difficult to identify. The dynamics between Native American and European cultures as they came into contact were extreme, but the material evidence is ephemeral. Protohistoric sites, reflecting both Native American and European cultures, should prove to be veritable laboratories for the study of massive and abrupt cultural change.

The most significant sites of the Historic period offer information that is not recorded in historic documents. This would include data on ethnic or social minorities not recorded in the mainstream culture, or sites reflecting poorly recorded or understood social movements or processes.

Sites Known by Region

The spatial perspective on archaeology in New Hampshire is governed heavily by two factors: - the natural environment and the demographics of the historic era. Sites tend to be preserved on stable (generally level) surfaces or in depositional environments. Erosion, particularly on steep slopes or cut-banks along rivers, will erase some archaeological evidence but may bury others. The hills and mountainsides of the state are generally, but not exclusively, bereft of sites, while the main stems of the rivers preserve an assortment of encapsulated sites, especially prehistoric camp sites.

Prehistoric sites are most commonly identified along the major waterways and around lakes or ponds. The abundance of riverine resources, especially fish, drew people to these locations, often for thousands of years. In addition, agricultural practices, especially tilling for row crops, can expose thinly buried sites. The most common locations for large, multi-component sites are near falls or rapids or at the outlets to lakes and ponds. These are places where anadromous fish (shad, alewife, and salmon) could be taken in great quantities. Upland areas were utilized, but less intensely.

The bedrock sources of stone for tool manufacture are the principal exception to this rule. The few places where workable stone is present were intensively used. The distributional pattern for sites in the state is therefore concentrated in bands along the rivers and around the lakes, with scattered concentrations of sites near important lithic sources for stone tools.

Historic archaeological resources are tightly tied to the agricultural and industrial histories of the state and closely follow those patterns of growth and decline. Cellar holes, barn foundations, and stone walls are abundant throughout the reforested rural landscape. While common, these resources are frequently overlooked and their importance undervalued, especially in areas where they represent the only evidence of long-vanished structures.

There are, however, several notable exceptions. One unique collection of historic sites is the former village of Monson in the southern part of the state. Settled in 1737, it holds the distinction of being the only town to voluntarily vote itself out of existence. Monson forfeited its town charter in the 1770’s. The community was never redeveloped, and its archaeological remains are essentially intact. Threatened by development in 1996, over 200 acres of Monson Center are now owned and managed by the Society for the Protection of
New Hampshire Forests in cooperation with the DHR. Later collections of house sites and dependencies can be found in isolated, mountainous areas including the Ossipee and Sandwich Mountains.

**The industrial history of the state is closely tied to the watercourses.** Mills of all sorts were constructed on the fast flowing brooks and small rivers throughout the state. As industrial development increased through the 19th century, the mills grew into large complexes, supplanting not only earlier versions of the mills but many prehistoric archaeological sites as well.

**The most prominent exception to the predominance of agricultural and industrial sites for defining the historic period is the small, but important, seacoast section of the state.** Along the coast and Great Bay are found the earliest European habitations as well as some of the latest Native American sites. Portsmouth, the principal city in this region, has the distinction of preserving the historic neighborhood known as Strawberry Banke, owned and operated by a private non-profit corporation. A substantial number of historic archaeological components have been identified and studied within this historic district.

**Historic Contexts**
Archaeological survey and the evaluation of sites has become increasingly context-based during the past decade. **Historic contexts define the flow of historical events, trends and processes according to a “time, place, and theme” format, and each context has a set of known and expected property types.** The DHR has defined 12 contexts to relate specifically to prehistory. Three emphasize time (pre-Columbian European exploitation; post-Columbian Native American contact with Europeans; and First “Paleoindian” occupations). Three others emphasize technological subsystems best represented in the archaeological record (lithic technology; ceramic technology; and mortuary practices). Six are focused on subsistence and settlement (including agriculture) and on adaptations to particular environments (riverine, upland, coastal, lacustrine, and northern marshland).

All historic contexts (such as small-scale water-powered milling and lumbering) are applicable to the disciplines of history, architectural history, and historical archaeology. Historic archaeological sites are but ruined versions of known and expected property types for these historic contexts.

**The Archaeological Database**
The identification of sites, the keeping of records, and the collection of artifacts did not begin in a systematic way until the founding of the New Hampshire Archeological Society in 1947. With the establishment of the State Historic Preservation Office in 1974, the NHAS site files were made available for reference through the state office. Since 1977 the NHAS and state files have been merged.

**Survey data exists in many forms:** 1) site file maps (US Geological Quadrangle Topographic Sheets with archaeological sites added by number); 2) site inventory forms; 3) formal survey reports; 4) draft reports, field notes, photographs, and other records; 5) catalog cards; 6) an electronic database of the site inventory information including map locations; 7) an electronic database of the survey reports and other documents held in the DHR archaeological files; and 8) collections of artifacts. Catalog cards, field notes, photographs, and draft reports tend to be housed with the collections.

There are currently six major collections of archaeological materials. The DHR has the state’s largest collection, with artifacts from approximately 300 historic and prehistoric sites. This collection is constantly growing, as this is the repository for nearly all work required under the National Historic Preservation Act. A major portion of this collection is on extended loan.
The Howard Sargent Museum holds a collection nearly as large. It was created when a newly created non-profit organization acquired most of Howard Sargent’s collection, accumulated over his 45 year career. Sargent acquired these materials, mostly prehistoric, from compliance surveys, field school projects and rescue operations. Smaller collections are held by the NH Archeological Society, the White Mountain National Forest, and Strawbery Banke. Many local historical societies and libraries also own collections of artifacts. These are summarized in “A Guide to New Hampshire Sites and Collections” by Patricia Hume and Donald Foster, published in The New Hampshire Archeologist, Volume 33/34, 1994 and revised by Patricia Hume in Appendix 2 of The Archeology of New Hampshire by David Starbuck, 2006.

The DHR maintains an inventory of site forms, site maps and formal reports and has responsibility for issuing site numbers. The NHAS maintains a duplicate set of forms as an archival back-up against a catastrophic event such as a fire. The two organizations maintain close cooperation for the maintenance of these duplicate files. The number of DHR recorded sites is approximately 1800, with slightly more sites in the NHAS files as it has issued site numbers (in their own, different, coding system) for unverified sites. These are listed in the DHR files as “leads”. All of the sites recorded by the DHR are included in the electronic database which is updated on a weekly basis. The formal reports are also summarized in a database which is kept up to date.

Survey Efforts in New Hampshire
Most archaeological survey work in New Hampshire is either coordinated or executed by the Division of Historical Resources. For a variety of reasons, educational institutions have tended not to conduct archaeological research within the state except in close coordination with the DHR.

Survey efforts can be categorized into three basic varieties: survey for compliance with federal and state regulations, survey expressly for the purpose of research, and survey in response to threats to specific archaeological resources.

In New Hampshire, compliance surveys are conducted by cultural resource management professionals, either as consultants or as agency personnel. Other types of survey are conducted principally by the DHR with the support of professional museum or academically based individuals and avocational volunteers. Compliance and research driven surveys rely upon the planning contexts to structure the kinds of questions studied. Rescue archaeology, by its nature, allows for less flexibility in the choice of research questions. The nature and extent of the threats, along with the characteristics of the archaeological resources, define the level of effort and kind of research devoted to any given rescue archaeology effort.

Surveys required for compliance with government regulations are most commonly associated with highway construction or the issuance of wetlands permits. Actual fieldwork is ordinarily carried out by private consulting firms. As sites are documented, they are then presented to the DHR Determination of Eligibility Committee to consider their eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

On rare occasions archaeological sites are identified during construction of federally funded or permitted projects. Of particular significance was the discovery of the “Negro Burying Ground” under Court Street in Portsmouth when improvements to the municipal sewer system were being implemented. Thirteen coffins were identified, eight were recovered and five were left in place. The City of Portsmouth responded with careful excavations followed by extensive coordination with the public and especially the African-American...
community. Plans have been developed to close the street and establish a memorial park.

**The Division's most extensive survey effort during the last five years has been spread across the whole length of the state.** Nearly all of the research and planning survey conducted by the DHR has been through the mechanism of SCRAP. Volunteered time, money and resources from the public have sustained the program and accounted for virtually all of the survey. The annual SCRAP field schools, six weeks in length and operated in partnership with Plymouth State College, provide the skill and labor for the surveys. Students are drawn from many educational institutions from across the United States and Canada, while others come as avocational volunteers. Additional SCRAP projects are conducted throughout the year and include laboratory work and report preparation. In 2001 intensive survey documented a Late Paleoindian component in the town of Merrimack, resulting in a publication in the *Archaeology of North America*. 2002 saw survey in the Ossipee Mountains which identified a long sought quarry source of hornfels, a tool stone widely used across the region for over 9000 years. Survey in 2003 and 2004 focused further north where an Archaic workshop site was found associated with the well known Mt. Jasper rhyolite mine in Berlin and a Paleoindian site extending over an acre in size was documented in Randolph. The latter site was selected for preservation through a conservation easement by the Trust for Public Lands, and critical funding from the NH Land and Community Heritage Investment Program was secured, in part, because of the importance of the site. 2005 saw investigations on the last remnant of the well known and highly significant Neville site in Manchester to determine whether the site should be sold by the city for residential development. Investigations revealed a Contact period component as well as Archaic occupations and the property was determined to be worthy of protection. These major efforts were completed through SCRAP summer field schools. Smaller scale efforts were executed throughout the state with commensurate results. Some of the fieldwork is an extension of efforts initiated during, or in preparation for, the annual field schools. Other efforts fall principally into the category of rescue archaeology.

**The DHR is frequently notified when potential archaeological sites are threatened with damage or destruction by projects without state or federal involvement. In these circumstances every effort is made to document the site and to recover as much information as the circumstances will allow.** Typically, SCRAP volunteers provide most of the labor on these projects. Examples include investigations of unmarked historic cemeteries, sites located during construction, and sites situated in sand and gravel pits. In all cases, the private landowners voluntarily provide access to the property and typically modify either construction timetables or the actual areas of impact.

**Evaluation and Future Direction**

*Thus far, the surveys completed in New Hampshire for prehistoric archaeological resources reflect a relatively narrow and biased sample, both temporally and spatially.* Survey coverage is best for the Middle Archaic period, followed by the Later Archaic, reflecting the comparatively long time span for the two periods. The Woodland period seems to be under-represented, given the assumed increase in population during this era and the apparent substantial population size just prior to the massive loss of life through plagues and famines brought by contact with Europeans. The Paleoindian period was much underrepresented in the inventory but this situation is improving. Survey in the northern third of the state has increased the number of known sites, more than doubling the number with undisturbed components. Still, the number of recorded sites are well below what must actually exist.
Spatially, survey efforts have been strongly biased in favor of the Merrimack River and Lake Winnipesaukee. These initiatives reflect a strong emphasis on compliance and research surveys in these areas of our greatest population. Another area with a strong representation in the survey inventory is the Ossipee Lake and Ossipee River area. Intensive survey by the DHR in the region has stimulated interest by local, avocational SCRAP volunteers, resulting in a strong and continuing survey effort. Upland areas in general have very low representation in the survey, largely because of past and contemporary land use. Wide-scale logging introduced erosion which undoubtedly destroyed or damaged many sites. Contemporary reforestation (which accounts for nearly 84% of the land surface) has made site discovery extremely difficult. The possibility of sites in the upland areas is strong but largely untapped.

The Connecticut River Valley is also underrepresented in the survey. The number of reported sites per river mile or per acres of floodplain is much lower than for the Merrimack River Valley. This may be due in part to a well-founded reluctance to build population and industrial centers on these floodplains. Deeply-buried sites are known to exist; however, appropriate survey techniques (backhoe trenches and deep coring) have rarely been applied. This deficiency was addressed with the execution of a field school jointly sponsored by SCRAP and Franklin Pierce College on a rapidly eroding riverbank site in Hinsdale, the southwesternmost community in New Hampshire. Here a Late Archaic and Woodland site was intensively surveyed and documented.

Another area with a severe deficiency of survey and recorded sites is the extreme northern portion of the state. A low contemporary population, remoteness from population centers, and consistent forest cover have discouraged work in this region.

Priorities for survey work in the future include the Connecticut River Valley, upland areas of the state, and the areas of lowest current population, especially in the northern quarter of the state. The time periods needing the most research include the Paleoindian, Early Archaic, Woodland and Historic periods. We know the least about the transitions from Paleoindian to Early Archaic, and from the Late Archaic to Early Woodland. Not surprisingly, the periods of relative stability are somewhat better known, while the briefer eras of cultural (and climatic?) instability are much more poorly identified and understood.

Given the realities of the level of funding available to the DHR, we can anticipate only a modest expansion of the archaeological survey program. We have added an archaeologist with historic period expertise to the staff, and we have been able to address this deficiency although that staff person’s time is limited by other critical responsibilities.
New Hampshire’s earliest survey efforts began in 1960 with the nomination of the Macpheadris-Warner House in Portsmouth as the state’s first National Historic Landmark.

Since then the program has worked toward the goals of encouraging more accurate and complete documentation of all types of historical resources and making that documentation accessible to the researchers, property owners, interested organizations and governmental agencies throughout the state. The program continues to work toward these goals, while constantly amassing more documentation, research materials and improved technology.

More systematic survey of New Hampshire’s historical resources began in the late 1970s with reconnaissance level surveys in a number of towns by regional planning agencies. Ten years later, with increasing responsibilities for reviewing publicly funded or permitted projects that could adversely impact historical resources, the DHR revamped its survey program, creating a three-tiered system of town-wide area forms, project area or historic district forms, and individual inventory forms. This successful approach continues in use today.

For surveys relating to transportation projects and planning programs, the DHR, the NH Department of Transportation (NHDOT), and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) also developed a “DOT Methodology,” which specifies the phasing, type and extent of survey activity, products and evaluation procedures. This methodology has worked so well that it has become the norm for most other geographically-based cultural resources surveys in the state.

Review and compliance projects continue to generate a great deal of the survey in New Hampshire, with housing and transportation projects contributing the majority of the inventories.

In total, the extent of New Hampshire’s survey data includes town-wide area forms completed for 55 municipalities, along with more than 370 project area or historic district forms, and 7600 inventory forms for individual properties. Added to this research base are the nomination forms for the state’s twenty-two National Historic Landmarks and 701 listings on the National Register of Historic Places. Because 106 of the latter entries are for large historic districts, a total of 3897 buildings, sites, structures and objects are actually registered. Nominations for 96 State Register properties and 380 HABS/HAER and state level documentation reports round out the state’s survey and inventory files.

These numbers do not reflect the research value of the thematic survey work completed in New Hampshire. Bridges, railroads, lighthouses, outdoor public sculpture, churches in two counties, twentieth-century post offices, burial grounds, libraries and plank houses have all been studied as individual historic contexts and resource types. These thematic studies are invaluable, particularly with complex or less commonly understood properties.

Work on the state’s Historic Bridge Inventory is constant, as bridges age and reach fifty years of age or as bridges are demolished, creating a smaller class of resources to consider. The DHR, NHDOT and FHWA are also working on the publication of volume two of a historic bridge book concentrating on metal and concrete bridges. Volume one, on covered bridges, was published in 1994.

Recently, development projects, weather events and environmental trends have called greater attention to the state’s 18th and 19th century masonry resources, such as dams, culverts, foundations and all types of stone walls. These structures, which often remain well-preserved despite centuries of non-use or neglect, are vulnerable to the forces of increasing development, rivers restoration, road expansion and flooding. The DHR is working with colleague
agencies such as the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the Army Corps of Engineers, the NH Department of Transportation and the NH Department of Environmental Resources to fund and complete historic context studies for dry-laid stone culverts and dams. With an understanding of these resources as a group, more informed and efficient decisions can be made regarding their preservation or removal for emergency situations.

The New Hampshire Barn Survey, initiated in 2000, has added an immense amount of data to the state’s agricultural and architectural historic context files. The barn survey is one part of a larger barn preservation program, spearheaded by an advisory committee representing a wide constituency of agricultural and preservation interests. Begun as a voluntary survey completed by barn owners, the project has expanded into a series of town-wide surveys of historic agricultural outbuildings, most often completed by a local historical society or heritage commission. To date, more than a dozen towns and 600 individual owners have participated, creating not only survey data but also a way to appreciate historic agricultural resources in a whole new light. The survey continues. DHR’s challenge now is analyze the data and create a published narrative that will inform and advocate for future preservation projects.

Other priorities for continued thematic evaluation include sporting cabins, summer camps, county homes and other publicly-owned institutions, religious properties, designed and managed landscapes, and state-owned properties and historic sites.

To assist thematic study of the state’s resources, DHR continues to assemble a broad list of historic contexts most commonly uncovered in the state’s properties and history. The Division maintains research files on each of the contexts and also enters surveyed properties into a database by context. This information is available to researchers investigating not only a certain theme, such as shoemaking, but also considering a single property that may relate to others with a shared history, such as shoe shops. The context list evolves as the state’s research base grows. The current list appears in Appendix J-1.

The DHR’s survey and inventory program has made good progress in meeting goals listed in the last state preservation plan. By improving the methods and holdings of the state’s survey and inventory program, the DHR hopes to both protect resources and increase the public’s knowledge of and appreciation for New Hampshire’s varied historic resources. Successful preservation projects all begin with a complete understanding of the resource.

Revised survey forms and manuals. Responding to public comment and changing technological needs, the state’s inventory forms for individual properties and for areas such as historic districts or project effect areas have been updated. They are now accompanied by thorough guidance for completing the forms, geared both to the professional and first-time user. Both are available on the DHR’s web site, eliminating paper waste and enabling users to complete the forms on their computers.

The revised forms and manuals have been especially useful for applicants to the New Hampshire State Register of Historical Places, established in 2001. The State Register program is designed to recognize and protect resources through a listing process that many property owners can pursue themselves. State Register resources do not need to be extraordinary or the best example in town; they can be common, although irreplaceable, features on the New Hampshire landscape. Properties as varied as bandstands, cemeteries and airport terminals have been listed, in addition to more expected resources such as homes, town halls and churches.

Historic Properties Database. Great progress has also been made in digitizing the DHR’s survey and inventory files. Since
1999, all newly submitted individual inventory forms have been entered into the state’s Historic Properties Database. The task of entering earlier individual inventory forms will be finished within the year. Researchers now have the option of making an appointment with DHR staff to query this database and locate records by a large number of attributes, such as location, construction date, historical context or building materials. This effort has been greatly assisted by the use of standardized answers to many of the fields on the revised inventory forms.

Resource room and research files. Other research materials at the DHR have been reorganized and entered into a database. Research tools such as historic maps, slides, photographs, construction plans, HABS/HAER and state-level documentation reports, and the historical context files are available in the DHR’s Resource Room, by appointment with a staff person who can assist researchers by finding materials and suggesting other sources of information. The town research files, comprising inventory forms, Register nominations and miscellaneous property information, have now been separated from the town review and compliance files and given more space, greatly easing their use by staff and by researchers.

No state survey and inventory is ever complete. Resources age, unrecorded properties are discovered, and perceptions of significance change with the passage of time and increased contextual knowledge. With much of the survey program’s organization renewed, the DHR’s first priority over the next five years is to increase the number of surveyed properties and districts across the state. A great deal of funding, partners and technical assistance will be necessary to reach this goal. The DHR will need to work with its established survey partners, such as housing and transportation agencies, but also with regional planning commissions, local heritage commissions and others to broaden and fund additional survey.

Federal agencies such as FEMA, US Fish & Wildlife and the Army Corps may be of greatest assistance with thematic surveys covering property types such as culverts, camps and dams. Local heritage commissions and certified local governments will be natural partners for geographically-based surveys. The DHR will add to its already published guidance on individual and area forms with a handbook on completing town-wide inventories aimed specifically at town and city heritage commissions.

A number of technological opportunities and challenges still remain for the DHR in the 21st century. The Historic Properties Database contains a great deal of information on individual surveyed properties, but no photographs. Nor is it linked to databases containing properties recorded through HABS/HAER and state level documentation reports or historic districts and surveyed project areas. These additions will create a much more comprehensive base of digital information.

Part or all of the state’s survey information can be made far more accessible to government agencies and the public via a public access terminal at DHR’s office or its web page. Accurate locational information for many of New Hampshire’s natural, cultural and political resources is now available through the state’s geographic information system, known as GRANIT, distributed by Complex Systems Research Center at the University of New Hampshire. Few historical resources are now recorded in the system. Working with Complex Systems and local and state planning agencies, DHR needs to determine how to portray historical resources on GRANIT, develop and implement a plan for accurately locating these resources, and then mesh these locations with selected information from the Historic Properties Database.
## ATTITUDES, THREATS, & TRENDS AFFECTING NEW HAMPSHIRE’S HISTORIC PLACES:

### WHAT NEW HAMPSHIRE PEOPLE ARE TELLING THE DIVISION OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES

#### POSITIVE ATTITUDES

- Individual and community longing for meaning and value in daily life and personal surroundings
- Recognition that historic preservation nurtures a sense of place and identity
- Belief that historic preservation sustains living culture
- Eagerness to change the perception of historic preservation, away from “a luxury for the elite” to “a way for addressing core concerns relating to safety, decent housing, jobs, education, community life”
- Expanding interest in reuse and recycling of natural and built resources
- Growing emphasis on sustainability and on "green" design and economics
- Increasing network of partners and stakeholders supporting historic preservation initiatives
- Evolving attitudes to encourage preservation of agricultural structures, mills, and historic downtown buildings
- Coordination of public/private efforts to prevent fragmentation of farm and forest land
- Broadening involvement in preservation and conservation easement programs
- Great importance attached to volunteering and participatory activity
- Preference for initiatives that are “bottom up” and community centered
- Strong and increasing interest in recreational trails, both motorized and non-motorized, and other forms of outdoor recreation
- Greater support for non-highway transportation systems, particularly by rail
- Growing advocacy and infrastructure for heritage tourism
- Higher sensitivity to planning and design issues among local officials and businesses
- Broad recognition that attractiveness is a key to community prosperity
- Popularity of farmers' markets and direct farm-consumer sales to support local agriculture, develop local food systems, and provide community gathering places
- "Protect rural character" and "revitalize the downtown" are the stated goals of most town and city master plans in New Hampshire

#### NEGATIVE VIEWS

- Paradox: fear of change coexists with belief that new construction is “progress” and therefore good
- Anti-regulatory attitudes
- Historic buildings and structures seen as expensive problems rather than as functional, programmatic or investment opportunities
- Reluctance to spend public funds on historic preservation for its own sake
- Prevalence of the "Jobs vs. Environment" myth (the zero-sum fallacy that gains in one mean losses on the other)

#### NATURAL & UNNATURAL DISASTERS

- Weather (floods, hurricanes, ice, snow, tornadoes, windstorms)
- Acid rain
- Accidents (fires, explosions, collisions)
- Demolition by choice and neglect
- Arson
- Vandalism
- Looting

#### INFORMATION & EDUCATION GAPS

- Lack of interest in the past
- Lack of historic preservation information, education, and training available to the public and to decisionmakers
- Few archaeology or historic preservation courses or workshops available in New Hampshire
- Insufficient scholarly knowledge about historic properties
- Few university-level instructors in archaeology or architectural history or New Hampshire history in the state
- Incomplete survey and inventory data
- Limited knowledge and use of historic preservation land use and planning techniques/treatments
- Insufficient availability of qualified tradespeople and historic preservation professionals to work on preservation projects; need exceeds supply
- Lack of knowledge about accessing private and public funding for historic preservation work
ATTITUDES, THREATS, & TRENDS AFFECTING NEW HAMPSHIRE’S HISTORIC PLACES:

WHAT NEW HAMPSHIRE PEOPLE ARE TELLING THE DIVISION OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES

POPULATION, ECONOMIC, & LAND-USE DYNAMICS

- Impacts of global, national, and regional economic trends (a counterpoint and contrast to the tenets of New Hampshire’s “Home Rule” and “Live Free or Die” attitudes)
- Transformation from manufacturing to service economy
- Growing diversity of New Hampshire’s population and popular culture
- Demographic changes
- Transformation of the composition and nature of families
- Generational transfers of wealth and property
- Changing working / commuting / shopping patterns
- Telecommunications and information technology revolution
- Expansion of transportation networks
- Changes in energy sources, generation, transmission, use, conservation and pricing

WORRISOME TRENDS

- Negative impact of New Hampshire tax structure and property taxes in particular on historic properties
- New Hampshire’s charitable giving is low in comparison to most other states
- Fragmentation of open space
- Changes in use / loss of viability of iconic property types and cultural landscapes
- Inappropriate alterations or uses of historic structures
- ”Tear-downs”– demolition of historic buildings for replacement with larger modern structures that are out of scale with the historic setting
- Intensive waterfront development that impacts archaeological sites and historical resources
- Negative effects of over-development, sprawl and "big-box" retailing
- Poorly planned and non-planned land use
- Archaeological losses due to erosion, mining and development
- General lack of funds or incentives for historic preservation work, and increasing difficulty in obtaining what is available.

STRATEGIC ISSUES

- Advancing a statewide shared vision for the future of New Hampshire
- Expanding public appreciation of the value-added and multiplier effects of investment in historic preservation and conservation programs
- Establishing historic preservation priorities as a central element of public policy
- Integrating historic preservation into local, regional and state planning policies and products
- Involving historic preservation goals and techniques into NHDOT / FHWA “Context Sensitive Solutions” program
- Designing multi-modal transportation systems that fit well into the natural and built environment
- Increasing citizen involvement in public planning and development issues, and as "Consulting Parties" in Section 106 project consultations
- Coordinating historic preservation resources for more effectiveness
- Marketing and publicizing the values of history, heritage, and historic preservation
- Giving greater attention to young people (who are also future civic decisionmakers) and educating them about historic preservation benefits and values
- Ameliorating impacts of national, state, and local codes and regulations on historic properties
- Educating property owners about appropriate treatments for archaeological sites, historic buildings and structures
- Encouraging better maintenance and monitoring of historic properties and places
- Seeking appropriate new uses for vacant/underused historic properties
- Developing preservation maintenance protocols for state-owned historic buildings and structures
- Strengthening and increasing state support for state historic sites
1. Survey and Recognition

New Hampshire has a diverse and rich variety of historical and archaeological resources. Survey, evaluation, and recognition efforts must accelerate so that a fuller understanding of New Hampshire’s past, as documented by these resources, can be shared with our citizens and visitors. Particular strategies will be to:

- Broaden survey and inventory of the state's historical and archaeological resources
- Expand the Division of Historical Resources (DHR) survey and inventory databases and make information available to a wider audience
- Identify and integrate relevant new topics into the historic contexts used by researchers and the DHR
- Organize system for DHR electronic data storage and migration to facilitate future use and accessibility
- Integrate survey and inventory information with GIS systems, including NH GRANIT, while maintaining confidentiality of protected data categories such as archaeological site locations
- Increase nominations to the National Register and the New Hampshire State Register of Historic Places
- Bring attention to specific resources and their stewards through awards and other recognition
- Provide technical assistance to individuals, organizations, and public agencies working on survey and inventory projects, including published guidance geared specifically toward town-wide inventories.
- Work with NHDOT and others to survey stone highway culverts in one or more watersheds, and to develop protocols for determining National Register eligibility for the more significant of these overlooked resources.
- Work with the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services to complete a survey of dams, integrating historical data that will expedite determination of National Register eligibility for dams and other water control structures.
- Work with industrial archaeologists and historians to enhance appreciation and protection for industrial resources and landscapes.

2. Education and Outreach

To provide the public with a greater appreciation of and responsibility for the state's cultural resources, more educational initiatives relating to historic preservation must be developed, especially to:

- Establish a New Hampshire post-secondary and graduate program of historic preservation and heritage studies
- Develop school programs and/or special materials (K-12, college-level and graduate programs) focusing on historic preservation
- Develop and distribute recommendations for a basic preservation toolkit collection at local and depository libraries
- Provide training for life-long learners through programs, conferences and workshops addressing both above-ground and archaeological resources
- Improve DHR and other New Hampshire preservation-related web sites to provide more and better preservation information to the public
- Develop and produce new publications, pamphlets, videos, DVDs, exhibits, and other materials to extend the preservation message
- Erect new historical markers, signage, and other interpretive materials to inform the public about specific places and resources
- Participate in relevant trade shows and related constituent outreach initiatives.

3. Planning and Protection

Preservation planning and a preservation ethic need to be integrated into decision-making on state, regional, and local levels. Specific steps to be taken include actions to:

- Increase funding and expand availability of professional consultant grants for services of architectural historians, historical architects, engineers, attorneys, and planners to assist with preservation project planning, technical assistance, and federal/state project reviews
- Encourage the creation of new and strengthen existing Certified Local Governments, Historic District Commissions, Heritage Commissions, and Main Street programs to address local preservation concerns
3. Planning and Protection, continued:

- Create new and enhance existing preservation planning tools such as demolition review ordinances, neighborhood heritage districts, and architectural design review
- Work with existing historic district and heritage commissions to update and improve their ordinances, regulations, and rules of procedure, and to establish design guidelines
- Provide support for establishing new historic district and heritage commissions in communities that do not already have them
- Provide historic preservation training/workshops for local planners, elected officials and other decision makers
- Strengthen existing municipal master plans by including historic preservation chapters
- Seek legislation to make a historic preservation chapter [RSA 674:2, III., (h)] a required rather than optional Master Plan component; and expand the purpose of the chapter to embrace the economic and community development potential of historic preservation and rehabilitation
- Strengthen public involvement in Section 106 and state historic preservation project reviews
- Provide materials and best examples concerning the proper treatment of historic properties, appropriate uses of historic places, and curation of objects and artifacts associated with historic resources
- Work with NHDOT and FHWA to draft, ratify, and implement a plan to reevaluate New Hampshire’s highway and railroad bridges for National Register eligibility, and to preserve those bridges that are found to possess high levels of significance.
- Work with NHDOT and others to develop preservation strategies for rail-related features both on active rail lines and on rail trails.
- Work with interested parties throughout New Hampshire to enhance recognition and protection of stone resources, including stone walls, cellar holes and foundations, causeways, dams, canals, culverts, and other stone features.
- Support sustainable land use and promote reinvestment in existing historical infrastructure
- Identify key properties for protection/preservation through easements or purchase
- Expand the use of easements for protecting historical and cultural resources
- Strengthen capacity for easement monitoring and enforcement
- Work with state agencies and organizations to incorporate historic preservation concerns into planning initiatives
- Increase linkages with conservation, agriculture, forestry, tourism, economic development, planning, affordable housing, social services and accessibility organizations
- Strengthen coordination among historic preservation-related agencies and organizations
- Reassess and update the New Hampshire archaeological site prediction model
- Work toward improved stewardship of state-owned historic sites and increase the range of the benefits they provide to the public.

4. Funding and Incentives

For any initiatives to be effective, additional sources of funding and incentives must be mobilized to support historic preservation efforts. Particular efforts will be made to:

- Expand the use of federal preservation tax incentives
- Promote and increase the use of state historic preservation tax incentives and easements
- Expand the use and scope of Certified Local Government (CLG) grants
- Administer the state conservation license plate (Moose Plate) grants, and provide assistance and support to stewards of eligible publicly-owned properties in applying for the grants
- Develop state grant program for barns and other agricultural properties
- Assist and support applicants seeking funding for historic preservation and archaeological projects from public and private programs
- Seek new and increase existing funding for New Hampshire archaeological, historic preservation and conservation projects
- Provide monitoring and technical assistance for publicly funded historic preservation projects
- Develop consultant service programs for historic properties.
Successfully achieving these goals and objectives will require partnerships among the DHR, other state agencies, Certified Local Governments, Historic District and Heritage Commissions, local historical societies, the Association of Historical Societies of New Hampshire, the Archeological Society of New Hampshire, the New Hampshire Historical Society, the New Hampshire Preservation Alliance, the Conservation License Plate program, the Land & Community Heritage Investment Program, Main Street programs, Regional Planning Commissions, public and private educational institutions, including the University System of New Hampshire, municipalities, schools, and many of the non-profit organizations in the state that are concerned with issues including preservation, planning, education, the environment and natural resources, sustainability, agriculture, land conservation, transportation, tourism, economic and community development, affordable housing, social services, accessibility, and others which affect New Hampshire’s quality of life.

Each of these potential partners has particular strengths and opportunities that can be drawn upon to enhance its distinctive role in building an accessible, effective and thoroughly interconnected statewide historic preservation program.
This plan, like its predecessors completed in 1996 and 2001, was developed by the staff of the Division of Historical Resources with considerable opportunity for public involvement.

Questionnaire

A DHR questionnaire was circulated to the public annually through 2004. It was included in our newsletter with a mailing list of nearly 3500, and made available through notification in the press, at conferences and workshops, and other preservation-related venues. Over the years, a pattern developed where the respondents were generally the same individuals and organizations, despite the breadth of the public notice and dissemination of the questionnaires. The responses consistently emphasized four program areas for special attention:

- technical assistance, public education and outreach, and partnership initiatives;
- local historical surveys (to focus on a community’s built environment as a key to understanding its history);
- context-based community planning; and
- preservation tax incentives.

When it became clear that there was little variation in the responses from year, the DHR experimented with a different format for eliciting information. In 2005, for the FY 2006 work program, we attempted to develop an on-line questionnaire, but our web site was not sufficiently sophisticated to enable direct responses. We are investigating other online formats for the FY 2007 annual work program.

Networking

As explained in the "updating" section, the plan has been and will continue to be reevaluated yearly by the DHR staff, the Commissioner of the Department of Cultural Resources, and the State Historical Resources Council (the State Review Board) as part of the preparation of the DHR’s annual workplan. The activities of the Historical Agricultural Structures Advisory Committee -- popularly known as the "Barn Committee" -- and the DHR’s increasing involvement in land conservation, state land management, and preservation of historic farms have significantly shaped and enriched the preservation vision embodied in the statewide historic preservation plan.

In addition to formal solicitation of feedback, during the last five years the DHR has developed a strong external orientation and a network of collegial relationships with other public agencies, partner organizations, and communities. As a result, the DHR benefits from constant and "real-time" feedback -- often in a context of cooperative planning and problem-solving, based both on regular interagency meetings and special workshop and training sessions -- that identifies new conditions, goals and objectives which the State Plan should address.

Even negative events -- for example, the extensive and deadly fall 2005 and spring 2006 floods -- have led to new long-range initiatives such as plans for a pilot survey of historic stone culverts.

Other valuable sources of public input and feedback for the State Plan include participation in statewide planning groups convened by other agencies, and technical assistance interactions with towns and cities -- both informally and in the context of planning charrettes sponsored by Plan New Hampshire. The DHR is also an invited presenter and exhibitor for annual statewide conferences/trade shows presented by planning, municipal government, natural and agricultural resources organizations, and for the biennial Old House and Barn Expo organized by the New Hampshire Preservation Alliance. All provide extraordinary opportunities for the DHR to connect with its constituencies and respond to their concerns.
Newsletter

The Old Stone Wall, the DHR quarterly newsletter, like many of the DHR's other initiatives, is a public/private partnership which combines the newsletters of the New Hampshire Preservation Alliance and the DHR into a single shared publication that is mailed to the preservation community, members of the state legislature, the Governor, and most state agencies; to all Certified Local Governments, to Historic District Commissions and Heritage Commissions; to many town boards, all of the libraries in the state, to organizations, businesses, and to private citizens with an interest in history. Additional copies are printed for general distribution at conferences, workshops, events, and trade shows. Beginning in 2003, copies of the DHR newsletter have been posted on our web site at http://www.nh.gov/nhdhr/newsletters.html.

Continuous Planning Process

The DHR has gathered information for this plan through regularly scheduled meetings with state and federal agencies, including the Department of Transportation, the Federal Highway Administration, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the Division of Parks & Recreation in the Department of Resources & Economic Development (DRED). The DHR is also a participant in the meetings of the interagency State Lands Management Committee and Rivers Restoration Task Force, and meets frequently with the Bureau of Public Works in the Department of Administrative Services, the Department of Fish & Game, and agencies and personnel of the Department of Environmental Services, to provide cultural resources information, direction, and technical assistance. The DHR has frequent contact with other agencies and organizations in the state, including the Office of Energy and Planning, the Office of Emergency Management, the Office of the State Fire Marshal, the Governor's Commission on Disability, the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, and the White Mountain National Forest.

We serve on many other committees including the Scenic & Cultural Byways Committee, the Transportation Enhancement Advisory Committee, and on the various friends' groups which support our state historical sites. We have been involved with legislative committees studying master planning for farm preservation, rehabilitation tax incentives, lead paint issues, sprawl, state facilities, stone walls, and telecommunications facilities.

Above all, we connect with our preservation partners on a frequent and sometimes daily basis. The Association of Historical Societies of New Hampshire, the NH Archeological Society, the NH Coalition for Sustaining Agriculture, the NH Historical Agricultural Structures Advisory Committee, the NH Center for Land Conservation Assistance, the NH Conservation License Plate (Moose Plate) Program, the NH Land & Community Heritage Investment Program (LCHIP), the NH Historical Society, the NH Humanities Council, the NH Main Street Program, the NH Preservation Alliance, the State Historical Resources Council, the Certified Local Governments, Historic District Commissions, Heritage Commissions, Regional Planning Commissions, public and private museums, libraries, and educational institutions, including the University System of New Hampshire, SCRAP volunteers, state and local land trusts, local historic preservation advocates and project sponsors, and the many fine preservation consultants in the state all provide us with ideas, stimulation, and encouragement.

We could not undertake these planning initiatives without their commitment and support.
This plan has been prepared by a collegial effort of the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources staff, under the direction of James McConaha, Director of the DHR and New Hampshire State Historic Preservation Officer.

We want the new five-year plan to be a practical guide that will promote productive responses to preservation threats and opportunities. This document is intended to be flexible and to respond to change as it is needed. To be successful, it must be broadly visible, useful, and accessible.

We will continue to seek guidance from the public to be sure that it addresses an appropriate range of preservation activity for the New Hampshire state historic preservation program, while taking into account the roles of our public and private preservation partners.

The development and implementation of this plan enables the Division of Historical Resources to assess its past progress and set goals and priorities for the future. It provides a tool for guiding the state’s historic preservation efforts for at least the next five years.

Internally, the plan will be reevaluated yearly as part of the DHR’s annual workplan. The DHR staff, the Commissioner of the Department of Cultural Resources, and the State Historical Resources Council (the State Review Board) will participate in the reevaluation, to assess progress made in attaining goals, and to address any substantive changes in circumstances.

Public participation in the process will also be ensured through public meetings and workshops, through involvement with the planning processes of towns and cities and other federal and state agencies; through feedback from local planning charrettes and statewide planning and municipal government conferences/trade shows; through the DHR’s daily communication with the general public, and by regular consultation with the preservation community. We have published the goals and objectives in our newsletter to seek feedback, and also intend to post the plan on our website in order to gather ongoing public comments and recommendations to help us prepare our annual Historic Preservation Fund workplans.

The DHR plans to revisit the full scope of the planning process and to completely revise and update this State Historic Preservation Plan beginning in late 2009.
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WHAT DOES THE NH DIVISION OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES DO?

Each state has a preservation program based on the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, amended (16 U.S.C. 470f), but tailored to its own needs and organizational structure. New Hampshire’s state historic preservation program began in 1974 as the State Historic Preservation Office in the Department of Resources and Economic Development. In 1985 it became the Division of Historical Resources (DHR) and was moved to a new department, renamed the Department of Cultural Resources in 1998, which also includes the State Council on the Arts, the State Librarian, and the American–Canadian French Cultural Exchange Commission.

Commissioner Van McLeod is head of the department; James McConaha, the Director of the Division of Historical Resources, is also New Hampshire’s State Historic Preservation Officer. The State Historical Resources Council (SHRC) acts in an advisory capacity to the DHR to review, recommend, and approve specific program activities, including nominations to the National Register of Historic Places. The DHR is also responsible for the New Hampshire Register of Historic Places. The Historic Agricultural Structures Advisory Committee assists the DHR with the New Hampshire Barn Survey and its new program of grants for preserving historic farm buildings.

STATE PROGRAM & SERVICES: The DHR is a state agency, supported by the State of New Hampshire, by the federal Historic Preservation Fund (through a matching grant administered by the National Park Service of the U.S. Department of the Interior), and by donated funds and services. The DHR’s state program responsibilities encompass the activities of the State Curator and the Archaeology Bureau, including the popular SCRAP program for training and certifying avocational archaeologists. The DHR manages a program to preserve and protect state-owned historical resources; it issues permits for archaeological projects on state lands or under state waters; and it oversees the treatment of unmarked human burials discovered during land-altering activities. The DHR accepts gifts of objects of historic significance and places them at appropriate locations; it advises state government on the conservation needs of state-owned historical objects; it administers the state heritage landmark designation review procedures and the State Historical Resources Council; and it coordinates with the Department of Transportation in management of the state highway historical markers program. The DHR cooperates with the State Archivist and the Director of the Division of Parks & Recreation; it helps municipalities to establish historic districts and heritage commissions, and it assists local historical societies. The DHR also works with other federal, state, and local agencies, organizations, groups, and individuals, in areas of mutual interest and concern, such as NH DOT’s “Stone Walls” protection policy, the State Land Management Team, the state’s Scenic/Cultural Byways program, and a variety of other partnership projects, including affordable housing, rural preservation, community charrettes, and technical assistance to enable historic properties to meet the requirements of building and safety codes, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

The DHR is part of many public/private partnerships focused on historic preservation; it has an especially strong and productive working relationship with the New Hampshire Preservation Alliance, the non-profit statewide organization dedicated to the preservation of New Hampshire’s historic buildings, landscapes and communities through leadership, advocacy, and education.

The Division of Historical Resources publishes a quarterly newsletter, The Old Stone Wall (please contact the DHR to be added to the mailing list). The historic preservation program is also a focal point and resource for New Hampshire state government’s emphasis on heritage tourism and sustainable development. So even with full and part-time staff members, and a lot of dedicated volunteers in the SCRAP archaeology program, DHR staff still work many extra hours to help communities and citizens take care of our New Hampshire heritage.

In addition to its state functions, the DHR is also responsible for administering the federal preservation program in New Hampshire, which includes nine different program areas:

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES: the National Register is the national listing of properties that are important to us as Americans, and which are worthy of preservation: districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that have integrity and are significant in history, architecture, archaeology, engineering and culture—not only at the national or state levels, but also at the local level, a source of community pride and identity.

COMPREHENSIVE PRESERVATION PLANNING: in order to participate in the federal preservation program and to receive federal preservation funds, a state must develop a preservation planning procedure to guide and energize preservation endeavors. The plan is both a document and a process, to link identification, evaluation, registration, and treatment of historical resources. It is also intended to help the people and organizations and governmental agencies whose activities are somehow connected with preservation to understand how their own roles can, or ought to be, coordinated with the statewide preservation strategy. As part of the process, the DHR circulates an annual questionnaire to elicit public comments and public participation. Each year, the responses have consistently emphasized four program areas for special attention: technical assistance, public education and outreach, and partnership initiatives; local historical surveys (which focus on a community’s built environment as a key to understanding its history); context-based community planning; and preservation tax incentives.

A-1
WHAT DOES THE NH DIVISION OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES DO?

**Survey & Inventory:** This, with the plan, should be the foundation of ALL preservation activity in New Hampshire. Unfortunately, less than 25% of New Hampshire’s communities have up-to-date, comprehensive, professional quality historical resource surveys; and without that information, it is difficult—and irresponsible—to make informed decisions about historic properties or land use planning issues. At present, the NH Department of Transportation is doing the most and best historical resources survey in New Hampshire, as part of its transportation planning process. But not every town or city is scheduled for a project study that would generate survey data. Mobilizing a statewide survey effort to help ALL communities compile a preservation data base is the DHR’s top priority.

**Historic Preservation Review & Compliance:** All federally funded, assisted, and licensed activities must take into account properties which are listed in, or determined eligible for, the National Register, so that any adverse effects can be avoided or mitigated; and there is a similar set of New Hampshire requirements for state-funded or contracted activities. This procedure does not, and is not meant, to stop projects; instead, it provides a conflict-resolution and problem-solving system to balance the public interest in historic preservation with the public benefit from governmental programs. As with the NH DOT-funded surveys, information and opportunities identified through the Review & Compliance process can be used to advance local preservation and land-use planning activity, or to enhance preservation elements of multi-purpose projects.

**“Certified Rehab” Federal Tax Incentives:** In 1976, federal tax policy was reoriented to encourage the preservation of historically and architecturally significant properties. The tax laws have changed many times since then, and so have the federal preservation tax incentives, but the benefits—though more circumscribed—still exist. The work must conform to standards set by the Secretary of the Interior; it must be approved by the DHR and the National Park Service, and it is limited to income-producing properties; but even with those restrictions, over 100 New Hampshire properties involving investments of hundreds of millions of dollars have participated in the program. The tax incentives are particularly beneficial for large-scale projects that would not be feasible otherwise, and have served as important economic generators for financially-distressed areas.

**Certified Local Governments:** This is a partnership between municipal governments and the state historic preservation program, to encourage and expand local involvement in preservation-related activities. To become certified, a town or city must create a local historic district commission or heritage commission, conduct a local historical resources survey, enforce state and local historic preservation legislation (which includes establishing a local historic district and adequate regulations for enforcing the district ordinance), and provide for public participation in the local historic preservation program. CLGs are responsible for reviewing National Register nominations for all properties within their communities, and are eligible for federal matching grants from a special “pass-through” fund set aside for the exclusive use of CLGs. Currently, there are twelve CLGs in New Hampshire: Concord, Derry, Durham, Gilford, Goffstown, Hollis, Jaffrey, Nashua, Newington, Newport, Sanbornton, and Somersworth; applications from several other communities are pending.

**Acquisition, Development, and Covenants:** The federal preservation program authorizes SHPOs to provide matching grants for acquisition and preservation work, but lack of funding has made it difficult for the DHR to offer financial assistance to preservation projects. Until matching grants for historic barns were inaugurated in 2001, the last “A&D” projects in New Hampshire were funded through the 1983 “Jobs Bill,” when eleven properties received assistance. For those properties which did receive federal preservation “A&D” funds, the DHR holds and monitors preservation covenants (also known as historic preservation easements or deed restrictions). The covenants insure that the historical qualities of the properties will be maintained. In addition, the DHR holds perpetual easements, acquired through the state Land Conservation Investment Program, at the Canterbury and Enfield Shaker villages; and the DHR is also involved in monitoring covenants for historic properties preserved by other state agencies, such as the NH DOT, as part of Review and Compliance mitigation activities.

**Administration:** This program area provides management and support of DHR activities that receive assistance from the federal Historic Preservation Fund.

**Technical Assistance:** This is the DHR’s information, resource, and referral service. It is also a reminder that the real work of historic preservation is accomplished by people, individually and together, taking the initiative to care for historic properties and places. In one word: STEWARDSHIP...respecting our heritage from the past, so we can pass it along to the future.
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offices & mailing address: 20 PARK STREET
CONCORD, NEW HAMPSHIRE
03301-6314

NH DHR / SHPO * September 2006
The legislature of New Hampshire has determined that the historical, archeological, architectural, engineering, and cultural heritage of New Hampshire is among the most important environmental assets of the state and that the rapid social and economic development of contemporary society threatens the remaining vestiges of this heritage; therefore, it is hereby declared to be public policy and in the public interest of this state to engage in a comprehensive program of historic preservation to promote the use and conservation of such property for the education, inspiration, pleasure, and enrichment of the citizens of New Hampshire.


A growing consensus holds that much of our New Hampshire economy is based on our history, and that preservation of New Hampshire's character and quality of life is the key to steady, sustainable development -- a conclusion based not on nostalgia, but on demographics and economics, both local and global.

The Division of Historical Resources' stakeholders see the DHR as the protector of heritage, beauty, values and resources; a source for information, education, guidance, and standards for heritage protection. They want the DHR to be a “visioning” agency, and a catalyst for change that is based on positive aspects of New Hampshire character and heritage. They call for the DHR to articulate a commitment to stewardship and social responsibility, to convey cultural heritage across the generations from past to future. And they assign to the DHR the accountability to speak for historic preservation as a public responsibility and a public trust, an attitude that connects people with place and identity, and a spiritual value that should infuse the way in which we live our daily lives.

Our constituents consistently plead for support of historic preservation education and advocacy; funding and technical assistance; partnering and networking; and reliable and useful information about historic properties, telling us:

- Change the image of historic preservation, away from “a luxury for the elite” to “a way to address core concerns relating to safety, decent housing, jobs, education, community life”
- Educate the public to understand the role of preservation in community identity, uniqueness, prosperity, and well-being; instill pride; connect people with place
- Celebrate the continuity and diversity of New Hampshire’s heritage and all those who have contributed to it
- Validate the feelings of local citizens on the importance of historic properties in their communities and provide the tools to preserve and protect those resources
- Incorporate historic preservation into local, regional, and state planning processes
- Secure funding for preservation of significant archaeological and historical properties (both public and private)
- Integrate the Department of Cultural Resources into a single facility, to enhance its ability to access historical knowledge and provide reliable and useful information to the public.

At the end of the 19th century, New Hampshire was also struggling with the threat of economic and environmental loss on a vast scale. The response, which began with individual insights and then evolved into a widely-held and powerful vision, was based on efforts to preserve and to promote the state’s environment and heritage in thoughtful and innovative ways. The New Hampshire conservation and preservation movement of the early 20th century became so successful that the attitudes and institutions which it generated have continued to exert their beneficial effects up to the present time. Much of the quality of our built and natural environment in New Hampshire is not the result of natural processes, but of conscious and thoughtful, informed choices by people who were motivated with concerns that transcended their personal needs or aspirations.

National studies demonstrate that New Hampshire ranks among the top six states in both “green” and “gold” economic indicators for protection of the environment and for overall economic performance. New Hampshire has the means, the capacity, and the ability to plan and achieve a sustainable economy based on technological creativity and on its natural and cultural
WHAT DOES THE NH DIVISION OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES DO?

assets, but needs the compelling vision to inspire the effort. New Hampshire heritage and identity should be at the core of that new vision.
New Hampshire's "State Historic Preservation Office" was established in 1974 as the Division of Historical Resources. The historical, archaeological, architectural and cultural resources of New Hampshire are among its most important environmental assets. Historic preservation promotes the use, understanding and conservation of such resources for the education, inspiration, pleasure and enrichment of New Hampshire's citizens.
CARROLL COUNTY
- Joy Farm, Silver Lake

CHESHIRE COUNTY
- Harrisville Historic District, Harrisville

COOS COUNTY
- Mount Washington Hotel, Bretton Woods

HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY
- Franklin Pierce Home, Hillsborough
- Mac Dowell Colony, Peterborough

MERRIMACK COUNTY
- Canterbury Shaker Village, Canterbury
- Daniel Webster Family Home, West Franklin

ROCKINGHAM COUNTY
- Robert Frost Homestead, Derry
- Matthew Thornton House, Derry
- Ladd-Gilman House, Exeter
- Josiah Bartlett House, Kingston
- Richard Jackson House, Portsmouth
- John Paul Jones House, Portsmouth
- Governor John Langdon Mansion, Portsmouth
- MacPheadris-Warner House, Portsmouth
- Moffatt-Ladd House, Portsmouth
- U.S.S. Albacore, Portsmouth
- Wentworth-Coolidge Mansion, Portsmouth
- Wentworth-Gardner House, Portsmouth

STRAFFORD COUNTY
- General John Sullivan House, Durham

SULLIVAN COUNTY
- Saint-Gaudens (Augustus) Memorial, Cornish
• Salmon Portland Chase Birthplace, Cornish Flat
CRITERIA: The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:

A. that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
B. that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
C. that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
D. that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

CRITERIA CONSIDERATIONS: Ordinarily, cemeteries, birthplaces, or graves of historical figures, properties owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes, structures that have been moved from their original locations, reconstructed historic buildings, properties primarily commemorative in nature, and properties that have achieved significance within the past 50 years shall not be considered eligible for the National Register. However, such properties will qualify if they are integral parts of districts that do meet the criteria or if they fall within the following categories:

A. a religious property deriving primary significance from architectural or artistic distinction or historical importance; or
B. a building or structure removed from its original location but which is significant primarily for architectural value, or which is the surviving structure most importantly associated with a historic person or event; or
C. a birthplace or grave of a historical figure of outstanding importance if there is no other appropriate site or building directly associated with his or her productive life; or
D. a cemetery that derives its primary significance from graves of persons of transcendent importance, from age, from distinctive design features, or from association with historic events; or
E. a reconstructed building when accurately executed in a suitable environment and presented in a dignified manner as part of a restoration master plan, and when no other building or structure with the same association has survived; or
F. a property primarily commemorative in intent if design, age, tradition, or symbolic value has invested it with its own historical significance; or
G. a property achieving significance with the past 50 years if it is of exceptional importance.

Code of Federal Regulations 36 CFR Part 60 (60.4: Criteria for Evaluation)

Information on documentation of properties and use of the Criteria for Evaluation may be obtained by writing:
The New Hampshire State Register of Historic Places is one part of the state’s efforts to recognize and encourage the identification and protection of historical, architectural, archeological and cultural resources. These irreplaceable resources may be buildings, districts, sites, landscapes, structures or objects that are meaningful in the history, architecture, archeology, engineering or traditions of New Hampshire residents and communities. The State Register is administered by the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources (NHDHR), which is the state’s Historic Preservation Office.

Listing on the State Register of Historic Places is one of several ways to acknowledge a property’s historical significance. A property may also qualify for the National Register of Historical Places, be designated a National Historic Landmark, be part of a local historic district, or recognized in a local or regional master plan. Please feel free to contact the NHDHR to learn more about these programs.

Listing in the State Register can contribute to the preservation of historic properties in a number of ways. Please see “Effects of Listing” for more information on these benefits:

- Public recognition that a property is significant to a community.
- Consideration and advocacy in the planning of local and state funded or otherwise assisted projects.
- Qualification for state financial assistance for preservation projects, when funds are available.
- Special consideration or relief in the application of some access, building and safety code regulations.
- A complimentary one-year membership to the New Hampshire Preservation Alliance.

**Listing a Property**

How do I list a property?

Property owners can nominate properties to the State Register by submitting a completed inventory form for the resource to the Division of Historical Resources. Forms and directions are available by contacting NHDHR or from the Division’s web site, at [http://www.nh.gov/nhdhr/formsmanual.html](http://www.nh.gov/nhdhr/formsmanual.html). They can be prepared by property owners or by a consulting architectural historian or archeologist at the owner’s request. NHDHR staff then review the nominations and make suggestions for editorial changes or additional research. If the property meets the State Register criteria and the inventory form is complete, the NHDHR recommends the property for listing to the State Historical Resources Council. The Council, composed of professionals in the fields of American history, architectural history, architecture, prehistoric and historic archeology and other related disciplines, meets quarterly and gives final approval to all nominations.

Following Council approval, NHDHR will present property owners with a letter and certificate confirming that their property is listed on the State Register of Historic Places. Information on the property will be entered into NHDHR’s database and files, and the owners can sign up for a mailing list to receive the Division’s newsletter and pertinent information on workshops, publications and other preservation events and topics.

Inventory forms are also completed as part of many state and local planning processes, such as environmental review for transportation projects, and through the efforts of town heritage or historical commissions. Property owners should check the NHDHR’s files for previous research prior to beginning their own inventory efforts.
What are the criteria for listing?

All properties listed on the State Register are documented and evaluated against the following criteria. These broad criteria are designed to guide individuals, local governments and others in evaluating potential entries in the State Register. Properties not specifically described in the text below may still be eligible.

Criteria for evaluation

Properties may be listed on the State Register for the story they tell. This story can be about a single event, such as a major labor strike at a factory, or about a much longer historical trend, such as the rise of textile manufacturing in the Merrimack River valley, or a number of stories that are together meaningful to a community’s history, such as a mill complex that has housed a number of different industries on which a village has depended. Although the State Register recognizes that many of these types of historical resources have changed over the years to accommodate evolving technologies, styles and needs, the listed resource must retain enough of its historic fabric to illustrate its historic uses and role in the community.

Properties may also be meaningful for their associations with people who made important contributions to a community, profession or local tradition. These types of resources could be the workshop of a popular painter, the home of successful local chair manufacturer or the store of the first merchant in town. Again, these resources should retain the bulk of their historical physical fabric. One test is to question whether the person whose life the property illustrates would recognize it today.

Properties may also be listed on the State Register for their tangible merit, either as a well-preserved example of local architecture, design, construction or engineering, or as long-standing focal point in a neighborhood or community. A variety of resources can be ushered into the State Register under this criterion: a well-preserved although typical example of a New Hampshire farmhouse, a town common or cemetery, or the intact stone foundations of a local grist mill. These types of resources need not be extraordinary or the best example in town; they often can be a common, although irreplaceable, feature on the New Hampshire landscape.

Identified, but unexcavated and unevaluated archeological sites may also be listed on the New Hampshire State Register of Historic Places. Artifacts at these sites can yield significant information about the lives, traditions and activities of New Hampshire’s earliest residents.

Types of Resources

As noted above, historic resources listed on the State Register can be buildings, districts, sites, landscapes, structures and objects. Examples of these types of resources include, but are not limited to:

- **Buildings:** houses, stores, barns, garages, boathouses.
- **Districts:** downtowns, mill complexes, railroad corridors, neighborhoods, agricultural properties.
- **Sites:** mill or building foundations, parade grounds, the location of a Native American Indian camp.
- **Landscapes:** cemeteries, parks, town forests.
- **Structures:** bridges, stone walls, fire towers, dams.
- **Objects:** watering troughs, light posts, boats, fountains.
How old does the property have to be?

Generally, properties eligible for listing on the State Register should be at least fifty years old. The passage of time allows for a more objective evaluation of a property’s historical significance. Properties approaching the fifty year mark can be listed if their historical values are already clear.

Changes to properties listed in the State Register

Any change to a historic property that harms or destroys its significant historic fabric may be grounds for removing that property from the State Register. These types of changes can include moving a building, replacing a building’s most significant historic building materials with unsympathetic materials, or the destruction of its most important historical attributes, such as the subdivision of a farm’s agricultural fields and the subsequent construction modern housing. The degree of harm a change can cause depends on the reason why the property was listed on the Register, and each case must be reviewed individually.

On the other hand, changes to a property once judged to be ineligible for the State Register could render it eligible, such as the removal of modern building materials from a commercial storefront and the restoration of its original façade.

Removing properties from the State Register

Any person or organization may petition in writing to the NHDHR for the removal of property from the State Register. Reasons for removing a property include: (a) changes that have harmed a resource’s historic integrity, (b) the introduction of additional information that shows a property does not meet State Register criteria, (c) procedural error in the nomination or listing process, or (d) a subsequent property owner’s preference. Given a clear, informative demonstration of why the property should be removed from the State Register, based on the four above grounds, NHDHR will either forward its concurrence or disagreement with the request to the State Historical Resources Council. As with listing a property to the State Register, the State Historical Resources Council gives final approval or disapproval to all removal requests.

Regardless of whether a property is listed on the State Register, or only determined to be eligible for listing on the State Register, many of the benefits described below in the section, “Effects of Listing,” still apply.

Assistance with listing a property on the State Register

Instructions for completing inventory forms and locating research materials are available at the NHDHR, as is a list of consulting architectural historians who are familiar with the inventory and State Register processes in New Hampshire. As noted above, researchers should also review the existing inventory files at NHDHR to determine whether information has been gathered on their property.

The National Park Service has published a number of guides to identifying and evaluating historic properties, including “Researching a Historic Property” (National Register Bulletin #39) and “Architectural Character: Identifying the Visual Aspects of Historic Buildings as an Aid to Preserving Their Character” (Preservation Brief #17). Copies of these guidelines are available at the NHDHR and on the National Park Service’s web pages at http://www.cr.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb39/ and http://www2.cr.nps.gov/tps/briefs/brief17.htm, respectively. A recently published book, A Building History of Northern New England by James L. Garvin, is the definitive guide to understanding New Hampshire architecture. Copies are available through local public libraries or bookstores.
Effects of Listing

Benefits

In addition to honorific recognition, listing in the State Register results in these benefits for historic properties:

Consideration in the planning of local and state funded or otherwise assisted projects: Listing on the State Register can help property owners and communities be more effective advocates for their historic properties by flagging these resources as vital parts of a community and its landscape. Both state and federal historic preservation regulations seek to protect identified historic resources during activities such as governmental land sales and transportation projects.

Qualification for state financial assistance for preservation projects, when funds are available: Historic preservation grants and funding from sources such as the Land and Community Heritage Investment Program use eligibility for or listing on the State Register, among other criteria, as a qualifying requirement. Private initiatives, such as grant programs from local historical societies, may use State Register listing as a requirement as well. The NHDHR has a complete list of what preservation project funding may be currently available for resources listed on the State Register.

Special consideration or relief in the application of access, building and safety codes: Historic properties, including those listed on the State Register, are offered special consideration in the application of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the BOCA National Buildings Code, the state lead poisoning prevention law and administrative rules, the state energy code, the state fire code, and the state floodplain ordinance. Historic properties are not exempt from these code regulatory processes. However, during the review and approval process, historic property owners, with NHDHR assistance if desired, can work with regulatory agencies to develop plans that meet preservation and access, building and safety needs.

A complimentary one-year membership to the New Hampshire Preservation Alliance: Founded in 1985, the New Hampshire Preservation Alliance works to preserve the state’s historic buildings, landscapes and communities through leadership, advocacy and education. A non-profit membership group, the Preservation Alliance works with the NHDHR on many projects and generously offers State Register property owners a complimentary one-year membership, giving each a voice in protecting the traditional beauty of New Hampshire and the places people value.

No Restrictions or Requirements

Owners of property listed on the State Register are free to maintain, manage or dispose of their property as they choose, without oversight or comment from the NHDHR. However, as property owners plan for needed maintenance or changes, staff members at the NHDHR are always available for questions and assistance.

Contact Information

The New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources, located at 19 Pillsbury Street in Concord, has more information about the New Hampshire State Register of Historic Places. This information, along with a blank inventory form and the manual needed to complete it, are available on the Division’s web site, at http://www.nh.gov/nhdhr/formsmanual.html. Staff can be reached at 603/271-3483, via e-mail at http://www.nh.gov/nhdhr, or via mail at 19 Pillsbury Street, 2nd floor, Concord, NH 03301.
THE CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENTS PROGRAM IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

The “Certified Local Governments” (CLG) program, enacted by the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980 (P.L. 96-515), is a partnership between municipal governments, the state historic preservation program, and the National Park Service, to encourage and expand local involvement in preservation-related activities.

To be certified, a town or city must:

1. Enforce appropriate state or local legislation for designation and protection of historic properties (this means that the community must have a legally-adopted historic district, and adequate regulations for administering the district ordinance);
2. Establish an adequate and qualified historic preservation review commission (historic district commission, or heritage commission with historic district responsibilities) under state law and local ordinances;
3. Maintain a system for the survey and inventory of historic properties;
4. Provide for adequate public participation in the local historic preservation program, including the process of recommending properties for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places; and,
5. Satisfactorily perform the responsibilities delegated to it by the State Historic Preservation Officer under P.L. 96-515.

The entire municipality, and not the Historic District or Heritage Commission alone, is designated as a “Certified Local Government.” Local governments that are certified have specific responsibilities for review of National Register of Historic Places nominations, for all properties within their communities (not just those within a historic district); they participate in the development of regional and statewide historic preservation goals; and they are eligible to apply for federal matching grants from a special “pass-through” fund set aside for the exclusive use of CLGs. (However, certification and funding are two separate processes; a community may choose to become certified, but not to apply for the federal CLG matching grants--but it must be certified in order to receive CLG grants.) CLG grants can be made only to certified communities, for eligible non-construction preservation activities. The federal program requirements specify that CLG grants are to be awarded exclusively to CLG communities, so only towns and cities can be CLG subgrantees. Non-profit organizations are encouraged to work with eligible municipalities to cooperatively plan and conduct CLG projects that address shared needs.

To learn more about the CLG program, or about working on a CLG project with an eligible municipality, contact the Division of Historical Resources, so that it can refer the inquiry to the appropriate local contacts.

To apply for CLG designation, the chief local elected official should send a letter of request to the State Historic Preservation Officer, accompanied by an application form (available from the DHR) and supporting documentation, including: a copy of the local historic preservation ordinance, as adopted by the Town Meeting or Mayor & Council or Board of Aldermen; the historic district commission’s rules of procedure, and the published criteria and guidelines for the commission’s actions; a map of the community, showing clearly-delineated boundaries of the locally designated historic district/s; a sample public notice for a historic district commission meeting; a sample notice to an applicant of a commission decision; and a list of the members of the commission and their terms of office, along with a brief resume for each, that demonstrates their interest, knowledge, or competence in historic preservation, and whether or not their qualifications meet the National Park Service professional standards (36 CFR 61).

The application materials are reviewed by the DHR to determine if they meet state and federal standards established by the CLG program. If they are approved, the certification agreement is signed by the State Historic Preservation Officer and the chief elected local official. If some of the application materials do not meet the standards (for example, the local historic district ordinance may not include a code of conduct), the DHR will work with the community to help it make the changes needed to qualify for the CLG program. After certification, ongoing technical assistance is available from the DHR to help the community and the historic district (or heritage) commission conduct historic preservation projects, address preservation issues and opportunities, and resolve concerns relating to federally-assisted activities that may affect historic properties.

* * * * *

The New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources / State Historic Preservation Office (DHR/SHPO) in the Department of Cultural Affairs is the New Hampshire state agency responsible for administering the federal preservation program created by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470). The DHR/SHPO is supported by the State of New Hampshire, the National Park Service (NPS) of the United States Department of the Interior, and by donated funds and services.

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF A CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT’S HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION INCLUDE:

1. Reviewing and rendering an opinion on all new construction, and on all alteration, repair, moving and demolition of structures and places within officially designated local historic district/s;

2. Enforcing its decisions through appropriate procedural or judicial means;

3. Preparing community-wide historical overviews;

4. Conducting a comprehensive community-wide survey of historical resources;

5. Making recommendations for designation of local districts to the appropriate local governing body;

6. Establishing and using written guidelines for the conservation of formally designated historic districts;

7. Acting in an advisory role to other elements of local government, regarding the identification, protection, and preservation of local historical resources;

8. Acting as a liaison between local government to individuals and organizations concerned with historic preservation;

9. Working toward continuing education about historic preservation issues and concerns for the community and its citizens;

10. Providing general technical assistance, and specialized education and training services, for commission members, municipal officials, and the public;

11. Participating in informational or educational meetings about Certified Local Governments, historic district [and heritage] commissions, and historic preservation issues;

12. Preparing historical resources components of local master plans; and insuring that historical resources are taken into account at every level of local decision-making; and,

13. Reviewing all proposed National Register nominations within the geographic boundaries of the community.

14. [reserved for future initiatives that CLGs may recommend]

based on paragraph V.B.2.p. of

REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFICATION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

March 1995 * Revised September 2002
Heritage Commissions give local governments in New Hampshire new abilities to recognize and protect historical and cultural resources.

Unlike historic district commissions, whose responsibilities are limited to specific parts of a community, heritage commissions are intended to have a town-wide or city-wide scope, and a range of activities that is determined by each individual municipality. Heritage commissions do for cultural resources what conservation commissions do for natural resources. Functionally, heritage commissions are somewhere between historical societies and historic district commissions, with their precise role determined locally. And while their primary duties are to advise and assist other local boards and commissions, including the planning board, heritage commissions are also empowered to accept and expend funds for a non-lapsing heritage fund, and to acquire and manage property and property rights.

Some communities may have heritage commissions that are only advisory, but others will want their commissions to take a much more active role, and to assume the responsibilities of a historic district commission. And all of these are local decisions, authorized by the state enabling legislation: it gives communities a menu, not a mandate.

The “heritage commission” concept provides communities with broader choices for the form and function of a municipal heritage body:

- no entity (nothing at all);
- a heritage commission only, with community-wide but non-regulatory responsibilities;
- a historic district commission only, with regulatory responsibilities limited to designated district/s;
- both a broadly focused non-regulatory heritage commission and a more narrowly focused, regulatory historic district commission; or
- a heritage commission (or historic district commission) that combines the functions of both entities.

The heritage commission statutes are “local option” legislation. They enable communities to establish heritage commissions with educational, advisory, and technical responsibilities; and, if desired, to merge an existing historic district commission with the heritage commission (or to give an existing historic district commission the additional responsibilities of a heritage commission), so that the commission would also have regulatory powers within locally-designated historic districts.

1995 legislation brought the membership requirements of conservation commissions, historic district commissions, and heritage commissions into conformity; it also specifically stated that members of these commissions may serve on other municipal boards and commissions. This clarification was made to help communities—especially those with few available volunteers—that wish to establish parallel conservation and preservation commissions; and it will also make citizens’ expertise more widely available to a broader range of local decisionmaking bodies.

For the first time, New Hampshire’s municipalities can choose a level of official involvement in heritage activity that each community is comfortable with. And they will also be able, if they wish, to start out with a heritage commission and then, as local preservation sentiment grows, assign historic district responsibilities to the commission.

One of the other innovations of the heritage commission legislation is that it allows municipalities to establish a non-lapsing Heritage Fund which the heritage commission can spend—after a public hearing and subject to approval of the local governing body, without going back to the town meeting or citywide balloting—to acquire property and property interests (easements, etc.). However, to protect private property rights, neither the municipality nor the commission can condemn property for acquisition with the Heritage Fund.

This is an exact analogue to the conservation fund provisions (RSA 36-A:4 and RSA 36-A:5) which have been in effect, very successfully, for municipal conservation commissions for over thirty years. The heritage commission is also responsible to “manage and control” the acquired property, just as the conservation commission manages and controls the property it acquires under RSA 36:A:4 and RSA 36:A:5.
HERITAGE COMMISSIONS FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE COMMUNITIES

NEW HAMPSHIRE REVISED STATUTES ANNOTATED (R.S.A.)
TITLE 64
Planning And Zoning
CHAPTER 674
Local Land Use Planning And Regulatory Powers
Heritage Commission
SECTION 674:44-b

§ 674:44-b Powers.

I. Generally. Heritage commissions shall have advisory and review authority, specifically, as follows:

(a) Survey and inventory all cultural resources.
(b) Conduct research and publish findings, including reports to establish the legal basis for a district and preparation of historic district ordinances within the municipality prior to its adoption or amendment as provided in RSA 675:6.
(c) Assist the planning board, as requested, in the development and review of those sections of the master plan which address cultural and historic resources.
(d) Advise, upon request, local agencies and other local boards in their review of requests on matters affecting or potentially affecting cultural and historic resources.
(e) Coordinate activities with appropriate service organizations and nonprofit groups.
(f) Publicize its activities.
(g) Hire consultants and contractors as needed.
(h) Receive gifts of money and property, both real and personal, in the name of the city or town, subject to the approval of the city council in a city or the board of selectmen in a town, such gifts to be managed and controlled by the commission for its proper purposes.
(i) Hold meetings and hearings necessary to carry out its duties.

II. Property. The commission may acquire, in the name of the town or city, subject to the approval of the local governing body, by gift, purchase, grant, bequest, devise, lease, or otherwise, a fee or lesser interest, development rights, covenant, or other contractual right, including conveyances with conditions, limitations, or reversions, as may be necessary to acquire, maintain, improve, protect, limit the future use of, or otherwise conserve and properly use the cultural resources of the city or town, and shall manage and control the same; provided, however, that the city, town, or commission shall not have the right to condemn property for these purposes.

III. Historic District Commission. Heritage commissions also may assume, if authorized by the local legislative body, the composition and duties of historic district commissions.

MAINTAINING VITAL CENTERS OF COMMUNITY LIFE AND IDENTITY

AREAS OF CONCERN TO OUR URBAN, RURAL, OR VILLAGE CENTERS

- New malls
- Big box retailers
- Strip development
- Transportation corridors (improvements, additions, expansions, new alignments and transects, etc.)
- Overscaled transportation projects
- New housing developments
- Other sprawl-associated development and anything else that discourages use of town/city centers
- Inappropriate siting of industrial/business/government complexes
- Lack of appreciation for historical / cultural assets
- Loss or devaluation of historic buildings/areas through neglect, inappropriate alterations, or demolition
- Lack of funding targeted for high-quality historic preservation work

WHAT CAN LOCAL GOVERNMENT DO?

- Using traditional zoning, define acceptable uses of land in a more protective manner
- Restrict uses deemed harmful to the economic health of downtown (municipal center impact review)
- Invest the center's infrastructure (roads, parking, lighting, trees and landscaping, pedestrian amenities, buildings)
- Educate and encourage public on use of preservation tax credits & building code variances for rehabilitation of income-producing properties
- Encourage heritage-based development in downtown/village center
- Adopt a municipal demolition delay ordinance and regulations
- Establish local historic districts and a local historic district commission, if none exist already
- Establish neighborhood heritage districts
- Create a heritage commission
- Explore benefits of becoming a certified local government
- Make sure planning & zoning law and regulation encourages mixed-use in the downtown
- Residential use in the downtown/village center area is essential, and should be encouraged
- Residential uses should cover the entire range of affordable/market/luxury housing to insure that the economic/civic/demographic mix is as broad as possible
- Encourage urban agriculture and horticulture: community gardens, farmers' markets, community-supported agriculture (CSAs) and food equity programs
- Prioritize downtown development
- Work with local banks, colleges and educational groups to create resource pools (money & knowledge)
- Incorporate emphasis on the significance of downtown into local education, from kindergarten to Elderhostel
- Encourage small-scale and incubator enterprises in downtown
- Distinguish between business development vs. building development
- Make sure community review & planning are integral to economic development initiatives
- Demonstrate an entrepreneurial ethic
- Ask if sprawl development serves a legitimate public purpose
- Seek to create a balance between property rights with public benefit
- Insert downtown into regulatory provisions at local and state levels
- Define the economic health of downtown as a legitimate public purpose
WHAT CAN LOCAL GOVERNMENT DO? (continued)

- Research & define actual costs of development to the municipality, not just short-term tax advantages
- Utilize CDBG and other funds to improve downtown (both public and private property)
- Hire a downtown manager to assist in revitalization issues, and set up a downtown office
- Create a downtown planning group, and identify priorities through community consensus
- Establish close working relationships with local/regional chambers of commerce
- Establish a merchants' roundtable to develop solutions to problems
- Develop design guidelines for downtown
- Establish a design review mechanism so development fits with size and scale of historic infrastructure
- Set up funding mechanisms for conservation & heritage commissions to preserve significant properties
- Create a revolving fund to provide incentives for top-quality historic preservation and rehab work (a bank, pooled funds, and/or mortgage credit programs)
- Create a job-training program to develop rehab skills
- Partner with the NH Main Street Center
- Conduct a cultural resource inventory and explore benefits of State and/or National Register listing
- Get involved with local and regional transportation and other publicly-funded projects at the very earliest possible points in the process

_Downtown references above are intended to include urban areas, towns and small villages. Village centers function in ways similar to that of a downtown in a larger community_.

Historical and cultural resources are a special kind of resources, like clean air and pure water, but people have to learn not to take them for granted, and then they have to learn how to capitalize on them. Communities with a good stock of historical and cultural resources truly do have an asset that other communities, that have been less fortunate in keeping theirs, lack.

**URBAN DEVELOPMENT**

Types of Urban Development

- Retail
- Municipal services and public buildings/structures/sites/places
- Restaurants
- Industry
- Urban residential
- Mixed use: combinations of the types above

When encouraging urban development, a community must consider ways to meet specific needs. All types of development need a certain level of convenience to compete with enterprises outside the urban area. Community considerations should include:

- Municipal parking including time/convenience and cost competitive facilities
- Maintaining a balance between retail & restaurant
- Providing public facilities such as rest rooms, bus shelters, bike routes & bike racks
- Providing parks/greenways/other amenities
- Providing weather protection

_The original version of these recommendations was developed with the assistance of the NH Main Street Center_
Character is what gives each community in New Hampshire its own special identity. It is part imagery, part memory and gathered time, part attitude. Character is found in whatever gives resonance to a place; whatever references the way life has been, and is, lived there; whatever identifies the community, its history, its resources, its people and their stories.

Your municipal master plan undoubtedly reflects this character, and identifies some of the notable resources that contribute to it: special buildings, downtowns and village centers, factories and bridges, scenic roads, farms and forests. If you have identified Community Cornerstones or participated in Civic Profiles or Community Stewardship or other initiatives, you have surely thought a lot about what makes your particular town or city unique.

What often have gone unrecorded, however, are the vestiges of an earlier economy and way of life left in the landscape.

New Hampshire is noted for its stone walls. Are they part of the environment you wish to preserve? Have you thought about old mill sites, family cemeteries, the foundation of old farmer Jones’ first barn, the place where the town meeting house used to be?

The list (which is by no means complete) that follows suggests some of the special resources your town or city may contain. We suggest you develop a base map on which to record the ones which exist, or once existed, in your community.

Use the map to locate vistas, structures, sites, and elements of landscape and streetscape that contribute to a sense of place and express something about local history and character.

Before beginning, mark the base map to show roads, waterways, railroads and other transportation corridors, topographical features, natural resources, and points of special interest that define your town or city. Then drive or imagine travelling through your community, jotting down those distinctive elements which you particularly cherish.

Other materials might prove helpful in your search. A timeline is easy to develop, and to expand as new facts are found. Old maps, photographs, town histories, and other sources can trigger memories and stories, and can provide important information about these resources.

A bibliography available from the DHR suggests some potentially helpful sources for further investigation.

The NH Division of Historical Resources uses what we call a “Town-Wide Area Form” to organize information about the resources and history of communities in the state. It provides an overview of the community, its historical development, and the architectural and archaeological properties within it which illustrate that development. If your town or city already has such a form, try to get a copy of it. If your community has not been inventoried yet, the DHR can send a sample of a town-wide form as a prototype.

How many of these historical and cultural resources can you find in your town or city?

What else should be on this list?

Agricultural Buildings
- barns (dairy, horse, sheep)
- beehive/apiary
- blacksmith shop
- carpenter shop
- carriage/wagon shed
- cider mill
- cottage
- creamery
- drainage systems
- fairgrounds
- farmstand
- garage
- granary/corncrib
- greenhouses
- ice house
- milk house
- piggery
- poultry house
- privy
- residence
- sawmill
- shed
Agricultural Buildings, continued
- shoe/harness shop
- smokehouse
- structures for specialty crops (flax/hops/potatoes/silk/starch)
- sugar house
- well house

Archaeological Sites/Cellarholes

Architecture & Engineering
- examples of well-known styles/types/functions/structural forms/
- decorative treatments

Arts & Culture
- auditoriums/opera houses
- commemorative structures
- movie houses
- museums/galleries
- public sculpture
- theaters

Brickmaking & Pottery
- brickyards
- ponds
- sheds/warehouses

Business
- auto showrooms
- banks
- offices
- stores
- warehouses

Dwellings

Education
- academies (public & private)
- CCC camps
- campuses
- elementary/secondary schools
- higher education complexes

Ethnic Populations
- grocery stores
- neighborhoods
- religious structures
- schools
- social halls/clubs

First Settlements
- dwellings
- garrison houses
- meetinghouses

First Settlements, continued
- military fortifications/forts
- mill sites
- muster fields
- school buildings or sites

Glassmaking

Government & Civic
- armories/military facilities
- asylums
- cemeteries
- corrections facilities
- courthouses
- fire houses
- grange halls/social halls
- hospitals/clinics
- libraries
- offices
- pest houses
- police stations
- poor houses
- post offices
- public works facilities
- sewage treatment facilities
- town forests
- town halls/city halls
- waterworks
- WPA projects

Ice Making

Landscape Resources
- bandstands/gazebos
- carriage drives
- commons/parks/greens
- fences
- gardens/groves
- mountain summits
- muster fields & parade grounds
- observation towers
- overlooks/vistas
- pounds
- shade/ornamental trees
- stone walls

Lumbering & Wood Products

Manufacturing
- boom piers
- carriage & wagon manufacture & related products (hames, harness, whips)
- charcoal manufacture
- cooperages
- dams/ponds
Lumbering & Wood Products
Manufacturing, continued
- fire lookout towers
- forests & woodlots
- furniture & cabinet making
- fire towers
- kilns
- logging camps
- logging roads & landings
- lumberyards
- manufacture of small and specialty lumber products
- pearl ash & potash manufacture

Metal Smelting & Iron Foundries

Mills & Factories
- cotton mills
- dam complexes/ponds
- fulling mills
- grist mills
- hosiery mills
- leather belting mills
- paper mills
- penstocks/canals/gatehouses
- sawmills
- smokestacks
- tanneries
- textile byproduct mills
- turbines/waterwheels/penstocks
- turning mills
- woolen mills

Mining & Quarrying
- barns/sheds
- crushers
- lime kilns
- mines
- offices
- quarries
- sluiceways/tailraces
- worker housing

Neighborhoods
- crossroads communities
- downtowns
- hamlets
- “lost” villages
- rural/agricultural districts
- summer home districts
- town centers
- urban areas
- villages
- workers’ settlements

Recreation & Entertainment
- amusement/theme parks
- dance halls/pavilions
- restaurants/taverns/bars
- sports facilities & grounds (ballparks/racetracks/stadiums…)
- summer recreation...
- tourist attractions
- winter recreation sites and facilities of all kinds...

Religion
- campgrounds
- cemeteries
- churches/chapels/cathedrals
- convents
- medical facilities
- meetinghouses
- monasteries
- mosques
- parsonages
- schools
- social halls
- synagogues

Summer Activities
- academic/ministerial colonies
- artist colonies
- boarding houses
- resorts/hotels
- summer camps

Transportation
- airports (& beacons/hangers lights/terminals/towers)
- amusement parks
- bridges
- canals
- cottage/cabin courts
- culverts/headers
- diners
- early roads/highways
- gasoline stations/garages
- hotels/motels
- lakes
- lighthouses
- railroads/rolling stock
- related buildings & structures (depots, docks, fueling facilities, piers, ramps, sheds, signals, warehouses, water towers, wharves)
- roadside museums
- shipwrecks
- steamboats
Transportation, continued
- streetcar barns
- tea rooms
- trails/paths
- turnpikes
- turntables/roundhouses

Utilities
- generating facilities
- towers
- transmission systems
TOOLS FOR PRESERVING BARNS

"Historic barns and agricultural structures symbolize the distinctive New Hampshire values of heritage, hard work, productivity and stewardship. They are witnesses to the role of agriculture in our state’s image and its economy, and they serve as scenic landmarks for residents and visitors alike."

-- New Hampshire RSA 227-C:27, 1999

RECOGNITION

The National Register of Historic Places - NH Division of Historical Resources (NHDHR), 603/271-3483.
The New Hampshire Barn Survey Project -- NHDHR, 603/271-3483.
Farms of Distinction - NH Department of Agriculture, Markets & Food, 603/271-3551.

GRANT PROGRAMS AND TAX INCENTIVES

Property Tax Incentives - property tax relief for owners of historic New Hampshire barns and other agricultural buildings, NHDHR, 603/271-3483.
Barn Assessment Grants - planning grants prior to rehabilitation projects, New Hampshire Preservation Alliance, 603/224-2281.
Land and Community Heritage Investment Program - for municipalities and non-profits, grants for preserving natural, cultural and historic resources, 603/224-4113.
Historic Preservation Fund Grants - when available, matching construction grants for barns and other agricultural structures listed on the National Register of Historic Places (no grant funds are currently available), NHDHR, 603/271-3483.
Conservation License Plate Program - for publicly-owned properties, grants for preservation and conservation projects, NHDHR, 603/271-3483.
How to purchase or give Moose Plates - and other FAQs.
Preservation Tax Credits - 20% federal income tax credit for the rehabilitation of income-producing structures on the National Register of Historic Places, NHDHR, 603/271-3483.

OTHER RESOURCES

Preserving Old Barns: Preventing the Loss of a Valuable Resource - by John C. Porter and Francis E. Gilman.
The Preservation of Historic Barns - by Michael J. Auer, Preservation Brief 20 from the National Park Service. A summary of historic barn types nationwide and technical advice for their maintenance.
Conserving the Family Farm - a manual in plain language about conservation easements and agricultural provisions, produced by the NH Coalition for Sustaining Agriculture and UNH Cooperative Extension, 603/679-5616.
NH Stories Inc. and New Hampshire Made, Inc. - promoting the people, products and services of New Hampshire, 888/647-8674.
Preservation and Agricultural Easements - contact the New Hampshire Preservation Alliance for more information on easements, 603/224-2281.
Is Your Town Farm Friendly? - A checklist for sustaining rural character, by Gary Matteson for the NH Coalition for Sustaining Agriculture and UNH Cooperative Extension.
OTHER RESOURCES, continued:

Preserving Rural Character: The Agriculture Connection - NHOSP Revised Technical Bulletin 6, by Lorraine Stuart Merrill. How to support local farming in land use policies and programs.

Barn Again! - national clearinghouse for information, awards and grants, National Trust for Historic Preservation, 303/623/1504.

American Farmland Trust - online library, research, technical and policy assistance for saving family farms and farmland.

National Barn Alliance - national barn preservation network.

National Agricultural Library - online library and links to agricultural topics, including extensive history and image collections.

Agriculture Online - portal and search engine for agricultural subjects and programs.

New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources
A historic context is an organizational tool for grouping properties related through their histories by theme, place and time. The Division of Historical Resources has assembled a broad list of historic contexts most commonly uncovered in the state’s properties and history. By their nature, some of these contexts apply to only a portion of New Hampshire; more apply to the entire state, which is small enough and homogeneous enough that while certain activities are necessarily confined to certain parts, there are not significant enough differences to warrant a spatially or chronologically segmented theme. The Division maintains research files on each of the contexts and also enters surveyed properties into a database by context. This information is available to researchers investigating not only a certain theme, such as shoemaking, but also considering a single property that may relate to others with a shared history, such as shoe shops.

This list does not represent all of the historical research topics that could be pursued in New Hampshire. Instead, it reflects the historic contexts illustrated by the properties in the Division of Historical Resources’ survey files. By nature, it evolves as more survey work is completed. An updated version may be available by contacting the Division.

**THE CONTEXTS**

**Exploration and Settlement**

1. Early exploration of the NH seacoast, 1400-1630.
2. First settlements on the NH seacoast, 1623-1660.
3. Early exploration and settlement in the interior of NH, 1623-1770.
4. The granting of land and towns, 1623-1835.

**Military**

5. The French and Indian Wars in NH.
7. The Civil War in New Hampshire.
8. World War I in NH.
9. World War II in NH.
10. NH’s coastal defenses, 1775-present.
11. The Cold War in New Hampshire.
12. New Hampshire’s early militia and the National Guard.

**Maritime History**

13. Fishing on the NH Seacoast and the Isles of Shoals, 1660-present.
15. Modern shipbuilding on the NH seacoast, 1900-present.
16. Shipwrecks in NH waters, 1620-1940. (F) (authors: Parker Potter and David Switzer)
17. New Hampshire’s inland lighthouses. (F) (authors: Parker Potter and Greg Clancey)

**Industry**

22. Logging, lumbering and saw mills, 1620-present.
25. Large-scale furniture production.
26. Small-scale furniture (cabinet) making.
27. Barrel making and commercial cooperages in New Hampshire, c.1807-1850.
28. Iron smelting and founding, 1715-present.
29. Mineral mining, 1770-present.
Industry, continued:
30. Granite quarrying and stone cutting, 1790-present.
33. General outwork/home manufacture in NH, 1840-1920.
34. Localized shoemaking, 1623-1900.
35. Heavily capitalized (factory) shoemaking, 1820-1940.
36. Shoemaking outwork/home manufacture, 1830-1920.
38. Metalworking in New Hampshire for local and regional markets, 1630-present.
40. The pottery industry, 1700-1900.
41. Brewing and distilling, 1700-1920.
42. Glassmaking, 1780-1920.
44. Machine tool manufacture, 1840-present.
45. Precision machine shops, 1820-present.
46. Carriage and wagon manufacture, 1820-1900.
47. Heavy manufacturing, 1850-present.
49. Musical instrument production in New Hampshire.
50. Tobacco pipe production in New Hampshire.

Agriculture
51. Mixed agriculture and the family farm, 1630-present.
52. Salt marsh farming in New Hampshire, 1630-present.
53. Grain farming and grist milling, 1650-present.
54. Orchards and cider production, 1650-present.
55. Maple sugar and syrup production, 1650-present.
56. Local-scale dairy farming, 1800-present.
57. Potato farming, 1800-present.
58. The sheep craze, 1820-1870.
59. Silk culture and silk production, 1840-1860.
60. Turkey raising in New Hampshire for urban markets, c.1850-c.1910.
61. Cattle raising and summer pasturing in New Hampshire, c.1850-present.
63. Creamery operations, 1860-present.
64. Poultry farming, 1870-present.
65. Dairy farming for urban markets, 1880-1940.
66. Farm revitalization by Finns in the Monadnock Region, 1880-1940.
69. Flax and linen production, 1650-present.

Entertainment and Recreation
70. Summer resort/grand hotel tourism, 1840-1940. [P] (author: Deborah Noble)
71. New Hampshire as artists’ colony, 1870-present. [P] (author: Lisa Mausolf)
73. Summer and vacation home tourism, 1880-present.
74. Summer colonies in New Hampshire, 1840-present.
75. Summer camps for children, 1890-present.
76. Winter recreation and the ski industry, 1890-present.
77. Parks, amusement parks, zoos and waterfront recreation in New Hampshire, 1880-present.
Entertainment and Recreation, continued:
78. Outdoor recreation in New Hampshire.
79. Theaters, opera houses, and movie houses in New Hampshire.
80. Museums and historical sites in New Hampshire.

Transportation
82. Pre-automobile land travel, 1630-1920.
83. Taverns, inns, hotels, motels, motor courts and bed and breakfasts, 1623-present.
84. Transportation on the lakes, 1760-present.
85. River and canal navigation, 1790-1890 (P) (author: Lisa Mausolf)
86. The railroads in NH, 1842-1960. (F) (authors: R. Stuart Wallace and Lisa Mausolf)
88. Automobile highways and culture, 1900-present.
89. Aviation in New Hampshire.

Communications and Utilities
90. Water supply, distribution and treatment in New Hampshire, 1850-present.
91. Gasoline and oil distribution in New Hampshire, 1900-present.
92. Hydropower in New Hampshire.
93. Electricity generation and distribution in New Hampshire.
94. Communications in New Hampshire.

Professions
95. Medicine and hospitals in New Hampshire.
96. The practice of law in New Hampshire.
100. Writing and publishing in New Hampshire.
101. The service industries in New Hampshire.
102. Social services in New Hampshire.
103. The food industry in New Hampshire.

Education
104. Higher education, 1770-present.
105. Elementary and secondary education, 1770-present.

Politics and Government
107. Local government, 1630-present.
108. County government in New Hampshire, 1771-present.
110. The federal government in New Hampshire, 1776-present.
111. Fighting the Depression in New Hampshire: The CCC, WPA, and other public works programs, 1929-1940.

Social History and Political Movements
112. Philanthropy, 1850-present.
113. Historic preservation, 1899-present (F). (authors: James Garvin and Parker Potter).
114. Women’s organizations and the suffrage movement in New Hampshire.
115. Social organizations in New Hampshire.
## Social History and Political Movements, continued:

117. The anti-slavery movement in New Hampshire.
118. The Grange in New Hampshire, 1870-present.
119. Cultural and community traditions, practices, arts and crafts.

## Religion

120. Religion in New Hampshire, 1623-present.
121. The Shakers in NH, 1795-present.
122. Camp meetings in New Hampshire, 1860-present.

## Ethnic Heritage

123. Post-Colonial Native American Indian Acculturation and Revitalization, 1780-present.
125. The Scots-Irish and Ulster-Scots in New Hampshire.
126. The French-Canadians in NH, 1840-present.
127. The Irish in New Hampshire.
128. European and Middle Eastern immigration to New Hampshire.

## Commerce, Community Planning, Cultural Landscapes

129. Commerce, industry and trade in New Hampshire cities, 1630-present.
130. Commerce, industry and trade in New Hampshire village and town centers, 1630-present.
133. Town and county planning and surveying.
134. Landscapes and their designs in New Hampshire.
135. The land conservation movement in New Hampshire.
136. Public and private cemeteries and burials.

## Archaeology

1100. Pre-Columbian European exploration and settlement.
1101. First (Paleo-Indian) occupations.
1102. Native American Indian lithic technology (P) (author: Richard Boisvert)
1103. Native American Indian ceramic technology.
1104. Native American Indian agriculture.
1105. Native American Indian mortuary practice.
1106. Native American Indian riverine adaptation/exploitation.
1107. Native American Indian upland adaptation.
1108. Native American Indian coastal adaptation.
1109. Native American Indian adaptation in the Northern marshlands.
1110. Post-Columbian Native American Indian contact with Europeans.
1111. Native American Indian lacustrine adaptation.
1112. Pre-Columbian Native American Indian cultures.
1113. Pre-Columbian cultural chronology.
RESEARCH SOURCES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE HISTORIC SITES

Published town and county histories, often with genealogical and biographical sections or sketches; check your local library, your local historical society, the New Hampshire Historical Society library, 30 Park Street, Concord, N.H., 03301; Tel.: (603) 225-3381, and the New Hampshire State Library, 20 Park Street, Concord, 03301; Tel. (603) 271-2144).

Family genealogies; check your local library or historical society, the New Hampshire Historical Society library (30 Park Street, Concord) and the State Library (20 Park Street, Concord).

Additional genealogical material may be available on microforms through the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (Mormon), which maintains a reference facility, the Concord, New Hampshire, Stake Family History Center, at 90 Clinton Street, Concord, N.H., 03301; Tel.: (603) 225-2848.

Statewide cemetery records; on file at New Hampshire Historical Society library, 30 Park Street, Concord, N.H., 03301.

Town vital records (births, marriages, deaths); available through town clerks or at the New Hampshire Department of Health and Human Services, Hazen Drive, Concord, N.H., 03301 (for full address, see “Contact People,” below).

Town records; microfilm copies available at the State Library. Also check with the town clerk and check any Town Papers deposited at the New Hampshire State Archives, 71 South Fruit Street, Concord, N.H., 03301; Tel.: (603) 271-2236. Some towns maintain separate town archives collections that are independent of the library and historical society holdings.

Index to proper names in the microfilmed town records at the State Library. This card-file index lists all the proper names that appear in the microfilmed town records on file at the State Library; the index does not cover other town records that may be located elsewhere. This can be a quick finding aid for town affairs involving an individual person. Among the records indexed in this card file are vital records (births, marriages, deaths) that were recorded in town books.

United States Census reports, 1790 to present (every ten years); on microfilm at the State Library, and original volumes at the State Archives. The first decades of the census list heads of families only, with indications of how many other people of either sex, and older or younger than sixteen years, were living in the household.

By 1850 or so, the census returns are more ample, listing by name, age, and occupation each person living in a given household. By this general period, there are also separate agricultural and industrial returns, which show the productivity of each farm and of each manufactory (including grist and saw mills). In some decades, the industrial censuses show the weeks or months of activity of seasonal operations like saw mills, the number of hands employed, the value of raw materials consumed, the value of finished products, and the type of motive power (even listing the types and horsepower of turbines for water-powered mills).

Deeds and wills; on file at the Registry of Deeds and the Registry of Probate at each county courthouse. New Hampshire probate records (wills and associated documents, excluding probate inventories) for the years 1635-1771 were published in volumes 31-39 of the New Hampshire Provincial and State Papers, 40 vols. (Concord: State of New Hampshire, 1867-1943). The original deeds and wills for this same period are filed at the State Archives in Concord.

Court records; either at the State Archives (if the county has relinquished them) or at the appropriate county courthouse. The New Hampshire province court records from 1640-1692, and court papers from 1652-1668, are published in volume 40 of the New Hampshire Provincial and State Papers, 40 vols. (Concord: State of New Hampshire, 1867-1943).
Town maps. Most accessible are:

1. the maps from the published Walling county map series of c. 1858-1860;

2. the maps from the *Town and City Atlas of the State of New Hampshire* (Boston: D. H. Hurd & Co., 1892). These town maps have been republished, in separate volumes for each New Hampshire county, by Saco Valley Printing, 76 Main Street, Fryeburg, Me., 04037; Tel.: (207) 935-2997;

3. early proprietors’ maps for many towns, showing the original lots of the towns as granted in the 1700s, published in volumes 24-28 of the *New Hampshire Provincial and State Papers*, 40 vols. (Concord: State of New Hampshire, 1867-1943).

The New Hampshire State Archives and the New Hampshire Historical Society have original manuscript proprietors’ maps (or later tracings of these maps) for many New Hampshire towns.

All published town, county, and state maps of New Hampshire before 1900 are listed and described in Cobb, *New Hampshire Maps* (see bibliography).

Also valuable are current and older United States Geological Survey maps, which are highly accurate federal surveys at scales of one inch to a mile (1:62,500) or 2-5/8 inches to a mile (1:24,000). Current editions of these maps are available in many bookstores and on-line through services like TerraServer: (http://terraserver.homeadvisor.msn.com/default.asp). The Dimond Library at the University of New Hampshire in Durham and the New Hampshire Historical Society in Concord collect older editions of the maps. *The UNH collection may be accessed on the Web at* http://docs.unh.edu/nhtopos/nhtopos.htm.

The State Archives has a book of manuscript maps compiled in 1804 for most towns in the state; microfilm copies of this volume may be consulted at the New Hampshire Historical Society and the State Library.

Other maps, including unpublished manuscript maps, may be available at the New Hampshire Historical Society, 30 Park Street, Concord, and the New Hampshire State Archives, 71 South Fruit Street, Concord. The State Archives also collects the records of defunct surveyors’ offices.

Bird’s-eye views of New Hampshire towns, mostly dating from the 1870s and 1880s, may be consulted at the New Hampshire Historical Society library; see the listing under “Ruell” in the bibliography. These maps may also be explored on-line by going to the Library of Congress site, clicking on “American Memory; American History in Words, Sound, and Pictures,” clicking on “Collection Finder,” clicking on “Maps,” and then clicking on “Panoramic Maps, 1847-1929.” You can search the Library of Congress collection of bird’s-eye views by keyword, geographic location, subject index, creator index, or title.

For some villages and urban areas, the Sanborn Fire Insurance Company maps show buildings and utilities in great detail, sometimes beginning as early as 1875. Microfilm copies of the New Hampshire Sanborn maps are available at the New Hampshire Historical Society library.

White Pine Blister Rust maps were compiled over many years in the twentieth century under federal funding to indicate the extent of the tree disease and of its alternate hosts (currant and gooseberry bushes). Foresters who drew these maps often indicated stone walls, cellar holes, cemeteries, and other landscape features with considerable detail. A nearly complete series of the maps is held by the State Archives; county foresters and town officials may have maps for particular counties or towns.
Aerial photographs can reveal individual buildings; roads; fields and other agricultural lands; stone walls and other property lines; other cultural features; and forest characteristics. Some aerial photographs (and the corresponding United States Geological Survey maps) can be searched on-line at sites like TerraServer: (http://terraserver.homeadvisor.msn.com/default.asp).

Aerial photographs are also available in various federal, state, or county agencies. The New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources (see below) can provide a listing of various series of aerial photographs and their repositories.

Historic photographs may be found in local historical societies, in regional repositories like the Historical Society of Cheshire County, and at the New Hampshire Historical Society. Many historic photographs have been published in a series of books on New Hampshire (and neighboring states) being issued by Arcadia Publishers, 1 Washington Center, Suite 304, Dover, N.H., 03820; Tel.: (603) 743-4266.

Family letters, financial accounts, diaries, photographs, if available. The best sources for such documents are local historical societies, the New Hampshire Historical Society in Concord, and the Historical Society of Cheshire County in Keene.

Contact people:

New Hampshire Historical Society, 30 Park Street, Concord, N.H., 03301; Tel.: (603) 225-3381: William N. Copeley, Librarian
David Smolen, Special Collections Librarian (manuscripts, newspapers, maps, photographs, etc.).

New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources (State Historic Preservation Office), P. O. Box 2043 (19 Pillsbury Street), Concord, N.H., 03301; Tel.: (603) 271-3483:
James McConaha, Director and State Historic Preservation Officer
Linda Ray Wilson, Deputy Director

New Hampshire Division of Records Management and Archives (State Archives), 71 South Fruit Street, Concord, N.H., 03301; Tel.: (603) 271-2236:
Dr. Frank C. Mevers, Director and State Archivist
Brian Burford, Records Manager (Brian is also a land surveyor who could assist in searching the surveyors’ records on file there).

New Hampshire State Library, 20 Park Street, Concord, N.H., 03301; Tel. (603) 271-2144:
Donna V. Gilbreth, Reference Librarian, Tel. (603) 271-3302.

Vital Records, New Hampshire Department of Health and Human Services, Hazen Drive, Concord, N.H., 03301; Tel.: (603) 271-4651. [The vital records are made available to the public through voluntary staffing by the Merrimack County Society of Genealogists. Attendants in the office will explain how to request birth, marriage, or death records.]

Historical Society of Cheshire County, 246 Main Street, Keene, N.H., 03431; Tel.: (603) 352-1895:
Alan F. Rumrill, Director

Town Officers (see your local telephone directory or obtain a copy of the current edition of City and Town Officials of the State of New Hampshire, prepared by the Municipal Highways Bureau of the New Hampshire Department of Transportation, Concord, N.H., 03301; Tel.: (603) 271-2107; or of the current New Hampshire Municipal Officials Directory, published by the New Hampshire Municipal Association, P.O. Box 617, Concord, N.H., 03301; Tel.: (603) 224-7447).

County Register of Deeds and Register of Probate (see your local telephone directory).
RESEARCH SOURCES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE HISTORIC SITES
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NEW HAMPSHIRE'S FAVORITE SYMBOLS

In celebration of the 21st century, the New Hampshire Historical Society invited the public to vote for the best-loved symbols of our state.

What is it about New Hampshire that inspires our affection? What are the most significant places, events, and traditions of our state? What icons symbolize the heart and soul of this place we call New Hampshire?

Voters chose from a list of 49 possible New Hampshire icons. There was also a provision for write-in votes. Thousands cast their votes both online and with paper ballots. Teachers used the project in their classrooms. Newspaper editors bantered about what did and didn't belong on the list. In the end, the people spoke with their votes.

The winning symbols range from Mount Washington to the Amoskeag Mills, from Lake Winnipesaukee to the Isles of Shoals. Country fairs, covered bridges, and stone walls all made the list, as did Canterbury Shaker Village and Dartmouth College. Topping the list, to no one's surprise, is the Old Man of the Mountain.

The winning symbols were showcased in an exhibition at the Society’s Museum of New Hampshire History, and online at http://www.nhhistory.org/chooses/index.asp, in text, graphic, and audio formats.

In alphabetical order, the favorites are:

• Amoskeag Mills, Manchester
• Balsams Grand Resort Hotel, Dixville Notch
• Canterbury Shaker Village, Canterbury
• Country Fairs
• Covered Bridges
• Daniel Webster Birthplace, West Franklin
• Dartmouth College, Hanover
• Isles of Shoals, Rye
• Kancamagus Highway
• Lake Winnipesaukee
• Maple Sugaring
• Mount Monadnock
• Mount Washington Hotel & Resort, Bretton Woods (Carroll)
• Mount Washington
• Mount Washington Cog Railway
• New Hampshire State House, Concord
• New Hampshire's First-in-the-Nation Primary (former) Franconia
• Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter
• Robert Frost Farm, Derry
• Stone Walls
• Strawbery Banke, Portsmouth
• The White Mountains

The project, a public/private partnership, had broad support. The exhibit was sponsored by Laconia Savings Bank, Peerless Insurance, and Anthem Blue Cross & Blue Shield; production and broadcast by New Hampshire Public Radio of the audio essays (available on the web site) was underwritten by Public Service of New Hampshire.
In 1792, the Rev. Jeremy Belknap completed the publication of his three-volume *The History of New-Hampshire*, affording readers their first comprehensive overview of the state’s past. By 1823, interest in the state’s political and social history led the legislature to charter the New Hampshire Historical Society as a private corporation. Interest in the past became increasingly evident through the publication of books and magazines in the early nineteenth century. Articles like Charles Warren Brewster’s “Rambles,” published in the *Portsmouth Journal of Literature and Politics* beginning in 1825, focused attention on the history and historical personages of New Hampshire’s coastal region.

The first house in New Hampshire known to have been opened to visitors for its historical interest was the Benning Wentworth Mansion in Portsmouth. By 1845, members of the Cushing family, then the owners, were giving tours of the house, which retained original wallpapers and exhibited carving and joinery from the 1750s and 1760s.

Events like the “Return of the Sons” celebration in Portsmouth, first held in 1853 and commemorated by a published lithograph, established the tradition of inviting native sons who had moved elsewhere to return to New Hampshire for a nostalgic reconnection with their roots. Eventually, such events inspired the idea of “Old Home Week,” established by New Hampshire governor Frank West Rollins in 1899 as the first such formal statewide reunion in the United States.

Books, poems, and articles played a critical role in instilling a preservation ethic and bringing attention to successful preservation efforts in the region. A number of influential books and articles appeared in print at the centennial of the independence of the United States, including Samuel Adams Drake’s *Nooks and Corners of the New England Coast* (1875), Robert Swain Peabody’s article, “Georgian Houses in New England” in *American Architect and Building News* (1877), and Arthur Little’s *Early New England Interiors* (1878). All of them included examples of New Hampshire architecture.

In the 1880s and 1890s, many New Hampshire towns founded their own historical societies, and a great number of well-researched town histories were published.

The destruction of the Thomas Hancock House in Boston in 1863 provided a symbolic rallying point for later preservation efforts in New England. Architect John Hubbard Sturgis, whose family summered on Sagamore Creek in Portsmouth, completed measured drawings of the Hancock House before its destruction. Loss of this house inspired the foundation of organizations like the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities (now Historic New England) in 1910.

Perhaps spurred by the successful preservation of structures like the Old Massachusetts State House and Faneuil Hall, the Society of the Cincinnati in New Hampshire, composed of descendants of officers in the Continental Army, purchased the eighteenth-century Ladd-Gilman House in Exeter in 1902. The Society’s acquisition of that house, which had been occupied by the treasurer of the State of New Hampshire during the Revolution and later by long-term governor John Taylor Gilman, was probably the first deliberate act of architectural preservation, and the first creation of a historic house museum, in New Hampshire’s history. The house is now headquarters of the American Independence Museum, established in 1991.

Similarly, the Thomas Bailey Aldrich Association was founded in 1907 to restore the boyhood home of the author and poet in Portsmouth. Long the custodian of the house, the Association transferred the property to the adjacent Strawbery Banke Museum in 1979.

Also in 1907, the Governor John Langdon House in Portsmouth was reproduced at the Jamestown Exposition in Virginia to symbolize New Hampshire’s role as one of the thirteen founding colonies in the country.

In 1908, the Town of Allenstown, New Hampshire, voted to transfer its old one-story meeting house to Buntin Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, but added the requirement that the chapter restore the building to its original condition of 1815 and maintain it thereafter. Buntin Chapter complied with this condition, rededicating the structure on August 22, 1909. In restoring the building, the chapter completed one of the first deliberate preservation projects in the...
state, preceded only by the acquisition of the Ladd-Gilman House in Exeter and the restoration of the Aldrich Memorial in Portsmouth. These contemporary efforts at preservation in the coastal region of New Hampshire were impelled by veneration for prominent individuals or events, whereas the preservation of the Allenstown Meeting House seems to have been motivated largely by affection for the ancient building and the memories that clustered about the structure and site. In this respect, the Allenstown project presaged later efforts to restore humble structures like district schoolhouses and railroad buildings out of nostalgic interest in the feelings they engendered.

Between 1910 and 1920, a number of preservation initiatives attained success in New Hampshire. The site of Daniel Webster’s birth in West Franklin was purchased by a private association in 1912, the birthplace was reconstructed (though from inaccurate evidence), and the property was given to the state as the first state-owned historic site in 1917. Efforts were begun to save other houses, including the Moffatt-Ladd House in Portsmouth by the Colonial Dames of America in the State of New Hampshire, the Wentworth-Gardner House in Portsmouth by Wallace Nutting, the John Paul Jones House in Portsmouth by Joseph Chandler, the Franklin Pierce House in Hillsborough by Franklin Pierce Carpenter and associates, and “Aspet,” the house and studio of sculptor Augustus Saint-Gaudens in Cornish, by the Augustus Saint-Gaudens Memorial.

The American Wing of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York opened in 1924, showcasing a chamber, with an unusual paneled ceiling, from the Shaw House in Kensington and an early eighteenth-century room and staircase from the Lieutenant-Governor John Wentworth House in Portsmouth. While the New York initiative attested to New Hampshire’s contributions to American architecture and decorative arts, it also raised awareness of the vulnerability of New Hampshire structures to removal, and heightened concern that significant buildings be preserved on their original sites. This concern was intensified by the fact that the Metropolitan Museum had purchased the Wentworth-Gardner House in Portsmouth in 1918 and had planned to move it to New York City until dissuaded by William Sumner Appleton, founder of the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities.

Other New Hampshire properties were saved during the 1920s and 1930s, including New Hampshire’s oldest surviving house, the 1664 Jackson House in Portsmouth, by the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities; the Governor John Wentworth farm site in Wolfeborough, given to the state by Lawrence Shaw Mayo, Wentworth’s biographer; and the Macpheadris-Warner House in Portsmouth, by a private association.

The National Park Service authorized creation of the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) in 1933. Soon thereafter, HABS teams recorded endangered structures in thirty-four New Hampshire communities. Most of the drawings were made by students in a then-extant architectural program at the University of New Hampshire.

Two milestones drew attention to the state’s rich craft traditions: the appointment of a Commission on New Hampshire Arts and Crafts (now the League of New Hampshire Craftsmen) in 1931, and the publication in 1940 of the book, Hands That Built New Hampshire: The Story of Granite State Craftsmen Past and Present. The Commission on Arts and Crafts was aided by financial support from the New Hampshire legislature beginning in 1934, a highly unusual commitment in a state with a long tradition of withholding state support from non-profit organizations.

Two very different pieces of federal legislation were passed in 1949, with opposite portents for historic preservation. The first chartered the not-for-profit National Trust for Historic Preservation, which brought national and congressional attention to endangered historic properties. The second was the Federal Housing Act, which provided federal grants for acquiring, clearing, and preparing land for urban renewal—legislation that was to have negative and sometimes catastrophic impacts on historic structures in older cities of the country.

In 1959, the New Hampshire legislature created the State Historical Commission, “to take such steps and to formulate such plans as
will tend to preserve the state’s heritage, improve the understanding of the public of such heritage, and preserve public records of historical interest, historical documents and objects of historical value.” The commission was also empowered to recommend legislation to the general court for the accomplishment of these objectives. In 1961, the legislature placed a state historical marker program, which had been created in 1955, under the jurisdiction of the State Historical Commission.

Until the late 1950s, preservation in New Hampshire had been limited to single structures that were recognized as homes of interesting or historically significant individuals, or as notable for their architecture or nostalgic associations. In 1957, local librarian Dorothy M. Vaughan addressed the Portsmouth Rotary Club, challenging its members to stop the casual destruction of the city’s early houses. The club appointed a committee to develop a plan to save the neighborhood of buildings still standing in one of the oldest parts of the city. The committee’s recommendations resulted in the incorporation of Strawberry Banke, Inc., in 1958, for the purpose of redeveloping an urban renewal area as an outdoor museum and tourist attraction—the first instance in the United States in which historic preservation was accepted as the principal development goal in an urban renewal project.

To accomplish this purpose, the New Hampshire legislature passed a law in 1959 that echoed provisions in the Federal Housing Act of 1954 by permitting the rehabilitation of structures in an urban redevelopment area rather than requiring the wholesale clearance of such an area. The following year, Strawberry Banke, Inc., was designated the redeveloper for the Marcy-Washington Streets Urban Renewal area in Portsmouth’s “Puddle Dock” neighborhood. On September 24, 1964, Strawberry Banke took ownership of ten acres of land and twenty-seven buildings. It opened its first houses to the public on May 29, 1965. The southern portion of the museum’s property was specifically designated the “area to receive historic structures from without,” being set aside as a refuge for buildings in other parts of Portsmouth that might be threatened with demolition.

In 1963, the New Hampshire legislature passed enabling legislation that permitted local governments to establish historic districts. This legislation provided the only available state-sanctioned protection for historic properties until 1973, when a law was enacted to define conservation and preservation restrictions and make them legally enforceable, thereby validating private efforts to protect historically and environmentally significant properties from inappropriate uses.

The first concerted efforts to save industrial buildings in New Hampshire occurred in the 1970s. The “Save the Mills Society” in Laconia was organized in 1970 to preserve the Belknap-Sulloway (1823) and Busiel-Seeburg (1853) mills, both slated for demolition under urban renewal. The Society’s efforts were successful, and Belknap Mill was designated the Meeting House of New Hampshire in 1976 under the “Heritage 76” initiative of the federal United States Bicentennial program.

Historic Harrisville, Inc., was founded in 1971 in reaction to the bankruptcy of a corporation that owned some twenty-five buildings within the textile manufacturing community of Harrisville. Rather than creating an outdoor museum in Harrisville, the trustees of the corporation sought to keep the village a living, working community. Enacting measures to protect the architectural qualities of the buildings, the corporation sought new economic uses for the mill buildings to keep the structures active and the townspeople employed. Harrisville provides an excellent example of the value of historic preservation to economic revitalization.

New Hampshire was slow in responding to the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 which, among other things, established the National Register of Historic Places, enacted a program of federal historic preservation matching grants, and authorized the creation of a State Historic Preservation Office in each state. In 1972, the New Hampshire Charitable Fund made a grant to the New Hampshire Department of Resources and Economic Development (DRED) to establish a minimal state historic preservation program.

Mary M. Jeglum, a historic preservation consultant, was hired to help the state meet the requirements for participating in the
national program, and to qualify for federal matching preservation grants. George Gilman, commissioner of the Department of Resources and Economic Development, served as State Liaison Officer, and a New Hampshire Review Board for Historic Preservation was appointed. Legislation to establish the historic preservation program as an official element of state government was introduced in 1973 but was not enacted, and the program was continued by executive order from Governor Meldrim Thomson, Jr.

In 1974 the legislature officially established a State Historic Preservation Office within the Department of Resources and Economic Development (DRED). Before the legislation could be fully implemented, however, Governor Thomson dismissed Mary Jeglum in a controversy over nomination of the Isles of Shoals to the National Register of Historic Places (which was seen as an impediment to building an oil tanker facility there) and over the impact of historic preservation review on urban renewal projects in several New Hampshire cities. The state program was suspended in January 1975 until it could meet federal standards for joining the national historic preservation program, then was reactivated in April of that year with George Gilman as State Historic Preservation Officer.

Beginning in 1981, the legislature has continued to give additional responsibilities to the Division of Historical Resources. Under the leadership of Dr. Gary Hume, then State Archaeologist, New Hampshire’s historic preservation statute (RSA 227-C) was amended in 1981 to provide for the protection of historical and archaeological resources on state lands and under state waters. The Division was authorized to provide methods of training nonprofessional persons in technical archaeological skills and of encouraging these people to participate in field investigations supervised by the Division. Out of this authorization grew the State Conservation and Rescue Archaeology Program (“SCRAP”). SCRAP provides training through summer field schools, offers opportunities to work in archaeological curation, and also, through a total of fourteen workshop offerings, provides certification for avocational archaeologists.

The State Historic Preservation Office remained in DRED until 1985, when, with recodification of RSA 227-C, the office became the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources within the newly created Department of Libraries, Arts, and Historical Resources (renamed the Department of Cultural Affairs in 1990 and the Department of Cultural Resources in 1998).

From its inception until 2006, the Division of Historical Resources has forwarded over 700 nominations, including 4,035 properties, to the National Register of Historic Places in Washington for final listing. Eighty-nine projects in New Hampshire have benefited from preservation tax incentives, producing over $198 million of economic productivity in new jobs, materials purchased, and rehabilitated buildings placed back on tax rolls as income-producing properties. Review by the Division of Historical Resources of projects involving federal funds, permits, or licenses has prevented thousands of historic properties from being destroyed or altered unnecessarily.

Recognizing the need for an honorific program that would be flexible and open to local perceptions of historical value and significance, the Division created the New Hampshire State Register of Historic Places in 2001. Properties may be listed in the State Register for the stories they tell. Although the State Register recognizes that many types of historical resources have changed over the years to accommodate evolving technologies, styles, and needs, a resource that is nominated to the State Register must retain enough of its historic fabric to illustrate its historic uses and role in the community. Nominated properties may also be meaningful for their associations with people who made important contributions to a community, profession, or local tradition. They may also be listed for their tangible merit, either as a well-preserved example of local architecture, design, construction or engineering, or as a longstanding focal point in a neighborhood or community. Identified but unexcavated archaeological sites may also be listed in the New Hampshire State Register of Historic Places. Generally, properties nominated to the State Register should be at least fifty years old.
Properties nearing the fifty-year mark may be listed if their historical values are abundantly clear before the fifty-year mark is attained.

Survey and Planning grants, largely given to regional planning commissions, educational institutions, non-profit preservation organizations, and, more recently, to Certified Local Governments, have funded projects that have provided detailed information and preservation strategies for individual properties and historic districts in towns and cities.

Legislation authorizing towns to establish historic district commissions and (since 1992) heritage commissions has given communities useful tools to address their local preservation concerns. By April 2005, eighty-six communities had done so, six of them having both a historic district commission and a heritage commission. Twelve towns and cities had become Certified Local Governments, allowing them to participate in the federal historic preservation program and to apply for matching federal funds.

When federal Acquisition & Development (construction) grants were available between 1974 and 1980, and again as part of the 1983 “Jobs Bill,” the State Historic Preservation Office provided federal matching grants for exemplary preservation work on fifty National Register-eligible New Hampshire properties. The Division received and monitored term preservation covenants (easements) on each of these properties, protecting their historical integrity.

Most of these term easements expired after twenty years, but the Division of Historical Resources has since acquired similar easements, some of them permanent, on other significant properties. The office received perpetual easements on Canterbury (NHL) and Enfield Shaker Villages when the state Land Conservation Investment Program provided funds to protect the open lands at both villages in 1992 and 1993. The office received permanent preservation easements on White Island Lighthouse (1853) at the Isles of Shoals in Rye, and on portions of Fort Point in New Castle, as a result of federal property transfers. Fulfilling National Park Service requirements, the Division has received and is monitoring fifty-year term preservation easements on several New Hampshire properties that have received federal “Save America’s Treasures” grants: the Eagle Block (1825) in Newport; Cheshire Mill No. 1 (1846-7) in Harrisville; and Music Hall (1877,1901) in Portsmouth. The Division has also been designated as grantee of a number of easements on that were placed on properties preserved by the New Hampshire Department of Transportation under DOT or FHWA project mitigation.

Although most state-owned historic sites are administered by the New Hampshire Division of Parks & Recreation, the Division of Historical Resources cooperates closely with its sister agency and owns three historic properties in its own right. Between 1988 and 1990, the surviving portion of the Old New Hampshire State House (1758) from Portsmouth was carefully investigated, documented, disassembled, and stored in a fifty-foot storage trailer. The trailer stands at the Division’s headquarters in Concord. In 2006, after some six years of working with committees in Portsmouth to plan for the future of the building, the Division received a federal Economic Development Initiative (EDI) grant for the purpose of planning the best treatment, location, and use of the structure.

In August 1986, a 7.5-acre parcel of land in Shelburne, New Hampshire (formerly designated the Gardner Wayside) was transferred from the New Hampshire Department of Transportation to the Division of Historical Resources to be used as a Native American reburial ground.

And the town of Hopkinton transferred title to the Contoocook Covered Railroad Bridge, in Contoocook Village in that town, to the Division of Historical Resources in 1989 under a New Hampshire statute that authorizes communities to donate their unused covered bridges to the Division with the approval of Governor and Executive Council. Because the Division has no capital budget with which to maintain the bridge, it has largely been dependent on contributions from the National Society for the Preservation of Covered Bridges, Inc., over the years. These contributions culminated in 2006 with the National Society’s paying a contractor to lift the four corners of the massive structure and
replace decayed corbel beams below the bottom chords. The Division applied for and received a Transportation Enhancement (TE) grant that will permit the installation of fire protection systems in the bridge.

A milestone in New Hampshire’s preservation history occurred with the chartering in 1985 of Inherit New Hampshire, Inc., a statewide non-profit preservation advocate. From its inception, INH held important statewide “town meetings” and heritage roundtables that enabled the organization to bring the issues of preservation, statewide growth, and the effects of sprawl and development to the wider public. Changing its name to the New Hampshire Preservation Alliance in 1999, the organization has played a key role in lobbying for every preservation-related program in New Hampshire for the past twenty years. Since 1996, NHPA and the Division of Historical Resources have published their newsletters in tandem, sharing mailing lists and building the two linked newsletters into a powerful forum for preservation ideas.

Until the turn of the twenty-first century, very few substantial sources of preservation funding were available on a predictable basis. Most preservation projects relied on the possibility that they might win a foundation grant or secure corporate support for their undertakings. This was true both on a national basis and within New Hampshire. Although Congress established its “Save America’s Treasures” program in 1998, this program was initially administered by a partnership between the National Park Service and the National Trust for Historic Preservation, with startup funding from the Getty Foundation, and was more honorific than financial in nature. Congressional appropriations eventually made “Save America’s Treasures” a viable grant program in 2000, and New Hampshire projects began to receive substantial funding from this source.

New Hampshire made its first serious commitment to land preservation with creation of the Land Conservation Investment Program in 1987. Although this initiative focused on land conservation, some LCIP projects involved buildings peripherally. Two such projects—Canterbury and Enfield Shaker Villages—contained structures of such significance that conservation and preservation easements were required to protect the public’s investment in these properties. In the case of both villages, the Division of Historical Resources agreed to act as grantee of the preservation easement.

New Hampshire’s most effective statewide preservation program came into being in 2000 with creation of the New Hampshire Land and Community Heritage Investment Program (LCHIP). The extended dearth of available funds for preservation and conservation projects in New Hampshire made the creation of LCHIP one of the most universally supported measures in state history. LCHIP was created out of recognition that both natural and cultural resources constitute New Hampshire’s character-defining environment. Thus, LCHIP divides its available funds into two roughly equal parts, making grants for both land conservation and historic preservation projects. In the first few years of its existence, LCHIP provided funding for some fifty historic preservation projects. All are monitored by the Division of Historical Resources for compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and for sound stewardship plans.

A second important preservation tool was offered to the people of New Hampshire by creation of the Conservation License Plate program in 2002. Like LCHIP, this program makes funds available to both land conservation and historic preservation projects. Funds for the program are derived from extra revenues realized from the sale of special automobile license plates. Several state agencies receive a share of revenues, including the Department of Resources and Economic Development (DRED) for care of the state-owned historic sites, and the Division of Historical Resources for re-grants for publicly owned cultural resources. NHDHR awarded the first grants under its share of the program in 2004. In the first two years of operation, the Division’s grant program funded a dozen projects around the state, and also provided supplementary funds to DRED for conservation work at state-owned historic properties.
CHRONOLOGY

The following are highlights in the development of historical consciousness and historic preservation (including the preservation of historical objects) in New Hampshire, with reference to activities in neighboring states where appropriate. The list includes a number of publications, because literature was essential in instilling a preservation ethic and in publicizing the success or failure of efforts to preserve elements of the past. In general, the field of historic preservation in New England evolved from a literary appreciation of antiquities and early legends, through a study and recordation of old houses and other buildings, to concerted efforts to acquire and preserve either imposing or evocative properties.

1825 Charles Warren Brewster became a part owner of the Portsmouth Journal of Literature and Politics, and soon began to contribute historical “Rambles” that focused on the antiquities of coastal New Hampshire (see also, 1859).

1830 Preservation of the Old State House in Boston through its remodeling as a city hall.

1831 Publication of John Greenleaf Whittier’s Legends of New England, a mixture of poetry and prose that gave literary stature to tales and antiquities of New England.

1845 Visitors were allowed to view the Governor Benning Wentworth Mansion at Little Harbor in Portsmouth, N. H., and were given tours of the house by a daughter of Charles Cushing, then the owner. Tours of the house continued as late as the 1870s at the invitation (by broadside) of Cushing’s grandson, William Pusey Israel.

1847 Destruction of the “Old Indian House,” Deerfield, Massachusetts, with preservation of its front door as a relic. Loss of this building strengthened the later preservation movement in the Deerfield vicinity (see also, 1877).

1853 The first “Return of the Sons” of Portsmouth, which established the tradition of nostalgic visits to the old seaport by native sons who had moved elsewhere, and led eventually to the idea of New Hampshire’s “Old Home Week” in 1899.

1853 Publication of Joseph Barlow Felt’s The Customs of New England. This was probably the first attempt in the United States to use pictorial evidence and artifacts to examine the material culture of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It was followed forty years later by several books on the same theme by Alice Morse Earle, including her Customs and Fashions in Old New England (1893) and Costume of Colonial Times (1894).

c.1775 Wentworth Cheswill of Newmarket carried out excavations of Native American Indian burials near Ossipee Pond, reporting his observations to the Rev. Jeremy Belknap about 1790. Cheswill simultaneously reported the discovery of a deeply-buried Indian shell midden in Newmarket circa 1760. Together, Cheswill’s reports constitute the earliest known archaeological observations in New Hampshire.

1792 The Rev. Jeremy Belknap completed publication of this three-volume The History of New-Hampshire, the first detailed and scholarly chronicle of the development of the province and state of New Hampshire up to that point. After leaving his pastorate in Dover, New Hampshire, Belknap was also instrumental in establishing the Massachusetts Historical Society (1791), the first statewide historical agency in the United States.

1823 Founding of the New Hampshire Historical Society, a private corporation chartered by the New Hampshire legislature on the 200th anniversary of the settlement of New Hampshire.

1823 Celebration of the 200th anniversary of New Hampshire’s settlement with an exhibition of ancient portraits and a ball at Franklin Hall in Portsmouth. This was probably the first public historical exhibit ever attempted in New Hampshire.
1856 Chartering of the Mount Vernon Ladies’ Association of the Union, an organization dedicated to the purchase and preservation of Washington’s home. The movement attracted widespread support, especially from Edward Everett of Boston. The Association eventually appointed vice-regents in almost every state of the Union, with “lady managers” for every county, town, or village in each state, thus becoming the first national preservation effort.


1863 Destruction of the Thomas Hancock House in Boston. Architect John Hubbard Sturgis, whose family summered on Sagamore Creek in Portsmouth, completed measured drawings of the structure before its destruction. Loss of this house provided a symbolic rallying point for later preservationists in New England, including those who fought to save the Old South Meeting House in 1876 and those who founded the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities in 1910.

1866 Publication of John Greenleaf Whittier’s *Snow-Bound*, a long poem that romanticized life on an early nineteenth-century farmstead and popularized a nostalgic regard for such symbols of early days as the rural farm. *Snow-Bound* also earned Whittier widespread popularity and gave poignancy to his countless other allusions to legends and scenes of northeastern Massachusetts and parts of New Hampshire.

1868 Publication of Thomas Bailey Aldrich’s *The Story of a Bad Boy*, which depicted Portsmouth, N. H., as already ancient and suffused with memories of a romantic earlier period of glory.

1869 Publication of the second series of Charles Warren Brewster’s *Rambles About Portsmouth*.

1872 Publication of Part II of Longfellow’s *Tales of a Wayside Inn*, containing the poem “Lady Wentworth,” which made the Governor Benning Wentworth Mansion in Portsmouth a literary landmark.


1873 Publication of Celia Thaxter’s *Among the Isles of Shoals*, which had earlier appeared in the form of essays in *The Atlantic Monthly*, beginning in 1869.

1874 Publication of Thomas Bailey Aldrich’s “An Old Town by the Sea” in *Harper’s New Monthly Magazine*, illustrated with wood engravings of some of the old houses and relics of Portsmouth, N. H.

1875 Publication of Samuel Adams Drake’s *Nooks and Corners of the New England Coast*.

1876 Preservation of the Old South Meeting House in Boston.

1876 Publication of the first edition of Sarah Haven Foster’s *The Portsmouth Guidebook*, which offered several walking tours of the historic sites of the city.

1876 Publication of George Henry Tripp’s novel, *Student-Days at Harvard*, whose protagonist was Samuel Wentworth, fictional scion of the Wentworth family of Little Harbor. This book reinforced the stature of the Governor Benning Wentworth Mansion as a literary landmark.

1877 Preservation of the birthplace of Benjamin Thompson, Count Rumford, in Woburn, Massachusetts, by the Rumford Historical Association, a private group. Except for Mount Vernon, this may have been the first house preserved and maintained by a historical society in the United States.
1877 Charles F. McKim, William R. Mead, and Stanford White visited Marblehead, Salem, Newburyport, and Portsmouth to make sketches and measured drawings of colonial houses. Together with the sketches of Arthur Little, compiled in the same year and published in 1878, this trip documents the first known instances of interest in colonial architecture by professional architects.


1877 Publication of Sarah Orne Jewett's Deephaven, illustrated with scenes of the Yorks, South Berwick, and Portsmouth.

1877 Preservation of the Parson Williams House, Deerfield, Massachusetts, by the trustees of Deerfield Academy.

1877 Commencement of publication of The Granite Monthly, A Magazine of Literature, History and State Progress. As the first magazine devoted to all aspects of New Hampshire, The Granite Monthly did much to define the character and to chronicle the history of the state. It continued publication for more than fifty years, ceasing publication in 1930 (see also, 1931).

1878 Publication of Arthur Little's Early New England Interiors. Sketches in Salem, Marblehead, Portsmouth and Kittery, which reproduced the author's pen-and-ink sketches of old New England houses, including the Governor Benning Wentworth (later Wentworth-Coolidge) Mansion in Portsmouth, N. H. This was the first publication on a group of colonial buildings by a trained architect.

1879 Publication of the first of a series of articles on the historic houses of New Hampshire by Frederick Myron Colby in The Granite Monthly magazine. The first article was "The Home of Lady Wentworth," describing the Governor Benning Wentworth Mansion in Portsmouth. This was followed by articles on the Governor John Langdon Mansion in Portsmouth (1880); the Governor John Wentworth Mansion in Portsmouth (1880); the General Miller Mansion in Temple (1880); the Walker House in Concord (1880); Holderness and the Livermore Family (1881); the Franklin Pierce Homestead in Hillsborough (1881); the Governor Meshech Weare House in Hampton Falls (1881); the Stark House in Dunbarton (1882); the General John Sullivan House in Durham (1882); the Rolfe-Rumford House in Concord (1882); the Badger Homestead in Gilmanton (1883); the Gilman House in Exeter (1883); the Jaffrey Mansion in Portsmouth (1884); and the Warner House in Portsmouth (1884).

1880 Restoration of the Old State House in Boston.

1883 Publication of Thomas Bailey Aldrich's An Old Town by the Sea in book form.

1886 Publication of Edwin Whitefield's The Homes of Our Forefathers . . . in Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont. Illustrated with lithographed drawings of scores of ancient houses, this book included buildings that were notable for their architecture as well as homes that were associated with famous or interesting people.

1887 Publication of Frank E. Wallis' Old Colonial Architecture and Furniture, which included some details of Portsmouth buildings.


1890 Publication of the brochure, Secure a Home in New Hampshire, Where Comfort, Health and Prosperity Abound, which listed 1,442 abandoned farms with tenantable buildings and set in motion the state's program to convince out-of-state people to buy and repair old farmhouses.

1891 Publication of Corner and Soderholtz's Examples of Domestic Colonial Architecture in New England, illustrating several Georgian houses of Portsmouth and Kittery Point.

1892 Death of John Greenleaf Whittier, followed by acquisition and preservation of his birthplace in East Haverhill, Massachusetts.

1895 Restoration of the 1794 Massachusetts State House, Boston.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Restoration of Faneuil Hall, Boston.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Preservation of the Whipple House (1640), Ipswich, Massachusetts, by the Ipswich Historical Society. This may have been the first instance in New England in which an ancient building was preserved largely for its architecture and its ability to convey a sense of life in a remote era. Preservation of the Whipple House was widely publicized throughout the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Establishment of Old Home Week by New Hampshire governor Frank West Rollins, drawing the attention of expatriate New Hampshire people to the places of their birth and “arousing interest in the old homesteads” of the state. Sixty towns held Old Home Week reunions in 1899, and seventy-two the following year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Publication of The Portsmouth Book, which contained an essay on the city’s historic architecture written by R. Clipston Sturgis and several other essays exploring the city’s colonial past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Founding of the Old York [Maine] Historical and Improvement Society to beautify York Village and preserve its past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Restoration and opening of the Old Gaol, York, Maine, by the Old York Historical and Improvement Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Preservation of the Wadsworth Longfellow House in Portland, Maine, by the Maine Historical Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Acquisition of the Ladd-Gilman House in Exeter by the Society of the Cincinnati. The Society used the house for periodic meetings and opened it to the public free of charge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Publication of Caleb Stevens Gurney’s Portsmouth: . . . Historic and Picturesque, a guidebook to the historic sites and buildings of Portsmouth, richly illustrated with photographs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Restoration of the John Greenleaf Whittier birthplace in East Haverhill after a fire in 1902 destroyed its roof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Publication of Samuel T. Pickard’s Whittier-Land, A Handbook of North Essex, a volume that romanticized the locales and buildings, many of them in Essex County in Massachusetts and Rockingham County (and elsewhere) in New Hampshire, that were mentioned in Whittier’s poetry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Restoration of the Thomas Bailey Aldrich Memorial in Portsmouth, N. H., by the Thomas Bailey Aldrich Memorial Association, which raised $10,000 by public subscription and, with the help of the late author’s family, recreated the appearance of an upper-middle-class Portsmouth home of the 1840s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Installation of three period rooms (a kitchen of 1750, a bedchamber of 1800, and a parlor of 1800) at the Essex Institute, Salem, Massachusetts, by George Francis Dow. Like the furnishing of the Thomas Bailey Aldrich Memorial, these rooms represented some of the earliest efforts in the United States to recreate the physical reality of a past era.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Reproduction of the Governor John Langdon Mansion in Portsmouth ads the New Hampshire building at the Jamestown Exhibit according to plans by architect Chase R. Whitcher of Manchester. Whitcher soon thereafter was designated as the New Hampshire “state architect,” and his familiarity with Georgian design was evident in features of some of his modern buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907-8</td>
<td>Restoration of the Paul Revere House, Boston.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1908 Restoration of the Old Allenstown Meeting House in Allenstown, N. H., by Buntin Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution. This was perhaps the first non-urban restoration project to be undertaken in New Hampshire. It was apparently motivated by nostalgic associations in a town that was losing its agricultural way of life and its rural population rather than by a wish to commemorate a prominent individual or an imposing specimen of architecture.

1910 Founding of the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities. The purpose of the Society was to preserve structures dating from the seventeenth to the early nineteenth centuries “which are architecturally beautiful or unique, or have special historical significance.”

1910 Founding of the Daniel Webster Birthplace Association to acquire and restore the supposed birthplace of the statesman and orator in West Franklin, N. H. The house was restored in 1912, and in 1917 the Association deeded the property to the State of New Hampshire as the first state-owned historic site.

1911 Acquisition by SPNEA of its first property, the Swett-Ilsley House (c. 1670) in Newbury, Massachusetts.


1913 Restoration of rooms in the privately-owned Gilman Garrison House in Exeter, N. H., by the Garrison House Associates for use as a meeting place and club headquarters.

1914 Restoration by Miss Clara Endicott Sears of “Fruitlands,” Harvard, Massachusetts, as a museum commemorating the life of Bronson Alcott and the Transcendentalist movement. Miss Sears proclaimed her special goal as the inspiration of contemplative thought in a setting that had nurtured some of New England’s most original thinking and writing.

1915 Acquisition by Wallace Nutting of the Wentworth-Gardner House in Portsmouth, N. H., as part of Nutting’s “Chain of Houses.” The two other dwellings initially included in the “chain” were in Massachusetts. Nutting carefully restored the Wentworth-Gardner House to a standard that had not previously been evinced in New Hampshire, and made serious attempts to attract motor tourists, a new class of visitors, to all properties in the “chain.” A decline in tourism during World War I forced Nutting to sell the Wentworth-Gardner House by 1918.

1915 Beginning of production of the White Pine Series of Architectural Monographs in Pencil Points magazine. This series was highly influential in employing essays, well-reproduced photographs, and measured drawings prepared by leading architects of the time to present early American buildings as a regular feature of a prominent architectural journal.

1917 Acquisition of the John Paul Jones House in Portsmouth by architect Joseph Chandler and associates, who eventually donated the structure to the Portsmouth Historical Society.

1917 Acceptance by the State of New Hampshire of title to the Daniel Webster Birthplace in West Franklin, New Hampshire.

1917 Purchase of the Franklin Pierce Homestead in Hillsborough, N. H., by a committee chaired by Franklin Pierce Carpenter. The committee deeded the property to Hayward H. Kendall of Cleveland, Ohio, in 1923 (see also, 1925).

1918 Acquisition by the Metropolitan Museum from Wallace Nutting of the Wentworth-Gardner House in Portsmouth, N. H. This purchase inaugurated a long period of anxiety over the eventual fate of the house and focused the attention of New Hampshire people on the possibility that they might lose one of the finest pre-Revolutionary houses in the state.

1918 Acquisition and preservation of the home in Amesbury, Massachusetts, of John Greenleaf Whittier by the Whittier Home Association.
1919 Gift by Woodbury Langdon to aid the Portsmouth Historical Society in restoring the John Paul Jones House.

1919 Establishment of the Augustus Saint-Gaudens Memorial by Augusta Saint-Gaudens to preserve the buildings, grounds, and art works created and assembled by her late husband at his studio, “Aspet,” Cornish, New Hampshire (see also, 1921, 1964).

1921 Transfer of the buildings and 22 acres of land at “Aspet” to the Saint-Gaudens Memorial corporation.

1922 Publication of Fiske Kimball’s *Domestic Architecture of the American Colonies and of the Early Republic*. This was the first study of American houses to be based on accurate dating information and documentation, and was the first to define the sources and progression of styles from the seventeenth through the early nineteenth centuries.

1922 Restoration of the Lady Pepperrell House (1760), Kittery Point, Maine, by architect John Mead Howells. The house was donated to the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities in 1940.

1924 Opening of the American Wing of the Metropolitan Museum of Art. The wing included a room from the Shaw House in Kensington, N. H., and another room and staircase from the Lieutenant-Governor John Wentworth House in Portsmouth. Opening of the wing symbolized a recognition of the importance of American architecture and decorative arts by a museum already known for its distillation of the highest accomplishments of all cultures.

1924 Opening of a series of furnished period rooms in the remodeled museum building of the New Hampshire Historical Society on North Main Street, Concord, N. H.

1925 Acceptance by the State of New Hampshire of the gift of the Franklin Pierce Homestead in Hillsborough, N. H., from Hayward H. Kendall.

1927 Acquisition of the Richard Jackson House (1664) in Portsmouth, N. H., the oldest surviving house in New Hampshire, by the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities.

1929 Moving of the Folsom Tavern in Exeter to the grounds of the Society of the Cincinnati for preservation after its original lot was sold for a gasoline filling station.

1931 Founding of the Warner House Association by Edith Greenough Wendell to acquire and care for the Macphheadris-Warner House in Portsmouth, N. H.

1931 Publication of John Mead Howells’ *Lost Examples of Colonial Architecture*, which illustrated a number of New Hampshire buildings, most of them in Portsmouth, that had been lost to fire or change.

1931 Beginning of the publication of the *New Hampshire Troubadour* by the State Planning and Development Commission, superseding *The Granite Monthly* in portraying New Hampshire. This pocket-sized magazine, distributed free, was a powerful influence in making the state’s history attractive and in establishing the renovation of old New Hampshire houses a dream of many people from out-of-state (see also, 1951).

1932 Opening of the Macphheadris-Warner House to the public.

1933 Gift to the State of New Hampshire of the Governor John Wentworth Farm in Wolfeborough by Wentworth’s biographer, Lawrence Shaw Mayo.

1935 Passage of the Historic Sites Act by Congress “to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance . . . for the inspiration and benefit of the American people.”

1935 Proposal by the National Park Service and the Works Progress Administration, together with local citizens, to restore parts of Portsmouth, N. H., using re-trained workers from the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. The committee submitted their proposal as a “Report on [a] Restoration and Housing Project, Portsmouth, New Hampshire.” The report was accompanied by a plan of the proposed restoration drawn in 1936 by “W. H. B.”
1935 Incorporation by Albert B. Wells and his brothers Channing M. Wells and J. Cheney Wells of the Wells Historical Museum, a non-profit corporation that eventually developed into Old Sturbridge Village in Massachusetts (see also, 1946).

1935-7 Recordation by the Historic American Buildings Survey of endangered New Hampshire buildings in thirty-four communities. The HABS drafting team was largely composed of students in the then-extant architectural program at the University of New Hampshire. Some of the photographs were taken by Clement Moran, associate professor of physics at UNH and unofficial university photographer in the late 1930s.

1937 Publication of John Mead Howells’ *The Architectural Heritage of the Piscataqua*, the first book to focus strictly on the buildings of the Piscataqua region of New Hampshire and Maine.

1937 Acquisition of the Governor John Langdon Mansion in Portsmouth by the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities.

1940 Conveyance by the Metropolitan Museum of Art of the Wentworth-Gardner House to the Wentworth-Gardner and Tobias Lear Houses Association, which had been formed for the permanent preservation of the house on its original site.

1940 Conveyance by William Sumner Appleton of the Tobias Lear House to the Wentworth-Gardner and Tobias Lear Houses Association, which had been formed for the permanent preservation of the house on its original site.

1940 Opening to the public of the Jeffords Tavern, York, Maine, by Elizabeth Perkins.

1941 Publication of John Mead Howells’ *The Architectural Heritage of the Merrimack*, with photographs and measured drawings of buildings in the Merrimack River Valley of Massachusetts and New Hampshire.

1946 The Wells Historical Museum in Massachusetts, having changed its name to Quinabaug Village Corporation, changed again into Old Sturbridge Village and opened to the public. Its preservation method of moving buildings from elsewhere for preservation and interpretation of an early way of life was a powerful influence in the preservation movement throughout the latter half of the twentieth century.

1947 Establishment of Shelburne Museum in Vermont. Like Old Sturbridge Village, Shelburne was one of New England’s first “outdoor museums” of buildings and structures moved from elsewhere, reinforcing the model followed at Old Sturbridge Village and later, to a lesser extent, at Strawbery Banke.

1949 Passage of the Federal Housing Act of 1949, under which federal grants were made available to communities for up to two-thirds of the cost of acquiring, clearing, and preparing land for redevelopment. The community was required to pay at least one-third of the cost, to have an active community planning program, and to take other steps to prevent the recurrence of blight and deterioration in redeveloped areas. This was the beginning of the federal urban renewal program, which was to have an extreme and generally negative impact of historic preservation in the older eastern states.

1949 Chartering by Congress of the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

1949 Bequest to the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities of the Hamilton House in South Berwick, Maine, by Elizabeth R. Vaughan, who had previously restored the dwelling and grounds.

1950 Transfer of the New Hampshire state historic sites (then including only the Daniel Webster Birthplace, the Hannah Dustin Monument, and the Franklin Pierce Homestead) from administration by the governor and executive council to the New Hampshire Forestry and Recreation Commission.

1951 Commencement of publication of *New Hampshire Profiles* magazine with the cessation of the state’s sponsorship of the *New Hampshire Troubadour* after twenty years of publication.
Published privately, _New Hampshire Profiles_ developed into an influential chronicle of New Hampshire places, events, and people, including a number of articles on historic preservation and building restoration. It continued in publication until 1991.

1951 Drafting of a proposal to create a crafts center, museum, and historical village on state land near the General Sullivan Bridge in Newington, to include historic structures from Newington Village if development of what became Pease Air Force Base compelled their removal.

1952 Incorporation of Historic Deerfield in Massachusetts to sustain the private preservation work of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Flynt, who had been acquiring properties along Deerfield Street. Historic Deerfield matured into one of the premier examples of preservation and historical interpretation in New England.

1954 Gift to the State of New Hampshire of the Wentworth-Coolidge Mansion in Portsmouth by Mrs. J. Templeman Coolidge.

1954 Passage of the Federal Housing Act of 1954, which enlarged upon the Housing Act of 1949 to include rehabilitation and conservation of buildings in urban renewal projects in cases when these redevelopment tools could be effective.

1955 Establishment by the State of New Hampshire of its roadside historic marker program (see also, 1961).

1956 Appointment of a Historic Sites Advisory Committee to advise the Recreation Division in its management of the Daniel Webster Birthplace, the Franklin Pierce Homestead, the Hannah Dustin Monument, and the Wentworth-Coolidge Mansion. Members included Dr. Charles H. Sawyer, Charles Buckley, Mrs. Robert Burroughs, Philip Guyol, Mrs. Hugh Gregg, Mrs. Nelle Holmes, Jeremy Waldron, Mrs. Alexander Nielson, James Barker Smith, and Mr. --- Eastman.


1959 Revision of New Hampshire enabling legislation (RSA 205) to permit the rehabilitation of structures to be a “purpose” within an urban renewal project and otherwise bringing the New Hampshire statute into conformity with the Federal Housing Act of 1954.

1959 Disposition Agreement between the Portsmouth Housing Authority and Strawberry Banke, Inc., naming the latter corporation as the redeveloper in the Marcy-Washington Streets Urban Renewal Project. This was the first instance in the United States in which historic preservation was accepted as the principal redevelopment goal in an urban renewal project.

1959 Establishment of the New Hampshire Historical Commission “to take such steps and to formulate such plans as will tend to preserve the state’s heritage, improve the understanding of the public of such heritage, and preserve public records of historical interest, historical documents and objects of historical value.” The commission was also empowered to recommend legislation to the general court for the accomplishment of these objectives.


1961 Transfer by the New Hampshire legislature of the state roadside historical marker program, which had been created in 1955, to the jurisdiction of the State Historical Commission.

1962 Demolition of the Concord railroad depot (1885). This loss instilled a strong preservation ethic in the state’s capital city and across the state.

1963 Legislation passed by the New Hampshire legislature granting authority for the establishment of local historic districts in the state.

1964 Acquisition by the National Park Service of the Saint-Gaudens site in Cornish. The Augustus Saint-Gaudens Memorial corporation, founded in 1919, continued its existence and its interest in the property.
1965 Acquisition by the State of New Hampshire of the Robert Frost Farm in Derry, N. H., and commencement of clean-up of the property, which had been used as an automobile scrap yard.

1965 Acquisition of the Gilman Garrison House in Exeter, N. H., by the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities, with long-term tenancy rights by members of the family of its former owners.

1965 Opening of the first restored houses at Strawbery Banke to the public.

1966 Passage of the National Historic Preservation Act (Public Law 89-665) “to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation [beyond those preserved under the 1935 Historic Sites Act] . . . as a living part of our community life and development.” This act also established the National Register of Historic Places, empowered each state to create a State Historic Preservation Office, made all federal undertakings subject to preservation criteria, created a federal preservation grant-in-aid program that provided 50% matching grants for the acquisition and preservation of National Register properties, and created the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to mediate conflicts and suggest measures to foster historic preservation.

1968 Incorporation of Portsmouth Preservation, Inc., a profit-making corporation chartered for the purpose of rehabilitating a number of houses in the Deer Street Urban Renewal Project in Portsmouth, N. H., for commercial reuse.


1969 Incorporation of Canterbury Shaker Village, Inc., a non-profit corporation founded to administer the village and eventually to transform it into a restored museum and center for research and education. Its public attendance eventually reached 60,000 a year, making the village New Hampshire’s premier cultural attraction. Sister Ethel Hudson, the last Canterbury Shaker, dies in 1992.

1970 Incorporation of the New Hampshire Farm Museum. In 1979, a decision of probate court permitted the museum to purchase the core of the Levi Jones Farm in Milton, with its connected farm buildings, from the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests.

1970 Founding of Save the Mills Society in Laconia, N. H., for the purpose of saving the Belknap-Sulloway (1823) and the Busiel-Seeburg (1853) mills, which were slated for demolition under urban renewal.

1971 Founding of Historic Harrisville, Inc., to confront threats to a historic textile manufacturing community that was endangered by the bankruptcy of the corporation that owned some twenty-five buildings constructed between 1820 and 1860.

1971 First effective funding of Historic Preservation Grant-in-Aid monies, authorized by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 to aid preservation work.

1971 Receipt by Historic Harrisville, Inc., of the first Revolving Fund Grant awarded by the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

1971 Establishment by the New Hampshire Charitable Fund of a Revolving Fund for Historic Preservation, making its initial loan to Historic Harrisville, Inc.


1973-4 Rehabilitation of the former Concord Post Office as the Legislative Office Building by architect Richard Dudley. The building has previously been slated for demolition.

1974 Establishment (by RSA 227-C) of the New Hampshire State Historic Preservation Office within the Department of Resources and Economic Development. In creating this office, the legislature “determined that the historical, archaeological, architectural, and cultural heritage of New Hampshire is among the most important environmental assets of the state and that the rapid social and economic development of contemporary society threatens the remaining vestiges of this heritage; therefore, it is hereby
declared to be public policy and in the public interest of this state to engage in a comprehensive program of historic preservation to promote the use and conservation of such property for the education, inspiration, pleasure, and enrichment of the citizens of New Hampshire."

1974 Publication by the Historic American Engineering Record of *New England: An Inventory of Historic Engineering and Industrial Sites.*

1976 Passage of the Tax Reform Act, which gave the rehabilitation of income-producing historic properties parity with new construction in the real estate marketplace.

1978 Publication of the first finished version of *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines*, which established a preservation philosophy governing all federally-funded undertakings that affect National Register-eligible properties.

1981 Revision of New Hampshire’s historic preservation statute (RSA 227-C), to elaborate upon the identification and protection of archaeological resources in New Hampshire. The newly-drafted RSA 227-C:10 authorized the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources to provide methods of training nonprofessional persons in technical archaeological skills and of encouraging these people to participate in field investigations supervised by the Division. Out of this authorization grew the State Conservation and Rescue Archaeology Program ("SCRAP") to provide training, field and laboratory experience and certification for avocational archaeologists.

1985 Incorporation of Inherit New Hampshire, a statewide, non-profit historic preservation organization, following a detailed study that documented the need for such an organization. Inherit New Hampshire changed its name to the New Hampshire Preservation Alliance in 1999. The Alliance has played a key role in advocating creation and passage of laws that created the Land and Community Heritage Investment Program, the New Hampshire Conservation License Plate program, and other state preservation initiatives that have been enacted since 2000.

1986 Enfield Shaker Museum founded to try to acquire and interpret Shaker properties that had been bought by land developers. The museum purchased the Laundry/Dairy building in 1991; the West Meadow Barn and stone machine shop in 1993; four more buildings, including the 1841 Great Stone Dwelling and 8.54 acres at the core of the village in 1997; and the Ministry House in 1999.

1987 Creation by the New Hampshire Legislature (under former RSA 221-A) of the Land Conservation Investment Program to acquire conservation lands or conservation easements on significant lands. Property interests so acquired were thereupon assigned to appropriate state agencies for management. In two cases, Canterbury and Enfield Shaker Villages, the protected lands included village cores that retained significant buildings and structures; in the case of Canterbury, these resources represent a National Historic Landmark. The Division of Historical Resources agreed to act as grantee for perpetual preservation easements on the exteriors of buildings in the village cores for these two LCIP acquisitions.

1985 Re-codification of RSA 227-C, renaming the State Historic Preservation Office the “New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources” and placing it within the newly-created Department of Libraries, Arts, and Historical Resources (renamed the Department of Cultural Affairs in 1990 and the Department of Cultural Resources in 1998).

1992 Passage of a law by the New Hampshire legislature permitting communities to establish Heritage Commissions instead of, or in addition to, Historic District Commissions. This flexibility, coupled with complete freedom in locally defining the duties of a Heritage Commission, gave New Hampshire communities the ability to create local boards that would perform the precise duties that town voters wish.
The duties of Heritage Commissions can range from merely offering advice and historical background to other local boards and commissions, through exercising the full regulatory powers of a Historic District Commission. Heritage Commissions may also accept and expend monies for a non-lapsing local heritage fund, and acquire and manage property.

1998 Establishment by Congress of “Save America’s Treasures,” a matching grants program that provides funds for nationally significant properties and collections. Between 2000 and 2005, fifteen New Hampshire properties were designated “America’s Treasures,” and seven eventually received grants under the program: the dwelling house at Canterbury Shaker Village; Belknap Mill in Laconia; the Eagle Block in Newport; Cheshire Mill No. 1 in Harrisville; White Island Light Station at the Isles of Shoals; Music Hall in Portsmouth; and Meadow Bridge in Shelburne.

1999 Concerned about the survival of New Hampshire's historic barns and agricultural buildings, the Legislature enacted H.B. 395 to facilitate financial assistance, creating a "Historic Agricultural Structure Matching Grants Program" and a non-lapsing "Barn Preservation Fund" within the Division of Historical Resources. The DHR was authorized to accept public and private grants, gifts, or donations for the fund, to be awarded competitively to eligible applicants on a matching basis; but no state appropriation was provided. The legislation also created an advisory committee to the Division of Historical Resources, for soliciting applications, recommending grant awards, and considering any other matters necessary to the administration of the program.

2000 Creation by the New Hampshire Legislature (by RSA 227-M) of the Land and Community Heritage Investment Program (LCHIP). The legislature found that “growth and development should be balanced with careful protection of the state’s most important natural, cultural, and historical resources” and that protection of “lands, buildings, and other physical assets . . . must be accomplished along with their planned long-term stewardship.”

This program protects both land and buildings, and in the first few years of its operation, granted matching funds toward preservation of some fifty historic buildings. The New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources monitors the stewardship plans for LCHIP-assisted properties and ensures that treatment plans for these properties follow the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

2001 Institution of the New Hampshire State Register of Historic Places by the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources, offering recognition to nominated resources with broader flexibility and inclusiveness than characterize the National Register of Historic Places.

2002 Passage of a law (RSA 79-D) by the New Hampshire Legislature permitting town governments to abate a portion of the tax assessment of historic agricultural structures in order to encourage their preservation rather than demolition. In return, the owners of such structures must grant a discretionary preservation easement to the municipality, agreeing to maintain the structure’s historical integrity and character.

2003 Creation of a Conservation License Plate program by the New Hampshire Legislature, under which the revenues received through voluntary purchases of special automobile license plates are applied to the protection of publicly-owned lands and historic buildings. Revenues from this program are distributed to the Department of Resources and Economic Development, the Fish and Game Department, and the Department of Cultural Resources. A portion of the Cultural Resources funds is passed to the Division of Historical Resources which, in turn, passes these funds to publicly-owned historical resources through an annual competitive grant program.

2002 “Preserve America” initiative announced by the White House to support the preservation and enjoyment of historic, cultural, and natural resources. The initiative included a matching grant program to fund projects that preserve and interpret cultural resources.
2006 The Division of Historical Resources receives the first New Hampshire “Preserve America” grant award. NHDHR will work with the New Hampshire Division of Parks and Recreation to develop new interpretive programs at the five staffed state historic sites: Wentworth-Coolidge Mansion, Robert Frost Farm, Pierce Homestead, Daniel Webster Birthplace, and Weeks State Park.

2006 The Legislature enacts RSA 79-E, creating a property tax incentive to encourage substantial rehabilitation of underutilized buildings located in urban and town centers. The law was structured to encourage not only rehabilitation of downtown structures, but also housing in the downtown area. Modeled on the discretionary easements for preserving open land (RSA 79-C) and historic agricultural buildings (RSA 79-D), it allows communities to authorize a finite period of tax relief for property owners who substantially renovate eligible properties. During the term of the tax incentive, an owner’s property taxes will not increase as a result of the rehabilitation work. In exchange, the property owner grants an easement to insure continuation of the public benefit while the tax relief is in effect. After it expires, the structure is to be taxed at its full market value, taking the rehabilitation into account.

2006 “Seven to Save” program inaugurated by the New Hampshire Preservation Alliance, to recognize and offer support for endangered properties throughout the state.
STANDARDS FOR PRESERVATION

1. A property will be used as it was historically, or be given a new use that maximizes the retention of distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships. Where a treatment and use have not been identified, a property will be protected and, if necessary, stabilized until additional work may be undertaken.

2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The replacement of intact or repairable historic materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate, and conserve existing historic materials and features will be physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection, and properly documented for future research.

4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

6. The existing condition of historic features will be evaluated to determine the appropriate level of intervention needed. Where the severity of deterioration requires repair or limited replacement of a distinctive feature, the new material will match the old in composition, design, color, and texture.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

STANDARDS FOR REHABILITATION

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
STANDARDS FOR RESTORATION

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use which reflects the property's restoration period.
2. Materials and features from the restoration period will be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize the period will not be undertaken.
3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate and conserve materials and features from the restoration period will be physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection, and properly documented for future research.
4. Materials, features, spaces, and finishes that characterize other historical periods will be documented prior to their alteration or removal.
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the restoration period will be preserved.
6. Deteriorated features from the restoration period will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials.
7. Replacement of missing features from the restoration period will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence. A false sense of history will not be created by adding conjectural features, features from other properties, or by combining features that never existed together historically.
8. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
9. Archeological resources affected by a project will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.
10. Designs that were never executed historically will not be constructed.

STANDARDS FOR RECONSTRUCTION

1. Reconstruction will be used to depict vanished or non-surviving portions of a property when documentary and physical evidence is available to permit accurate reconstruction with minimal conjecture, and such reconstruction is essential to the public understanding of the property.
2. Reconstruction of a landscape, building, structure, or object in its historic location will be preceded by a thorough archeological investigation to identify and evaluate those features and artifacts which are essential to an accurate reconstruction. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.
3. Reconstruction will include measures to preserve any remaining historic materials, features, and spatial relationships.
4. Reconstruction will be based on the accurate duplication of historic features and elements substantiated by documentary or physical evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different features from other historic properties. A reconstructed property will re-create the appearance of the non-surviving historic property in materials, design, color, and texture.
5. A reconstruction will be clearly identified as a contemporary re-creation.
6. Designs that were never executed historically will not be constructed.

These standards were initially developed in 1975 and were revised in 1983 and 1992. This revision of the Standards was codified as 36 CFR Part 68 in the Federal Register, Vol. 60, No. 133, July 12, 1995; it replaces the Federal Register notice, Vol. 48, N. 190, September, 1983.
1. Look at the place where you live (your street, or road, or neighborhood) and see how many historic buildings and structures and land uses are present.
2. Talk to neighbors and “old timers” about their memories and stories of the area -- where they have lived, where you live, what they learned from “old-timers” when they were young.
3. Go to the library and find out what information it has about local history; read the town history and study local history publications.
4. Learn how to research the deeds for your house or a nearby historic property.
5. Write the history of your own house.
6. Find and study old maps of your neighborhood or community: what is still recognizable? what has changed? why did it change?
7. Using your maps, locate and record old roads and trails, and house, shop, and mill foundations in your town.
8. Look at old photographs and views of your house, your neighborhood, your community, and try to imagine yourself in the pictures. What can you see, hear, feel, touch, taste? How would it be different now?
9. Arrange to borrow, copy, and catalogue old photographs of your town for your local library or historical society.
10. Do follow-up research on the local history stories you’ve learned and the new insights you’ve gained.
11. Give time (or money) to the library to organize a historic preservation “how-to” collection.
12. Take a historic preservation or architectural history or building rehab course.
13. Join the local historic preservation or heritage organization; if none exist, explore the possibility of organizing one.
15. Volunteer to help the historical society with a task or project (it can be mundane, not monumental -- just do it!).
16. Learn how to use the Internet to find historic preservation information, and teach others how to do it, too.
17. Offer to do public relations or marketing for local historic preservation organizations or projects.
18. Visit historic places in your community...in neighboring communities...in the region...in the state.
19. Share the enjoyment of what you’ve learned with others, especially children (an impromptu “history walk,” a “preservation picnic,” a historic “mystery tour,” an outing to a museum or to nearby historic sites, a trip to explore architectural history/building construction exhibits at Strawbery Banke, telling historical or historic preservation bedtime stories...).
20. Join the Division of Historical Resources’ SCRAP (Statewide Conservation & Rescue Archaeology Program) and become certified as an avocational archaeologist.
21. Participate in SCRAP training, field schools, and workshops.
22. Talk up historic preservation at every opportunity (being shy is not a barrier; confidence will grow with every conversation).
23. Get others to really look at historic architecture, landscapes, townscape...and to think about what they are seeing.
24. Help others to understand how historic preservation is not a luxury but a resource that builds better lives and communities.
25. Encourage building rehab work that is sensitive and sympathetic to the character of the structure and its setting.
26. Recognize and compliment good historic preservation work, and encourage others to do so, too.
27. “Adopt” a vulnerable historic building or site and educate others about its historic value and its reuse potential.
28. Educate decision-makers about the value of preparing historic structures reports and preservation plans for historic properties.
29. Learn how to disagree without being disagreeable, and how to build consensus...then practice those skills!
HOW TO DO HISTORIC PRESERVATION AS PART OF YOUR EVERYDAY LIFE:
101 WAYS TO MAKE A DIFFERENCE

30. Become an advocate for historic preservation and encourage a preservation ethic within groups or organizations that you belong to or work with.
31. If there is a local historical resources survey underway, volunteer to help. If not, work with other interested individuals, groups, and boards or commissions to organize one.
32. Support local nominations to the National Register of Historic Places.
33. Organize a local historic preservation program, display, exhibit, or lecture.
34. Invite friends and family to attend local historic programs.
35. Join or create an oral history project.
36. Persuade local businesses to donate space for historic preservation displays and promotions.
37. Organize and promote “fun” historic preservation events for the general public; or help plan an annual historic preservation celebration that will appeal to a mix of ages, backgrounds, and interests.
38. Organize a historic preservation essay or poster contest for children.
39. Establish a historic preservation awards program in the schools.
40. Volunteer to help with local history projects in the schools.
41. Support expansion of history and historic preservation activities in the local schools.
42. Get involved with a historic preservation program for teens.
43. Join a statewide archaeology, history, or preservation advocacy organization.
44. Join a national archaeology or historic preservation organization.
45. Join an international historic preservation organization.
46. Familiarize yourself with historic preservation issues at the state, national, and international level; donate time or money to support efforts of special concern.
47. Attend an archaeology or history workshop or historic preservation conference...then put into action something you learned there.
48. Help with a fund-raiser for a preservation project.
49. Donate money or services or materials to an archaeology or historic preservation project.
50. Encourage others to donate money, services, or materials, too.
51. Attend public meetings of local officials and land use boards (Planning Board, Zoning Board, Historic District Commission) and the Heritage Commission, Conservation Commission, or Parks & Recreation Commission to find out about local issues, concerns, and decisions that are being considered (you don’t have to speak!).
52. Encourage other preservation-minded people to attend public meetings with you.
53. Learn about the interrelationships between historic preservation and other aspects of land-use planning.
54. Familiarize yourself with strategies and techniques that communities and Regional Planning Commissions can use to advance and enhance historic preservation action and achievements.
55. Encourage local officials, commissions and committees, and land-use boards to incorporate concern for historic preservation into their policies, regulations, and decision-making.
56. Volunteer to help land-use boards with research or data-gathering.
57. Work with local land-use boards and service organizations to bring citizen-participation local betterment programs (Community Cornerstones, Civic Profile, Community Stewardship, Saving Place) to the community.
58. Enlist others to help establish a local Heritage Commission, if the community lacks one.
59. Volunteer to help create or update a historic preservation chapter for the community Master Plan.
60. Prepare a local historic preservation manual.
61. Propose “Scenic Road” designation for qualifying local roads.
62. Encourage your community to participate in the state “Scenic Byways” program.
### How to Do Historic Preservation as Part of Your Everyday Life: 101 Ways to Make a Difference

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Attend meetings of the Selectmen (or Mayor &amp; Aldermen, or Council) and the Budget Committee to learn how historic preservation issues are being considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Volunteer (or run for election) to a local land use board, or as a local official.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Attend state legislative hearings for preservation-related bills (you don’t have to testify unless you want to!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>Talk to your state Representative and Senator about your historic preservation concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Talk or write to your Members of Congress about your historic preservation concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>Share your historic preservation ideas and concerns with the local news media: prepare an op-ed essay, or feature article, or radio spot, or video clip, or public-access cable program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>Write a “letter to the editor” on a history or historic preservation topic (be courteous!).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>Ask the local newspaper to include historic preservation-related activities in the daily or weekly “events” listing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>Do a photo-essay about an archaeology or historic preservation issue, event, or hero/ine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>Prepare a historic preservation supplement for the local newspaper and order off-prints for later distribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>During the “NH Primary Season,” talk to national candidates and the news media about your historic preservation concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>Find technical and financial assistance to help historic properties (and programs) maximize their accessibility to people with disabilities, in ways that meet both accessibility and historic preservation goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>Organize historic preservation “How-To” and technical assistance workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>Develop a “Historic Preservation Helper” program to assist senior citizens and low-income homeowners with minor home repairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>Establish a local historic marker, plaque, or signage program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>Propose a state historical marker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>Publish an annual local calendar with a historic preservation theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>Assist with a local history/historic preservation video.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>Initiate a local historic preservation newsletter if there isn’t one already.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>Create a community historic preservation awards program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>Publicize preservation success stories from within the community, and from other places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>Develop a history/historic preservation component for community “welcome” programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>Help with a local history or architecture walking/driving tour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>Organize a local or regional brainstorming session for historic preservation organizations, to explore shared concerns and opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>Get involved with a regional Heritage Roundtable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>Support legal action to save and reuse historic properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>Educate real estate brokers, lenders, insurers, accountants, attorneys, architects, and builders about the advantages of historic preservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>Promote the economic and social values of rehabilitating historic buildings for the widest possible variety of purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>Have a reuse feasibility study prepared for a historic building, site, or complex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>Invest in rehab of a historic building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>Encourage use of federal “certified rehab” investment tax credits for rehabilitation of income-producing historic properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>Cooperate with housing providers to explore joint use of federal “certified rehab” and “low income” tax credits for affordable housing rehab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>Enlist sponsors for a community historic preservation grants program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>Work with others to create a local historic preservation revolving fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>Explore the feasibility of establishing a historic preservation easement program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>Donate a historic preservation or conservation easement to a historic preservation or land protection organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
99. Educate and encourage others to donate easements.
100. Join with interested groups and individuals to explore and promote the role of historic preservation in developing sustainable local and regional economies.
101. Contact the NH Division of Historical Resources for information and technical assistance about these and many other historic preservation initiatives!

These suggestions are only a few of the possibilities. Be creative and come up with your own...then tell the Division of Historical Resources so we can share your ideas with others.

This fact sheet was prepared in January 1996, as part of “New Hampshire’s State Historic Plan, 1996 – 2000,” and was revised in September 1997, February 1999, and again in September 2006. It has been produced with the assistance of a federal “Historic Preservation Fund” matching grant from the National Park Service of the United States Department of the Interior, through the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources/State Historic Preservation Office. However, its contents and opinions do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of the Interior or the Division of Historical Resources.

Regulations of the U. S. Department of the Interior strictly prohibit unlawful discrimination in departmental federally assisted programs on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, or disability. The State of New Hampshire (under RSA 275 and RSA 354 A) prohibits discrimination on the basis of age, sex, race, creed, color, marital status, physical or mental disability or national origin. Any person who believes that he or she has been discriminated against in any program, activity, or facility operated by a recipient of federal assistance should write to: Director, Equal Opportunity Program, U. S. Department of the Interior, PO Box 37127, Washington DC 20013-7127.

New Hampshire’s state historic preservation program began in 1974 as the State Historic Preservation Office; in 1985 it became the Division of Historical Resources and moved to a new department, renamed the Department of Cultural Resources in 1998, which also includes the State Council on the Arts, the State Library, and the American-Canadian French Cultural Exchange Commission. Commissioner Van McLeod is head of the department; and James McConaha, Director of the Division of Historical Resources, is New Hampshire’s State Historic Preservation Officer.

The DHR is a state agency, supported by the state of New Hampshire, by the federal Historic Preservation Fund (through a matching grant administered by the National Park Service of the U.S. Department of the Interior), and by donated funds and services. It assists the people and communities of New Hampshire to recognize and to protect their heritage, and to encourage the stewardship of their architectural, archaeological, historical, and other cultural resources. The DHR and its staff also work with a variety of partners to act as a clearinghouse and network center for sharing historic preservation information with individuals, organizations, and agencies throughout the state.

DHR publications and resource materials are available in some alternate formats on request. Call the DHR at 603-271-3483 or Voice / TDD Relay Access 1-800-735-2964, or contact the DHR through FAX at 603-271-3433, to specify the publications and formats desired.

NH Division of Historical Resources
January 1996
Revised September 1997 & February 1999
Reformatted September 2001 & September 2006
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New Hampshire History and Source Materials

Arcadia Publishing is the leading local history publisher in the United States, and may be best known for its  Images of America series. Each title features a community, place, activity, or region, and is illustrated with more than two hundred historic black-and-white photographs. By September 2006, Arcadia had 79 New Hampshire titles available.
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ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY

Architectural and Social History:
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Architectural Field Guides and Style Guides:
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**Dictionaries of Architecture:**
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BRIDGES


BUILDING TECHNOLOGY

General:
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Brick, Tile, Mortar, and Concrete:


Glass and Windows:
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Hardware:
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**Heating, Ventilation, Cooking, and Plumbing:**


**Lighting:**


**Metals—Architectural:**


Paint:
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Plaster, Stucco, and Composition:


-----.


Slated Roofing:


Stone:


Wallpaper:


Wood: Structure:
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Wood: Milling, Carpentry, and Joinery:


**Wood: Roofing:**


Special Issue: Roofs. _The Old-House Journal_ 11:3 (April 1983).


**MAIL-ORDER PLANS, PRE-CUT HOUSES, PREFABRICATION**
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INVESTIGATION, RESTORATION AND MAINTENANCE OF BUILDINGS


Building Research 1:5 (September-October 1964), special issue of the journal of the Building Research Institute on the restoration and preservation of historic buildings. Contains articles on historical, architectural, and archaeological research; photography, architectural photogrammetry and measured drawings; and building restoration and maintenance.
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STONE STRUCTURES AND RUINS


HAND TOOLS: HISTORY AND USE (SEE ALSO, REPRINTS OF EARLY ARCHITECTURAL SOURCEBOOKS)


REPRINTS OF EARLY ARCHITECTURAL SOURCEBOOKS


1. The Country Builder’s Assistant (1797)
2. The American Builder’s Companion (1806)
3. The Rudiments of Architecture (1814)
4. The Practical House Carpenter (1830)
5. The Practice of Architecture (1833)
6. The Builder’s Guide (1839)
7. The Elements of Architecture (1843)
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JOURNALS AND PERIODICALS CONTAINING INFORMATION ON BUILDING DESIGN AND TECHNOLOGY

APT Bulletin. Published quarterly by the Association for Preservation Technology International, this journal includes both general articles and case studies illustrating techniques for the conservation of historic structures.

Blueprints. Published by the private, non-profit National Building Museum in Washington, DC, this quarterly journal covers all aspects of the design, construction, and function.

BR: Building Renovation. Published quarterly from 1992 to 1996 by Penton Publishing, Cleveland, Ohio, this was a trade journal for those engaged in the renovation and preservation of existing structures.

CRM [Cultural Resource Management]. Published by the National Park Service to “promote and maintain high standards for preserving and managing cultural resources,” this occasional publication includes information of value to managers of historic sites and articles on building preservation and conservation.

Preservation [until July-August 1996, Historic Preservation]. Published six times a year as the members’ journal of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, Preservation includes articles on the field of historic preservation, features on specific preservation projects, organizations, or individuals, and a general portrayal of the role of preservation in American life.

History News. A quarterly published by the American Association for State and Local History as a membership benefit, History News emphasizes concerns of historical agencies and societies, but includes occasional information on preservation of historic buildings.

IA. Published biannually as a membership benefit by the Society for Industrial Archaeology, IA includes articles on industrial structures, sites, and processes, including processes related to the fabrication of building materials.
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Information. Published by the National Trust for Historic Preservation, this bulletin is available only to members of the Preservation Forum, a special Trust membership category. Each issue contains thematic essays on specific preservation subjects or issues.

Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians. Published quarterly by the Society of Architectural Historians, this academic journal contains articles about historic structures (mostly non-American) and reviews of current books on architectural history.

The Old-House Journal. Published six times a year, this popular magazine is intended primarily for private owners of older houses and contains information on a wide range of old-house problems and concerns.

Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture. Published occasionally since 1982 by the Vernacular Architecture Forum, each issue is a collection of papers presented at VAF meetings. Subjects are wide-ranging, and generally treat vernacular buildings as cultural artifacts that reveal patterns of human behavior.

Preservation Briefs. Published on an occasional basis by the Preservation Assistance Division of the National Park Service, Preservation Briefs cover topics in building preservation and conservation and in procedures for rehabilitating historic structures according to federal standards. Some forty Briefs have been published; about twenty are cited specifically in this bibliography.

Preservation Tech Notes. Published by the National Park Service, Preservation Tech Notes “are designed to provide practical information on techniques and practices for successfully maintaining and preserving cultural resources,” describing techniques that conform to established National Park Service policies, procedures, and standards.

Technology and Conservation. Published quarterly by The Technology Organization, Inc., in Boston, this journal emphasizes building conservation and the application of modern technology to historic structures.

Traditional Building. Published six times a year, this subscription journal discusses and lists sources for a wide range of materials and services applicable to preservation and restoration of historic structures of all kinds.
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