

The Camera & Clipboard

Historical & Architectural Survey Newsletter



National and State Register Programs
Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation
Colorado Historical Society

January 2008 ♦ Number 18



STAFF CHANGES: HELLO AND GOOD BYE

Changes are afoot at the office at E. 16th Street, with the State Historical Fund (SHF) welcoming a new professional and a long-time National Register Historian bidding us farewell. This article features an introduction from Liz Blackwell and details about Holly Wilson's departure.

My name is Liz Blackwell and I'm delighted to introduce myself as the newest member of the survey squad at the Colorado Historical Society. I am new to both the job and to the State of Colorado. As an Arkansas native who has hopped around a handful of southern states, I am excited to be in Colorado where the mountains are high enough for skiing and Chapstick is always on my shopping list.

I began my academic studies in Arkansas, earning Bachelor of Science in Architectural Studies from the University of Arkansas. While studying in Arkansas I discovered my great passion for historic architecture and went on to study Historic Preservation at the University of Georgia, completing an M.A. in Historic Preservation.

Prior to accepting this job, I worked in the Arkansas SHPO with both the National Register and community outreach programs. It was a great experience to work in my home state, but Colorado offered not only a welcome change of scenery (it's hard to beat Colorado for dramatic scenery) but also the opportunity to work with an impressive grant program, the State Historical Fund.

As an HP Specialist I will be working closely with Mary Therese Anstey on the historical & architectural survey program. Survey is extremely important, providing the basis for further understanding and interpretation of Colorado's architectural heritage. I have previously completed survey work in Arkansas, Georgia, Texas, and Mississippi and am looking forward to exploring the architectural history of Colorado through the planning and review of SHF historical & architectural survey projects.

In closing, this southern belle is excited to work with all of you and hopefully learn a lot in the process. Don't hesitate to contact me at 303-866-2851 or elizabeth.blackwell@chs.state.co.us.

Members of the survey community also should be aware of a staffing change within the National Register program. After 17 years of tireless service, National and State Register Historian Holly Wilson has decided to retire. Her last official day in the office is February 29. For those of you who have worked with Holly over the years, be sure and take some time to wish her well in her future endeavors. And watch this space for details about the hiring of a new Historian.

The activity that is the subject of this material has been financed in part with Federal funds from the National Historic Preservation Act, administered by the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior. However, the contents and opinions do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the U.S. Department of the Interior, nor does the mention of trade names or commercial products constitute an endorsement or recommendations by the Department of the Interior or the Society. 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 handicap. Any person who believes 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, National Park Service, 1849 C Street, Washington, D.C. 20240.

These activities are also partially funded by the State Historical Fund, a program of the Colorado Historical Society.

HANDY WEBSITES

<http://www.preservenet.cornell.edu/phpBB2/index.php> - PreserveNet, established by Cornell University professors Michael Tomlan and Bob Pick in 1994, has always been an excellent source for employment announcements in the field of historic preservation. Several months ago this site launched a "Forum" section. After registering your user name and password you will be able to engage in online communication with fellow preservation professionals. The site welcomes postings on the following topics: General, Education, Professional, and Announcements.

<http://www.rootsweb.com/~coplaces/index.html> - This site lists Colorado place names, past and present, and notes location by county. The developers have attempted to include every settlement, trading post, military post, mining camp, ghost town, stage station, railroad stop, post office, rural community, town, and city from the earliest known into the present. Users may either browse or search the site (via initial letter of place name). The gathered information appears to be taken from scholarly sources, all of which appear on an annotated bibliography on the website.

<http://www.historypress.net> - Would you like to see some of your writing published? The History Press is continually seeking proposals from historians and archivists for new history publications of all kinds. They are a traditional publisher, not a vanity press, and handle all stages of publishing including financing, sales, marketing, and distribution. Authors are paid on a royalty basis. The company has identified a growing audience for regional history titles, including brief histories of towns, personal narratives of local citizens, and definitive histories of local industry. Visit the History Press website to see a list of current titles. The site also includes contact details for ordering publications, hosting book signings, and submitting book proposals to the editors.

NOTE: If writing an entire book for the History Press seems too ambitious, consider submitting an article proposal on a survey-related topic for *The Camera & Clipboard* to marytherese.anstey@chs.state.co.us.

NEW BPC MEMBERS

The Best Practice Committee recently appointed three new members. They are Carol Beam, Jason Marmor, and Adam Thomas. In addition, Liz Blackwell, new SHF Historic Preservation Specialist (see introduction on page 1) also will be joining the group.

Carol, HP Specialist with Boulder County Parks & Open Space, was chosen to fill the local government vacancy left when Ryan Kragerud departed the City of Longmont. She brings a special background to the BPC: in her current role she both commissions consultants to complete grant-funded historical & architectural survey projects and completes a few forms herself and she has past experience with OAHP correcting and encoding site forms into the database.

Jason, Staff HP Specialist with Felsburg Holt & Ullevig, will fill the compliance survey role created when Dawn Bunyak resigned. He has past experience as an independent consultant and in his current role he works primarily on Section 106 compliance projects with CDOT.

Adam, consultant and owner of the architectural history firm Historitecture based in Estes Park, was selected to fill Laurie Simmons' grant-funded survey consultant vacancy. Existing BPC members found his previous experience, involvement with students, and views on the meaning of historical & architectural survey particularly relevant.

Since BPC members serve staggered terms, there will be additional vacancies to fill throughout the next year. Specifically, Carl McWilliams' grant-funded survey consultant position will be vacant in June 2008, Lisa Schoch's state agency role will need to be filled in September 2008, and federal representative Jeff Overturf's position will expire in December 2008.

If you are interested in serving on the BPC, keep in mind the group meets quarterly, the terms of service are three years plus one meeting, and replacement members are chosen by consensus of the BPC from an applicant pool of interested individuals and committee member nominees.



INITIATING CONSULTATION

By Amy Pallante, Compliance Coordinator

If “Location, Location, Location” is the key in real estate, then “Consultation, Consultation, Consultation” is the key to good Section 106 projects. As discussed in previous columns, there are four steps to the Section 106 process. Consultation is the key to completing all four of those steps.

Once the lead agency has determined a proposed undertaking or project has the potential to affect historic properties, the agency should begin consultation. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) defines consultation in their regulations (36 CFR 800) as: “...the process of seeking, discussing, and considering the views of other participants, and where feasible, seeking agreement with them regarding matters arising in the Section 106 process...[36 CFR 800.16(f)].”

The first step in the consultation process is for the lead agency to identify the appropriate participants, known as consulting parties, and to clarify their roles. The State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)/Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO), Tribes, local governments, and applicants for Federal assistance, permits, licenses, and other approvals are required to be notified of the lead agency’s project and invited to participate in the Section 106 process. If the project has the potential to affect a National Historic Landmark (NHL), the National Park Service must be notified and invited into the Section 106 consultation process. The lead agency must provide the consulting parties the opportunity to comment on the project.

Lead agencies also must seek and consider the public input when carrying out the Section 106 process. According to ACHP regulations: “The views of the public are essential to informed Federal decision making in the Section 106 process [36 CFR 800.2(d)(1)].” In consultation with the SHPO, the lead agency must consider how to notify the public at-large as well as identify and invite other consulting parties, who might have a demonstrated interest in the project, into the consultation process. Members of the public may request at any time during the Section 106 process to become a consulting party. The lead agency, in cooperation with the SHPO, must consider the request and then make the final decision on whether or not to accept the request for consulting party status. Once all the consulting parties have been established, the lead agency must consult with the parties during each step of the Section 106 process.

Consulting parties are not the same as “interested parties” under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Consulting parties play a greater role in project development than an interested party, who might fill out a project comment card or post a comment on a project website. Lead agencies must take into account comments provided by consulting parties.

Lead agencies often struggle with the level of effort consultation requires. The ACHP offers recommendations about the appropriate level of effort: 1) Lead agencies should consider the consultation process in their project schedule and begin consultation at the earliest planning stages; 2) When possible, Section 106 consultations should be coordinated with (but NOT substituted for) other environmental reviews, such as NEPA; and 3) The scope and scale of work planned, the level of Federal involvement, and the nature of the effects on historic resources all can affect the degree of consultation.

Consultation among the lead agency and various consulting parties forms the foundation of the Section 106 process. Remember, if consultation is not done or is done only in a limited way, the project will experience delays and confusion. So, get out there and consult, consult, consult.



PHILOSOPHICALLY SPEAKING: ‘ORGANIC’ NATURE OF SURVEY PROCESS

Staff at OAHP often hear the question, “When is resurvey appropriate?” The answer to this question varies from project to project depending upon the degree of resource change over time, the needs of the local community, the quality of the original documentation, and several other factors. Yet the issue of resurvey also raises more philosophical questions regarding the nature of historical & architectural survey. This topic leads us to ponder, “When is a survey done?” The answer to this question is more complex. However, it is an issue worth exploring, since it impacts not only all historical & architectural survey projects but also all individuals involved in the planning, executing, and use of survey products.

The simple answer to the question regarding when historical & architectural survey projects are complete is, “Never”. This statement may strike some readers as inaccurate. Consultants know they have identified historic buildings and structures, researched historical background, evaluated significance and integrity, prepared the required forms and reports, and been compensated for their efforts. Agencies and local communities know they have commissioned consultants to prepare forms and reports, reviewed draft versions of these products, and used the results to make key preservation decisions or, perhaps, designate eligible resources. And OAHP staff know they have assisted in project planning, reviewed draft and final versions of products, entered these results in the database, and filed all of the submitted forms and reports. Yes, all of these events have occurred for numerous historical & architectural survey projects; this is the purpose of historical & architectural survey and part of OAHP’s charge to record and evaluate Colorado’s resources. Clearly, there is a need to distinguish between the project and the information collected. Any individual project may be considered complete when all of the required products are submitted and the contract end-date is reached, yet it is important to remember even the most meticulously prepared forms may not represent the definitive, end-all and be-all of knowledge about that individual site.

Potential for change indicates the organic nature of the information collected as part of any historical & architectural survey project. Most of us have experience with projects where crucial information-- details related to the historical background, construction history, property ownership or access to the property-- simply was not available. These are the projects which can leave the agency, local community, consultants, and OAHP staff feeling slightly dissatisfied. But perhaps we need to reassess those feelings, concentrating upon the lessons learned and pursuing solutions to such research deficiencies. For example, the final survey report might encourage the local community to actively gather oral history accounts from older residents or other relevant historical materials in the local library so these records may be used for future projects and preserved for future generations. Of course, accepting the organic nature of historical & architectural surveys does not excuse anyone involved with projects from doing their due-diligence; OAHP will not accept poorly prepared products and consultants still are expected to search all available sources for the required information. The goal of each historical & architectural survey project is to create the very best products at the time of submission, keeping not only the resource but also the short- and long-term uses of the collected data in mind.

The changeable nature of survey also impacts assessments of eligibility. Consultant field assessments and OAHP official assessments are always based upon the available information noted on the survey form. If the survey process did not gather sufficient supporting details, consultants may be forced to determine the resource not eligible and staff may tick the box for either Officially Not Eligible or Needs Data. Recently staff have tried to indicate, when ticking Needs Data on the form, exactly what type of data is needed. This approach guides future survey efforts, pointing out which key details for making the case for eligibility are missing. Timing also plays a role in changes to assessments. OAHP’s files feature numerous forms for properties

Continued on Page 5



PHILOSOPHICALLY SPEAKING, CONTINUED

Continued from Page 4

which were, at the time of survey project completion, determined Officially Not Eligible but have since been listed on the National Register. For example, a variety of New Deal era resources were determined not eligible when surveyed in the 1970s and 1980s because they failed to meet the National Register threshold of 50 years and the appropriate amount of scholarship had not been gathered or appropriate historic contexts had not been developed. Yet, now the SHF is funding the third of three phases of survey and nomination for New Deal resources on Colorado's Eastern Plains. This same situation is likely to arise even more frequently in the future as more and more of the resources associated with the post-World War II building boom "come of age."

The fact all assessments of eligibility are subject to change also illustrates the need for a degree of caution when consulting any products completed during a historical & architectural survey project. Unfortunately, some agencies, communities, and consultants consider the assessment information for previously recorded sites as binding. As this article has presented, such an approach is faulty. This topic brings our philosophical discussion full-circle, returning to the need for and timing of resurvey. OAHP staff, in order to stress the changing nature of eligibility assessments to users of survey data, have toyed with the idea of having the COMPASS database automatically update the assessment field five years after the survey project is completed to highlight the need for routine reconsideration of previous assessments, both field and official.

Acceptance of the organic, changeable nature of historical & architectural survey is not always easy. It is particularly challenging for individuals who see things as black or white, right or wrong. Part of this viewpoint is a societal issue. We are conditioned to want to be right, to have the correct answer. In our rush-rush, hurry-hurry world the majority of people seem unwilling to listen to nuanced explanations, instead wanting to hear a definitive response. Unfortunately, historical & architectural surveys, like all historic preservation endeavors, are much more about the gray than the black and white. Certainly there are a few fields on the survey form which deal with exact information. But the majority of the form is open to interpretation. Take, for example, Field 22- Architectural Style or Building Type. If you have five architectural historians in one room you may get five or more opinions about the "correct" style or type label to assign. To a certain extent, the assigning of architectural styles is similar to 'beauty being in the eye of the beholder'-- we all bring our previous experience, training, and 'eye' to the process. No two individuals have the same exact background and neither do the various OAHP staff who review the survey forms. In cases where OAHP staff make changes to submitted final products, we have agreed to initial and date any changes. This potentially time-consuming effort has lead most staff to be very selective about any marks they make on the final forms. In recognition of the organic nature of historical & architectural survey projects and acknowledging the grays of differing opinions, most staff have been keen to add rather than change information for those fields most open to interpretation. It is our hope all notations are discrete and further the shared goals of consultants, communities, agencies and OAHP staff to gather the most accurate information for each historical & architectural survey project. These marks are not intended to be the stereotypical bleeding red ink of a cranky schoolmarm and it is our hope individuals who consult these forms do not interpret them as such.

What are your opinions about the organic nature of historical & architectural survey, the OAHP approach to reviewing forms, and other related issues? *The Camera & Clipboard* is your publication and we welcome input from the readers. Comments and article submissions can be sent to Mary Therese Anstey at marytherese.anstey@chs.state.co.us.



ARCHITECT BIOGRAPHY

By Dale Heckendorn

EDWIN A. FRANCIS

A high point in Edwin Francis' architectural career, both literally and figuratively, came with his design for the Mount Evans Crest House, a lodge and observation point constructed in 1940-41 at an altitude of 14,260 feet. He incorporated engineering techniques enabling the building to withstand the extreme high altitude weather conditions. Francis utilized natural materials from the site and reflected elements of the futuristic and Art Moderne to create a modern interpretation of the Rustic style. Unfortunately, a 1979 explosion and fire partially destroyed the building and it remains unreconstructed.



*The Crest House on Mount Evans shortly after its completion (ca. 1941).
Source: Western History/ Genealogy Department, Denver Public Library*

Born in La Junta, Colorado, in 1905, Edwin Francis came to Denver with his family in 1908. He graduated from Denver's South High School and received his architectural training at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. In the late 1920s and early 1930s, Francis worked first with Denver architect J.J.B. Benedict and later with Harry James Manning. While employed by Manning, Francis specialized in the design of ornamental details. After leaving Manning's employment he opened his own firm in 1932.

Francis established his office as a traditional architectural designer. By the mid-1930s, he became an early proponent of the International Style in Denver and, in partnership with William Cabot, Francis designed an early local example of the style, the 1936 residence at 300 East Exposition Avenue. Working alone, Francis drew the plans for the 1937 International Style residence at 660 Fairfax Street. He also designed one of the finest pre-war Modernist buildings in the city, the 1938 terra cotta International Style residence at 940 Bonnie Brae Boulevard.

World War II interrupted his practice. Stationed in England, Francis put his architectural training to good use in the Army Corps of Engineers. Returning to Denver after the war, he reestablished a solo practice and designed the fine Modernist style 1951 Van Hummell Insurance Company Building at 444 Sherman Street. In 1958, he created the plans for the expressionistic Johnson-McFarland Residence Halls, with their distinctive folded-plate roofs, for the campus of the University of Denver.

In partnership with Carlisle Guy during the 1950s and 1960s, Francis designed the 1961 Broadmoor International Center, the 1962 Broadmoor South, and other projects at the world-famous hotel and resort south of Colorado Springs. Francis and Guy functioned essentially as resident architects. The Broadmoor South and the 1963 Capitol Life Tower, at 225 E. 16th Avenue in Denver, are the only high-rise designs by Francis. He continued his architectural practice until his death in 1966.

Can't get enough Architect Biographies? New entries for Temple Buell, Victor Hornbein, and Meredith Musick are available in the online guide Architects in Colorado (<http://coloradohistory-oahp.org/guides/architects/architectindex.htm>)



**ASK THE
STAFF**
by *Les S.
Moore*

Dear Les: On a recent trip to OAHP, I found site forms I prepared several years ago with modified UTMs written next to the ones I carefully obtained from my GPS. Will you clarify who changed these and why?

--- **Bewildered in Beulah**

Dear Bewildered: To provide the most consistent information to the public, changes to UTMs on the site form may occur when OAHP staff plot the site into our GIS database. The changes typically result from one of the following circumstances:

- 1) The site form UTM does not correspond with the map provided. For example, the UTM provided on the form plots a highway bridge in the middle of a pasture next to the highway. In such cases, the site form map always supersedes the given UTM notation and OAHP will GIS the site accordingly;
- 2) The topographic map is not a USGS map or it is a different version (different year with previous topo lines) of the appropriate USGS map. Keep in mind OAHP uses digital basemaps from the Bureau of Land Management; submission of other formats with forms will result in changes to the provided UTMs;
- 3) The incorrect zone number is provided on the site form;
- 4) UTMs on the form were projected in NAD 83 instead of NAD 27, the projection OAHP uses;
- 5) The UTMs provided were located in a place (middle of building, edge of site) other than the center of the surveyed site;
- 6) The site form listed only one UTM for a linear resource or a site over ten acres. Such resources require a minimum of four UTMs; OAHP staff will list at least four GIS-based UTMs on the form.

Clearly, changes to consultant UTMs represent yet another example of preservation 'grays' (see pages 4-5) present on OAHP survey forms.

**Historical & Architectural Survey
OAHP Staff Support**

Mary Therese Anstey- Historical & Architectural Survey Coordinator 303-866-4822
marytherese.anstey@chs.state.co.us

Dale Heckendorn - National & State Register Coordinator 303-866-4681
dale.heckendorn@chs.state.co.us

Chris Geddes - National and State Register Historian 303-866-4683
chris.geddes@chs.state.co.us

Holly Wilson - National and State Register Historian 303-866-4684
holly.wilson@chs.state.co.us

Liz Blackwell – SHF: HP Specialist- Survey & Education 303-866-2851
elizabeth.blackwell@chs.state.co.us

Erika Schmelzer - Cultural Resource Historian/ GIS Specialist- Architecture 303-866-2656
erika.schmelzer@chs.state.co.us

Heather Peterson - Cultural Resource Historian/ GIS Specialist- Architecture (source for new site numbers) 303-866-5216

heather.peterson@chs.state.co.us

File searches

file.search@chs.state.co.us

Lori Brocesky/Amy Kirchberg - Administrative Assistants (form and report access and copies) 303-866-3392/ 303-888-3395

lori.brocesky@chs.state.co.us

amy.kirchberg@chs.state.co.us

COMPASS

compass@chs.state.co.us



**Colorado Historical Society
Historical and Architectural Surveys**

225 E. 16th Avenue, Suite 950

Denver, CO 80203-1606

www.coloradohistory-oahp.org

