

The Camera & Clipboard

Historical & Architectural Survey Newsletter



OFFICE of ARCHAEOLOGY and HISTORIC PRESERVATION
COLORADO HISTORICAL SOCIETY

October 2008 ⊕ Number 21



No 'MONKEYING' AROUND: RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE ABOUT ARCHITECTURAL INVENTORY FORM

Members of the Form Forum subcommittee working on revising OAHP's historical & architectural survey forms developed two questionnaires using the Survey Monkey tool in order to solicit opinions from both all consultants and communities where grant-funded survey projects have been completed within the past five years. Questions to consultants concentrated on issues related to the preparation of the forms while the community contact questionnaire emphasized how the collected information on the completed forms is used locally. An abbreviated, mostly numerical summary of the Survey Monkey results appears below.

Consultants: (Response rate – nine consultants or 35%)

<i>Types of projects completed –</i>	Compliance/ Section 106:	56%
<i>(NOTE: check all that apply)</i>	CLG grant-funded:	56%
	SHF grant-funded:	100%
	Other grant-funded:	22%

Type of project completed most often – SHF: 75%, CLG: 37.5%, and compliance/ Section 106: 25%

Approximately how many projects (with Architectural Inventory Form) completed – a range from one to more than 50

<i>Method to produce Architectural Inventory Forms – Commercial database such as Access:</i>	78%
<i>Word processing program:</i>	67%

(NOTE: Figure does not total 100 percent; assumption consultants have used both methods based upon project characteristics or shift to database use over time)

<i>Desirability of electronic importing of survey data into OAHP database –</i>	Yes:	67%
	No:	11%
	Don't know:	22%

Other states where complete forms – Fifty-six percent of the respondents have completed survey projects in other states, mentioning work in Wyoming, Montana, New Mexico, and South Dakota most often.

Missing information – Suggestions for additions included: a tick box for sites surveyed as part of Section 106 projects; tick boxes to indicate if the surveyed resource is located in a city, town or unincorporated area; Field 12- changing request for addition and year to prompts for subdivision name and year platted. Also comments about the directions and Lexicon: request for better guidance (including examples) for preparing architectural descriptions and return to former practice of allowing use of Vernacular as a style.

Information to be omitted – Nearly half of the consultants felt there were no fields needing to be excluded from the survey form. Two respondents questioned the function of the temporary resource num-

Continued on page 3

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.

GRANT-FUNDED SURVEYS UPDATE

Each issue of *The Camera & Clipboard* lists all of the awarded, ongoing, and completed grant-funded historical & architectural surveys. The list below features status changes over the past three months.

Certified Local Government Projects

Ongoing:

Greeley - Intensive Survey of 50 sites between 17th and 18th Streets and 6th and 8th Avenues- Kelly Courkamp

Littleton - Reconnaissance Survey of 83 sites in Arapaho Hills subdivision- Diane Wray Tomasso
Steamboat Springs – Intensive Survey of 50 sites within “Old Town”- Cultural Resource Historians

Westminster – Intensive Survey of 30 scattered rural sites in Jefferson County- Dawn Bunyak

Completed:

Boulder County – Intensive Survey of 50 sites in Town of Eldora – Historitecture

Lafayette – Intensive Survey of 11 sites within city limits – Preservation Publishing

Loveland – Intensive Survey of 51 sites along West 5th Street – Cultural Resource Historians

Pueblo – Intensive Survey of 81 sites in the Northside neighborhood – Historitecture

Steamboat Springs – Intensive Survey of 50 sites within “Old Town” – Cultural Resource Historians

The survey reports from these CLG projects are posted on the PPURC (“Perk”) portion of the OAHF website:

<http://www.coloradohistory-oahp.org/programareas/register/PPURC.htm>

State Historical Fund Projects

Awarded:

Historic Denver, Inc. – Reconnaissance and Selective Intensive Survey (35 sites) within Kountze Heights neighborhood

Colorado School of Mines – Intensive Survey of 23 buildings on campus

Fort Collins – Selective Intensive Survey of 62 sites related to commercial and residential development from 1945 to 1967

Ongoing:

Carbondale – Intensive Survey of 20 Residential Sites – Reid Architects

Kiowa County – Countywide Reconnaissance and Selective Intensive survey (up to 50 sites) in three towns – Front Range Research Associates
Bayfield – Intensive Survey of 30 sites in commercial downtown - Nik Kendziorski

Boulder – Comprehensive Reconnaissance and Selective Intensive Survey (104 sites) within 10 postwar residential subdivisions – TEC, Inc.

Broomfield – Selective Reconnaissance and Intensive Survey (38 sites) – SWCA

Eastern Plains - Selective Reconnaissance and Intensive Survey (40 sites) in Baca and Phillips Counties - Colorado Preservation, Inc.

Florence – Intensive Survey of 62 sites as part of Small Town Survey Initiative – Front Range Research Associates

Fort Lupton – Intensive Survey of at least 90 sites in commercial downtown – Tatanka Historical Associates

Genoa - Intensive Survey of 40 sites as part of Small Town Survey Initiative – Front Range Research Associates

Gilpin County – Reconnaissance and Selective Intensive Survey (90 sites) in communities near the Moffat Tunnel - SWCA

Hinsdale County – Intensive Survey of at least 30 sites - Preservation Publishing

La Plata County – Comprehensive Reconnaissance and Selective Intensive Survey of 100 sites – Cultural Resource Planning

Larimer County – Intensive Survey of at least 85 sites in the Town of Bellvue – Tatanka Historical Associates

Meeker - Intensive Survey of at least 30 sites as part of Small Town Survey Initiative – Reid Architects

New Deal, Phase III – Intensive Survey in 11 remaining counties – Colorado Preservation, Inc.

Routt County – Intensive Survey of 26 sites in the Town of Hayden – Mountain Architecture Design Group

Silverton – Intensive Survey of at least 225 sites within National Historic Landmark boundaries - Silverton Restoration Consulting

Windsor – Intensive Survey of 45 sites in commercial downtown – Historitecture



QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS, CONTINUED

Continued from page 1

ber. One consultant suggested allowing for the appropriate geographic location information based upon the type of resource, believing lot and block descriptions apply to resources within cities and towns but for such sites UTM and PLSS citations are “redundant and irrelevant.” Echoing this sentiment, another respondent expressed the opinion the boundary description and justification is unnecessary unless the resource is a rural unplatted property. Yet another consultant noted the subdivision date is never used. Other targets for omission included the special features and site type. Two respondents recommended combining existing fields, one advocating placing the construction history and historical background together and another suggesting grouping the Statement of Significance with the Assessment of Integrity, labeling this new prompt as ‘Field Eligibility Evaluation.’

Community Contacts: (Response rate – 16 contacts or 46%)

Usefulness of completed historical & architectural forms – Strongly agree: 50%
Agree: 50%

Use of completed historical & architectural forms – Distribute copies to owners: 94%
(NOTE: check all that apply) Place copies in a local repository: 81%
Nominate properties/districts at local level: 75%
Prepare interpretive materials: 69%
Post copies on the Internet: 38%
Nominate properties/districts to NR/SR: 31%
Develop/amend design guidelines: 25%
Establish/amend preservation ordinance: 19%
Create/amend comprehensive plan: 13%

Information from forms used most often – Historical background: 100%
Architectural description: 81%
Eligibility assessment: 75%
Construction history: 38%
Photographs: 25%
Locational information: 6%
Maps: 6%
Other: Statement of Significance, legal description

Missing information – Suggestions for additions included: fields regarding local eligibility (both individual and district) and space for: 1) character-defining architectural elements of surveyed property, 2) details about information still needed to make an assessment of eligibility and why consultant did not collect data at time of survey, 3) reasons why consultants determined the resources not eligible, and 4) justification for determination of contributing/noncontributing status of resources within identified district.

Information to be omitted – Over half of the individuals who answered this question expressed general satisfaction with the information currently collected. Some responses, such as suggestions to remove the temporary resource number and site type, matched consultants’ opinions. One respondent advocated removal of the UTM reference and another commented on both the limited utility of the geographic information and repetition of information from Fields 17 through 20, 23, and 24 in the architectural description.

The members of the Form Forum wish to thank all questionnaire respondents. Your answers should prove useful in our ongoing process of updating the historical & architectural survey forms. To read a more thorough account of these results go to <http://www.coloradohistory-oahp.org/programareas/register/PPURC.htm>. If you did not receive the original questionnaire and have opinions to share, please feel free to contact Mary Therese Anstey.



HISTORICAL & ARCHITECTURAL SURVEY TRAINING INITIATIVE LAUNCHED

October marks the beginning of a new educational program aimed at growing the historical & architectural survey profession. Mary Therese Anstey received SHF funding to cover the costs of supplies for the Historical & Architectural Survey Training Initiative. This program includes both a short course introduction to historical & architectural surveys and an opportunity for selected participants to work over an entire academic year to complete an actual historical & architectural survey project.

The first of two introductory courses, consisting of four four-hour Saturday sessions, started on October 4. The 20 participants include Masters students from both the History, Architecture, and Planning programs at the University of Colorado-Denver and the Colorado State University Public History program plus individuals who responded to general appeals in Historic Denver, Inc. and Colorado Preservation, Inc. newsletters. During the class participants will learn more about the role of survey within the preservation system and practice key skills such as mapping, writing architectural descriptions, researching building histories, and taking photographs. Each participant will complete a single Architectural Inventory Form for a non-surveyed historical building in Denver. The introductory course will be offered again in April 2009.

The Initiative's practical experience will be structured around nine monthly Saturday sessions between September 2009 and May 2010. This opportunity will be open to 20 participants who have completed the prerequisite introductory course. Students will work in pairs to complete Architectural Inventory Forms for 20 sites and a survey report, an arrangement intended to offer a more realistic exposure to the time and workload demands of a 'real' project. Assuming full enrollment, the practical experience component will result in 200 site forms and 10 survey reports. Copies of these products will be filed in OAHF and provided to the City of Denver.

Watch this space for periodic updates on the process for and products from the Historical & Architectural Survey Training Initiative.

INPUT SOUGHT: ADDITION OF NO DEFINED STYLE TO LEXICON

No one wants to be told they don't have any style. This is one of the reasons some consultants are hesitant to hang the No Style label on surveyed resources. Property owners sometimes misunderstand the Lexicon term No Style, assuming because their building is labeled this way it is not important. While community education has made some progress in refuting this misperception, OAHF staff have been discussing the possibility of changing No Style to *No Defined Style* to soften the blow. This new term also would be useful for identifying vernacular expressions since the term Vernacular is not allowed as a style label. Finally, consultants could use No Defined Style for very recent resources or others which do not yet appear in the Lexicon or *A Field Guide to Historic Architecture & Engineering*.

So, what do you think? If you have thoughts, either in favor of or in opposition to this suggested change, please click [here](#) to email Mary Therese Anstey. Staff will consider your input in making their final decision regarding this change to the Lexicon. Responses prior to October 30 are appreciated.

HANDY WEBSITE

<http://www.preservationdirectory.com/preservationbookstore/books.aspx> - The Portland, Oregon-based online resource for historic and cultural resource preservation, PreservationDirectory.com, recently announced in a press release they have launched a comprehensive "Preservation Bookstore." The bookstore features a broad array of titles in the fields of historic preservation, including: building restoration; architectural history and design; downtown, Main Street, and urban revitalization; historic preservation funding sources, laws, and policy; historic real estate; architectural tours and heritage tourism; identifying architectural styles; researching house history; endangered history; museum management; and roadside attractions.

The Preservation Bookstore works in partnership with Powell's City of Books - the largest independent bookstore in the United States, also located in Portland.



Best Practice Committee NEWS

BEST PRACTICE COMMITTEE APPOINTS NEW MEMBERS AND SEEKS VOLUNTEERS TO FILL ADDITIONAL VACANCIES

Expiration of member terms and professional relocations have created a number of changes in the membership of the Best Practice Committee (BPC). At their July meeting the BPC welcomed new member Kris Hoehn, an architect and grant-funded survey consultant, chosen to fill the vacancy left when Carl McWilliam's term expired. A second new member, Dianna Litvak, started her service with the BPC at the October meeting. Dianna is the CDOT Region 6 Senior Historian and was chosen to fill the State agency representative vacancy, the role BPC member Lisa Schoch filled prior to the expiration of her term.

As mentioned in the previous issue of *The Camera & Clipboard*, the October meeting was the last for Federal agency representative Jeff Overturf. In August compliance survey consultant Jason Marmor informed staff he had accepted a new position with the Virginia Department of Transportation in Fredricksburg, Virginia, and would have to resign his position on the BPC. These routine and unexpected vacancies mean the Committee now has two slots to fill.

The BPC will be developing a list of nominees for these vacancies. If you are interested in being considered, be aware new members should be able to attend quarterly meetings (January, April, July, and October) in Denver on the second Tuesday of the month and serve a 3 year + 1 meeting term. Also all candidates should possess considerable involvement with OAHF historical & architectural survey projects, a familiarity with current survey approaches and policies, and a willingness to share their opinions. Individuals who want to fill either the federal agency or compliance survey consultant vacancy should contact Mary Therese Anstey via email. In addition to expressing your interest, please write a short paragraph describing your background and likely contributions to the group. All new members will be selected by consensus of the BPC.

SAVE THE DATE: BPC TO HOST LUNCH GATHERING DURING CPI CONFERENCE

Are you planning on attending the Wednesday workshops during the Colorado Preservation, Inc. (CPI) Conference in February of 2009? If so (or even if you're not), consider joining members of the Best Practice Committee at Panera Bread at 1330 Grant Street where they will be hosting a lunchtime event to discuss various issues associated with planning, managing, and completing both grant-funded and compliance historical & architectural surveys. Each individual in attendance is responsible for purchasing his or her own lunch (there really is no such thing as a free lunch), but BPC members will be there to facilitate the conversation. The members will be in the function room at the restaurant from 11:30 to 2:00 on Wednesday, February 4th, giving attendees plenty of time to eat and chat between the two CPI workshops. If you are interested in joining the BPC for food and networking, please RSVP to Mary Therese Anstey.



Meet and eat with the BPC on February 4. Photograph from Colorado Historical Society



NEW ARCHITECTURAL STYLES AND TYPES: MODERNE

by Chris Geddes, National and State Register Historian

Moderne, also called Art Moderne or Streamline Moderne, saw popularity in the 1930s and early 1940s. Restrained Moderne bridged the gap between the flamboyant Art Deco and the functional International Style of the 1940s and 1950s. While the Art Deco style of the 1920s displayed vertical elements, zigzags, and sophisticated ornamentation, Moderne exhibited a horizontal emphasis and simple, smooth surfaces. The Art Deco style was used for apartment buildings whereas single family homes were constructed using Moderne style or influences. International Style mimicked the horizontality of Moderne but exhibited a complete lack of ornamentation.

With the advent of the Moderne style, speed lines of trains, ships, and automobiles made their way onto houses and commercial buildings. The streamlining of machines easily transferred to architecture, reflecting the excitement of technological advances put forth by industrial designers and engineers. Smooth stucco exteriors, rounded corners, and curved metal canopies all gave the impression of a sleek and modern building. Portholes, taken directly from the luxury liners of the time period, found their way onto buildings, most often applied to garages, bus terminals, and airports.

Moderne was a celebration of the achievements of the country's engineers, even during the difficult times of the Depression. The 1933 World's Fair in Chicago, dubbed "A Century of Progress," exhibited Moderne buildings and Moderne influences quickly infiltrated every aspect of American life, including appliances, toys, and jewelry. As stated in Lester Walker's *American Shelter: An Illustrated Encyclopedia of American Houses* (1998), "In a five year period beginning around 1932, it changed the shape of virtually everything in the American home including the home itself."

Some architectural historians believe Moderne has origins in the German Bauhaus school established in 1919; the Bauhaus sought to renew architecture and create simple and functional structures. Most professionals, however, recognize the similarities between Moderne architecture and the trains, airplanes, gas stations, transportation centers, and appliances of the era. These individuals view Moderne as a style that looked to the future, devoid of many historical references and completely breaking with the styles of the past.

Construction slowed down significantly with the onset of World War II and the restrictions placed on various materials. As Moderne faded, simple and stark buildings in the International Style emerged, reflecting the sparse times in which they were constructed.

Common elements:

- stucco exterior
- flat roof
- horizontal emphasis
- rounded corners
- smooth surfaces
- glass block
- speed lines
- little ornamentation
- curved metal hoods
- porthole openings



Heister House – Salida (Photo by Fay Golson)

To update your copy of *A Field Guide to Colorado's Historic Architecture and Engineering*, go to <http://coloradohistory.oahp.org/guides/fieldguide/fieldindex.htm> and print the new Moderne entry and an updated version of the Suggested Readings for your binder.



STEP 3: ASSESSING EFFECTS*by Amy Pallante, Compliance Coordinator*

In past articles, I have discussed the first two steps in the Section 106 process. We are now ready to move onto Step 3: Assessment of Adverse Effect (36 CFR 800.5). According to the regulations, an effect is an “alteration to the characteristics of a historic property qualifying it for inclusion in or eligibility for the National Register [36 CFR 800.16(i)].” At the beginning of this step, the lead agency must determine if a project or undertaking will affect properties eligible or listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

Effects can be direct, indirect or cumulative in nature and can have either negative or positive impacts upon the historic property. Direct effects include impacts such as demolition of a historic resource. The introduction of visual and audible elements such as constructing a highway adjacent to a historic resource represents an indirect effect. Cumulative effects on a historic resource are similar to a “death by a thousand cuts,” such as multiple inappropriate alterations made to a historic house that then make it not eligible. The lead agency must consider all reasonably foreseeable impacts in considering the potential effects to a historic resource. It is also important to remember if a project *may* diminish the integrity of the historic property, it must be considered as an effect under Section 106.

When considering effects, there are three possible findings: no historic properties affected, no adverse effect, and adverse effect.

- **No historic properties affected** - The lead agency either 1) has not found any historic properties eligible for the NRHP within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) or 2) has determined there are NR-eligible properties within the APE, but the proposed project will have no effect on them. [See 36 CFR 800.4(d)(1)]
- **No adverse effect** - The lead agency determines the proposed project may impact NR-eligible properties, but that effect will not be adverse. [See 36 CFR 800.5(b)]
- **Adverse effect** - Occurs “when the undertaking may alter, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of a historic property that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the property’s location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association.” The Section 106 regulations include a complete list of adverse effects, but some of the most common negative impacts from projects include physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property; alterations not meeting the Secretary of Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties; introduction of visual, atmospheric or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property’s significant historic features; and the sale, lease or transfer of property out of Federal ownership without assuring its preservation. [See 36 CFR 800.5(a)(1-2)]

There are certain time considerations associated with effects within the Section 106 process. The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and other consulting parties have 30 calendar days from receipt of a project to comment on the proposed effects. If the SHPO, lead agency, and consulting parties fail to concur, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) must review and comment on the project, providing their comments regarding effects within 30 calendar days. Once the lead agency receives these comments from the ACHP, the project may move forward, either as planned or with modifications to mitigate adverse effects.

IN THE NEXT ISSUE: The Compliance Corner column in the January *Camera & Clipboard* will discuss how to resolve adverse effects: avoiding, minimizing, and mitigating.



HISTORIC LANDSCAPE FEATURES IMPORTANT CLUES TO THE PAST

We've all heard the phrase, "You can't see the forest through the trees." This same concept can apply to an historical & architectural survey project. There is a tendency to focus so intently on the buildings and structures as to miss the bigger picture of the site itself. In this article historical & architectural survey consultant and former Best Practice Committee member **Jason Marmor** provides his tips for expanding your focus to consider historic landscape features.



This historic (ca. 1910) image of a Grand Junction residential neighborhood illustrates the relationship between the built environment and landscape features such as street trees and sidewalks. Photograph from Colorado Historical Society.

Historical & architectural surveys typically document residential, commercial, institutional (like schools and churches), and other

types of buildings comprising the historic fabric of our communities. Given this focus, the information required on the survey forms, and the time and budget constraints of projects, it is not surprising most survey consultants concentrate nearly exclusively upon the architectural characteristics of the buildings and structures they record. To properly evaluate the architectural significance of a building, we must identify its style and/or building type, consider the building materials, inventory its key stylistic characteristics, and assess its condition and integrity. However, as professionals we must not overlook the abundant landscape features and general setting which often provide historical clues. Key landscape features include streets, sidewalks and sidewalk brands, driveways, retaining walls, hitching posts, carriage steps, street lights, and trees. These features not only provide useful information but also may be contributing elements of properties meeting the National Register or other designation criteria.

When keeping your eyes open to frequently overlooked landscape features it is important first to carefully examine both a property and its setting in detail. This step should occur before writing a single word in your field notebook. Below are some tips for locating and interpreting various historic landscape elements.

Streets: When surveying in a neighborhood be sure to walk along the block, examining not only the range of architectural styles and approximate dates of construction but also the width and form of the sidewalks and street. You may notice some streets are wider than others, often reflecting their former use as trolley routes. Although the tracks were removed long ago, the pre-

Continued on page 9



LANDSCAPE FEATURES, CONTINUED

Continued from page 8

sent street width provides a clue to this important but now invisible aspect of local history.

Sidewalks: In conjunction with subdivision plats, these features may reveal development patterns within residential subdivisions. Sidewalk brands— the impressions left in wet concrete sidewalk panels by the contractor— serve as a sort of testimonial and usually include the date the sidewalk was poured. Examples of such brands appear, for example, throughout the east side of Fort Collins’ older residential area, testifying to prolific construction activity in the 1920s. Numerous sidewalk panels and at least one driveway bear the carefully hand-inscribed cursive imprint of the concrete mason: “Laid by J.L. Rodgers 1925.” Remnants of distinctive red flagstone sidewalks reflect the trend of using stone quarried in the foothills west of Fort Collins and Loveland for sidewalk construction. Archival research often can date when these sidewalks were laid. Unfortunately, both sidewalk brands and flagstone walks represent vulnerable features, susceptible to replacement and insensitive ‘improvements.’

Driveways: The concrete mason’s art is also evident in the construction of two-track concrete driveways leading to detached garages on residential lots. Such driveways were cost-effective and may represent either original or contemporary features of residential properties built in the 1910s and 1920s. Two-track drives also may represent improvements to older properties where a detached garage was added once owners purchased an automobile.

Hitching posts: This historic feature was common during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century in both residential and commercial areas. Used originally to tie up horses or horse-drawn carriages, they are found close to the street and consist of a heavy iron ring attached to a carved stone, cast concrete or painted cast iron post embedded in the ground. Hitching posts can remain scattered throughout older residential areas, sometimes even after an historic home has been remodeled beyond recognition or replaced. Carriage steps of either trimmed stone or cast concrete, although rare and typically found only at “elite” homes, also may still remain.

Trees: Mature trees often indicate the location of historic homes, farms, and rural roads. In residential areas trees were planted for both beautification and shade, with builders or subdividers specifying certain species of trees to meet their design aesthetic. Rural farmsteads are quite often recognizable from a distance as oases of tree growth in expansive farmland or wide-open prairie. Windbreaks of mature tree tend to appear along rural roads. Although most of us are not botanists or arborists, during survey it is a good idea to try to identify the mature trees intentionally planted as site features. It is helpful to be able to identify common tree species— in Colorado, these include cottonwood, elm, aspen, spruce, fir, and evergreen trees— or at least to distinguish between deciduous and evergreen trees and to plot their locations on site sketch maps.

The examples above just scratch the surface on the topic of historic landscape features. It is important to remember not to limit one’s attention solely to the architecture of a historic building while undertaking a survey. Each individual property is set in its own site-based landscape, as well as a broader neighborhood, commercial district or rural landscape, all of which warrant documentation.

For more guidance refer to two relevant National Register Bulletins from the National Park Service: *How to Evaluate and Nominate Designed Historic Landscapes* and *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes*. Links to both publications are available on the OAHF website.





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

Dear Les:
Please settle a bet between my fellow consultants and me. They say OAHp will not accept double-sided survey forms, but I believe you do. Who's right?
Sincerely,
Wagerer in Weldona

Dear Wagerer:
Congratulations, you win the bet. OAHp currently accepts double-sided survey forms, although they are not required. Double-sided submissions save not only trees but also limited storage space in our office. When submitting forms with printing on both sides of a page, care should be taken to assure the text and images are still legible. Using a high quality, slightly heavier weight paper usually resolves this issue.

I understand why your fellow consultants may have been confused. In the early 2000s OAHp advised consultants to submit single-sided forms for ease of scanning for posting on COMPASS. However, we have upgraded to equipment capable of scanning double-sided survey forms. To avoid any misperceptions about acceptable forms, the next update of the *Colorado Cultural Resource Survey Manual* will include specific guidance regarding the submission of double-sided forms.

**Yours,
Les**

ANNOUNCEMENT

Effective July 10, 2008, the price for an OAHp file search changed. The new rate is \$8 per section and \$20 for custom searches. For more details about or to request a file search, go to <http://coloradohistory-oahp.org/faq/file.htm>. Remember, since 2006 the survey manual, has allowed consultants to conduct their file searches in one of two ways: 1) request a search from OAHp or 2) conduct their own search using the COMPASS online database.

**Historical & Architectural Survey
OAHp Staff Support**

- | | |
|---|------------------------------|
| Mary Therese Anstey
Historical & Architectural Survey Coordinator
marytherese.anstey@chs.state.co.us | 303-866-4822 |
| Dale Heckendorn
National & State Register Coordinator
dale.heckendorn@chs.state.co.us | 303-866-4681 |
| Chris Geddes
National and State Register Historian
chris.geddes@chs.state.co.us | 303-866-4683 |
| Heather Peterson
National and State Register Historian
heather.peterson@chs.state.co.us | 303-866-4684 |
| Liz Blackwell
SHF: HP Specialist- Survey & Education
elizabeth.blackwell@chs.state.co.us | 303-866-2851 |
| Erika Schmelzer
Cultural Resource Historian/ GIS Specialist-Architecture
erika.schmelzer@chs.state.co.us | 303-866-2656 |
| Judith Broeker
Cultural Resource Historian/ GIS Specialist-Architecture
judith.broeker@chs.state.co.us | 303-866-2680 |
| Mark Tobias
Cultural Resource Historian/ GIS Specialist-
Archaeology (source for new site numbers) | 303-866-5216 |
| File searches
file.search@chs.state.co.us | |
| Lori Devanaussi/Amy Kirchberg
Administrative Assistants
(form and report access and copies)
lori.devanaussi@chs.state.co.us
amy.kirchberg@chs.state.co.us | 303-866-3392
303-866-3395 |

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