

# The Camera & Clipboard

## Historical & Architectural Survey Newsletter



OFFICE of ARCHAEOLOGY and HISTORIC PRESERVATION  
COLORADO HISTORICAL SOCIETY



July 2009 ✦ Number 24



### NEW PPU COORDINATOR APPOINTED

The Preservation Planning Unit (PPU), encompassing both grant-funded historical & architectural survey and National and State Register functions, will have a new leader on board on July 8<sup>th</sup>. The staff are pleased to welcome Astrid Liverman, who comes to us from Hawaii where she worked most recently on a HABS documentation project at Mason Architects Inc. She also worked with both the Section 106 and National and State Register programs in the Hawaii SHPO. She has earned a trio of degrees from colleges and universities in Virginia, including a Ph.D. in Art and Architectural History from the University of Virginia in 2006. Her dissertation was entitled "Art Nouveau as Social Art: The Modern Democratic Aesthetic of Parisian Worker Housing, 1894-1914."

Hopefully everyone will have a chance in the very near future to meet and welcome Astrid.

### PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE PLANNING UNDERWAY

Mary Therese Anstey is currently recruiting participants for the third and final component of the SHF-funded Historical and Architectural Survey Training Initiative (HASTI). The Practical Experience class will meet once a month during academic year 2009-2010. This offering is a follow-up to the introductory Survey Short Courses held in October/ November 2008 and March/ April 2009. In those classes all participants completed a single #1403- Architectural Inventory Form. Individuals who successfully finished one of the Short Courses are eligible to enroll in the Practical Experience where participants will work in pairs to complete 20 survey forms and to prepare a survey report. The goal of this third component is to provide interested individuals with hands-on training more closely mimicking a 'real' historical & architectural survey project. While 20 forms and a report represents a relatively small project, far smaller than nearly all grant-funded and compliance historical & architectural surveys professional consultants routinely undertake, it was important to set reasonable goals for this class. This project size also seems appropriate considering the other time commitments of students, professionals, and avocationalists likely to take the class.

The HASTI is a trial effort. Participants in both Short Courses provided a great deal of constructive feedback about the curriculum, format, and quality of the introductory classes; the Practical Experience also will solicit participant opinions. Staff will analyze all student evaluations, consider the initiative's overall track record, and propose a plan for future historical & architectural survey training. So watch this space.

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.



THE CAMERA & CLIPBOARD



## 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

#### **Awarded:**

*Boulder County* – Intensive Survey of 45 properties in Wondervu

*Breckenridge* - Intensive Survey of 40 properties within the National Register Historic District

*Loveland* – Intensive Survey of 60 scattered resources within the city limits

*Pueblo* – Intensive Survey of 43 properties in East Side neighborhood

*Steamboat Springs* – Intensive Survey of 30 properties within “Old Town”

#### **Ongoing:**

*Aurora* – Comprehensive Reconnaissance Survey of Hoffman Heights subdivision – Hoehn Architects

*Littleton* - Reconnaissance Survey of 83 homes in Arapaho Hills subdivision- Diane Wray Tomasso

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

#### **Completed:**

*Greeley* - Intensive Survey of 50 properties between 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> streets and 6<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> avenues - Kelly Courkamp

*Steamboat Springs* – Intensive Survey of 50 properties within “Old Town” - Cultural Resource Historians

### State Historical Fund Projects

#### **Awarded:**

*Douglas County* – Context development and Selective Intensive Survey (12 sites)

*Town of Erie* – Selective Intensive Survey of 23 properties within town limits

City of Lamar- Intensive Survey of 83 properties in downtown area

Park County – Selective Reconnaissance and Intensive Survey (10 sites) along Tarryall Road

#### **Ongoing:**

*Bayfield* – Intensive Survey of 30 properties in commercial downtown - Nik Kendzioriski

*Boulder* – Comprehensive Reconnaissance and Selective Intensive Survey (104 homes) within 10 postwar residential subdivisions – TEC, inc.

*Broomfield* – Selective Reconnaissance and Intensive Survey (38 properties) – SWCA

*Carbondale* – Intensive Survey of 20 Residential properties – Reid Architects

*Colorado School of Mines* – Intensive Survey of 23 buildings on campus – Preservation Partnership

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

*Fort Collins* – Selective Intensive Survey of 62 sites built from 1945 to 1967 – Historitecture

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

*Genoa* - Intensive Survey of 40 properties 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

*Historic Denver, Inc.* – Reconnaissance and Selective Intensive Survey (35 buildings) within Kountze Heights neighborhood - Front Range Research Associates

*Kiowa County* – Countywide Reconnaissance and Selective Intensive survey (up to 50 sites) in three towns – Front Range Research Associates

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

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

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

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

*Windsor* – Intensive Survey of 45 buildings in commercial downtown – Historitecture

#### **Completed:**

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

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



## LEGION PARK: HISTORY IN THE LANDSCAPE

*Issue #21 of this newsletter featured an article entitled, “Historic Landscape Features Important Clues to the Past” in which the author encouraged surveyors to look beyond just the buildings. This article, by Best Practice Committee member and Boulder County Historic Preservation Specialist **Carol Beam**, illustrates this advice in practice, telling about the important history of a local park staff discovered.*

Historical & architectural surveys typically record the built environment. This focused approach provides valuable information to local governments interested in assessing historical significance and integrity in order to make determinations of eligibility or issue alteration certificates. Usually this approach works very well, but there are situations where a broader focus beyond the built environment is beneficial.

Boulder County Parks & Open Space staff took this broader view, researching the history of a 28-acre park east of the City of Boulder. Known as Legion Park, this open space property is located along Arapahoe Road between North 63<sup>rd</sup> and North 75<sup>th</sup> Streets on top of Goodview or Hoover Hill. Legion Park’s commanding view of the Boulder Valley is immediately apparent, but its significant role in Boulder County’s history required research.

On November 26, 1917, John Howard Empson deeded the land for Legion Park to Boulder County for one dollar. Empson was a well-known local businessman who pioneered the development of the canning industry in Northern Colorado, using locally grown produce from his numerous farms and canning them at his nearby plants. The first indication of any construction at the site appeared 14 years later in 1931 when the County Commissioners ordered the construction of a new scenic road to the top of Goodview Hill in order to provide a vantage point for visitors to get an “unparalleled panoramic view.” Boulder County and representatives of Legion Post #10 signed a lease agreement on November 23, 1932, to beautify the property and create a memorial to soldiers killed in World War I. The terms of the agreement included a lease period until October 2031, a fifty-cent annual fee, and an obligation to keep the property in good condition.

Well-known Denver landscape architect Saco R. DeBoer designed the memorial to include a two foot high rock wall 382 feet long and 100 feet wide, two flagpoles, and a German artillery piece located at each end. Local Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) crews provided the labor, initiating construction in January 1934. The rock for the wall came from Valmont Butte and had to be carefully matched since the volcanic material could not be shaped or chipped down to size. Additional CCC workers constructed a new access road to the memorial from the west and improved the existing road to the east.

A large dedication ceremony occurred at the park on the evening of June 22, 1934, with numerous *Daily Camera* stories listing the program agenda, inviting all citizens to attend, and touting how the newly completed park added “to the many points of interest in and around Boulder.” For the next 42 years the park served the public as a scenic retreat and war memorial. Over time picnic tables, a loop trail, and upgrades to the parking lot have been added. On Memorial Day 1977, the park was re-dedicated as Boulder Veterans Memorial Park.

Over the years the artillery pieces and flagpoles at the memorial suffered vandalism. Around 1976 American Legion Post #10 removed the 25cm wheeled mortar and in 2005 they reclaimed the 77mm field cannon. The location of the mortar is unknown, but the field cannon was restored and now sits in front of the Legion building in north Boulder. In 1976 the American Legion Post also relinquished management of the park to Boulder County. The park is still open to the public, with visitors coming to hike the trails and experience the view. In 2008 Boulder County restored the damaged CCC rock walls and plans to install interpretive signs to inform visitors of the park’s historic past.

The former Legion Park is an example where looking beyond the built environment and considering the wider landscape revealed an extraordinary cultural resource.



## **IMPORTANCE OF DETERMINING HISTORIC BOUNDARIES**

*by Amy Pallante, Section 106 Compliance Manager*

Often when surveying a property for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, we focus more intensely on evaluating the significance and integrity of the property and forget about establishing an appropriate boundary for a property determined to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

According to *National Register Bulletin 21: Defining Boundaries for National Register Properties*, the National Park Service recommends you begin to consider boundaries during the research and data-collection process of a cultural resource survey. This approach is especially important in regards to the Section 106 process. Establishing a boundary for a National Register-eligible property early in the project allows for accurate evaluation of the potential effects of the project on that historic property. The National Park Service offers further suggestions on how to establish boundaries:

- 1) Encompass, but do not exceed, the full extent of the significant resources and land area making up the property.
- 2) Include all historic features of the property, but do not include buffer zones or acreage not directly contributing to the significance of the property.
- 3) Exclude peripheral areas that no longer retain integrity due to alterations in the physical conditions or setting caused by human forces, such as development, or natural forces, such as erosion.
- 4) Contain small areas that are disturbed or lack significance when they are completely surrounded by eligible resources. "Donut holes" are not allowed. Donut holes happen when a portion of a single boundary is cut-out to avoid properties.
- 5) Define a discontinuous property when large areas lacking eligible resources separate portions of the eligible resource. Typically, below ground archaeological resources will have separate discontinuous boundaries because they are separated in space but related in context.

Sometimes it is neither possible nor practical to define the full extent of the boundary for a National Register-eligible property, especially for a Section 106 project. For Section 106 projects where the boundary cannot be fully delineated, a partial boundary should encompass the resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE). For the area of the boundary outside of the APE, surveyors should use their best judgment, drawing the boundary using maps, aerial photographs, and other available information. The current legal parcel boundary also can be used when appropriate.

To better clarify, the legal boundary represents the current legal parcel of the property. The historic boundary is the remaining land or setting that can convey an area of significance and retains integrity. Often the historic boundary will be appropriate when the current legal boundary has non-contributing or modern intrusions encompassed within the legal boundary. An example is a historic farmstead that has leased land within its current legal boundary to a U-Storage unit company. The modern U-Storage units are non-historic intrusions leading to a portion of the site no longer conveying the agricultural significance. That area containing the modern storage units should be eliminated from the historic boundary.

For further guidance on boundaries, refer to *National Register Bulletin 21: Defining Boundaries for National Register Properties*, *National Register Bulletin: How to Complete the National Register Registration Form*, and *National Register Bulletin 36: Guidelines for Evaluating and Registering Historical Archeological Sites and Districts*. These bulletins can be found online at <http://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins.htm>



## REPRISED ARCHITECTURAL STYLES AND TYPES: TERRITORIAL ADOBE

*NOTE: Territorial Adobe appeared in A Guide to Colorado Architecture (1983) but was inadvertently dropped from later versions of A Guide to Colorado's Historic Architecture and Engineering and the current A Field Guide to Colorado's Historic Architecture and Engineering. For that reason this is a reprised rather than new entry.*

Territorial Adobe buildings are most common in southern Colorado and date from approximately 1880 through the 1940s. These buildings were constructed using adobe blocks, yet have some elements of formal architectural style or are influenced by traditional or popular "Anglo-American" design. The earliest examples used elements of the Greek Revival, however, few of these survive in Colorado. Territorial Adobe buildings differ from earlier Hispanic Adobe construction in several ways. Hispanic Adobe buildings tended to have flat roofs while Territorial Adobe examples feature pitched roofs. The walls of Territorial Adobe buildings are thinner, measuring about 10 to 16 inches instead of the two to three feet walls of Hispanic Adobe buildings. Hispanic Adobe examples were built directly on the ground and Territorial Adobe buildings feature stone or concrete foundations to protect the adobe from moisture.

The majority of anglicized adobe buildings used simple details such as gabled or gambrel roofs, false fronts or Gothic pointed arches. The most elaborate example of Territorial Adobe is the Baca House in Trinidad which features a few Italianate details. Many adobe buildings have been stuccoed or plastered, making it difficult to determine if the building is adobe.

### Common elements:

- adobe construction
- pitched (gable, hipped, gambrel) roof
- thinner walls than Hispanic Adobe
- stone or concrete foundation
- frequently covered in stucco or plaster



*Baca House – Trinidad*

Keep your copy of *A Field Guide to Colorado's Historic Architecture and Engineering* current. Go to <http://www.coloradohistory-oahp.org/guides/fieldguide/fieldindex.htm> and print the entry for Territorial Adobe. Remember to print an updated version of the Table of Contents and the Lexicon for your binder as well.

## SURVEYLA—KEEP TABS ON AN AMBITIOUS PROJECT

Those of you interested in survey beyond the boundaries of the State of Colorado are probably already aware of a large survey project the City of Los Angeles has undertaken. The municipality is engaged in SurveyLA, a citywide effort to record historic resources representing significant themes in the city's history from 1865 to 1980. To date only 15 percent of the city has been surveyed and this effort seeks to dramatically boost the number of recorded sites.

SurveyLA is partially funded by a \$2.5 million grant from the J. Paul Getty Trust and the Getty Conservation Institute has been active in pre-project planning—see [http://www.getty.edu/conservation/field\\_projects/lasurvey/lasurvey\\_publications.html](http://www.getty.edu/conservation/field_projects/lasurvey/lasurvey_publications.html) for documents they have prepared about the need for and likely organization of the citywide survey effort.

SurveyLA is divided into initiation and implementation phases. The key tasks involved in the ongoing initiation include developing a citywide historic context, upgrading information management systems and web sites, engaging in community outreach, and conducting pilot surveys. To monitor the progress of this ambitious effort go to [www.surveyla.org](http://www.surveyla.org).







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

**Dear Les:**  
I know the Survey Manual requires completion of a file search for the survey area. But what exactly am I supposed to do with the results of the search?

**Wondering in Wiley**

**Dear Wondering:**  
The purpose of the file search is to see if any

resources within the survey area already have been recorded. There is a link between the file search results and the assigning of site numbers. OAHF wants to make sure each site has only a single site number. Either requesting a file search from OAHF or following the do-it-yourself approach on COMPASS at the beginning of the project should avoid confusion, inaccuracies in the survey report, and post-project changes when the survey results are entered into the OAHF database.

The file search results also can play a role in the project scope and your choices about which resources to survey. Use the file search to pull the forms for previously recorded resources within your survey area. Look at these forms, considering three factors: 1) when the resource was recorded, 2) the level of documentation, and 3) the current condition of the property.

As a general rule, a new #1403- Architectural Inventory Form should be completed every 10 years. If one of the resources you planned to survey is listed on the National or State Register and that nomination was prepared within the last 10 years or so, you may decide the nomination adequately documents the resource and instead choose to survey a building which has not been recorded at all. Conversely, if the last record for the site was a reconnaissance survey it may make sense to gather the full dataset required for an intensive-level survey. Finally, assess the current condition of the building. If it has changed dramatically since its last recording, then a new #1403 should be completed. Keep in mind, when resurveying, it is always a good idea to fact check the information on the original form. A comparison of previous and current photos also may be useful for Field 29- Construction history.

**Historical & Architectural Survey  
OAHF Staff Support**

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

COMPASS  
[compass@chs.state.co.us](mailto:compass@chs.state.co.us)



Colorado Historical Society  
Historical and Architectural Surveys  
225 E. 16th Avenue, Suite 950  
Denver, CO 80203-1606  
[www.coloradohistory-oahf.org](http://www.coloradohistory-oahf.org)

