

National Park System Advisory Board  
Landmarks Committee  
Meeting

November 8-10, 2011

The Ray Group International  
Washington, D.C.

Call to Order and Welcome.....	3
National Park System Advisory Board Report.....	6
National Historic Landmarks Program Report.....	6
Approval of Minutes, May 24-26, 2011.....	6
Architecture	
United Congregational Church, Newport, RI.....	6
Central Congregational Church, Boston, MA .....	7
University Heights Campus (Bronx Community College of The City University of New York, Bronx, NY).....	9
The Republic, Columbus, IN .....	10
Landscape Architecture	
Greendale Historic District, Village of Greendale, WI .....	12
Wawona Hotel Historic District, Yosemite National Park, CA.....	12
Archeology	
Davis Oriole Earth Lodge Site, Mills County, IA.....	14
Murray Springs Clovis Site, Cochise County, AZ .....	14
Drakes Bay Historic and Archeological District, Marin County, CA.....	15
Transportation	
McKeen Motor Car #70 (Virginia & Truckee Railway Motor Car #22), Carson City, NV.....	16
SS <i>Badger</i> (Car Ferry), Ludington, MI.....	17
American Latino Heritage Initiative.....	19
San José de los Jémez Mission and Gúsewa Pueblo Site, Sandoval County, NM .....	20
Trujillo Homesteads, Alamosa County, CO.....	22
Nuestra Señora Reina de la Paz, Kern County, CA.....	23
Japanese-American	
Poston Elementary School, Unit I, Colorado River, Relocation Center, La Paz County, AZ.....	24
Landmarks Committee Workshop.....	25
Independent Studies	
Central Branch, National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers/Dayton Veterans Administration Home, Dayton, OH.....	29
Stepping Stones (Bill and Lois Wilson House), Katonah, NY.....	30
Updated and Additional Documentation	
Nantucket Historic District, Nantucket County, MA.....	31
Adjournment.....	32

Meeting Notes, National Park System Advisory Board, Landmarks Committee Meeting  
November 8-10, 2011  
The Finn Forum, The Ray Group International,  
United Mine Workers of America Building, Washington, D.C.

November 8, 2011

**Call to Order and Welcome**

Mr. Ronald James, Chair of the National Park System Advisory Board Landmarks Committee, called the meeting to order at 1:09 p.m. and asked members of the Committee and staff members to introduce themselves. The following Committee members were present: Dr. James Allan, Dr. Darlene Clark Hine, Professor Luis Hoyos, Dr. Barbara Mills, Dr. William Murtagh, Dr. Franklin Odo, Dr. William Seale, and Dr. Michael Stevens.

Over the course of the three-day meeting, the following individuals were present for part or all of the meeting:

National Historic Landmark (NHL)/National Park Service (NPS) Program staff included:

Ms. Caridad de la Vega, Historian, NHL Program, WASO  
Ms. Patty Henry, Historian, NHL Program,  
Dr. Elaine Jackson-Retondo, Historian, NHL Program, Pacific West Regional Office  
Dr. James Jacobs, Historian, NHL Program,  
Dr. Antoinette Lee, Assistant Associate Director, Historic Documentation Programs  
Mr. J. Paul Loether, Chief, National Register of Historic Places and National Historic Landmarks Program  
Dr. Alexandra M. Lord, Branch Chief, NHL Program,  
Dr. Erika Martin Seibert, Archeologist, NRHP and NHL Program,  
Ms. Linda McClelland, Historian, NRHP and NHL Program,  
Mr. Roger Reed, Historian, NRHP and NHL Program,  
Ms. Carol Shull, Interim Keeper, National Register of Historic Places  
Ms. Barbara Wyatt, Historian, NHL Program

NPS Cultural Resources, WASO Program staff included:

Ms. Alexis Abernathy, Historian, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)  
Ms. Stephanie Altbier, Digital Library Technician, NRHP  
Mr. Patrick Andrus, Historian, NRHP  
Ms. Paloma Bolasny, Historian, NRHP  
Mr. Stanley Bond, Chief Archeologist, NPS  
Ms. Lisa Davidson, Historian, Historic American Building Survey (HABS), NPS  
Ms. Lisa Deline, Historian, NRHP  
Ms. Blaise E. Farina, Historian, NRHP  
Mr. Kevin Foster, Historian (Retired), Maritime History, NPS  
Mr. Jim Gabbert, Historian, NRHP  
Mr. David Gadsby, Archeologist, NPS  
Ms. Catherine Lavoie, Chief, HABS

Ms. Virginia Price, Historian, HABS  
Ms. Kelsea Raether, Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act  
(NAGPRA) Intern

Presenters, supporters, and guests included:

Mr. Peter Barton, Acting Administrator, Division of Museums and History, State of Nevada, McKeen Motorcar (Nevada)  
Mr. Jeff Brown, Owner, The Republic (Indiana)  
Mr. Bill Broydrick, Broydrick & Associates, *S.S. Badger* (Michigan)  
Ms. Jane Pike Childress, Archeologist, New Mexico State Office, Bureau of Land Management, Murray Springs (Arizona)  
Mr. Don Clingan, *SS Badger* (Michigan)  
Mr. Edward Connors, Preservation Consultant, Edward Connors & Associates, United Congregational Church (Rhode Island)  
Mr. Guillermo Corral, Cultural Consul, Embassy of Spain, Drakes Bay (California)  
Ms. Lisa A. Easton, AIA, Partner, Easton Architects, Bronx Community College University Heights Campus (New York)  
Mr. Vincent Erfe, Office of Representative Mike Turner (R-OH), National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers (Ohio)  
Mr. Michael Gessel, Dayton Development Coalition American Heritage Veterans Center, National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers (Ohio)  
Mr. James Goeld, Drakes Bay (California)  
Ms. Robin Hawks, New Mexico Bureau of Land Management, Murray Springs (Arizona)  
Mr. Andre Hurmi, Architect, Bronx Community College University Heights Campus (New York)  
Ms. Charlene James, Church of the Covenant Building Committee (Massachusetts)  
Mr. Edward James, Church of the Covenant Clerk (Massachusetts)  
Dr. Carole M. Berotte Joseph, President, Bronx Community College, University Heights Campus (New York)  
Mr. Louis Joyner, Architect, The Republic (Indiana)  
Mr. Drew Kawasaki, Church of the Covenant (Massachusetts)  
Ms. Karen LaFrance, La Farge Restoration Fund at Newport Congregational Church, United Congregational Church (Rhode Island)  
Mr. Aaron Marcavitch, Anacostia Trails Heritage Area, Nantucket Historic District (Massachusetts)  
Ms. Marilyn A. Martorano, RMC Consultants, Inc., Poston/Trujillo Homesteads/San José de los Jémez (Arizona/Colorado/New Mexico)  
Mr. Warren Maruyama, Japanese American National Museum, Poston (Arizona)  
Ms. Nora Matus, Office of Representative Lynn Woolsey (D-CA), Drakes Bay (California)  
Mr. Michael May, Executive Director, Nantucket Preservation Trust, Nantucket Historic District (Massachusetts)  
Mr. Patrick McDonough, Architect, Stepping Stones Advisory Council (New York)  
Mr. Bill Montague, National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers (Ohio)  
Mr. James Moogan, President, Board of Trustees, Stepping Stones (New York)

Mr. Floyd Mori, CEO, Japanese American Citizens League and NPS Relevance Committee, La Paz/Poston (California/Arizona)

Ms. Sheena Morrison, La Paz/Stepping Stones (California/New York)

Mr. Stephen Oetken, University of Maryland

Ms. Emily Palus, New Mexico Bureau of Land Management, Murray Springs (Arizona)

Dr. Daina Penkiunas, National Register Coordinator, Wisconsin Historical Society, Greendale (Wisconsin)

Ms. Annah Perch, Executive Director, Stepping Stones (New York)

Ms. Cynthia Peterson, Archeologist, Office of the Iowa State Archeologist, Davis Oriole Earth Lodge Site (Iowa)

Mr. Brian Pfeiffer, Consultant, Nantucket Historic District (Massachusetts)

Mr. Brian Reardon, Church Administrator and Building Manager, Central Congregational Church (Massachusetts)

Ms. Nancy Schamu, National Conference State Historical Preservation Office

Ms. Marlene Shigekawa, Poston Alliance (Arizona)

Mr. Andy Sigman, Office of Representative Mike Turner (R-OH), National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers (Ohio)

Ms. R. Laurie Simmons, Front Range Research Associates, Poston/Trujillo Homesteads/San José de los Jémez (Arizona/Colorado/New Mexico)

Mr. Thomas H. Simmons, Front Range Research Associates, Poston/Trujillo Homesteads/San José de los Jémez (Arizona/Colorado/New Mexico)

Mr. Bruce Terrell, NOAA National Marine Sanctuary, Drakes Bay (California)

Ms. Brittney Vander Heiden

Mr. Ole Varmer, National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Drakes Bay (California)

Mr. Edward Von der Porten, President, Drake Navigators Guild, Drakes Bay (California)

Ms. Elaine Von der Porten, Member, Drake Navigators Guild, Drakes Bay (California)

Mr. Michael Von der Porten, Member, Drake Navigators Guild, Drakes Bay (California)

Ms. Jessica Wehrman, *Dayton Daily News*, National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers (Ohio)

Ms. Iris Weinshall, Vice Chancellor, Bronx Community College, University Heights Campus (New York)

Mr. William M. Worden, Maritime Historian, SS *Badger* (Michigan)

## **National Park System Advisory Board Report**

Mr. Loether stated that all of the recommendations made by the National Park System Advisory Board (NPSAB) at its April 12-13, 2011 meeting were approved by the Secretary of the Interior during the summer of 2011.

The next meeting of the National Park System Advisory Board is scheduled for December 1-3, 2011, in Key Largo, Florida.

## **National Historic Landmarks Program Report**

Dr. Lord stated that the Presidential Advisory Committee on the Cold War Theme Study met for the first time on May 23, 2011. John Salmon, a National Park Service (NPS) contractor, has prepared a draft version of the theme study, with assistance from the Committee. The draft version will be publicly available on the NHL website in December 2011.

The National Historic Landmark (NHL) Program is working to improve its educational outreach. An NHL tutorial is available on the NHL website now, which incorporates suggestions received from State Historical Preservation Offices (SHPOs), Federal Preservation Officers (FPOs), Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs), and the public. Also, a series of webinars are being held to educate preparers and the public about the NHL Program and NHL nominations. Five webinars, with about 20-40 participants each, have been held.

Additionally, pursuant to Dr. Carson's suggestion at the last Landmarks Committee meeting, the NHL Program is seeking to work with universities to encourage students to learn about NHL nominations and theme studies. The Program has launched a pilot partnership with the History Department of the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. A course on writing a National Historic Landmark nomination is being taught to graduate students this fall; the professor and students have been working closely with NHL staff. This course will result in a National Historic Landmark nomination which will be tentatively presented at the Spring 2012 Landmarks Committee meeting.

Dr. Lord thanked Landmarks Committee members for supporting the NHL Program's work to follow Director Jarvis's request that the National Park Service "green up" its operations. Nominations are now being read on-line not only by Landmark Committee members but also by SHPOs, FPOs, and THPOs.

## **Approval of Minutes, May 24-26, 2011**

Mr. James entertained a motion to approve the minutes of the May 24-26, 2011 meeting. Dr. Stevens made a motion to approve the minutes. Professor Hoyos seconded the motion. The Committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes.

## **Architecture**

### **United Congregational Church, Newport, RI**

Mr. Edward Connors presented the nomination. Ms. Karen LaFrance spoke in support of the nomination.

Dr. Allan asked about modifications to the interior. Mr. Connors stated that the bright blue over-paint is intended to be painted over.

Dr. Hine asked whether the building is still in use. Mr. Connors replied that, although some congregation members have left, a small portion of the original congregation whose existence can be traced back to the seventeenth century still uses the church for worship. Dr. Hine stated she was impressed, not only by the beauty and artistry of the church, but by the fact that it continues to live as part of the community.

Professor Hoyos commented on the unusual feature of having a building's interior designed by someone other than the architect. Mr. Connors replied that the architect, Joseph C. Wells, died around the time John La Farge designed the interior. Professor Hoyos commented that the nomination did a good job of illuminating the architectural history of the building.

Dr. Murtagh asked why the blue color was added in 1962. Mr. Connors suggested that it might have something to do with the widespread brightening of church spaces brought about by Vatican II in the early 1960s. Mr. James added that blue is especially common in churches because of its association with heaven.

Dr. Stevens asked whether any other church interiors designed by La Farge survive intact. Mr. Connors said that no other complete church interiors produced solely by La Farge remain. The United Congregational Church is the only interior over which La Farge had complete creative control.

Dr. Allan moved to recommend the nomination using the standard motion:

“I move that the Landmarks Committee recommend to the National Park System Advisory Board the approval of the United Congregational Church in Newport, RI, with the criteria and exceptions (if any) as noted in the nomination, and that the Advisory Board recommend to the Secretary of the Interior the designation of the property as a National Historic Landmark.”

Dr. Murtagh seconded the motion.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend the nomination.

### **Central Congregational Church, Boston, MA**

Ms. Charlene James presented the nomination. Mr. Brian Reardon and Mr. Edward James spoke

in support of the nomination.

Dr. Allan asked whether the art glass lantern was designed specifically for the church. Ms. James replied that the lantern was designed first for the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition, and then bought by a representative of the Central Congregational Church.

Professor Hoyos asked Ms. James to describe the relationship between Dr. Edward Clark and the Tiffany designers. Ms. James said that Tiffany had a design book of memorial windows used to offer suggestions to customers across the country. In the case of the Central Congregational Church, there was more interaction between Dr. Clark and the Tiffany artists, because of Dr. Clark's aesthetic sophistication. For instance, the idea for the Christ and the Sparrow window, and, in particular, the idea that the sparrow should be hard to find in the design, came from Dr. Clark.

Dr. Stevens noted that the United Congregational Church and the Central Congregational Church, two New England congregational churches designed around the same period, make strikingly different statements; the latter embraces exuberant representational art, and the former shuns even a cross. Which end of the spectrum was more common in Congregationalist thinking during the 1880-90s?

Ms. James responded that some Congregationalists, such as Dr. Clark, believed that showing Scriptural ideas in pictorial form, like an illustrated Bible, were acceptable because of their meaning. Such designs were popular in Congregationalist churches during the 1880-90s, but the Central Congregational Church was at the beginning of this trend.

Mr. Connors added that, when the United Congregational Church was being designed, Henry Van Dyke had to strike a balance between the stark, unornamented interior desired by older congregants, and the beauty desired by younger congregants. This transition, which was occurring in the 1880s, was full-blown by the time of the Central Congregational Church. Mr. Loether added that different parts of New England had different cultural traditions.

Dr. Mills asked whether any windows have had to be repaired, and if so, by whom. Ms. James replied that the church was repainted with the guidance of Historic New England. Out of the 42 windows, one lancet of one window has been restored, and two clerestory windows were repaired because of ice damage. More restoration needs to be done. Tiffany windows have a tendency to internally crack or bow, but there are local artisans who have the skill to restore them.

Mr. Brian Reardon, the church administrator, stated that the protective covering over some of the windows is currently being replaced with a laminate which will allow ventilation. Repairs have been done to some of the tesserae using Boston Museum of Fine Arts expertise.

Dr. Odo asked whether the church is a destination for visitors. Mr. Reardon stated that it is, and the church is working to enhance its ability to be open more often. Students from the Boston Architectural College give tours.

Mr. Edward James described some of the community Programs the church hosts, such as Alcoholics Anonymous, prison counseling services, and a women's lunch held six days a week. Dr. Hine praised the church for reaching out to its neighborhood.

Dr. Stevens moved to recommend the nomination using the standard motion:

“I move that the Landmarks Committee recommend to the National Park System Advisory Board the approval of the Central Congregational Church in Boston, MA, with the criteria and exceptions (if any) as noted in the nomination, and that the Advisory Board recommend to the Secretary of the Interior the designation of the property as a National Historic Landmark.”

Dr. Mills seconded the motion.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend the nomination.

### **University Heights Campus (Bronx Community College of The City University of New York, Bronx, NY)**

Ms. Lisa Easton presented the nomination. Dr. Carole M. Berotte Joseph, Mr. Andre Hurmi, and Dr. Iris Weinshall spoke in support of the nomination.

Dr. Seale asked whether Stanford White was personally involved in the plans for the building. Ms. Easton stated documentation shows his notes and signature on various designs, even designs for light fixtures.

Dr. Mills asked about Gould Residence Hall. Ms. Easton said that the hall is now a classroom building. The exterior is characteristic of a McKim, Mead & White building, but the interior is not at all. The building is also far removed from campus, so it is not being nominated for NHL status.

Dr. Allan asked whether there are plans for restoration of the Gould Library. Ms. Easton stated that a Conservation Master Plan for adaptive reuse is in place, and the first step will be to add new exits.

Professor Hoyos asked whether, if Marcel Breuer's work still existed, it would be historic. Ms. Easton replied that it would be. NYU's first architect was McKim, Mead & White, but Marcel Breuer became the architect of choice in 1950-1962. There is a tension between the Breuer buildings and classical Beaux Arts buildings on campus. Mr. Hurmi stated that the eight Marcel Breuer buildings are a significant presence on campus.

Professor Hoyos asked about the renovation of Havemayer Laboratory. The exterior has not been renovated, but the interior has.

Dr. Hine asked whether the laboratory is in use. Ms Easton stated that yes, all the buildings, except for Gould Library above the rotunda, are in use. There are 29 buildings on the campus,

but only a selection of the McKim, Mead & White buildings are being considered for NHL designation.

Mr. James commented on the transformation of the Pantheon motif from a pagan temple to a library. Mr. James asked whether it would be appropriate to reference connections with other campuses of the same period in the nomination. Dr. James Jacobs said that could be done.

Dr. Hine moved to recommend the nomination using the standard motion:

“I move that the Landmarks Committee recommend to the National Park System Advisory Board the approval of the University Heights Campus of Bronx Community College in Bronx, NY, with the criteria and exceptions (if any) as noted in the nomination, and that the Advisory Board recommend to the Secretary of the Interior the designation of the property as a National Historic Landmark.”

Dr. Seale seconded the motion.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend the nomination.

### **The Republic, Columbus, IN**

Mr. Louis Joyner presented the nomination. Mr. Jeff Brown spoke in support of the nomination.

Professor Hoyos praised the succinct, well-written nomination. He inquired about Myron Goldsmith’s descriptions of the project. Mr. Joyner replied that Goldsmith viewed the building as an urbanistic representation of the power of the state.

Mr. Brown said that, although the printing press has been moved, the building is still used for office space. The building has endured three or four renovations in response to changing technology. Allowing the public to look in and see the presses operating was part of the intent of the building. Mr. Brown stated that his father saw the glass wall as symbolizing the newspaper being held accountable by the public, just as the paper holds government accountable.

Dr. Hine asked whether the building was consciously designed to be “modern” or simply labeled modern after the fact. Mr. Joyner responded that modernism is part of the cultural fabric of Columbus. Mr. Brown stated that his father’s intent was not so much to build something modern as to set a standard for the community in a dilapidated neighborhood.

Dr. Stevens asked the NPS staff to clarify why The Republic has national significance, not just significance within the context of Columbus, IN. Dr. Jacobs replied that this nomination is related to the existing theme study which sought to identify outstanding examples of modernism in the U.S., in particular in Columbus.

Dr. Murtagh also expressed concern that many nominations are not given enough national context. The NHL Program, Dr. Murtagh said, was intended to identify landmarks which are important for all Americans, regardless of where they are found.

Professor Hoyos stated that, among the huge repertory of buildings by Skidmore, Owings & Merrill (SOM), The Republic stands out as an embodiment of SOM design. Dr. Jacobs commented that NPS staff had asked for a demonstration of the national importance of SOM and of Myron Goldsmith. NHL staff members who reviewed this document believe that the context study on modernism in Columbus (Indiana) has demonstrated this. Not only that, but The Republic is one of Goldsmith's most important designs. Mr. James and Dr. Murtagh commented that that point is not fleshed out in the nomination.

Dr. Stevens asked whether the building is currently threatened, and Mr. Joyner said it is not. Dr. Stevens asked why then it is necessary to make an exception to the fifty-year rule. Mr. James stated that modernism often necessitates exceptions to that rule, keeping in mind the existence of theme study which was intended to recognize the national significance of modernism before fifty years had passed.

Dr. Murtagh described his rationale for making an exception to the fifty-year rule in the case of Dulles Airport, during his tenure as Keeper of the National Register. The only way to weave the voice of the preservationist into the dialogue of change, he said, was to put Dulles Airport on the National Register before plans for its expansion went through. But without such pressing reasons, Dr. Murtagh questioned whether an exception is appropriate.

Mr. Loether said that the purpose of the fifty-year rule is to provide a long-term perspective on a proposed National Historic Landmark. There is enough perspective in this case, he said, but the nomination should do more to put The Republic in context.

Mr. James and Dr. Murtagh discussed the factors which might justify an exception to the rule. Dr. Murtagh asked how this exception might be justified at a budget hearing. Mr. James stated that the way we evaluate this property will probably not change much if another eight years pass. Dr. Stevens asked whether a historic district nomination might be appropriate, given the number of important modern buildings in Columbus. Mr. Joyner replied that, in Columbus, no overall plan was created to establish a relationship between buildings, and the important buildings are scattered throughout the county. Therefore, individual nominations for the properties in question are being pursued.

Professor Hoyos asked Dr. Jacobs whether he thought the nomination addresses the information contributed by the context study. Dr. Jacobs replied that the nomination addresses the modernism aspect of the study, but not the patronage aspect. Mr. James asked NPS staff to add a few sentences underscoring the national importance of this property.

Professor Hoyos moved the following:

“I move that the Landmarks Committee recommend to the National Park System Advisory Board that the nomination be altered to reflect comments received during the review meeting and that those comments be forwarded to NPS staff for further coordination and for further review by the Landmarks Committee at a time and date to be agreed upon.”

Dr. Stevens seconded the motion.

Dr. Allan asked whether this building is the first in the redevelopment area, and if the redevelopment is considered a success. Mr. Joyner and Mr. Brown responded yes to both questions. Mr. Brown said that the south end of Columbus needed to be anchored into the town, and this building was the first to do so. Mr. Joyner said that The Republic created a framework for further development, in the area, including the City Hall across the street.

Mr. James asked Professor Hoyos to clarify his motion. Professor Hoyos said that the motion was to delay voting on the nomination. However, after further consideration, Professor Hoyos withdrew his motion, with the consent of Dr. Stevens.

Professor Hoyos then moved the following:

“I move that the Landmarks Committee recommend to the National Park System Advisory Board that, pursuant to comments received at this meeting, the nominee is instructed to work with staff and clarify language contained in the nomination. Following the coordination work with the staff, I further move for the approval of The Republic in Columbus, IN, with the criteria and exceptions (if any) as noted in the nomination, and that the Advisory Board recommend to the Secretary of the Interior the designation of the property as a National Historic Landmark.”

Dr. Odo seconded the motion.

Mr. James stated that the committee will receive a copy of the amended nomination.

The Committee voted unanimously to amend and approve the nomination.

## **Landscape Architecture**

### **Wawona Hotel Historic District, Yosemite National Park, CA**

Mr. Loether stated that staff is recommending that this nomination not go forward at this time. NPS staff would like more time to discuss the impact of this designation with the Superintendent of Yosemite National Park.

### **Greendale Historic District, Village of Greendale, WI**

Dr. Stevens recused himself during the discussion of the Greendale Historic District, since the Wisconsin State Historic Preservation Office prepared this nomination.

Dr. Daina Penkiunas presented the nomination.

Dr. Murtagh asked Dr. Penkiunas how Greendale compares to the other garden cities: Greenbelt, Maryland, and Greenhills, Ohio. Dr. Penkiunas commented that the three cities are quite

different; they approach the same goals in different ways. Greendale has a more traditional plan, with private space for every family.

Ms. Linda McClelland commented that the garden cities are different partly because of the cultural values of their regions.

Dr. Odo asked about diversity within the village. Dr. Penkiunas replied that families were picked for Greendale according to income level and family size, with race being an unspoken criterion. A maximum income level was in effect and families were given units according to their family size. Every family was visited to see if they would fit into the new community. The average age was relatively young, with almost half of the residents being children. Dr. Penkiunas added that people who lived in Greendale as children still come back to live there.

Professor Hoyos said that Greendale is a wonderful example of collaboration between government officials and private designers. Professor Hoyos asked about Clarence Stein's role in working with Elbert Peets. Ms. McClelland outlined Stein's work selling the idea of planned communities to those in charge of the New Deal. Stein developed detailed guidelines and technical standards for designers working on these communities. Bringing utilities close to the street, for example, cut costs.

Dr. Hine asked what role the government played here. Ms. McClelland replied that the government bought the land, hired the designers, and put Works Progress Administration (WPA) employees to work in construction. The intent was that the cities would become cooperative communities, but this didn't happen. In 1952, the cities were sold to a holding corporation and then sold to individual homeowners.

Mr. Loether noted that this nomination may be a springboard for the nomination of Greenhills, Ohio, as well, since the context applies to all three cities. Mr. James stated that Greenbelt, Maryland is already a National Historic Landmark.

Dr. Allan moved to recommend the nomination using the standard motion:

“I move that the Landmarks Committee recommend to the National Park System Advisory Board the approval of the Greendale Historic District, Village of Greendale, WI, with the criteria and exceptions (if any) as noted in the nomination, and that the Advisory Board recommend to the Secretary of the Interior the designation of the property as a National Historic Landmark.”

Dr. Murtagh seconded the motion.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend the nomination.

Mr. James asked Dr. Penkiunas to correct references to Jeremiah Curtin in the nomination.

The meeting was recessed at 4:45 p.m.

**November 9, 2011**

Mr. Ronald James, Chair of the National Park System Advisory Board Landmarks Committee, called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. All those present introduced themselves.

## **Archeology**

### **Davis Oriole Earth Lodge Site, Mills County, IA**

Ms. Cynthia Peterson presented the nomination.

Dr. Mills asked whether this is the most intact earth lodge site in the area. Ms. Peterson responded that it is; there are many lodge sites in the area, but the vast majority are not intact. One other relatively intact lodge site was considered for NHL nomination, but the owner did not give permission.

Dr. Allan asked why this site was so unusually well-preserved. Ms. Peterson said that, fortunately, the smoke wash sealed the basin off.

Dr. Seale asked about the long-term prospects for protection of the site. Ms. Peterson said that the site is publicly owned and will be protected.

Dr. Allan asked whether there are plans for archeological investigation of the site. Ms. Peterson said that the plan is to leave the site alone for the time being. The site is in a public county park.

Dr. Hine asked for more detail about the inhabitants of the site. Ms. Peterson stated that the inhabitants were part of a group called the Nebraska phase people. When human remains are found at sites in the area, which is rare, they are repatriated to descendent communities.

Dr. Mills moved to recommend the nomination using the standard motion:

“I move that the Landmarks Committee recommend to the National Park System Advisory Board the approval of the Davis Oriole Earth Lodge Site, Mills County, IA, with the criteria and exceptions (if any) as noted in the nomination, and that the Advisory Board recommend to the Secretary of the Interior the designation of the property as a National Historic Landmark.”

Dr. Allan seconded the motion.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend the nomination.

### **Murray Springs Clovis Site, Cochise County, AZ**

Ms. Jane Pike Childress presented the nomination. Ms. Emily Palus and Ms. Robin Hawks were present in support of the nomination.

Dr. Allan asked how the site is protected. Ms. Childress responded that the site is open for visitation, and it is monitored by site stewards and archeologists from the New Mexico Bureau of Land Management. If any remains were to be found, they would be evaluated; what has been found has mostly been redeposited rather than found in situ.

Dr. Mills emphasized the importance of this site for understanding the colonization of the Americas. Another National Historic Landmark Clovis site, Lehner Ranch, is nearby. Ms. Childress said that the sites are probably near-contemporaneous. At Lehner Ranch, a campsite was never found, but Murray Springs is valuable for showing three different components of Clovis life: a mammoth-kill, a bison-kill, and a campsite.

Dr. Hine asked for more detail on how the site was found. Ms. Childress said that the scholar who found the site, Dr. Haynes, had worked at Lehner Ranch and therefore knew that Clovis materials were likely to be found just under a black clay layer. Other studies done at Murray Springs, such as a pollen analysis, attracted Haynes's attention as well. Erosion in Curry Draw helped uncover bones. There are many more actual or potential sites in southeastern Arizona.

Dr. Mills made a small correction to the captions of photographs in the presentation.

Dr. Murtagh commented that both the Murray Springs and Davis Oriole nominations were beautifully written. However, he stated that technical archeological terms in the nominations made them hard to read for a non-archeologist. Ms. Erika Martin Seibert replied that the staff does give consideration to the language used in nominations. In the Davis Oriole nomination, the language used was more technical because the argument being made was more complex. Dr. Murtagh suggested that, if technical language is used, it should be defined.

Dr. Mills moved to recommend the nomination using the standard motion:

“I move that the Landmarks Committee recommend to the National Park System Advisory Board the approval of the Murray Springs Clovis Site, Cochise County, AZ, with the criteria and exceptions (if any) as noted in the nomination, and that the Advisory Board recommend to the Secretary of the Interior the designation of the property as a National Historic Landmark.”

Dr. Allan seconded the motion.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend the nomination.

### **Drakes Bay Historic and Archeological District, Marin County, CA**

Mr. Edward Von der Porten presented the nomination. Mr. Bruce Terrell, Ms. Nora Matus (on behalf of Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey), and Mr. Guillermo Corral (on behalf of the Spanish Ministry of Culture) spoke in support of the nomination. Mr. James Goeld was present in support of the nomination.

Dr. Allan emphasized the importance of this nomination and thanked those who prepared it for their hard work.

Professor Hoyos asked about plans for protecting and interpreting the site. Mr. Von der Porten stated that Drakes Bay is within the Point Reyes National Seashore. The site is not threatened. Some interpretative material is available, but the historical element of the site has not yet been interpreted much. Mr. Loether said that the American Latino Heritage Initiative will direct more focus to the site.

Dr. Allan asked about the potential for renewed collaboration between NOAA and NPS. Mr. Von der Porten stated that such a collaboration is being discussed. Mr. Goeld added that a Memorandum of Understanding exists between the Spanish Ministry of Culture and NOAA for a cooperative Program intended to study and preserve Spanish shipwrecks in U.S. waters (such as the *San Agustin*) and U.S. ships in Spanish waters.

Dr. Stevens asked whether the *San Agustin* is in divable waters, and whether photo documentation is possible. Mr. Von der Porten said that it is, but the ship is located in sand and in a breeding area for great white sharks. There has not been an attempt to go into the sand to find the hull. However, there are targets such as magnetometers under the sand. Research is ongoing on the question of why the ship was wrecked. Dr. Allan added that there was a past attempt to dive below the sand, but it did not succeed in finding anything related to the wreck.

Dr. Allan moved to recommend the nomination using the standard motion:

“I move that the Landmarks Committee recommend to the National Park System Advisory Board the approval of the Drakes Bay Historic and Archeological District, Marin County, CA, with the criteria and exceptions (if any) as noted in the nomination, and that the Advisory Board recommend to the Secretary of the Interior the designation of the property as a National Historic Landmark.”

Dr. Seale seconded the motion.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend the nomination.

## **Transportation**

### **McKeen Motor Car #70 (Virginia & Truckee Railway Motor Car #22), Carson City, NV**

Mr. James recused himself for this discussion, because of his connections with the McKeen Motor Car and with Mr. Peter Barton. Dr. Stevens was the acting Chair.

Mr. Peter Barton presented the nomination.

Dr. Seale asked about the restoration of the motor car. Mr. Barton stated that it is restoring the motor car to its original, as-delivered appearance in 1910. The motor car still has its original porthole windows, although four frames had to be fabricated.

Dr. Allan asked how the car is stored, and Mr. Barton said that the car is operated on the railroad for about a mile loop three or four days a year. The remainder of the year, it is stored indoors, and trained docents lead tours through the car.

Dr. Hine asked how many such motor cars were constructed. Mr. Barton replied that approximately 160 cars were built and approximately six still exist, but Motor Car #70 is the only operable one.

Dr. Murtagh expressed a desire for information about the number of motor cars produced and operated across the United States. More national context is needed. Mr. Barton stated that that information is available, and Dr. Murtagh said that it should be added to the nomination.

Mr. Loether added that McKeen was bought by GM in order to eliminate competition. The concept of this approach to transportation, Mr. Loether said, is as significant as the car itself. This motor car is the progenitor of modern self-propelled rail cars. Dr. Stevens clarified that the car is not being nominated as a typical motor car, but because it was groundbreaking.

Dr. Hine moved to recommend the nomination using the standard motion:

“I move that the Landmarks Committee recommend to the National Park System Advisory Board the approval of the McKeen Motor Car #70 (Virginia & Truckee Railway Motor Car #22), Carson City, NV, with the criteria and exceptions (if any) as noted in the nomination, and that the Advisory Board recommend to the Secretary of the Interior the designation of the property as a National Historic Landmark.”

Dr. Seale seconded the motion.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend the nomination.

Mr. James returned to serve as Chair for the rest of the meeting.

### **SS *Badger* (Car Ferry), Ludington, MI**

Mr. William Worden presented the nomination. Mr. Kevin Foster spoke in support of the nomination. Mr. Don Clingan was present in support of the nomination. Mr. Bill Broydrick spoke in opposition to the nomination.

Mr. Broydrick expressed two concerns about the nomination. First, Mr. Broydrick expressed his suspicion that the owners are merely pursuing NHL status in order to evade environmental regulations about the dumping of coal ash into Lake Michigan. A recent amendment to the Coast Guard Authorization Act passed by the House of Representatives would allow the SS *Badger* to continue dumping coal ash in perpetuity if nominated as a National Historic Landmark. Mr. Broydrick described this as a subversion of the NHL process.

Second, the SS *Badger* does not meet the NHL criteria, Mr. Broydrick said, because its Skinner

UnafLOW engine is not unique. Such an engine is used on the Milwaukee Clipper and can be bought online. Also, the origins of the Skinner UnafLOW engine are not American, but British and German.

Mr. Worden responded that the *SS Badger*'s engines are the only operating examples of Skinner UnafLOW stepple compound engines in the world. The Milwaukee Clipper has a standard quadruple-expansion steam engine.

Dr. Allan asked about the issue of coal ash. Mr. Worden stated that the *SS Badger* is operating under an EPA permit allowing the dumping of coal ash. No illegal dumping is going on. The issue of coal ash did not come up when the *SS Badger* was nominated for the National Register. Mr. Worden said that the coal ash issue seems irrelevant to consideration of the ship as a National Historic Landmark. It is an issue for the EPA (Environmental Protection Administration).

Mr. Broydrick responded that the EPA VGP (vessel general permit) is in violation of Michigan law. The provision allowing dumping of coal ash was added without the knowledge of the state government. The current permit expires in 2012, and a new one is expected to be issued this week. The new permit is not expected to allow dumping of coal ash, but because of the NHL nomination, the House amendment will permit the *Badger* to continue dumping anyway.

Dr. Stevens stated that the environmental issue is a moot point, because the *SS Badger* has already been nominated. Because the ship is already listed in the National Register, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act already applies (and would apply even if the *Badger* was only eligible to be listed in the National Register.)

Mr. James said that the Landmarks Committee is supportive of legitimate concerns about the environment. However, given these facts, approving the NHL nomination would have no consequences for the dumping of coal ash. Dr. Stevens stated that the issue before the Committee is that of the *Badger*'s historical significance.

Mr. Loether stated that the *Badger*'s engines are unique. The Milwaukee Clipper's quadruple-expansion engines are a significantly different type of propulsion system. Mr. Foster agreed with this assessment. Dr. Stevens asked whether a Skinner UnafLOW engine is really available for purchase on the Internet. Mr. Broydrick said that it is, but Mr. Loether rejoined that one cannot buy an engine that is still in operation. Mr. Loether added that the documentation available supports the claim that this is a rare type of engine.

Dr. Hine inquired whether the nomination is enhanced by the fact that the *SS Badger* is still a working ship. Mr. Worden replied that an operating ship speaks to the public in a way a stationary one cannot. However, the historical significance of the ship is not affected by the way it is currently being used.

Mr. Broydrick stated that the owners of the *Badger* are seeking to change the ship's propulsion system. Mr. Loether said that decisions on nominations are generally made based on what is, not what might be. If major changes were made to the *Badger*, their possible adverse impact could

be reviewed under Sections 106 and 110 of the Act.

Mr. Worden pointed out that the proposal to change the propulsion system was made in response to the possibility that the ship might not be allowed to continue operating with its current system. Moreover, the proposal would have left the Skinner Unaflo engines in place, although not operational.

Professor Hoyos expressed his support for the nomination, and stated that the case for the SS *Badger*'s significant rarity and design has been made.

Dr. Allan noted that the propulsion system is only part of the reason for this nomination; the *Badger*'s design, style, and role in the transportation system are also important.

Dr. Hine moved to recommend the nomination using the standard motion:

“I move that the Landmarks Committee recommend to the National Park System Advisory Board the approval of the SS *Badger* (Car Ferry), Ludington, MI, the criteria and exceptions (if any) as noted in the nomination, and that the Advisory Board recommend to the Secretary of the Interior the designation of the property as a National Historic Landmark.”

Professor Hoyos seconded the motion.

The Committee voted to recommend the nomination, with eight in favor and one abstention by Dr. Odo.

### **American Latino Heritage Initiative**

Dr. Antoinette Lee introduced the American Latino Heritage Initiative. The origin of this initiative is a 2009 publication entitled *Hispanic Reflections on the American Landscape*. The Secretary of the Interior believes that this publication was incomplete and he has encouraged NPS to create an expert panel on Latino history. Professor Hoyos and Ms. Belinda Faustinos will be the Co-Chairs of the American Latino Scholars Expert Panel.

An American Latino theme study will be completed by June 1, 2012. The Secretary wishes NPS to explore Latino history across the country, including urban areas as well as the Southwest. The theme study is founded on a better understanding of the distinction between Hispanic and Latino.

Dr. Allan asked whether the book, *Hispanic Reflections on the American Landscape*, will be replaced. Dr. Lee said that the book will not be completely redone, but the theme study will be issued as a companion to it. Mr. James added that the relevant NHL nominations to be discussed today will form some of the groundwork for a possible second edition of the book.

Professor Hoyos commented that this initiative is expected to produce many new NHL nominations, especially urban sites related to the social history of Latinos.

## San José de los Jémez Mission and Gúsewa Pueblo Site, Sandoval County, NM

Mr. Tom Simmons presented the nomination.

Dr. Seale asked what the material of the church is. Mr. Simmons replied that the church is limestone, while the *convento* is made of a mixture of limestone and volcanic tuff. The buildings were constructed with native labor using only rudimentary tools. Mr. Simmons added that the careful layout of buildings around this challenging site is the work of the friars concerned. For instance, the *convento* curves in accordance with the topography.

Dr. Lord stated that this nomination was given an expedited review because it is part of the American Latino Heritage Initiative. NPS needs to receive waivers from the site owner and the highest local official waiving their right to a sixty-day review of the nomination. A signed waiver has been received from the owner and NPS expects to receive one from the highest local official, the Sandoval County Commissioner, by the December 1<sup>st</sup> deadline.

Dr. Odo asked whether there is a community living around the site. Mr. Simmons stated that the site is within the small town of Jémez Springs. Most of the Jémez live at Jémez Pueblo, about 12 miles to the south.

Dr. Odo and Mr. Simmons discussed the challenges that friars faced in getting congregants and construction workers for the church. Mr. James noted that conversion work in New Mexico was much less coercive than in California. The presence of the Spanish military protected Jémez people from raids by Navajo and Plains peoples. The Pueblo revolt in 1680 occurred after Spanish military support was withdrawn.

Dr. Seale asked whether the mission was reopened after 1680. Mr. Simmons said it was not. Although many records were destroyed during the Pueblo Revolt, there is no recorded mention of this mission after 1639. Fortunately, the church was not burnt during the revolt because it had already been abandoned. However, Jémez people lived around the site until at least 1680.

The construction of the kiva inside the *convento*, Mr. Simmons said, represents a reassertion of indigenous religion. Dr. Seale asked whether the Jémez remained Catholic. Mr. Simmons responded that another Catholic church was built later on, but he did not know what proportion of the Jémez remained Catholic.

Dr. Mills inquired whether the construction of the Visitors Center in 1965 revealed any subsurface archeological remains. Mr. Simmons replied that it did, but without showing signs of continued Jémez habitation. Dr. Mills recommended the work of Matt Liebmann and Bob Preucel for further study.

Dr. Allan asked whether there has been any assessment of archeological potential elsewhere on the site. Mr. Simmons stated that almost the entire site has been explored, although there is no photographic documentation for some early twentieth-century expeditions.

Dr. Stevens asked Mr. Simmons to indicate where repairs and restoration of the church has been

done. Mr. Simmons said that a lintel was added and the walls were evened out. The church design would have had a ‘shock and awe’ effect on the native population. Dr. Seale asked whether the church was plastered on the outside, and Mr. Simmons replied that it may have been.

Dr. Stevens commented that most likely syncretism occurred, with no clear-cut distinction between Catholic practices and native religious practices. Mr. Simmons added that people whom the Catholic church considered converts may have picked and chosen which elements of Catholicism they found valuable.

Dr. Allan asked whether the Jesuits preceded the Franciscans in missionary work in the area, and Mr. Simmons stated that in this particular area, the Franciscans were the only missionaries until the arrival of the Jesuits in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century.

Dr. Stevens moved to recommend the nomination using the standard motion:

“I move that the Landmarks Committee recommend to the National Park System Advisory Board the approval of the San José de los Jémez Mission and Gúsewa Pueblo Site, Sandoval County, NM, with the criteria and exceptions (if any) as noted in the nomination, and that the Advisory Board recommend to the Secretary of the Interior the designation of the property as a National Historic Landmark.”

Dr. Seale seconded the motion.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend the nomination.

Dr. Seale asked why this nomination is considered part of the American Latino Heritage Initiative, rather than being considered part of Hispanic heritage. Dr. Lord and Dr. Lee replied that, since this nomination was already under way, it was decided to include it in the initiative.

Dr. Stevens asked for clarification of the distinction between Hispanic and Latino heritage. Dr. Lee stated that the working definition comes from Professor Frances Negrón-Mutaner, who is on the expert panel. The definition is:

“Hispanic heritage pertains to the Spanish colonial presence and Spanish colonial legacies in North America and the Caribbean. U.S. Latinos are Americans who may also identify as indigenous, Afro-Latino, white, and/or a mixture of all or some of these categories. Latino may imply racial mixing, histories of slavery, and colonial violence directed at native populations. These shaped *criollo* populations in Puerto Rico and mainland U.S. and may define the experiences and reception of later Latinos who entered the U.S.”

Mr. Loether added that Latino-American is the terminology being used for the initiative overall, even for earlier historic sites which may not fit the textbook definition. Dr. Seale asked about the definition of *criollo*. Mr. Simmons replied that the word is used for a person born in New Spain of Spanish parents.

## **Trujillo Homesteads, Alamosa County, CO**

Mr. Simmons presented the nomination. Ms. Marilyn Martorano spoke in support of the nomination.

Dr. Seale asked whether the log structure is a reconstruction, and Mr. Simmons said that it is a restoration. Dr. Seale asked whether there is a Latino American tradition of log buildings. Mr. Simmons stated that there is some, but there is speculation that Pedro Trujillo deliberately built a more Anglo type of house.

Dr. Mills asked about prehistoric archeological sites in the area. Mr. Simmons stated that the phrase “archeological sensitivity” in the presentation refers to the whole site, and there are no known prehistoric sites on the Trujillo Homesteads. However, Ms. Martorano added that there are many archeological sites in the valley. Lithics and pottery found in the homesteads site contribute to the nomination.

Dr. Allan asked for the definition of a loafing shed or loafing barn. Mr. Simmons replied that it is a one-sided open structure generally oriented against the prevailing wind and used to provide shelter to animals. Dr. Allan further asked for a definition of “sadiron,” and Ms. Martorano replied that it is a handle attached to the metal part of an old-fashioned iron, so that when one iron cooled, the handle could be detached and used with another hot iron.

Professor Hoyos asked whether there are plans to protect more weathered parts of the site. Mr. Simmons responded that the Nature Conservancy controls the site, but he did not know of any specific plans.

Dr. Odo asked how large the 1500-acre ranch is, in comparison to others in the vicinity. Mr. Simmons replied that it is large for a Hispano ranch, although there were much larger Anglo ranches in the area.

Mr. James questioned whether there was true stained glass at the ranch, or merely colored glass. Mr. Simmons stated that documentary newspaper evidence refers to stained glass, but it could have been colored glass. Dr. Jacobs stated that it may have been stained glass, because stained glass was becoming more widely available in that period. Mr. James concluded that the term “stained glass” should stay in the nomination.

Dr. Lord stated that this nomination was also expedited, and that appropriate waivers have been received.

Dr. Odo moved to recommend the nomination using the standard motion:

“I move that the Landmarks Committee recommend to the National Park System Advisory Board the approval of the Trujillo Homesteads, Alamosa County, CO,, with the criteria and exceptions (if any) as noted in the nomination, and that the Advisory Board recommend to the Secretary of the Interior the designation of the property as a National Historic Landmark.”

Dr. Murtagh seconded the motion.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend the nomination.

### **Nuestra Señora Reina de la Paz, Kern County, CA**

Dr. Elaine Jackson-Retondo presented the nomination. Mr. Floyd Mori spoke in support of the nomination.

Dr. Odo asked whether the nomination mentions the Filipino farm workers who supported the United Farm Workers (UFW). Dr. Jackson-Retondo replied that the nomination does take note of their contribution.

Dr. Allan asked whether the case has been made for an exception to the fifty-year rule in this nomination. Mr. James replied that, in his opinion, the extraordinary significance of this site justifies an exception.

Dr. Mills noted how fitting it is to consider a nomination related to the UFW in the UMW building.

Dr. Murtagh asked about the owner of the property. Dr. Jackson-Retondo replied that the owner, Stonybrook Corporation, is a nonprofit subsidiary of the National Farm Workers Service Center, the nonprofit wing of the UFW.

Dr. Stevens stated that the nomination was unclear when referring to the “administration building.” The former administration building has been razed, but the current administration building is in existence and contributes to the nomination. Dr. Jackson-Retondo agreed that using one set of terms to refer to buildings would make the nomination clearer.

Dr. Allan expressed his concern about the integrity of the site. Dr. Jackson-Retondo said that the north unit was rehabbed in 2005, reusing some material. The primary changes to the exterior were made to improve handicapped accessibility. Dr. Allan asked whether more changes are planned. Dr. Jackson-Retondo stated that there is a preservation plan for the site. A small chapel may be added, but there are no major plans for development.

Dr. Allan asked for a translation of the name Nuestra Señora Reina de la Paz, and Dr. Jackson-Retondo said that it translates to Our Lady the Queen of Peace.

Dr. Stevens asked whether the Cesar Chavez gravesite and memorial garden are part of the nomination. Dr. Jackson-Retondo replied that they are noncontributing.

Dr. Murtagh asked when the UFW came into being. Dr. Jackson-Retondo replied that the UFW began in 1968, although there were predecessor organizations. Dr. Murtagh further asked for a justification of the exception to the fifty-year rule. Dr. Jackson-Retondo responded that Cesar Chavez was the undisputed leader of the UFW, and the 1975 Labor Relations Act was a

watershed event. Professor Hoyos added that the Forty Acres site, the original UFW headquarters, is a NHL. The possibility of a trail in an area that doesn't get a lot of cultural tourism also exists.

Professor Hoyos stated that it is to be expected that a large site which is still in use will be modified to a certain extent to meet modern needs. Skilled on-site interpretation and sensitive development is needed to deal with this issue.

Professor Hoyos moved to recommend the nomination using the standard motion:

“I move that the Landmarks Committee recommend to the National Park System Advisory Board the approval of Nuestra Señora Reina de la Paz, Kern County, CA, with the criteria and exceptions (if any) as noted in the nomination, and that the Advisory Board recommend to the Secretary of the Interior the designation of the property as a National Historic Landmark.”

Dr. Allan seconded the motion.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend the nomination.

### **Japanese-American**

#### **Poston Elementary School, Unit I, Colorado River Relocation Center, La Paz County, AZ**

Mr. Simmons presented the nomination. Ms. Marlene Shigekawa, Mr. Warren Maruyama, and Mr. Floyd Mori spoke in support of the nomination.

Mr. Loether commented on the volume of comments received from individuals in support of the nomination of this site.

Dr. Hine commented on the significance of a school built by internees, who overcame hardship and oppression to build something lasting. The school represents a community coming together.

Dr. Odo contrasted internment of Japanese-Americans in Arizona and in Hawaii. The Japanese-American community itself has not always wanted to address this issue because of the shame associated with being interned.

Dr. Stevens asked about the status of other relocation camps. After Poston is designated, only Gila River will remain not designated. Ms. Barbara Wyatt stated that Gila River is on reservation land, and the tribes are not interested in NHL status. Jerome in Arkansas is being considered by the NPS for NHL status. Hawaiian sites are also being considered.

Dr. Allan asked about the nature of the controversy around the construction of the school. Mr. Simmons stated that there was a nativist movement opposing the use of any resources to provide facilities for Japanese-Americans.

Dr. Odo moved to recommend the nomination using the standard motion:

“I move that the Landmarks Committee recommend to the National Park System Advisory Board the approval of Poston Elementary School, Unit I, Colorado River Relocation Center, La Paz County, AZ, with the criteria and exceptions (if any) as noted in the nomination, and that the Advisory Board recommend to the Secretary of the Interior the designation of the property as a National Historic Landmark.”

Dr. Murtagh seconded the motion.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend the nomination.

Dr. Murtagh commented that, when Japanese-American families were relocated, many people destroyed family treasures so that they would not be identified with the Japanese enemy. This is part of the cost of internment.

### **Landmarks Committee Workshop**

This presentation was in response to the request of the Landmarks Committee that the NHL Program explain how staff members assess properties, especially when those which are borderline.

Dr. Lord outlined the NHL review process. First, the NHL Program receives a letter of inquiry from the nomination preparer. This letter is given to a staff person who possesses an expertise in that topic; some nominations require multiple reviewers, but one individual is assigned as the lead reviewer. A property is then assessed in terms of all possible applicable criteria. Consultation, with other NPS staff members or with external scholars, is done as needed. Regional offices are always informed about the progress of a letter of inquiry. The goal is to reply to the letter of inquiry in three months, but the process sometimes takes longer.

Dr. Lord presented two examples of properties characterized by NHL staff as close calls.

The first of these was Bowne House, a house museum in New York City. This property asked for consideration multiple times, beginning in 1960. The most recent letter of inquiry proposed that the Bowne House be considered under Criteria 1, 2, and 4. However, since the policy is to give the property a fresh look with an open mind each time, staff considered it under Criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6.

An archeologist, an architectural historian, and a historian were all assigned to review this property, with the historian, Ms. Patricia Henry, acting as the lead.

Ms. Henry reviewed the life of John Bowne. John Bowne was a Quaker who was imprisoned and exiled from the New Netherlands, later New York, for his beliefs. He eventually won a decree of religious toleration from the Dutch West India Company. To protest Bowne's exile, inhabitants of the New Netherlands wrote a document known as the Flushing Remonstrance, which called for religious toleration.

The owners of Bowne House argued that John Bowne was a nationally significant figure in the history of the development of religious freedom in the U.S. However, Bowne did not sign the Flushing Remonstrance. This document was not signed or drafted at the Bowne House, and Bowne was not directly connected to the document. Dr. Lord said that research also found that Bowne's efforts were not unique in the development of religious freedom in the New Netherlands.

Staff then examined whether Criterion 4 on architecture might apply. Dr. Jacobs stated that the historic structure report found that, although the building frame dates from the 1660s, very little of the visible parts of the building can be dated to the seventeenth century. The building's lack of historic integrity, and the fact that the building has been redecorated and seen additions over time, makes Criterion 4 inapplicable. Bowne House was also considered for significance as one of the first house museums, but it was found that there was insufficient documentation to support that.

Professor Hoyos asked how much supporting material is required for a letter of inquiry. Dr. Lord said that the amount received varies; staff may go back and request new information as it becomes necessary. Mr. Loether added that staff often starts by determining whether the property has a National Register nomination, which is a good way to get information.

Dr. Erika Martin Seibert discussed the possibility of applying Criterion 6 on archeology. Very little archeological investigation has been done at the site. The possibility of studying the frame of the building might make it significant for building archeology. However, this would be an unprecedented use of Criterion 6, and it would be a very difficult case to make.

Dr. Lord emphasized that staff spent a great deal of time speaking with property owners, their consultants, and the head of the John Bowne Historical Society. The idea of possibly combining Criteria 4 and 6 in an unprecedented way was raised. However, most of the experts contacted on the subject said that such a project would be infeasible.

Finally, the NHL Program sent the owners a letter stating that, if a scholar could be found willing to do the work and make a compelling argument, there was a slight possibility the property could be considered under Criteria 4 and 6. However, a nomination of this type would be extremely difficult to research and write as there is no precedent for this type of argument. The owners have chosen not to pursue this project. Dr. Lord stated that, hopefully, the owners now have a better understanding of why staff has been saying no repeatedly over the years.

Mr. Loether added that archeological investigation of the building frame would involve a certain amount of exploratory destruction of the historic building. It is unclear whether such exploration would be worth the cost.

Dr. Allan asked what criteria led Bowne House to be listed in the National Register. Ms. Henry stated that it was most likely John Bowne's significance in local history.

Another issue which sometimes comes up during a review, Dr. Lord said, is disagreement about

the meaning of a site or discomfort with new facts which may be discovered during a review. In this case, Bowne family history states the John Bowne did not own slaves. However, research shows that he did. For that reason, the owners did not wish to pursue the possibility that the site might be significant in the history of slavery in early New York.

Mr. Loether noted that, when staff receives a letter of inquiry, they don't simply examine the claims made in the letter; they thoroughly investigate the property itself, which may reveal facts property owners didn't know.

Dr. Mills asked what proportion of the staff's time is spent on unsuccessful requests for designation. Dr. Jacobs replied that staff spent an unusual amount of time on Bowne House. Usually, when a request is unsuccessful, it is clear from the beginning that it will be rejected. Most rejection letters are sent out more quickly. For Bowne House, Dr. Lord said, staff wanted to give a truly definitive answer, so that the owners can redirect their energy toward other pursuits instead of continuing to request NHL status every few years.

Dr. Stevens asked whether the NHL Program automatically considers every National Register nomination which is made at the national level of significance as a potential NHL. Dr. Lord replied that the NHL Program staff work closely with National Register staff. Sometimes documentation prepared for a National Register nomination can be reused for an NHL nomination. Mr. Loether stated that the NHL Program does consider National Register nominations of national significance as a matter of course. The two programs are joined at the hip. Ms. Henry also said that National Register reviewers pass on to NHL reviewers properties that they consider worthy of NHL status.

The second example staff presented was Reynolda in North Carolina, a country-place era estate and farm built as the home of R.J. Reynolds and his wife. Dr. Jacobs, an architectural historian, was the lead on this review; Ms. McClelland was the second reviewer. Mrs. Reynolds, not R.J. Reynolds, built the estate, and R.J. Reynolds died before the estate was completed. Additionally, another NHL, more closely associated with R.J. Reynolds, already exists. This eliminated NHL Criteria 1 and 2.

Ms. McClelland discussed the context of landscape architecture and the work of Thomas Sears. The additions and changes made to Reynolda, such as the addition of a museum wing and parking lots, compromised the site's integrity. Reynolda has lost its rural setting and acquired more of an urban look. Landscape architecture, architecture, and interior design are the three components determining the national significance of a country-place era estate. Staff also looks for properties which retain a pervasive sense of historic character.

Ms. Barbara Wyatt continued the discussion. This case highlights the need to balance the photography submitted of a site with the site plan, because photographs might not show important features of a property. Ms. Wyatt traveled to the area and looked at the site. The new museum wing and parking lots constitute an infringement on the original landscape of Reynolda. Also, the site is much smaller than it was originally, and a highway and shopping center nearby change the site's character as well.

Dr. Jacobs stated that the house was designed by Charles Barton Keen, who is a nationally significant country-place era estate designer. However, the changes made demonstrate that the current property does not preserve the original defining features of Keen's design. The original approach to the house is gone; the original open porches have been glassed in; and the large museum wing ensures that Keen's work can only be appreciated from one vantage point, the one which hides the museum from view.

Dr. Lord next briefly discussed Rosemont, the claimed boyhood home of Jefferson Davis in Woodville, Mississippi. Staff is still waiting for a response from the property owners, but the property will probably not be nominated. This is another property which has undergone repeated review.

It is doubtful that the house dates from 1810, when the Davis family bought the property. Documentary evidence suggests that the house was constructed later by William Stamps, Jefferson Davis's brother-in-law. There is a possibility that the property could be considered architecturally significant in the state of Mississippi. However, the owner has been reluctant to do dendrochronological reports which might show that the true age of Rosemont. This is another case in which family lore conflicts with research findings.

Dr. Mills asked whether regional staff are ever involved with this sort of review. Mr. Loether said they often are, as are SHPOs. Sometimes properties are brought to the attention of the NHL Program through regional staff. Dr. Lord added that SHPOs are routinely informed in advance when the NHL Program intends to send a rejection letter. Professor Hoyos commented that it is a thoughtful, lengthy process. Dr. Lord responded that the back and forth between staff and the property owner often takes time.

Mr. Loether stated that staff members collaborate, so that expertise is shared between those with different areas of expertise as well as between NHL and National Register staff. Ms. Henry detailed some of the existing collaborative relationships.

Dr. Seale and Dr. Jacobs discussed the state of preservation of Beauvoir in Biloxi, MS, an existing NHL associated with Jefferson Davis.

Professor Hoyos brought the Committee's attention back to the terms "Latino" and "Hispanic." One rule of thumb is that Latino sites are more contemporary. "Latino" is intended to be an all-inclusive term which will not offend any group. A lot of Latinos chafe at the term "Hispanic" because it refers back to Spain. "Latino" is an imperfect term of convenience which is closest to being the consensus term. Mr. Loether added that the Secretary of the Interior prefers the term "Latino." Ms. Shull asked whether the National Register's online travel itinerary might do better to use the term "Hispanic/Latino" rather than "Hispanic."

Professor Hoyos stated that nominations coming in under the Latino Heritage Initiative might date from what is technically considered the Hispanic period. However, these sites build up Latino identity, and therefore can be considered part of Latino heritage.

The meeting was recessed at 4:46 p.m.

**November 10, 2011**

Mr. Ronald James, Chair of the National Park System Advisory Board Landmarks Committee, called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m. All those present introduced themselves.

### **Independent Studies**

#### **Central Branch, National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers/Dayton Veterans Administration Home, Dayton, OH**

Ms. Caridad de la Vega presented the nomination. Mr. Bill Montague, Mr. Vincent Erfe (on behalf of Congressman Michael Turner) and Mr. Michael Gessel spoke in support of the nomination.

Dr. Odo asked how interpretation of the site is done, considering the large, detailed nature of the site. Ms. de la Vega answered that that is the function of the regional NPS office, which works with the site.

Dr. Odo asked whether there are plans to restore parts of the site in fair to poor condition, such as the Grotto Arch. Ms. de la Vega replied that that is again a question for the regional office.

Mr. James noted that the proponents of this nomination were concerned that features of the site which predate the nomination's period of significance would be ignored. However, a distinction must be made between evaluation and interpretation. Features which may not help illuminate the period of significance may not be included in a national-level evaluation. On the other hand, interpreters on site can interpret the whole of the site. Mr. Montague agreed that the site can be interpreted longitudinally, with attention to the Central Branch's role in different historical periods.

Dr. Stevens asked whether properties from the earlier Disabled Volunteer Soldiers era are listed independently in the National Register, so that they are given larger recognition. Ms. de la Vega replied that they are.

Ms. Shull commented that the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) has funded one of NPS's Discover Our Shared Heritage online travel itineraries, which features all branches of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers. The VA has done extraordinary work to educate the public on these sites. Mr. Loether agreed that the VA is one of the most proactive agencies NPS works with, in terms of fulfilling their responsibilities under Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Professor Hoyos expressed his interest in the evolution of this type of hospital building. He stated he was glad that the buildings will be adaptively reused.

Dr. Seale asked whether the site had the first stand-alone chapel built by the federal government, and Ms. de la Vega said it did.

Dr. Odo wondered whether recent cuts in Federal budgets might affect facilities like this one. Dr. Stevens responded that adaptive reuse makes such facilities dual resources, with both historical and contemporary reasons for its continued use. Success stories such as this one should be spread around the VA, as a model for the adaptive reuse of other VA historic sites.

Dr. Stevens moved to recommend the nomination using the standard motion:

“I move that the Landmarks Committee recommend to the National Park System Advisory Board the approval of the Central Branch, National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers/Dayton Veterans Administration Home, Dayton, OH, with the criteria and exceptions (if any) as noted in the nomination, and that the Advisory Board recommend to the Secretary of the Interior the designation of the property as a National Historic Landmark.”

Dr. Murtagh seconded the motion.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend the nomination.

### **Stepping Stones (Bill and Lois Wilson House), Katonah, NY**

Ms. Annah Perch presented the nomination. Mr. James Moogan spoke in support of the nomination. Mr. Patrick McDonough was present in support of the nomination.

Dr. Murtagh asked how many visitors come to Stepping Stones. Ms. Perch replied that between 3,000 to 3,500 people come each year. Unlike Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) itself, Stepping Stones is not required to be anonymous, so it advertises to a limited extent.

Dr. Murtagh asked what Wit's End is. Ms. Perch stated that it was a writing studio Bill Wilson built by hand, which allowed him to have a private space away from his many visitors. It was called Wit's End so that Lois Wilson could tell callers her husband was not available, since he was at his wit's end. Lois Wilson was not an alcoholic; in fact, she drank and was able to keep alcohol in the house because Bill was so secure in his recovery. Ms. McClelland asked whether the name Wit's End might be a play on the nearby Woods End. Ms. Perch replied that is indeed a possibility.

Dr. Allan asked how the collection of manuscripts is preserved. Ms. Perch replied that most archives are in a new modern building with all appropriate protection. The house itself has some archives related to Bill and Lois Wilson, and has a pest management Program and fire suppression system.

Dr. Murtagh moved to recommend the nomination using the standard motion:

“I move that the Landmarks Committee recommend to the National Park System Advisory Board the approval of Stepping Stones, the Bill and Lois Wilson House in Katonah, NY, with the criteria and exceptions (if any) as noted in the nomination, and

that the Advisory Board recommend to the Secretary of the Interior the designation of the property as a National Historic Landmark.”

Dr. Seale seconded the motion.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend the nomination.

### **Updated and Additional Documentation**

#### **Nantucket Historic District, Nantucket County, MA**

Mr. Brian Pfeiffer presented the nomination. Mr. Aaron Marcavitch spoke in support of the nomination. Mr. Michael May was present in support of the nomination.

Mr. James asked for a point of clarification. If the Landmarks Committee does not act, would it become more difficult to implement certain preservation covenants? Mr. Pfeiffer replied that that is the case. Mr. James commented that in this case, updating the NHL nomination is not just honorific, but makes a critical difference to day-to-day activities in Nantucket.

Mr. Pfeiffer clarified that two bodies are involved: a local zoning commission and the State Historical Commission. The State Historical Commission will not approve a covenant concerning property which is not a contributing element in a National Register, NHL, or on the State Register of Historic Places. Individual buildings which contribute to context may not be individually listable on the State Register, so designation as a National Historic District becomes important.

Mr. Pfeiffer added that the lull in tourism Nantucket is experiencing because of the state of the economy gives it breathing room to address issues of historic preservation.

Dr. Murtagh stated that more attention should be given in the nomination to the major impact of Walter Beinecke and the Preservation Institute of Nantucket. Dr. Murtagh, who has long personal experience with Nantucket preservation efforts, gave a brief history of how these efforts were initiated. Jim Lentowski of the Conservation Foundation, Blair Reeves, and Arthur “Buddy” Jacobs could be consulted for information on Walter Beinecke’s work. The nomination mentions Beinecke, but Dr. Murtagh said that the immensity of his impact does not come through.

Mr. Pfeiffer replied that the importance of Beinecke’s work is not in dispute, but the nomination presents only a summary. Mr. James suggested that a few paragraphs on this subject should be added to the nomination, but a comprehensive research project is not needed. Mr. Pfeiffer agreed.

Dr. Murtagh moved using the standard motion for additional and updated documentation:

“I move that the Landmarks Committee recommend to the National Park System Advisory Board the approval of the updated and additional documentation for the

Nantucket Historic District, with the criteria and exceptions (if any) as noted in the nomination, and that the Advisory Board recommend to the Secretary of the Interior the designation of the property as a National Historic Landmark, with the understanding that the additions previously specified will be made.”

Dr. Mills seconded the motion.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend the nomination.

### **Closing Comments**

Mr. James and the rest of the Landmarks Committee thanked The Ray Group International staff for their assistance throughout the meeting.

Mr. James expressed his appreciation for the hard work of all the committee members and NPS staff. Mr. Loether acknowledged the work of regional offices and SHPOs, and in particular the work of Dr. Alexandra Lord, Ms. Patty Henry, Ms. Caridad de la Vega, Ms. Carol Shull, and Dr. Antoinette Lee.

Dr. Lord reviewed potential dates for the spring meeting with the committee, and it was decided to hold the next meeting on May 15-17, 2012.

### **Meeting Adjournment**

Dr. Murtagh made a motion to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned by consent at 11:01 a.m.