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This issue takes a look at alternative methods for evaluating historic preservation that our members are exploring around the country. More and more, preservation commissions are beginning to look at how to identify and protect cultural and social landmarks as well as architectural ones.

First though, we take a look at what is being done to salvage those important architectural features when we lose buildings, through the eyes of the Architectural Heritage Center in Portland, Oregon. Next, Lauren McCroskey has begun looking at how to value historic buildings when you can’t put an actual market value on them, through a case study that involved a Corps of Engineers project in Ohio. Then we explore the amazingly colorful murals that are being preserved in San Francisco’s Mission District, and see the work that has been done to catalog them. From there we move up the west coast to Seattle where 4Culture, a county-wide cultural development authority, has devoted time and money to finding more equity in historic preservation, with an interesting study that involved researching hundreds of local landmark nominations.

Finally, we go nationwide with Preservation Action’s President, Russ Carnahan, who describes the significant grassroots impact that preservationists had in saving the federal historic tax credit program in the waning hours of 2017. And speaking of nationwide, don’t forget to plan on attending NAPC’s FORUM 2018 in Des Moines, Iowa, July 18-22. Our next issue will be devoted to what you can see and do while you’re there. In the meantime, enjoy this issue of The Alliance Review and don’t hesitate to let us know if you have suggestions for future articles or topics to consider.
Saving Portland’s Architectural Heritage

By Carrie Sturrock

The sandstone rosette covered a large chunk of a small table inside the Architectural Heritage Center as the curators decided what to do with it. About two feet wide and gritty, it’s an architectural detail from the recently demolished Ancient Order of United Workmen Temple across the river in downtown Portland, Oregon. The rosette could end up on a wall at the museum even though it weighs a couple hundred pounds. Or it might be filed away for future use in the museum’s cavernous rented warehouse containing an odd collection of America’s past. Val Ballestrem, the museum’s education manager, and his colleagues haven’t decided yet.

He does know he’d rather have the building it came from intact than the nifty piece sitting there for his museum’s collection, which represents a battle lost to save architecturally significant buildings and houses.

These days, large historic buildings like the Ancient Order don’t get demolished often because there are so few left. Constructed in 1892, just 47 years after Portland, Oregon’s founding, the six-story brick building was designed by Justus Krumbein. Located at 914 SW Second Ave, it was one of the city’s most prominent remaining from the 19th century. It had served as the offices for the Portland chapter of the Ancient Order of United Workmen fraternal organization for just a
decade before leading a life of varied use included housing the Oregon Historical Society and later a furniture store and warehouse. After preservationists lost a fight to save it, demolition crews began tearing it down this past August. The demolishers knew where to take the pretty pieces.

It’s a little-known fact Portland boasts the largest collection of century-old architectural artifacts like windows, doors and moldings west of the Mississippi. But the Architectural Heritage Center’s curators consider it a collection tinged with sadness because the examples of craftsmanship all came from demolished buildings like the Ancient Order of United Workmen Temple. It’s the story of what once was. And it highlights a massive waste of embodied energy. Beyond all that, the collection says something about the vision of two men passionate about beautiful craftsmanship. It also underscores Portland’s ethic of reuse and sustainability. Many Portlanders have long seen the value in what’s old whether it’s a whole building or just a piece of it. “That door needs to be fixed? Let’s fix it. Those old windows - they don’t need to be ripped out,” explained Ballestrem. “It’s that mindset that helps a lot.”

APPRECIATING CRAFTSMANSHIP

In the museum’s basement are racks of stained glass windows, boxes of electrical plates, door knobs and other building details like newel posts and pressed tin exterior decorations shaped like musical instruments. But incredibly there’s another 8,000 square feet of warehouse space filled with more pieces of demolished buildings including
a few hundred windows of all shapes and sizes from around the country. “It’s so vast you can’t really wrap your mind around how much they have,” said Lauren Radwanski, a graduate student of historic preservation at the University of Oregon who volunteered at the museum for two years.

How did this collection come to be? And why in Portland? Jerry Bosco was a teenager and a budding artist interested in architecture when he was biking through the Lloyd District in northeast Portland in the mid-1950s. Demolition crews were tearing down houses to make way for what would become one of the nation’s largest malls when it opened in 1960 and the first to ever have an ice rink. A beautiful stained-glass window caught Bosco’s eye. He balanced it on his bicycle and pedaled home, said Ballestrem. That was the beginning.

By the mid-1960s, he and Ben Milligan, his life partner, were salvaging pieces of destroyed buildings and selling them. But they kept more than they sold. And the times might have had something to do with that. Like many cities around the country, Portland had begun to discover and appreciate the heritage embodied in its historic buildings as urban renewal cleared vast spaces for freeways during the 1950s and 60s.

“People began to look around and say, ‘Hey, some of these buildings are rundown but they’re interesting and there’s going to be nothing unless we pay attention,’” said Carl Abbott, Professor Emeritus of Urban Studies and Planning at Portland State University. Fortunately for Portland, the city grew relatively slowly in the 1950s compared to other older cities whose leaders razed buildings on a more fast-paced, massive scale.

“I like to characterize Portland as a conservative city,” said Abbott. “Conservative in that it likes to hold onto things that seem to be worth keeping whether it’s the natural environment or old buildings.” That said, Portland’s preservation movement kicked into high gear after the city demolished a number of important buildings including the grand, 326-bedroom Portland Hotel in 1951 to make way for a parking structure for the Meier & Frank Building.

SAVING CAST IRON FOR FUTURE BUILDINGS
Portland’s many cast iron buildings were also under threat. It is a relatively young city and was built up during the heyday of cast iron facades. To keep those buildings from the wrecking ball, architect Bill Hawkins started the Portland Friends of Cast Iron Architecture. The group helped save the buildings in what became Portland’s first historic district, Skidmore/Old Town, which was named a National Historic Landmark in 1977. To this day,
Portland has one of the largest collections of cast iron facades next to Soho in New York City.

Not surprisingly, the Architectural Heritage Center also has a sizable collection of cast iron pieces from demolished buildings. Bosco and Milligan’s habits were influenced by a Portland preservationist named Eric Ladd who bought entire buildings threatened with demolition and sometimes moved them to new locations. He also bought building fronts from demolished structures and managed to amass a huge collection of cast iron facades. Later, Bosco and Milligan collected facades with the goal of fitting the pieces back into Portland’s built environment.

Which is what is happening right now. A new building going up in the Skidmore/Old Town Historic District, the WorldMark on Naito Parkway, is going to include cast iron arches and columns from the collection started by Ladd and continued by Bosco and Milligan. In another instance, the two men ended up with the original porte-cochere from the Calvary Presbyterian Church, which had been removed during a renovation. Years later, they donated it back to make the building whole. “They wanted to see as many of these things go back into Portland’s buildings as possible,” said Hawkins. “It was their greatest dream.”

In 1975, Bosco and Milligan created Genesis Glass to make stained glass, a business that later became West’s Block as they built and repaired stained glass windows. The couple also continued to collect windows from demolished buildings not just in Portland, but from around the country. What began as an effort to save the pretty pieces morphed into something much larger. Ballestrem said the couple thought about it this way: “They’re tearing down this beautiful house? Let’s save as many pieces as we can.”

SAVING HISTORIC ARCHITECTURE DESPITE WEAK PRESERVATION LAWS

Oregon’s preservation laws and financial incentives are relatively weak. Brian Libby, who writes the blog “Portland Architecture” argues developers might have kept the Ancient Order of United Workmen Temple had there been tax credits at the state, county and city level for renovations. Another problem: Oregon is the only state that requires owner consent for the designation of historic resources and the owners of the Ancient Order of United Workmen Temple never had the building designated.
And yet, Portland has many beautiful historic buildings and neighborhoods. What has led to historic preservation in Portland is in part, the same ethic that lead to the Architectural Heritage Center’s collection. “It’s the reuse, reduce, re-cycle ethic,” said Ballestrem. “It’s more that than the historic nature of something.” Case in point: Portland passed in 2016 the nation’s first deconstruction law of its kind, which requires any house or duplex built in 1916 or earlier to be carefully deconstructed so the materials can be reused instead of crushed and landfilled.

Portland historic resources program manager Brandon Spencer-Hartle said the places protected in Portland are more due to the will of individual owners than the collective will of the community. Sadly, that’s reflected in how few historic resources the city has protected for reasons of ethnic, social or cultural history such as houses owned by people of color that may not be architecturally significant, said Spencer-Hartle. Historic buildings receive a lot of attention but thousands of Portland residents have helped preserve elements of the city’s history with small “acts of preservation” by fixing their houses. Or by keeping those houses instead of selling them to developers to tear them down as the city undergoes a development boom.

“It’s an ethic but what they’re doing is an act of preservation,” said Ballestrem.

That ethic has manifested itself in other ways. It led to the development of a preservation technology in Portland that allows people to keep their original old growth wood single-pane windows while making them energy efficient. Sam Pardue, who invented Indow window inserts, received a lot of initial support from the community because people could appreciate what he was trying to do. Oregon BEST (Built Environment & Sustainable Technologies Center), which invests in clean technology innovation that leads to sustainable outcomes, gave him a grant early on. “I couldn’t see ripping out something made with durable old growth lumber, which you can hardly find anymore and is naturally rot resistant,” said Pardue. “Also, the window glass was hand blown. It would have destroyed the character of the house to take it all out.”

Had he replaced his windows, they likely would have ended up at The ReBuilding Center, which didn’t exist when Bosco and Milligan were building their collection. Located on Mississippi Avenue in Portland, The Rebuilding Center moves 6-8 tons of material from demolished houses or renovation

A salvaged window
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projects each day. Back when it opened its doors in 1998, it was one of the country’s first community nonprofits dedicated to reusing building materials and has since served as a model across the United States. It sells used windows, doors, claw-foot tubs, sinks, moldings and more. “Portland has a long history of people who are willing to salvage materials and reuse them,” said manager Tom Patzkowski. “We care about our history and the resources that go into it. We’re scrappy.”

So was Rejuvenation when it started in 1977 as a salvage shop of architectural details with a focus on vintage light fixtures, a company bought in 2011 by Williams-Sonoma, Inc. Hippo Hardware still specializes in hardware, lighting, architecture and plumbing from 1860-1960 in its three floors packed with doors, windows, knobs, lamps, sinks and tubs. It’s a Portland institution with the motto: “Recycling the past for a more livable future.” The Heritage Center with its own doors, windows and hardware, is just a half mile away in the same southeast quadrant of Portland.

It’s not unfair to ask, “How does a museum display pieces of buildings?” To give some context to the collection, Ballestrem created an exhibit pairing some of the pieces with downtown photographs taken by Minor White for the Works Progress Administration from 1938-42. He spent hours poring over White’s photos staring at the now-demolished buildings to see if his museum had any of the architectural details in storage. In one photo of a junk shop, he could see in the background a long-gone building on First Avenue and realized he had the molded sheet metal ornamentation depicted. It now hangs over that particular picture by White. He hopes this exhibit will help people appreciate the buildings Portland does have. “If you build that appreciation, things are more likely to be saved,” he said.

Other exhibits have included one focused on windows; on the use of wood materials; on terra cotta; on the use of architectural metals. When Bosco and Milligan were first building their collection, they didn’t envision it becoming a museum. Any notes they took early on were scribbled onto scraps of paper. They simply loved what they saw and wanted to preserve it with a drive that perhaps had a touch of hoarder in it. Maybe the biggest contribution Bosco and Milligan made wasn’t a catalog of “things” but a reminder that preserving the history of a local culture involves little details that often go unappreciated whether it’s a handcrafted window or an unremarkable space where a music legend got her start. Part of it is simply reflecting on what’s around us and why it matters. Maybe the next time you take a photo, capture something as common as the nearest gas station. Or the next time you work on your house, reuse materials from your community. In the end, it’s the details that matter.
Historic buildings and structures seldom receive a positive monetary value when conventional market analyses are applied. Typical qualifiers based upon location, square footage, and condition often penalize historic properties for the very historic assets that define them: uncommon materials and craftsmanship, unique structural components and joinery, and dimensions and spatial characteristics that do not conform to building codes and contemporary aesthetic notions.

Economic models exist to determine the ability or willingness of the public to support added costs for the maintenance, restoration, or relocation of an endangered historic building or structure. Such “contingent valuation,” is normally derived from public surveys that elicit attitudes about arts and culture, historic sites, and historic buildings. Most of these models are related as either a “willingness to pay [extra]” or as a “willingness to accept a proposal [without monetary contribution].” Surveys and risk assessment data are also used to gauge attitudes about projects that may pose harm in the form of increased noise and vibration due to construction activities. Such results are used to factor how much – and whether – the public may agree to pay added taxes or assessments to maintain a degree of quality of life based upon the potential public good of the project. However, few studies have been able to discern the public’s attitudes about the loss of integrity of a historic site or building (i.e. architectural values), due to say, alteration or relocation.

Historic preservationists have successfully demonstrated how historical designation and rehabilitation can reap economic benefits for a community. Less easily obtained are methods for valuing properties needing compensation due to abandonment or construction conflicts. For example, how much is a two-story, nineteenth-century house worth as...
compared to a contemporary one-story rambler? How can the unique values of historic buildings be drawn out and given credibility for compensation purposes?

This article does not propose a true algorithm or formulaic valuing based upon surveys or economic models. However, in the following example it was possible to identify “value added” or asset variables that may be considered along with conventional real estate assessments. These qualifiers address intrinsic and often unquantifiable historic values such as character, authenticity, craftsmanship, etc.; the intangible assets that are difficult to quantify or present as numeric values. Within the context of an economic analysis, these values are most meaningful when added as descriptive classifications.

CASE EXAMPLE: ZOAR VILLAGE, OHIO, FOR THE U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, HUNTINGTON DISTRICT

The case of Zoar, Ohio provided an opportunity for refinement of conventional real estate models to account for the full value of historic buildings and structures. The village, a National Register listed, early 19th century German utopian community is comprised of buildings expressing strong vernacular design, and fine craftsmanship. Survival of the village, located behind a weakened 1930s levee along the Tuscarawas River, is dependent in part upon retaining the special historic and cultural values of the district’s buildings and landscapes.

Alternatives to remedy the compromised levee included both structural and non-structural solutions, such as repair actions that would likely cause construction related damage to sensitive historic building components and materials, as well as the outright purchase of properties, with compensation to property owners. Compensation for the potential loss of property required special consideration for the unique characteristics of the buildings, and the inherent qualities that would be nearly impossible to reproduce should the structures be damaged or lost. The National Register of Historic Places criteria for
eligibility and nomination provided some direction for this discussion. Properties within the Zoar historic district possess significance under criteria A and C (historical and architectural significance) – as well as archaeological significance (criterion D), which could be identified as additional assets. These criteria are supported by site-specific qualities that evoke historic and cultural importance, for example the siting of communal and religious buildings along the main axis, or the placement of the conservancy building adjacent to the public garden. It was concluded that most all structures at Zoar are dependent upon visual continuity and association with neighboring properties, and draw some of their value from the way in which they were sited on the landscape to make use of natural resources and topographic qualities.

Some individual buildings in the village also derive part of their economic status from commercial or retail activities that could only be successful if performed in the subject historic properties. Tours, gift shop sales, historical reenactments, and bed and breakfast operations are examples. Furthermore, owners of National Register listed properties are eligible for federal tax credits when buildings are rehabilitated according to preservation standards. Whether an owner had taken advantage of the credits or not, the incentive was considered an asset. These values were supplemented both by tangible data (sales receipts, visitation, etc.) and by intangible data (perceptions about the desirability and rarity of historic and architectural values).

In order to augment conventional real estate data in Zoar, the following variables were assigned to historic buildings and structures in the village, or applied to individual properties within the district. Two approaches were suggested. In Approach A, a property needed to satisfy one or more additional values in each category. Approach B allowed for a value-specific breakout, which increased numerical values overall, but also enabled certain properties to be recognized above others for multiple values within each category.
HISTORIC ASSETS VARIABLES

APPROACH A: A single point is assigned if the property meets one or more of the characteristics described under each heading. Value is captured as High (4-5); Medium (2-3); or Low (0-1).

+1 Historical Designation – Eligibility for or Listing in the National Register of Historic Places
- Contributes historic, architectural, cultural, or archaeological significance.
- Provides statutory protection when certain private or government actions pose adverse effects (Section 106 of the NHPA, etc.).
- Affords access to public or private incentives for restoration or rehabilitation, or to grant monies or other funding (federal investment tax credit for the certified rehabilitation of historic buildings, etc.).
- Invokes landmark review board oversight, and the ability to request the expertise of preservation professionals.

+1 Location
- Original location, setting, and association are essential for cultural identity, and an understanding of how the property developed, functioned, and related to other buildings and structures.
- Historic or cultural value is derived in part from natural topography, natural resource, or from a particular land feature.
- Prominent location enhances visibility, promotes awareness and creates easy access for commercial or community activities.

+1 Economic Assets and Heritage Tourism
- Sustains existing economic opportunities (sale of site-specific goods, food, services) that would be less successful if conducted without the historic asset.
- Provides income to a property owner – or has income producing potential – and is thereby eligible for the 20% federal investment tax credit for certified rehabilitation of income producing properties.

President William McKinley of Canton, Ohio, was a frequent guest at the Zoar Hotel. It is owned by the Ohio Historical Society and is currently awaiting interior renovation.
cultural group are not available elsewhere.
  • Archaeological resources associated with the
    property have the potential to increase
    knowledge and understanding of prehistory
    and/or history.
  • Immediate oversight and protection of archaeo-
    logical resources is ensured by continued
    occupation or use of the historic building or
    structure.

+ 1 Physical and Material Qualities
  • Qualities of design, style, materials, and
    craftsmanship cannot be reproduced due to
    lack of available expertise, or to prohibitive
    expense.
  • Type or method of construction is a cultural
    manifestation rarely found elsewhere in the
    locality, state or nation.
  • Landscape values and features are integral
    to the value and understanding of the property’s
    overall historical development and functionality.

APPROACH B: A single point is assigned for each
characteristic. The value is captured as – High
(12-17); Medium (6-11); Low (0-5).

The Bimeler Cabin, built by Joseph Bimeler, Zorite leader,
who led a group of 200 to Ohio, where they established the
Village of Zoar in 1817. Sometimes called mystics, socialists
and communists, the community’s property was held by the
Society of Separatists of Zoar.

• Data confirm heritage motivated visitation by
  the public that generates retail or other
  commercial profits.
• Maintenance and repair work could not be
  funded without the economic activity that takes
  place in the property.

+ 1 Education and Information
• Tangible educational opportunities for the
  particular subject matter/historical period or

Levee along the Tuscarawas River, protecting historic Zoar Village.
Historical Designation – Eligibility for or Listing in the National Register of Historic Places
+1 = Contributes historic, architectural, cultural, or archaeological significance.
+1 = Provides statutory protection when certain private or government actions pose adverse effects (Section 106 of the NHPA, etc.).
+1 = Affords access to public or private incentives for restoration or rehabilitation, or to grant monies or other funding (federal investment tax credit for the certified rehabilitation of historic buildings, etc.).
+1 = Invokes landmark review board oversight, and the ability to request the expertise of preservation professionals.

Location
+1 = Original location, setting, and association are essential for cultural identity, and an understanding of how the property developed, functioned, and related to other buildings and structures.
+1 = Historic or cultural value is derived in part from natural topography, natural resource, or from a particular land feature.
+1 = Prominent location enhances visibility, promotes awareness and creates easy access for commercial or community activities.

Economic Assets and Heritage Tourism
+1 = Sustains existing economic opportunities (sale of site-specific goods, food, services) that would be less successful if conducted without the historic asset.
+1 = Provides income – or has income producing potential – and is thereby eligible for the 20% federal investment tax credit for certified rehabilitation of income producing properties.
+1 = Data confirm heritage motivated visitation by the public that generates retail or other commercial profits.
+1 = Maintenance and repair work could not be funded without the economic activity that takes place in the property.

Education and Public Information
+1 = Tangible educational opportunities for the particular subject matter/historical period or cultural groups are not available elsewhere.
+1 = Archaeological resources associated with the property have the potential to increase knowledge and understanding of prehistory and/or history.
+1 = Immediate oversight and protection of archaeological resources is ensured by continued occupation or use of the building or structure.

Physical and Material Qualities
+1 = Qualities of design, style, materials, and craftsmanship cannot be reproduced due to lack of available expertise, or to prohibitive expense.
+1 = Type or method of construction is a cultural manifestation rarely found elsewhere in the locality, state or nation.
+1 = Landscape values and features are integral to the value and understanding of the property’s overall historic functionality.

SUGGESTED READING


San Francisco Mission Murals Inventory Project

By Lyndy Secrist Morris

San Francisco’s Mission District is known for its vast collection of vibrant murals that not only add beauty to the urban environment but demonstrate the rich Latino culture and history of the area for both tourists and residents to enjoy. Many of these murals were created during the Community Mural Movement of the 1970’s and 1980’s and reflect community values and issues. However, as the neighborhood gentrifies and changes, these murals are under threat of being lost. One of the greatest threats the community murals face is change of ownership. The new owners, in some cases having no ties or obligations to the community, will be unaware of the importance of the mural and might choose to make changes to their building that impacts the mural.

The Mission Murals Inventory Project was conducted by the San Francisco Planning Department in collaboration with San Francisco Heritage and Precita Eyes Muralists to address the issues of mural preservation in the Mission. The project resulted in an internal planning tool that consists of an inventory documenting mural information, a GIS layer of mural locations, and an addition to the San Francisco Property Information Map (PIM) with the goal of alerting planners to the existence of murals on a building. This tool will help planners be aware of culturally and historically significant murals and know how to further proceed in their preservation.

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The Mission Murals were born out of the Community Mural Movement of the 1970’s. The political issues and turmoil of the late 1960’s caused many people to speak out about their views. Murals were being painted all over the country as a way for working class people to express what was


important to them at this time and San Francisco was no exception. The primarily Latino population in the Mission District was also influenced by a tradition of Mexican murals and Los Tres Grandes: muralists Jose Clemente Orozco, David Alfaro Siquieros, and Diego Rivera. The result is the largest concentration of community murals in San Francisco.

Community murals are unique in that they are painted by or with community members rather than for them, as an individual effort, or on commission. The themes reflect the values of the community, and in the case of the Mission Murals, common themes are social and political issues, pride in Latino culture and heritage, and celebration of life.

Various community organizations were also founded during the Community Mural Movement including Galería de la Raza, the Mission Cultural Center for Latino Arts, Precita Eyes Muralists and later on, the Clarion Alley Mural Project and Mission Art 415.

TIMELINE OF IMPORTANT ORGANIZATIONS AND EVENTS IN THE COMMUNITY MURAL MOVEMENT

1970 Galería de la Raza was founded as a community based art organization that fosters public awareness and appreciation of Latino art. They also organized the first community mural program in the United States.

1972 Mujeres Muralistas was a collaborative of female artists who painted large outdoor murals focusing on themes of political and social change but from women’s perspectives and experiences. They painted their first outdoor mural together in Balmy Alley in 1972.

1974 The 24th Street Mini Park was a project of muralists Ralph Maradiaga and Michael Rios to create a space in which Latino children could learn about their rich cultural traditions and heritage.

1977 Precita Eyes Muralists was founded as a community mural organization that collaborates with the community and Mission Cultural Center for Latino Arts was founded by artists and community activists to promote Latino culture and arts.

1984 Ray Patlan moved to the Bay Area in the late 1970’s from Chicago where he participated in the early days of the mural movement. In 1984 he organized the mural project PLACA that made Balmy Alley into the mural space it is today. Balmy Alley already had a few murals from the 1970’s (sparked by las Mujeres Muralistas’ first outdoor mural) but Patlan’s idea was to paint as many new murals as possible that reflected themes of Central America’s indigenous heritage as well as opposition to U.S. intervention in Central America. The project resulted in 27 murals throughout the block. Not many of the PLACA murals still remain, but artists are encouraged to continue the tradition of painting themes on social and political struggle and Latino heritage.

1992 Clarion Alley Mural Project (CAMP) created in 1992, was inspired by the Balmy Alley mural project of the 80’s. It is filled with murals by contemporary artists who update or paint new

mural periodically. It is more of a free art space since the murals here are mostly temporary. Many of the murals address social and political issues.

Spray Can Art became more popular during the 1990’s and today the majority of mission muralists use spray cans, whether that is for tags and designs or portraits.

2007 Mission Art 415 was founded as a way to combat graffiti vandalism by filling the neighborhood with commissioned murals. The organization curates Lilac and Cypress alleys to create a space for street artists.

Precita Eyes Muralists, one of the main collaborators on the Mission Murals Inventory Project was founded by Susan and Luis Cervantes during the heart of the Community Mural Movement. It is a community mural organization that collaborates with residents and allows them to reflect their concerns and values through the artwork. Currently, Precita Eyes still works to beautify the urban environment and educate people about community mural art. Precita Eyes sponsors mural projects, offers youth art classes and workshops, works to restore existing murals, and conducts tours of the Mission District’s community murals.

GENTRIFICATION IN THE MISSION

Historically, the Mission District has been known as the heart of San Francisco’s Latino community and has long been the home of many working-class residents. However, as the tech industry booms in San Francisco, many new wealthy professionals are seeking homes in this desirable community. Housing prices and rents are increasing and the neighborhood demographic is changing. Residents whose families have lived in the Mission for generations fear displacement as the neighborhood rapidly gentrifies. As the neighborhood changes, the need for cultural preservation increases.

One of the biggest threats that community murals face in the Mission District is change of ownership. In some cases, new owners may move in who have no ties to the community. They may feel no obligation to the community, history, or culture of the neighborhood and choose to paint over a mural or do work that impacts a mural on their property. Oftentimes this is not done out of apathy or any ill will, but simply because a new owner is unaware of the importance of the mural. For example, the 1988 mural, Alto al Fuego/Cease Fire painted by Juana Alicia, was painted over in recent years leaving a blank wall in its place. The Mission Murals Inventory Project was created to address this issue and prevent the loss of culturally
and historically significant murals in the Mission District.

METHODS
The methods used to complete the Mission Murals Inventory Project were primarily research, interviews, survey, and inventory. Research included how other jurisdictions handle mural preservation as well as how other public art inventories are organized. Background research also included a history of the Mission District and the Community Mural Movement in order to gain a context for the area. Precita Eyes opened their archives to help with the project, and founder Susan Cervantes provided useful mural information through interviews.

A survey was conducted in order to document the existing murals. The Precita Eyes Mission Mural Walk map was used as the initial survey boundary since it already had many of the murals located. This area extends from about 17th Street, south to Precita Park which is partially in the Bernal Heights neighborhood, and from Dolores Street, east to Potrero Ave. Other murals included were found by walking around and talking to community members who would point out their favorite murals. An inventory of all the murals surveyed was created which includes mural and artist information, location information, and background information.

MURAL CLASSIFICATION
Part of the inventory includes a classification of the murals. During interviews, Susan Cervantes helped categorize which murals Precita Eyes deemed most significant. The result is three separate categories: legacy murals, contemporary murals, and temporary murals. Legacy murals are the most significant. They are murals that were painted as part of the mural movement in the early 1970’s through the 1980’s. This also refers to murals that are part of historic mural clusters (a group of murals located together that share a common theme) like the 24th Street Mini Park or the Cesar Chavez Elementary School. Lastly it refers to murals that were painted by veteran artists of the mural movement at any point in their careers. These artists include Ray Patlan, Juana Alicia, Las Mujeres Muralists and others.

Contemporary murals are those painted after the mural movement usually in the 2000’s and not by legacy muralists, but are done by muralists who have contributed a lot of artwork to the Mission District and whose work is highly valued and respected by community members. Temporary Murals are painted over or changed relatively quickly. Usually alleys serve as galleries for tem-
porary murals, such as Lilac Alley and Clarion Alley. With temporary murals, preserving the art space for artists to express themselves is more valued than preserving a specific mural itself for long periods of time. Some temporary murals have existed for a few years whereas others are painted over after a year or less.

**FINAL PRODUCT**

The inventory and resulting Block Book Notification in PIM will be used to flag buildings that have murals so that planners can be aware of them and know how to proceed. When an address that houses a mural is searched through PIM, the planner will see a notice that reads, “Murals have been identified at this location as part of the Mission Murals Inventory: For projects including exterior work please consult a preservation planner for further review.” Preservation planners can then review the Mission Murals Inventory to see how a mural is classified, where on the building the mural is located, its age, and any historical or background information. This helps a planner understand the significance of the mural and if it will be affected by the project’s scope of work.

This inventory project is timely considering the changing demographics and gentrification happening in the Mission. Already the inventory and mural documentation has proved useful in helping planners provide feedback on projects affecting murals in the Mission District. Although various other cities have maps or inventories of public art, not many jurisdictions have city-mandated policies or practices that specifically protect community murals, especially if they are located on privately owned buildings. In most cases, the organizations advocating for mural preservation and restoration are non-profits. However, the protection of non-profit organizations is not always effective when the threat is not just aging and deterioration, but destruction due to urbanization, demolition, and changes in property ownership. Hopefully this tool does more to preserve important cultural elements in such a rapidly changing environment.

**SOURCES**


Indigenous Eyes (1991), Susan Cervantes. Legacy mural located at Balmy Alley.

Para la Mission, Mel Waters. Contemporary mural located at 2300 Mission St.
Toward Equity in Historic Preservation: A Study of Seattle and Greater King County, Washington

By Kirsten Freeman

The Beyond Integrity Working Group, comprised of preservation professionals of King County, Washington, initiated the Equity in Preservation internship with the goal of contributing to a larger discussion in the historic preservation community. 4Culture serves as a cultural services agency for King County and focuses on the four program areas of arts, heritage, historic preservation, and public art.

4Culture’s historic preservation program is committed to increasing the diversity of cultural resources that are identified, protected, and interpreted, to be more representative of the multicultural populations in King County. The program aims to encourage more comprehensive identification and stewardship of historic cultural properties associated with underrepresented communities.

In the summer of 2016, 4Culture’s first Equity in Preservation Intern completed an initial assessment of whether designated historic landmarks in Seattle and greater King County reflect the historic diversity of their communities. The first intern focused on gathering a set of data on designated landmarks, including 128 King County properties and 348 properties located in Seattle. The data was used to produce multiple maps illustrating the distribution and the varying levels of association with underrepresented communities (referred to as ‘UC association’).

The creation of a second Equity in Preservation Internship in the summer of 2017 aimed to further the study. The goal of this internship was to add to the data collected the previous summer and to identify properties with high potential for significance to underrepresented communities. These properties were the subject of more focused investigation, including research on their history and significance. Finally, a series of case studies analyzed potential for nomination (for never-nominated
able and thorough source proved to be property files located at the City of Seattle’s Department of Neighborhoods office. Key areas of interest for review in a property’s file were the landmark nomination reports, criteria recommendations, and criteria evaluations. In the nomination reports, the statement of significance often provided clues to possible UC associations. Recommendations written by landmark board staff provided guidance on what criteria they believed the property qualified under, while preservation consultants or architectural firms were often responsible for evaluations which assessed each criterion to determine whether the property in question met any criteria.

A spreadsheet tracked the information gathered from the sources. Besides basic information on a property such as date built and address, other data collected included: level of association (LOA), underrepresented community association (UC association), area of significance, nomination criteria, and a notes section. Level of association was a number based scale created to indicate the degree to which a property was associated to an underrepresented community based on information found in nominations and designation reports. The scale was from zero to three, with zero having

METHODOLOGY
The first part of the internship was devoted to data collection and followed the model and methodology set in 2016. Two lists were generated to gather information on properties which had not been designated in King County and Seattle. The list for King County consisted nine of pre-selected properties never nominated for landmark designation, but thought to have a strong UC association. The King County Historic Preservation Program provided previously gathered information about these properties as the source for data collection. The list for Seattle consisted of one hundred and one properties which either did not qualify for landmark nomination or reached nomination but failed to be designated. This set of properties was considered for landmark nomination between 2008 and 2016. A variety of sources provided data for the Seattle properties, but the most relia-
no association and three indicating a strong UC association. Label of association fell into seven categories: not applicable (N/A), communities of color, women, LGBTQ, labor history/working class, early European settlers, and other. Reference to early European settlers was not considered a contributing factor in the LOA rating; however, these references were noted to illustrate the imbalance between groups considered important to the region’s historical narrative and those considered to be less important. The category of ‘other’ included these subcategories: homeless, low income, veterans, and persons with disabilities.

The second part of the internship involved selection of properties for cases studies to gain a more in-depth understanding of the challenges that the nomination and designation process presents for properties associated with underrepresented communities. The properties selected were mostly associated with African American or Asian American communities and spanned the decades from...
the 1890s through the 1970s. They included such diverse resource types as commercial buildings, residences, school, farming cooperative, and a golf club. Case studies fell into one of three categories, with one or two properties selected per category. The three categories for case studies were:

1. Non-nominated properties – one property from the King County list was chosen for a case study, as well as one property in Seattle known to have a UC association, but never nominated.

2. Non-designated properties – two case studies examined properties nominated but not designated as Seattle Landmarks, each with a high level of association with underrepresented communities.

3. Designated properties not fully engaging UC association – for this case study, the 2016 internship spreadsheet was consulted for a property indicating a low LOA, but known by the Beyond Integrity group to have a high UC association.

The non-nominated pair of case studies were approached as potential landmark nominations for King County and Seattle. This necessitated gathering as much information as possible to document a strong UC association. The non-designated pair of case studies focused mainly on documenting the reasons why the properties were denied landmark designation and also finding additional information on their particular UC association. The already
designated case study focused mainly on finding supplemental information on the property’s UC association that was missing in the nomination report or not presented to the board during the nomination process. The addition of this supplemental information to a property file would help to more completely convey its significance.

Properties nominated but not achieving landmark designation, and the property which had reached designation but did not reflect its UC association, required a follow up trip to the Department of Neighborhoods for a more thorough examination of the nomination reports and other supporting material in property files. Reports related to integrity or general information on alterations to the specific buildings required further investigation. Meeting minutes provided commentary from the public and Landmarks Board regarding integrity and placed importance on cultural and social aspects of the property. Public comments included in the files as well as supplemental information showed what was deemed important by the public and the Landmarks Board when considering landmark designation. General research into the properties’ UC association was also important for determining if the nomination left out any important information.

**FINDINGS**

Once entered into the spreadsheets, properties associated with underrepresented communities began to emerge. Of the nine properties from King County five had a LOA of 3, while seven of the one hundred and one Seattle properties had an LOA of 3. It is likely many more properties have a strong UC association that simply was not included in the statement of significance, since the nomination report provided the basis for these ratings. In terms of the level 3 associations, of which there were 7 from the Seattle list, there are interesting observations related to criteria worth pointing out: two of the seven were not recommended for landmark designation under any criteria by landmark staff, three of the seven were deemed ineligible under any criteria by a consul-
tant performing an evaluation of the building, and two of the seven were recommended by landmark staff based at least partially on their association to an underrepresented community.

Upon further analysis of the data, general observations emerged for both the King County and Seattle properties. First, LGBTQ, Native American, and Latin American communities are largely absent when looking at properties considered for a UC association. It is unclear if this means that properties associated with these communities are simply not being nominated or if the UC association is not being presented. Similarly, the role of women is rarely described in nominations and if mentioned as part of the significance, it is very brief. At least half of the nominations mentioning women involve an association to a woman or group of women who are important enough that a greater degree of research would have surely uncovered more information.

In terms of the case studies, certain characteristics stand out within each of the three types. The non-nominated properties were rich in history and significance related to an underrepresented community. Both properties even seemed to have more information to research than the case study properties that were nominated for landmark designation.

When examining the two non-designated case studies, meeting minutes and the focus of the nominations indicated that integrity was the main obstacle to designation. Focus on alterations made to the buildings overwhelmingly dominated in the nomination reports, rather than factors such as social or cultural significance. Also, in both cases the nomination reports submitted by consultants included little content related to an UC association. Both of these properties clearly had a rich social and cultural history associated with an underrepresented community; however this part of the significance was not presented to the extent of other topics related to the architecture itself. It was also notable that both of these properties had a very strong backing for designation from the community. In both instances the community felt it necessary to provide supplemental information about the social and cultural significance of the property, pointing out that this was lacking in the nomination reports and landmark meetings.

When researching the nomination and designation process for the case study of a designated property not fully engaging its UC association, some observations were worth pointing out. The nomination report focused almost exclusively on the architectural significance, despite having a very well-known association with an underrepresented community. The only reference to any social or cultural significance in the report was a few sentences. When questioned about the property's cultural significance by a board member at the nomination meeting, the preparer of the report couldn’t answer the question.

RECOMMENDATIONS
Recommendations were that the two non-nominated properties be considered for landmark nomination. Buildings on both properties were still standing and had more than enough information on significance to be successfully designated and hopefully protected in the future. Also recommended was that the other four properties with a LOA of 3 on the King County list be considered for landmark nomination. All of these properties had information to support a nomination based on their social or cultural significance and with likely more information to uncover with further research. In terms of the non-designated properties used as case studies, both were demolished after they
failed to achieve landmark designation. These properties should serve as cautionary examples for the future. The other properties with a high UC association that are still standing and previously denied designation could re-nominated, with additional research to substantiate their significance. (In Seattle, re-nomination is allowed five years after a designation is rejected.)

Based on the findings when conducting research on properties that were not designated, another recommendation is that a UC association and any sort of social or cultural significance be thoroughly researched and given equal importance as architectural significance. Also recommended, if landmarks staff find information on the UC association or social/cultural significance lacking in the nomination report submitted, they may ask the preparer to conduct further research on these topics and resubmit the report.

Lastly, designated properties that do not fully engage their UC association could benefit from further research. This research would seek to provide supplementary information not included in the original nomination report. The supplemental information could then be submitted to landmarks staff and placed in its property file to further inform the significance of the property.

REFERENCES
MODERN COMFORT
ORIGINAL CHARM

You know you don’t have to feel like you’re living in the 18th century even if your home was built in the days of stocking caps and long-handled copper bed warmers. Central heating? Check. Indoor plumbing? Check. But did you know there’s more comfort to be had? Indow inserts seal out drafts in old growth wood windows made with single-pane hand blown glass. Edged in silicone, our inserts press inside window frames without a mounting bracket. They’re nearly invisible, so they preserve the aesthetics of irreplaceable, original windows. Call it the latest chapter in the history of comfort.
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“I GET IT” Moments and the Story of Historic Preservation Advocacy in 2017

By Russ Carnahan

In the 1960’s there was a broad national conversation in the United States about how to make historic preservation a priority that resulted in a wave of federal elected officials who, when presented with the facts collectively, said “I get it.” Those officials drafted landmark legislation – the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) – that would become today’s National Historic Preservation Program (NHPP).

The NHPA was enacted to coordinate federal and state efforts to preserve historic properties and cultural resources nationwide, to encourage private agencies and individuals undertaking preservation by private means, and to assist state and local governments to expand and accelerate their historic preservation programs and activities. It also established the National Register of Historic Places to recognize and designate historic properties of national, state, and local significance.

In 1974, Preservation Action (PA) was established as a 501(c)4 non-profit advocacy organization to protect and promote the various functions of the National Historic Preservation Program. Ever since, PA has served as the national grassroots lobby for historic preservation with the mission to make historic preservation a national priority by advocating to all branches of the federal government. PA provides information and training, and promotes direct contact with federal elected officials with the annual Historic Preservation Advocacy Week being the highlight of each year. Please mark your calendar early and make plans to participate in Historic Preservation Advocacy Week 2018 in Washington, DC on March 12-14.
Our sister organization, Preservation Action Foundation (PAF) (formerly known as the Center for Preservation Initiatives), is a 501(c)3 charitable non-profit organization with an educational mission to promote understanding about federal policies and programs that affect our nation’s historic and cultural resources. The PAF also encourages informed and scholarly discourse about preservation policy that lays the groundwork for effective action, and developing educational programs and resources to inspire and inform a new generation of preservation advocates.

Preservation Action and its allies have always championed a broad advocacy agenda to promote and defend issues that impact the National Historic Preservation Program. Unprecedented threats to the Federal Historic Tax Credit (FHTC) in 2017 - a vital component of that program – generated widespread grassroots action by historic.
preservation advocates.

That action has focused on telling the national historic preservation success story along with state specific examples from a wide range of real constituents of members of congress - especially those members on key committees with jurisdiction over the tax reform bills. First, we know the statistics for the FHTC are compelling in terms of leveraging private investment, creating jobs, promoting tourism, preserving cultural heritage and improving education. Second, we know local constituents with local examples are powerful and persuasive to elected officials and their staff members. The advocacy stories from 2017 exhibited all of that and more.

The incredible energy of grassroots advocacy in 2017 led with a huge jump in the number of opinion pieces, letters to the editor, and newspaper articles on the tax credits at the state and federal level from all across the country. Headlines such as “Historic Tax Credits for Rockford Renewed” (Illinois), “Historic Tax Credit Uncertainty Halts Redevelopment Projects in Green Bay” (Wisconsin), “Mr. Speaker, Tax Credits are the “Magic Sauce” to Protect Historic Buildings” (Tennessee), “Opinion: The Economic Advantage of Embracing Atlanta’s History” (Georgia). Seeing other communities write about the impacts of the tax credits inspired others to do the same.

By October of 2017, when the news out of Washington was that the tax credits were on the chopping block, the grassroots advocates stepped up even more. The National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Historic Tax Credit Coalition, Preservation Action, and others kept members up to date with weekly action emails with the latest news. PlaceEconomics’ Donovan Rypkema, preservation economics guru and author of numerous studies on the economic impact of historic preservation, wrote “38 Reasons to Keep Federal Historic Tax Credit.” Cities such as Boston, Shreveport, and Clarksburg, West Virginia passed resolutions supporting the tax credits. The Boston Preservation Alliance and Mayor Marty Walsh started a support letter gathering signatures from mayors across the country. The groundswell of social media presence was noticeable too. Joyce Barrett of Heritage Ohio, videotaped a room of 200 advocates...
together at the statewide annual conference chanting “save the historic tax credits” and tweeted it to the Ohio senators.

The National Trust for Historic Preservation hosted an action center on their website that included a simple form for advocates to fill out that auto-populated a letter to their representative. When it was all said and done, 13,000 advocates sent 40,000 letters through their website – the most responses ever to an advocacy action on the Trust’s website. According to the National Trust, during the three-month period between October and December 2017, preservation advocates generated 228 media stories campaigning for the historic tax credits. All of this grassroots action spurred the hard-won legislative outcome, the 20% historic tax credit retained, though spread out over five years instead of taken in the year the building is rehabilitated. While the senators from Louisiana, Iowa, Kansas and others get the name recognition as the authors of saving the tax credits, it’s the local constituents, the preservation grassroots advocacy voices, who are the real heroes.

The “National Historic Preservation Program” refers to the array of functions distributed among numerous agencies and entities at various levels of government and the private sector as contemplated by the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). This includes partnerships across federal agencies, including the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP); between the National Park Service (NPS) and the National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP); partnerships with State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs) and Tribal Historic Preservation Offices (THPOs), partnerships with tribes without THPOs, as well as work at the community level through Certified Local Governments (CLGs). This array of multi-tiered partnerships in which the NPS is a lead participant forms the core of the preservation movement.
I am so very proud of the major way so many supporters of historic preservation have stepped up the last few months during the debate over tax reform. Collectively our grassroots efforts have created many “I get it” moments for Republican and Democratic members of Congress and armed them to be champions for defending the FHTC against attempts to eliminate it. We will continue our mission focused advocacy through these challenging times and as we kickoff our new year of advocacy in 2018. Preservation Action needs you and your organizations to collectively be the strongest possible national coalition backed up by the widest possible grassroots networks in every state. Together we can ensure that America’s Preservation Program remains on a solid foundation for historic preservation for decades to come.

Take this moment to show you “get it” and resolve to join Preservation Action as a member, as a sponsor, on our board, during Advocacy Week or with outreach to our federal elected official in your home communities. Please visit our website at preservationaction.org to learn more and to sign up for our weekly legislative updates.

**VIRGINIA CITIES & TOWNS REVITALIZING THEIR DOWNTOWNS THANKS TO THE HISTORIC TAX CREDIT**

Map of all the Virginia cities and towns revitalizing their downtowns thanks to the Historic Tax Credit.
Peaceful downtown Norwich, Vermont, population 3,500, lies just across the Connecticut River from Dartmouth College. The local historic preservation commission is advisory only, so has no regulatory authority. It was formed in 2009 as the result of a preservation kerfuffle over the community’s historic bandstand, built in 1915, and located on the Norwich Town Green. Some in the community felt the bandstand had deteriorated, was too small to accommodate some current bands, and was not fully accessible. The Norwich Historical Society felt the bandstand could be repaired, was adequate for bands, and could be modified to be largely accessible, plus it was a significant part of the town’s history. Before other options could be fully explored, the bandstand was partially demolished, and the Historical Society leaders felt they had not been part of the Town’s decision-making. Ultimately they pursued Certified Local Government (CLG) status for Norwich, and the Historic Preservation Commission was formed. Peter Brink moved to Norwich after the bandstand controversy. He has been a member of the Commission since its inception in 2010 and is now Vice-Chair. On moving to Vermont, Peter also became a board member of the Preservation Trust of Vermont, and has been on the board ever since, including 3 years as Board Chair.

EXPANSIVE CAREER

Peter has a long career in historic preservation, but he started out practicing law. A graduate of Harvard Law School, he spent 2-1/2 years working in Basutoland, a British territory surrounded by the Republic of South Africa. The territory gained its independence from Britain in 1966, a month after Peter’s arrival, and is now known as Lesotho. After 3 years with a DC law firm and stint with a political campaign, he began working for a firm whose clients included
Mary Ann Beinecke of Williamstown, Massachusetts. They were pioneers in trying to save an early railroad yard in North Adams to become an artists’ guild.

Hired as a consultant by the Galveston Historical Foundation (GHF) in the early 1970s to develop one of the first revolving funds for historic preservation, within 6 months he became their executive director. During his tenure The Strand, Galveston’s 19th century cast-iron commercial district, attracted over $100 million in investment with extensive use of the federal historic preservation tax credit, and GHF became a major city-wide preservation organization.

In 1989, after 17 years in Galveston, Peter became Vice President for Programs at the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and relocated to Washington, D.C. He had a long and storied career at the Trust, where he developed field services and advocacy across the country, spearheaded development of the Heritage Tourism program, and made the Statewide and Local Partners program a powerful force for strengthening and expanding the organized preservation movement. Upon retirement in 2009, the Trust honored him by establishing the Peter H. Brink Leadership Fund (supporting mentoring activities among statewide and local organizations) and the Peter H. Brink Award for Individual Achievement. He has been hailed as “one of the finest leaders preservation in America has ever known,” and Richard Moe, former President of the Trust has remarked, “It’s hard to imagine the National Trust without him."

NORWICH HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
The Commission participates in major decisions of the Town regarding historic resources, but those don’t come along very often. They did have an impact on a Town proposal to broaden the paving of Main Street, and on shortcomings in a proposal to convert a major historic house on Main Street to a B&B with caterer’s kitchen in an attached building to the rear. But they have focused primarily on identifying resources and outreach.
Their first project was the design and production of a Norwich Historic Walking Tour brochure, utilizing a CLG grant. Research came from the Norwich Historical Society (NHS), and the printing of 10,000 brochures was donated. They are now approaching 30,000 brochures distributed through selected Vermont Welcome Centers, the Norwich Inn, Town Offices, and NHS. They also partnered with NHS to produce the exhibit Norwich Farms, about the eight working farms in Norwich today, along with an excellent video about four of the farms. The partnership between the Commission and NHS is an important one in the community. NHS is a 501c3 nonprofit, has substantial archives, a restored 1807 house available for community meetings and exhibits, and educational programs. It is a perfect complement to the Commission’s functions.

The Commission completed an overall historic survey of the entire Town of Norwich using another CLG grant. It included all structures as well as public sculptures, architect designed landscapes, and archeological sites. The survey was explained well in advance on the Town listserv, and when it was completed, there was a final community presentation in February 2016. In the last few years the commission has concentrated on doing National Register nominations with good outreach to the owners and the community. Two of earliest were historic one-room schoolhouses, and these listings later helped the schools obtain state grants for upgrades and rehabilitation.

Norwich’s Planning Director, Phil Dechert, administers the program, and the town provides $1,500 a year to support the work of the Commission. Most importantly, the accomplishments of the Commission, like the town-wide windshield survey, are integrated into the data bases of the planning office, and Phil’s door is always open to discuss matters related to historic preservation and planning.

NOTABLE RECENT ACTIVITIES

The Commission recently received grants for National Register nominations for Maple Hill Farm - a lovely 1789 farmhouse with barns and land, for Brigham Hill - a cluster of four farmhouses from the late 1700s, and for an archeological resources assessment and review of pre-settlement sites and a long-standing industrial site along the banks of the Ompompanoosuc River. The Commission also initiated a focus on Mid-Century Modern architecture in Norwich with a nomination for a district that includes 14 Mid-Century structures. This resulted in NHS having a major exhibit and walking tours about Mid-Century houses in Norwich.

The Commission’s make up includes commission- ers knowledgeable in research, design, real estate and town history. They have explored initiating an advisory service for owners of historic structures who want to make exterior changes. They envision using the archives of NHS and partnering with volunteer architects to provide suggestions. Peter is closely tracking potential development proposals for Lewiston, a remnant of Norwich’s light industry hamlet with structures dating from 1880 to 1920. They are developing a CLG request to prepare a National Register district nomination for Lewiston. They also have commented on aspects of the updated Town Plan affecting historic resources. Peter is quite proud of the work the Norwich Historic Preservation Commission has accomplished in its short existence. He should be - the Commission was designated “Commission of the Year” in 2016 by the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions for its outstanding work in raising awareness about Norwich’s rich historic architectural and cultural resources. If you ever find your way to the area, stop by and check out their wonderful town.
This compelling introduction invites online visitors to the United States chapter of Docomomo International. Founded in the Netherlands in 1988, Docomomo is a catchy acronym for documentation and conservation of buildings, sites, and neighborhoods of the modern movement. With committees in 69 countries, Docomomo made its way to the US in 1995. A nonprofit organization, Docomomo US consists of a national board of directors and staff representing regional chapters of members, united in their affinity for modern architecture and design.

Harnessing the momentum of its international forerunners, Docomomo US seeks to preserve modern architecture, landscape and design through advocacy, education and documentation. Architects, designers, historians, preservationists, students and enthusiasts make up the organization. The skills and expertise of Docomomo’s members enables the organization to provide the leadership and knowledge necessary to facilitate a national conversation on the importance of modern design principles. The organization focuses on the social context, technical merits, aesthetics and settings of American modernist design as an important piece of the Nation’s recent past.

Docomomo US is active on the local, regional, and national level. In addition to offering an abundance of locally-based architectural tours and events, Docomomo hosts a yearly National Symposium. This multi-day conference is considered the primary event in the United States for those interested in the preservation of modern architecture. In addition, the organization holds a yearly “Face to Face” meeting where attendees have an opportunity to participate in national discussions and engage the organization on a broader level. Docomomo’s Modernism in America Awards program annually recognizes exemplary projects representing not only the highest level of preservation efforts, but also the growing trend to document and share those findings with the public. The organization draws attention to threatened and lost sites as well, providing members and the general public with an opportunity to take action in saving modern sites. Funding for Docomomo US depends on memberships and donations as well as attendance of their multitude of events. To learn more about this organization please visit their website: http://www.docomomo-us.org/

“Before there was Mad Men, Design within Reach, or Dwell there was Docomomo...”
CALIFORNIA
The Long Beach Cultural Heritage Commission recently voted to designate the “world famous” sign from VIP Records a Long Beach historic landmark. It’s a big win for Kelvin Anderson, or “Pops,” as he’s known around the Central Long Beach neighborhood. Kelvin has been a prominent figure in the area since the late 1970s, when he bought the record shop on Pacific Coast Highway from his older brother and built it into a brand known around the globe. In the early 1990s, when gang violence was at an all-time high in Long Beach, Kelvin decided to try something different to keep the neighborhood youth off the streets and out of trouble. So he turned a storage closet into a makeshift recording studio. And it was there, in the back of his record shop, that the sounds of West Coast rap and gangsta-funk, or G-funk, were born. A number of local artists, including Snoop Dogg, Warren G and the late Nate Dogg, recorded their first demos at VIP. The 20-foot-tall, Googie-style sign actually belonged to the business that preceded VIP, Whistler Liquor, which explains why the man on the sign is whistling. Using Whistler’s original sign as a base, Kelvin turned it into a symbol reflective of his own business, painting the letters VIP at the top with a black vinyl record at the center, complete with blinking neon lights that gave it a spinning effect. The sign has undergone about a dozen minor changes over the years, but the original style remains. Since the original VIP Records closed, the sign has been removed from its current location so it can be prepared for restoration and storage until Kelvin can secure a new location. https://www.presseleagram.com/2017/11/14/vip-records-sign-gets-nod-to-become-local-historic-landmark-in-long-beach/

IOWA
The Davenport Historic Preservation Commission unanimously voted against a request from the Public Works Department to remove an intersection at 5th Street and Western Avenue in Davenport from the list of protected brick streets so it could replace it with asphalt. The public works director and city engineer argued that an asphalt replacement would cost less than replacing the entire roadway in brick. While it seemed like the high cost was because of the brick, much of the expense results from drainage issues. The former mayor asked the commission to deny the request, arguing that a properly laid brick street can be prepared for restoration and storage until Kelvin can secure a new location. https://qctimes.com/news/local/government-and-politics/goodbye-brick-road-not-so-fast-davenport-historic-preservation-commission/article_a3e84d90-1dab-536f-a25d-df22b3e44b58.html

MISSISSIPPI
The Carnation Plant in Tupelo, Mississippi opened in 1927. It was part of a thriving industrial district, and it operated for 45 years in a part of the city known as Tupelo Mill Village. Over the last few decades, however, the structure fell into decline and became a makeshift shelter for Tupelo’s homeless. In more recent years, the city started to clean up the lot surrounding the complex and began the search for investors to develop the property. In early December, however, the chief operations officer of the city of Tupelo had a storage building and manager’s office near the complex razed. It quickly became clear that these two buildings were part of the historic Carnation Milk Plant, a site protected by both local and national historic registers. The COO immediately confessed to the mistake, stating that there was no malice intended. He said the clean-up was completed for efficiency’s sake and safety reasons. Without exception, everyone in Tupelo’s historic circles gives him the benefit of the doubt, although they lament the loss of the buildings. As a result of these demolitions, city departments have become more aware of the need to check in with the Tupelo Historic Preservation Commission and the Tupelo Historic Preservation Society. http://www.wtva.com/content/news/466689733.html

NEW YORK
The National Trust for Historic Preservation announced plans for a preservation easement on the property once belonging to Madam C.J. Walker. The protection status means owners of the 1918 Irvington estate, called Villa Lewaro, cannot make changes to the property that destroys the historic and architectural features of the mansion. Madam Walker was America’s first female self-made millionaire, making her fortune from the creation of hair care products for African-American women. The majestic 34-room estate, constructed along the Hudson River at the cusp of Walker’s success, was built for entertaining. Walker, an African-American leader in business, politics, and philanthropy, used her home as a meeting place for prominent members of the Harlem Renaissance, including W. E. B. Du Bois and Langston Hughes. The elegant home was designed by Vertner Tandy, the first African-American registered architect in the state of New York. He was an original founder of the oldest historically black Greek organization, Alpha Phi Alpha fraternity. The designation comes at the 100th anniversary of the property’s construction and the 150th anniversary of Madam Walker’s birth. http://www.lohud.com/story/news/local/westchester/2017/12/22/preservation-status-reached-madame-c-j-walker-property/973350001/
OHIO

Steve Coon, a developer who specializes in historic restoration, is planning to breathe life into Ohio’s famous but vacant “Big Basket.” His firm recently purchased the 20 year old building and plans to renovate it for new uses. The seven-story, 180,000-square-foot building opened in 1997 as the headquarters of the Longaberger Co., which makes baskets and pottery. It was designed by NBBJ and Korda Nemeth Engineering to resemble the company’s biggest seller, the Longaberger Medium Market Basket. Peter Ketter, Director of Historic Preservation for Stanvick Architects, said, “It’s going to continue to look like a basket. The owner is excited about the iconic nature of the building and sees it as a positive.” This includes the handle on top and the basket weave skin, which is an EIFS veneer. He added that the development team plans to nominate the building for listing on the National Register of Historic Places so the renovation could qualify for preservation tax credits. The team also wants to preserve a large interior atrium and possibly much of the cherry wood used inside, he said. Ketter said the new owner is exploring a variety of redevelopment options, including multi-tenant office use, a hotel or a mixture of uses. “All options are on the table at this point,” he said. There is no firm timetable for construction but Ketter estimates it will take a couple of years to complete work on this one-of-a-kind building. https://archpaper.com/2018/01/longaberger-basket-building-sold/

TENNESSEE

Cheatham County Mayor Kerry McCarver is one of 72 county mayors statewide to express support of moving President James K. Polk’s tomb and remains from the Tennessee State Capitol to the James K. Polk Ancestral Home and Museum in Columbia, an endeavor that stirred some debate last year. McCarver noted in his Oct. 16 letter in support of the initiative that the Columbia site is a National Historical Landmark and the move would “fulfill the last will and testament” of the 11th president of the US. Polk died a few months after leaving office in 1849. He was initially buried on the outskirts of town because of a city ordinance created to keep the spread of cholera in check. His will, however, stated he wanted to be buried at home: Polk Place in Nashville. He was exhumed and moved to the location nearly a year after his death at home: Polk Place in Nashville. He was exhumed and moved to the location nearly a year after his death but after his wife, Sarah, died in 1891, more than 50 family members initiated a legal battle that relocated the Polks again in 1893 to the Tennessee State Capitol. The House of Representatives would have to pass a joint resolution and the Tennessee Historical Commission and the Tennessee Capitol Commission would each have to sign off before the Chancery Court of Davidson County makes the final determination on whether the tombs can be moved. https://www.tennessean.com/story/news/local/cheatham/2018/01/09/mccarver-supports-debated-move-president-james-k-polks-tomb/1016757001/

TEXAS

Since 2012, a painted sign proclaiming “Be Someone” has been displayed on a Union Pacific railroad trestle above Interstate 45, just outside downtown Houston. According to a petition on Change.org, the message should be protected as a historic landmark because it’s known as a symbol for the city. There are currently more than 16,000 signatures on the petition. However, Union Pacific, which owns the bridge, is opposed to the designation. Jeff DeGraff, a spokesperson for the railroad, said they support the message and the sentiment, but not the historic designation. “Any application of artwork is a potential safety threat to both the artists, as well as the trains and the automobiles below it,” said DeGraff. He added that Union Pacific is aware of the petition and has no plans to change or alter the bridge. Minnette Boesel, who chairs the 13 member Historic Commission for the city of Houston said no form of street art has ever been given historic status. In a statement Boesel said, “...While we applaud those wanting to preserve a symbolic urban artwork through city historic designation the possibility is challenging. The online petition calls for designation as a “Protected Landmark” which requires owner approval/consent...The language in the city’s Historic Preservation Ordinance provides for a process for the designation of buildings, structures, historic districts, objects and sites (such as archeological) that meet certain criteria stated in the ordinance. The term “artwork” is not included in the language...” Therefore, at least for the moment, it appears unlikely that the artwork will become a landmark. https://www.houstonpublicmedia.org/articles/news/2018/01/04/259775/con-graffiti-art-become-historic/
The National Alliance of Preservation Commissions is excited to announce its eleventh biennial FORUM in Des Moines, Iowa, July 18-22, 2018. Join us and discover the latest trends in preservation and receive valuable training through a combination of educational sessions, tours and workshops. NAPC FORUM is always a great opportunity to network with your fellow preservationists and professionals in the field.

### Early Bird Registration
*April 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Early Bird</th>
<th>Regular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Member</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>$275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Day</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FORUM Hotel:
Embassy Suites Des Moines: Main Conference Hotel – Rate of $159 per night plus limited government rate rooms available.

### Conference Schedule:
Conference pre-sessions open on the afternoon of Wednesday, July 18, tours and pre-sessions on Thursday, July 19, full conference sessions begins on Friday, July 20 through noon on Sunday, July 22, 2018.

For more information on attending FORUM 2018, becoming a sponsor, and general questions contact NAPC at director@napcommissions.org or 757-802-4141.
Become part of the national network of local preservation, historic district, and landmark commissions and boards of architectural review. Organized to help local preservation programs succeed through education, advocacy, and training, the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions is the only national nonprofit organization dedicated to local preservation commissions and their work. NAPC is a source of information and support for local commissions and serves as a unifying body giving them a national voice. As a member of NAPC, you will benefit from the experience and ideas of communities throughout the United States working to protect historic districts and landmarks through local legislation, education, and advocacy.

MEMBERSHIP CATEGORIES

$20.00
• Student

$35.00
• Individual Membership

$50.00
• Commissions: Municipal/county population less than 5,000*
• Local nonprofit organizations

$100
• Commissions: Municipal/county population of 5,000 to 50,000*
• Regional or statewide nonprofit organizations

$150
• Commissions: Municipal/county population greater than 50,000*
• State Historic Preservation Offices
• Federal Agencies
• National nonprofit organizations

PROFESSIONAL NETWORK

$150
• Consultants/Consulting Firms
• Businesses/Companies
• Other Professional Services

In addition to receiving all NAPC membership benefits, Professional members are listed in the NAPC Professional Network Directory at http://napcommissions.org/directory.

* Membership includes all commission members and staff. Please provide complete list of members with names, phone numbers and email addresses for additional digital copies.

$250 CHAIRS CIRCLE
$500 FOUNDERS CIRCLE

Half of all premium membership dues support NAPC’s student internship and Forum scholarship programs.

THE ALLIANCE REVIEW GREEN FEE

$30.00
Please include this Green Fee in addition to the membership fees above to receive a quarterly, print version of The Alliance Review in the mail.