

**State Historic Preservation Review Board Meeting  
May 18 and 19, 2012, Flathead National Forest Supervisor's Office Building,  
Kalispell, Montana**

**Minutes**

**May 18, 2012**

**Board Members Present:** Tim Urbaniak, Jon Axline, Lesley Gilmore, Miki Wilde, Jeff Shelden, Deb Hronek, Don Matlock, Tim Light, Rosalyn LaPier

**State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) Staff:** Mark Baumler (SHPO), John Boughton, Kate Hampton, Pete Brown

**Guests:** Jordan Smith, Christine Brown, Abaki Beck, Jim Lekander, Gail Burger

**Call to Order-8:08 a.m.:** Chairman Tim Light called the meeting to order. Mr. Light read the board mission statement, and asked for the board, SHPO personnel, and guests to introduce themselves.

**SHPO Preservation News-8:15 a.m.:** John Boughton briefed the Review Board about several subjects including:

**“Diggers” and “American Diggers”**—two television shows currently airing that promote site looting.

**Preserve America IV grant (Preservation Planning) update:** Ongoing monitoring of \$150,500 in sub-grants to six Montana Preserve America communities, Montana Mainstreet, and the Museums Association of Montana (MAM). MAM completed its 2011 update to the 1999 economic impact study of Montana museums and released its results at the 2012 MAM meeting in Bozeman, March 23-25. All other PAIV sub-grant projects are due by June, 2012.

**CLG Update**—Columbus and Stillwater County completed paperwork to become a new CLG program.

**Retirement of Josef Warhank, Compliance Officer:** Replaced by Kathryn Sears.

**State Historic Preservation Plan Update.** Questionnaires handed out to board to complete.

**Properties listed since January 2012 Review Board Meeting:**

- Deer Medicine Rocks NHL
- Ft. Benton NHL Boundary Clarification
- O.S. Warden Bridge
- Shonkin Creek Bridge
- Locate Creek Bridge
- Fred Robinson Bridge
- Orange Street Underpass
- Marias River Bridge
- Huntley Bridge

Mossman Overpass  
Ft. Missoula HD Addendum and Boundary Increase

**Potential Upcoming nominations:**

Babcock Theatre (Billings)  
Huseby House (Helena)  
Great Falls High School  
John Ervin Homestead (Fergus County)

**8:30 a.m.** Mr. Light asked to begin the consideration of nominations.

**Consideration of Nominations:**

**1) Western Life Insurance Company Helena Branch Office (Helena)**

Mr. Light introduced the nomination's author, Christine Brown of the Montana Preservation Alliance, who presented the nomination. The property was presented as significant under Criterion C.

The following issues discussed by the Review Board are to be addressed prior to submittal to the Keeper of the National Register:

*Questions and Comments from the Review Board:*

- The upper windows on the original south elevation drawings aren't present. Were the plans changed or design modified? [The windows were added; this was noted in the nomination.]
- What type of roof currently covers the building?

Mr. Matlock motioned for the nomination, with the discussed edits, to be forwarded to the Keeper. Ms. Gilmore seconded the motion. The Review Board unanimously concurred. Motion passed.

**2) Dayton State Bank (Dayton)**

Mr. Light introduced Christine Brown of the Montana Preservation Alliance, who presented the nomination. The property was presented as significant under criteria A and C.

The following issues discussed by the Review Board are to be addressed prior to submittal to the Keeper of the National Register:

*Questions and Comments from the Review Board:*

- Any historic photographs found? [None to date.]
- Delete the discussion of Lewis and Clark as it is irrelevant to the nomination.
- The property can be forwarded under local and state significance.

Mr. Sheldon motioned for the nomination, with the discussed edits, to be forwarded to the Keeper. Mr. Axline seconded the motion. The Review Board unanimously concurred. Motion passed.

### **3) Garfield School (Billings)**

Mr. Light introduced the nomination's author, Jordan Smith of High Plains Architects, who presented the nomination. The property was presented as significant under criteria A and C.

The following issues discussed by the Review Board are to be addressed prior to submittal to the Keeper of the National Register:

#### *Questions and Comments from the Review Board:*

- The date on page 2 of the photographs needs to change from “1943” to “1934”.
- Clarify the style of the latest addition—Neo Classical?
- Change the period of significance from “1901-1948” to “1920-1962”.
- Make it obvious/clarify the original building no longer exists.
- Reduce the discussion of the original building as it no longer exists. Discuss it in terms of its influence on the extant 1920 addition.
- Expand the World War I and II discussions a bit due to their importance in the growth of Billings.
- Further discuss the importance of the oil boom in Billings.
- Provide a broader acknowledgement of the other tribes in the area.
- Provide a small discussion of the other (non-stone) schools in the area that predate the Garfield School.
- Provide a better transition between the discussion of the original (1901) building and the subsequent building of the nomination's focus. Maybe use headers to differentiate them.
- Include a description of the interior from the “Part I” tax credit forms provided to the SHPO office.
- Explain why the school was named “Garfield”.
- Change Wikipedia references to original sources; in general, never use Wikipedia as a reference in a National Register nomination.
- Review for consistency the use of “Classical” and Neo-Classical”. State it is a simple version of Neo-Classical.
- Check for typos.

Mr. Matlock motioned for the nomination, with the discussed edits, to be forwarded to the Keeper. Mr. Axline seconded the motion. The Review Board unanimously concurred. Motion passed.

The description of the interior will be reviewed by Ms. Gilmore prior to forwarding the nomination to the Keeper.

#### **(4) Coram Hotel (Hotel Libby) (Libby)**

Mr. Light introduced the nomination's author, Gail Burger, who presented the nomination. The property was presented as significant under Criterion A.

The following issues discussed by the Review Board are to be addressed prior to submittal to the Keeper of the National Register:

*Questions and Comments from the Review Board:*

- Change the period of significance from “1910-1972” to “1910-1962”.
- Change the BNSF reference from “railroad” to “railway”.
- Incorporate the technical edits from the review board.

Ms. Wilde motioned for the nomination, with the discussed edits, to be forwarded to the Keeper. Mr. Urbaniak seconded the motion. The Review Board unanimously concurred. Motion passed.

**Break-10:15**

**Reconvene-10:35**

#### **(5) University Heights Historic District (Darby)**

Mr. Light introduced Kate Hampton of the Montana State Historic Preservation Office, who presented the nomination. The property was presented as significant under Criterion A.

The following issues discussed by the Review Board are to be addressed prior to submittal to the Keeper of the National Register:

*Questions and Comments from the Review Board:*

- Mention draftswoman Mary Mahoney in the nomination.
- Include a small discussion of Frank Lloyd Wright.
- Fix the geographic discrepancies—the Sapphire Mountains are east and the Bitterroot Mountains are west.

Mr. Matlock motioned for the nomination, with the discussed edits, to be forwarded to the Keeper. Mr. Shelden seconded the motion. The Review Board unanimously concurred. Motion passed.

#### **(6) Lockridge Medical Clinic (Whitefish)**

Mr. Light introduced Kate Hampton of the Montana State Historic Preservation Office, who presented the nomination. The property was presented as significant under Criterion C.

The following issues discussed by the Review Board are to be addressed prior to submittal to the Keeper of the National Register:

*Questions and Comments from the Review Board:*

- Use of “Wrightian” vs. “Usonian” is fine.
- The changes to the roof addition are not sufficiently described in the Integrity statement.
- If this was the last medical center building designed by Wright it should be mentioned in the nomination.
- Change “concrete soffit” to “cementitious soffit”.

Ms. Wilde motioned for the nomination, with the discussed edits, to be forwarded to the Keeper. Mr. Urbaniak seconded the motion. The Review Board unanimously concurred. Motion passed.

**(7) Jocko River Bridge (Arlee vicinity)**

Mr. Light introduced the author, Jon Axline, who presented the nomination. The property was presented as significant under criteria A and C. The Review Board was informed that Lake County objected to listing the bridge.

The following issues discussed by the Review Board are to be addressed prior to submittal to the Keeper of the National Register:

*Questions and Comments from the Review Board:*

- Clarify if the guardrail is new.
- Clarify that the “Oregon fir” reference relates to the deck of the bridge.

Ms. Hronek motioned for the nomination, with the discussed edits, to be forwarded to the Keeper. Ms. Gilmore seconded the motion. The Review Board unanimously concurred, with Mr. Axline abstaining. Motion passed.

**Public Comment and Review Board New Business-11:30 a.m.**

Mr. Light called for public comment. There was none.

Ms. La Pier made a general observation regarding many of the nominations presented to the Review Board in terms of the historical narrative and context for the General Allotment Act (Dawes Act), the Homesteading Act and the opening of six of the seven Montana reservations to non-native homesteading. Montana’s history in this regard differs from other states. The *Kalispell Mainstreet Historic District Addendum and Boundary Increase* National Register nomination provides a good discussion of the sequence of events and serves as a good example. It should be recommended by SHPO staff for use in future nominations.

The Review Board discussed the use of Wikipedia as a reference; the board universally agreed it should be avoided.

The Review Board minutes from the January 20 and 21, 2012 meeting were approved. Mr. Axline motioned for the minutes to be approved. Ms. Hronek seconded the motion. The Review Board unanimously concurred. Motion passed.

SHPO Mark Baumler discussed the update of the Montana Historic Preservation Plan for 2013-2017. Review Board members will review the existing 2008-2012 Plan and send individual comments and recommendations to the SHPO. Part of the September 2012 Review Board meeting will be set aside for a final draft updated Plan discussion.

The Review Board decided the next meeting will occur on September 19 and 20, 2012 in Helena, in conjunction with the Montana History Conference.

### **Break-12:10**

### **Reconvene-12:40**

Mr. Light asked to begin discussion of the Senate Bill 3 agency reports of state-owned heritage property stewardship and the board's role in reporting to the Legislature.

Mr. Matlock briefed the Review Board and SHPO regarding the meetings of the three-person board committee tasked to review the state agency reports and outline the Board's report to the Legislature. As a result of these meetings the committee determined several questions important to the SB3 reporting, as follows:

- What has the Review Board learned about state-owned heritage properties?
  - No uniform opinion of what state-owned heritage properties are or what they actually mean.
  - A diversity of treatments exists.
- What does the board hope the agencies will learn?
  - Awareness of the properties they own.
  - Awareness of the maintenance needs of the properties.
  - Acknowledge their stewardship responsibilities.
- Given what was learned, what are the most important pieces to include in the board report to the Legislature?
- What do we hope the report accomplishes?
- Can this exercise be a teaching moment for the board, the agencies, and the legislature?

The committee also drafted letters of comments to the individual agencies and these drafts were previously distributed to the full Review Board and the SHPO for review. The board discussed the content of these letters and agreed they were ready, with final editing to be sent to the agencies after this meeting. SHPO agreed to assist the board in printing and mailing the letters.

The board proceeded to discuss a preliminary outline for their report to the Legislature, with the intent of produced a 10-12 page report. The basic structure of the report to be: Front Matter (Acknowledgements/Executive Summary); Introduction; Summary of Findings (following the 5 reporting content areas established in SB3); Recommendations; and Closing Statement.

**Recess until following morning-4:30**

**May 19, 2012**

**Board Members Present:** Tim Urbaniak, Lesley Gilmore, Deb Hronek, Don Matlock, Tim Light

**State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) Staff:** Mark Baumler (SHPO)

**Guests:** None

**Call to Order-8:50 a.m.:** Chairman Tim Light called the meeting to order.

The board resumed its discussion of and filling out of the outline of the report to the Legislature.

Upon completing the outline, the board agreed that the committee, with help and comment from SHPO, should draft the initial report following the outline to be distributed to the full board for comment and acceptance by July 13.

**Adjourn-10:30 a.m.**