

State Historic Preservation Review Board Meeting
January 20, 2012, The Montana Historical Society, Helena, Montana
January 21, 2012, The Downtown Holiday Inn, Helena, Montana

Minutes

January 20, 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

Guests: Eddie Greene, Angie Gifford

Call to Order-1:00 p.m.: Chairman Don Matlock called the meeting to order. Mr. Matlock read the board mission statement, and asked for the board, SHPO personnel, and guests to introduce themselves.

SHPO Preservation News-1:08 p.m.: John Boughton briefed the Review Board about several subjects including:

Position upgrade at SHPO Office—the upgrade of the office Administrative Clerk to Administrative Assistant owing to additional new duties.

Modernism Update—past and future activities:

- 1) SHPO hosted viewing of a Modernism documentary at the Historical Society on October 8, 2011.
- 2) Kate Hampton discussed the significance of the Modernist Montana Historical Society Building with the staff of the entire Historical Society on December 20, 2011.
- 3) Plans to make the current Modernism special exhibit displayed at the Historical Society into a travelling display.
- 4) Modernism public presentation by Rafael Chacon at the Montana Historical Society on January 12, 2012.
- 5) Preparation of a Historical Society Building brochure.
- 6) Possibility of assembling a Modern architecture teaching trunk through the Historical Society.
- 7) Tentatively publishing a Montana Modernist architecture article in the summer edition of the *Montana, the Magazine of Western History*, the Historical Society magazine.
- 8) Presentation of one Modernist building nomination, the Walt Sullivan Building, at the day's Review Board meeting.
- 9) Future Modernism nominations in preparation include the Little Western Life building in Helena and the Lockridge Medical Clinic in Whitefish.

Preserve America Update— Ongoing monitoring of 2011 SHPO Preserve America subgrants for preservation planning to 6 communities, Montana Mainstreet and the Museums Association of Montana. No new Preserve America Grant related projects coming through SHPO for the foreseeable future as no funding is included in current federal budget.

Deer Medicine Rocks NHL—the Advisory Board of the National Park System recommended National Historic Landmark designation for Deer Medicine Rocks in Rosebud County. The recommendation is forwarded to the National Park Service Director then to Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar, who officially designates NHLs.

CLG Update—Madison County commissioners passed a resolution to apply for an expansion of the existing CLG in Virginia City into a countywide CLG.

Preliminary ongoing discussions continue regarding Columbus and Stillwater County becoming a new CLG program.

SB3 Amendments to State Antiquities Act regarding state agency reporting on stewardship of state-owned heritage properties—a webpage has been developed on the SHPO website and forms and reports are posted on-line.

Upcoming nominations:

1:17 p.m. Mr. Matlock asked to begin the consideration of nominations.

Consideration of Nominations:

1) Glacier County Courthouse (Glacier County—Cut Bank)

Mr. Matlock introduced Kate Hampton of the Montana State Historic Preservation Office, co-author, who presented the nomination. The property was presented as significant under criteria A and C.

Questions and Comments from the Review Board:

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

- Add transitional phrases to smooth out the nomination.
- Include building plans, if possible.
- Discuss how Native Americans weren't allowed to vote at the time of the selection of the county seat and how it affected the final outcome.
- Remove quotes from around "treaties".
- Expound on the different systems of government in Glacier County (Glacier National Park, the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, and the Santa Rita Strip area).

- Indicate who the architect is for the 2009 addition.
- Provide more information regarding the integrity of the addition.
- Indicate how massing of the façade and addition are well articulated.
- Is McIver really a “Master” architect?
- Please add more information on McIver.
- Correct typographical errors.
- Add some comparison with other similar court houses.
- Make “WPA” and “PWA” consistent between the Glacier County Courthouse nomination and the bridge nominations presented at this board meeting by Jon Axline.

Ms. Gilmore motioned for the nomination, with the discussed edits, to be forwarded to the Keeper. Mr. Axline seconded the motion. Eight members of the Review Board concurred; Ms. LaPier did not concur. Motion passed.

Don Matlock asked that the revised nomination be sent to Review Board members prior to sending to the Keeper.

Break (2:00)

Reconvene (2:10)

2) the Walt Sullivan Building (Helena)

Mr. Matlock introduced Happy (Doris) Avery who authored and presented the nomination to the Board. The nomination was prepared under contract to SHPO as part of SHPO’s Modernist architecture initiative. The property was presented as significant under criteria A and C.

Questions and Comments from the Review Board:

The following issues discussed by the Review Board are to be addressed prior to submittal of the nomination to the Keeper.

- Please add more information on Walt Sullivan, which can be included in a footnote.
- Add, if possible, information regarding it being the “largest clearspan structure in the nation”? Anything in the records indicating this choice?
- Please elaborate on the use of local materials (other than travertine).
- Mention no Capitol Master Plan existed when the building was constructed; Capitol campus buildings were constructed according to available space.
- Add additional engineering drawings showing elevations to the nomination, if they can be located.
- Add a paragraph better explaining the growth of state government and explaining the government was planning on the additional employee growth, hence the construction of the building.
- Provide more information on the louvers; how did they operate?

- Add the Criterion A callout under the conclusion.
- Edit the first summary paragraph.
- Photo 2 –the direction may be inaccurate.

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

3) Montana’s Historic Steel Stringer and Steel Girder Bridges, 1901-1961 Multiple Property Document (MPD) and eight accompanying bridge nominations

Mr. Matlock welcomed Jon Axline, historian and Review Board member, who authored and presented the MPD and nominations to the Board. Mr. Axline provided background on the MPD, which focused on Montana Department of Transportation (MDT) owned or inspected bridges. While many historic steel stringer and steel girder bridges are eligible under Criterion C, some are also considered eligible under Criterion A. The history of the development of steel stringer and girder bridges, the general distribution and age of building, and the registration criteria for significance and integrity are explained in the MPD.

The following issues discussed by the Review Board need to be addressed prior to submittal of the MPD and individual nominations to the Keeper.

Questions and Comments from the Review Board:

- Better define and clarify “stringer” and “girder”.
- Double check whether nominations should indicate “state” or “local” significance. Justify designated level of significance in nominations.
- The MPD states under registration criteria that guardrails need to be original but the guardrails of the **Mossmain Overpass** and **Fred Robinson Bridge** are not original. Recommend that the MPD needs to be changed to be in sync with the nominations. Consider altering MPD criteria to allow for in-kind or compatible replacements.
- How do stringer and girder bridges in Montana compare to these types of bridges nationally? Are they based on a similar standard? Mention in MPD.
- Include in the individual nominations what the bridge is/was used for – why it was built.
- Please explain in the **Mossmain Overpass** how an underpass is built under an active railroad.
- Measurements on the Marias River Bridge don’t match. Check measurements for all bridge nominations.
- Please quickly explain the “bad experiences” of Thomas Stanton as it leaves the reader hanging (footnote).
- Does the **Huntley Bridge** possess its original guardrails or not? Fix.
- **Mossmain Overpass**—does the approach description refer to each or the total?

Ms. Gilmore motioned for the MPD and accompanying individual nominations, with the discussed edits, be forwarded to the Keeper. Ms. Wilde seconded the motion. The Review Board unanimously concurred (Mr. Axline abstained). Motion passed.

Break (3:50)

Reconvene (4:00)

The two new Review Board members, Debra Hronek and Tim Urbaniak, described their backgrounds.

Public Comment (4:05)

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

New Business (4:05)

Mr. Matlock called for approval of the September 2011 Meeting Minutes, which were approved unanimously by the Review Board.

Mr. Matlock called for nominations for the next Board chairperson. Ms. Gilmore nominated Tim Light; the Review Board proffered no other names. Mr. Shelden seconded the motion of Mr. Light serving as chairperson. The Review Board concurred unanimously.

The Review Board discussed locations and dates for the next meeting in May. The Review Board agreed to hold the meeting on May 18th and 19th in the Kalispell/Whitefish area. The location of the September meeting was also discussed; options include Helena or Lewistown.

Recess until the following morning, January 21 (4:23)

January 21, 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, Peter Brown, Kate Hampton

Guests: Patrick Rennie (DNRC), Kevin Chappell (DNRC)

Reconvene (8:30 a.m.): Chairman Tim Light called the meeting to order. He asked for the Board, SHPO personnel, and guests to introduce themselves.

Mr. Light described the purpose of the meeting this day was to discuss the Board's responsibility to report and make recommendations to the Legislature under the 2011 Senate Bill 3 (SB3) amendments to the State Antiquities Act requiring state agencies to report biennially to the Board on their stewardship of state-owned heritage properties (properties in or eligible for listing in the National Register). State agency reports are due to the Board this cycle by February 7, 2012.

Mr. Light requested Dr. Baumler provide an overview of SB3. Dr. Baumler discussed the origins of the bill, reviewed background on information and guidance SHPO and the Board provided the agencies for the completion of the reports, described what is supposed to be included in reports submitted by the agencies, and offered ideas on what the Board's approach might be on reporting this information and making its recommendations to the Legislature.

The Board discussed its reporting under SB3. Objectives and possible goals/ideas discussed by the Review Board in reporting and making recommendations to the Legislature included:

- 1) Providing over-arching ideas for improvement of agency management and reporting (i.e., the importance of completing an inventory by each agency or having an inventory policy in place);
- 2) Limiting the size of the Board's report to not overwhelm the designated audience;
- 3) Providing general cross-agency observations and recommendations along with individual information specific to each agency that highlights the agencies' endangered properties and concerns;
- 4) Using the format of state agency reports to organize the Board's report to the Legislature;
- 5) Focusing on best practices, endangered sites, and management recommendations;
- 6) Note the unfunded bill takes agency and SHPO personnel away from other duties;
- 7) Provide direct feedback to the agencies regarding what the Review Board liked or felt wasn't needed in their reports to the Review Board to assist in future reporting;
- 8) Discussion of mechanics and schedule for developing a report by June 30 in the context of only one more full Review Board meeting in May 2012;
- 9) Inclusion of a generalized summary table providing information on the total number and type of Heritage properties reported, and their overall reported status and condition;
- 10) Inclusion of a graphical map showing the locations of state-owned heritage properties or the number of state-owned heritage properties by county;
- 11) Discussion of state agency budget needs for stewardship and management of heritage properties.

After general discussion of SB3, the Review Board appointed a subcommittee to execute a framework for reporting to the Legislature and providing feedback to the individual agencies. Volunteer subcommittee members include Tim Light, Lesley Gilmore, and Don Matlock who agreed to meet on their own time in early March to begin this work. Review Board members not serving on the subcommittee were asked to review the submitted state agency reports (posted on SHPO website) and provide written input to the subcommittee. Dr. Baumler offered that SHPO staff would also review and develop

notes on individual state agency reports to give to the subcommittee for its work in March. The subcommittee will lead the Board in the development of the final report and recommendations to the Legislature at the Board's May 2012 meeting.

Meeting Adjournment (11:45): Mr. Light motioned to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Axline seconded the motion which passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.