



## A NOTE FROM THE EDITOR...

Welcome to the newest edition of the newsletter for the Committee on Historic and Archaeological Preservation (A1F05)! It has been sometime since our last newsletter, however, I believe that we have a system set up now that will ensure continued production. Our goal is to publish the newsletter twice a year, in October and in May. Hopefully we can also begin to work towards an all electronic newsletter, which could be updated more frequently, and with greater ease.

I think that we have created a newsletter that contains information and articles that are pertinent to the purpose and goal of the committee, and I hope that we can continue this with future editions. If you have any thoughts or suggestions for future articles, please let me know!

Having said that, I want to call your attention to an important issue that was discovered through the production of this newsletter. The committee mailing list is very out of date. So please take a moment to confirm your name and address on the mailing label of your newsletter, and email me to let me know if the information is correct or not. (I would appreciate an email even if all the mailing information is correct – that way I can make a note that your information is correct, and I can also add your email address to the list.) Along the same lines, if you know of someone who did not receive their copy of the newsletter, please ask them to contact me so that we can check their contact information.

Before ending, I just want to thank everyone who helped get this newsletter finished. It definitely wouldn't have happened without all of you!

I hope to see many of you at the Summer Meeting and I look forward to hearing from all of you. If you have any suggestions for future newsletters, please don't hesitate to contact me!

Sincerely,

Mary Alfson  
Newsletter Editor  
malfson@chrsinc.com

### Table of Contents:

A Note From the Editor	pg. 1
“Regulation is Not Preservation” By Bob Newbery	pg. 2
New From Maryland...	pg. 2
“Historic Residential Suburbs – A New National Register Bulletin” By Linda McClellan	pg. 3
A1F05 Website	pg. 3
“Taking It on the Road: National Register Documentation Becomes Available Over the Internet” By Sarah Pope	pg. 4
“King County's Cultural Resources Protection Project” By Fennelle Miller	pg. 5-6
General Reminders	pg. 6

**“REGULATION IS NOT  
PRESERVATION”**

By Bob Newberry, Wisconsin DOT

That was the aphorism guiding participants in the A1F05 Historic Preservation Workshop at the 81<sup>st</sup> TRB Annual Meeting. Put together by Bob Newberry, WisDOT, and Margaret Buss, CalTrans, with assistance from Leslie Schwab, OregonDOT, the workshop attracted 16 participants ranging from 20-year cultural resource veterans to an engineer whose new job (about to begin) included oversight of the cultural resource section. The workshop began with a warm-up drill to ask the question, “In your experience, who can be overly ‘bureaucratic’ (rigid) in the Section 106 process?”

Participants then tackled the issue of bureaucratic rigidity as an obstacle to streamlining by working to conclude the Section 106 process for a series of specific projects. The projects included a bridge replacement, a proposal for widening two lanes to four in a suburbanizing fringe around Milwaukee, a major freeway interchange reconstruction in an area containing Native American burials in California, and a house relocation (mitigation for a runway extension). True to Margaret’s pre-workshop prediction, it did not take much to get cultural resource practitioners off and talking!

The case study materials included project descriptions, copies of the regulations, copies of guideline materials (such as the ACHP’s *A Citizen’s Guide*, and WisDOT’s briefer version of public involvement, *History & Highways*). “Wild cards” --sudden changes in the scenario due to last minute developments --were prepared for use by the facilitator in case any group thought they had successfully solved a case study! At the end of the four-hour session, there was general consensus that the opportunity to interact with fellow practitioners was valuable and the case study approach provided appropriate focus and structure.

Copies of the materials used in the workshop will be available at the summer meeting of A1F05 in Kansas City, and a coaching session for those

wanting to use the workshop/case study format for their own training session is possible.

If you would like more information, please contact Bob Newberry by email at:

robert.newberry@dot.state.wi.us.

**NEW FROM MARYLAND...**

**The "Suburbanization Historic Context and Survey Methodology"**

The "Suburbanization Historic Context and Survey Methodology" was developed specifically for the I-495/I-95 Corridor Transportation Study in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area of Maryland. However, because the context also discusses suburban development in Baltimore, it has statewide applicability. The report identifies the variety of residential, commercial and civic developments which transformed the landscape in and around Washington D.C. and Baltimore beginning in the nineteenth century. Two important aspects of the context are the identification of patterns of development and CDEs for various types of suburban development in planned and unplanned neighborhoods, and the creation of individual Community Summary Sheets which capture the important features of many areas in Prince George’s and Montgomery counties, Maryland.

Maryland also has the following new contexts, available at their website:

- Historic Highway Bridges in Maryland: 1631-1960, Historic Context Report
- Small Structures on Maryland’s Roadways, Historic Context Report

For more information, please visit:

<<http://www.marylandroads.com/ontheroad.htm>>

**HISTORIC RESIDENTIAL SUBURBS – A  
NEW NATIONAL REGISTER BULLETIN**

By Linda McClellan, National Register of Historic Places

The body of literature on America's suburbanization is vast and growing, covering many disciplines and reflecting diverse opinions. The National Register will soon be publishing the bulletin, *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Historic Residential Suburbs*, which brings together information about current scholarship and preservation practice relating to the history of suburban neighborhoods in the United States. The bulletin has been developed by Dr. David L. Ames of the Center for Historic Architecture and Design, University of Delaware, and National Register historian, Linda Flint McClelland, in tandem with a national multiple property listing entitled, "Historic Residential Suburbs in the United States, 1830-1960, MPS" under which related properties may be listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

Because suburban neighborhoods were generally platted, subdivided, and developed according to a plan, often following the professional principles of design practiced by community planners and landscape architects, the bulletin puts forth a landscape approach, consistent with that presented in earlier National Register Bulletins on designed and rural historic landscapes. The landscape approach is based on an understanding that suburban neighborhoods possess important landscape characteristics, such as spatial organization and circulation networks, and typically took form in a three-layered process that called for 1) the selection of location; 2) the platting and layout of a subdivision; and 3) the design of each house and yard.

The bulletin presents a framework for identifying suburban property types based on chronological periods that correspond to advances in transportation technology, such as the 1887 introduction of the electric streetcar or the

expansion of freeways in the 1950s. The historic context on suburbanization examines patterns of suburbanization from various perspectives, including domestic land use, subdivision design, suburban housing types, and the landscape design of neighborhoods and suburban yards. A wide variety of topics are covered, including the highly influential FHA principles of housing and subdivision design of the 1930s, trends in African-American suburbanization, the evolution of prefabricated methods of house construction, and the influence of popular magazines on garden design.

The bulletin outlines a context-based approach to identification and evaluation and encourages the development of local contexts at the local or metropolitan level. Many sources are recommended for further reading and for researching local suburban history and historic neighborhoods.

Together, the bulletin and MPS are intended to encourage the expansion of existing historic resources surveys, foster the development of local and metropolitan suburbanization contexts, and facilitate the nomination of residential historic districts and other suburban places to the National Register. For further information contact the National Register at 202-343-9536, or watch for the bulletin online at <[www.nr.nps.gov/](http://www.nr.nps.gov/)>.

**A1F05 COMMITTEE WEBSITE**

<<http://itre.ncsu.edu/a1f05/A1F05.htm>>

**Please check out the Committee Website!!**

**Comments and suggestions can be emailed to Hope Luhman at [hluhman@louisberger.com](mailto:hluhman@louisberger.com)**

**TAKING IT ON THE ROAD: NATIONAL REGISTER DOCUMENTATION BECOMES AVAILABLE OVER THE INTERNET**

By Sarah Dillard Pope, Historian, National Register of Historic Places, National Park Service

In 1994, Diane Miller reported on the valuable uses of the National Register Information System (NRIS) and the National Register collection, in her *CRM* article, "National Register Information is a Hidden Treasure." At that time, on-line access to the NRIS was only available for states and Federal agencies. The general public could request from the Register hard copy print-outs if they needed a list of properties in their communities or the answer to a specific question. The National Register had not yet created a Web site (the Web site debuted in 1995) and was only exploring the possibilities of this rather new technology. The database was, nonetheless, an important source of information for policy analysis, project planning, community awareness, and research. Eight years later, the NRIS remains an important source of information, but is now an expanded and more accessible tool. Providing names of properties, their addresses, associated data elements (such as architectural style, significant dates, and applicable National Register criteria) and links to pertinent National Park Service Web sites, the NRIS now links to quad maps for all National Register listings (except those that are address restricted, most commonly archaeological sites).

In 2000, the National Register began to explore the possibility of digitizing its entire collection and integrating that information with the NRIS by consulting the Cornell Institute for Digital Collections on issues associated with conversion, funding, on-demand digitization, and database management. After meeting with representatives of the National Register and the National Historic Landmarks Survey and inspecting the collection, CIDC presented its findings to the program in the fall of 2001. With these recommendations, the National Register developed a work plan for digitizing the collection and making it available through the NRIS.

The first phase of the project, currently underway, is the digitization of the Multiple Property Documentation Forms or thematic covers. The National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form nominates groups of related significant properties. On it, the themes, trends, and patterns of history shared by the properties are organized into *historic contexts*, *property types*, and *registration requirements*. The Multiple Property Documentation Form may be used to evaluate, nominate and register thematically-related historic properties simultaneously, or to establish the registration and eligibility requirements for properties that may be nominated in the future.

The National Register chose to first digitize the thematic covers because as a management tool, the thematic approach can furnish essential information for historic preservation planning. They provide historic context information that can be used widely to assist in project planning, in identifying and evaluating cultural resources, and for public education and interpretation and other research. Furthermore, during the 1999 National Forum on Assessing Historic Significance for Transportation Programs, sponsored by the Transportation Research Board, the Federal Highway Administration and the National Park Service, participants recommended that existing historic contexts be made available to transportation planners, other preservation professionals and the public via the Internet. By spring 2002, the Register projects that approximately 700 historic contexts will be digitized. The next phase of the project will be the digitization of individual nomination forms.

With 3,400 user sessions recorded on the NRIS each week and approximately 194,000 pages of National Register documentation copied and distributed to the public each year, there is a clear demand for full-text versions of National Register thematic covers and nominations. By providing this information through the Web, the National Register hopes to assist agencies in identifying and evaluating cultural resources for planning projects and registration, and increase the public's awareness of the role historic places play in preserving America's heritage.

**KING COUNTY'S CULTURAL  
RESOURCE PROTECTION PROGRAM**

By Fennelle Miller, Archaeologist  
King County Dept. of Transportation, Road  
Services Division.

In early 2000 a Transportation Enhancement Act grant was received by King County to undertake a multi-part project. Two main goals of this project – the “Cultural Resources Protection Project” or CRPP – were to develop and populate a “digital library” for cultural resources in King County, and to develop an archaeological sensitivity model using GIS. Neither goal, in and of itself, is revolutionary. What is new and exciting is the scope of the CRPP.

The project is overseen jointly by staff from the King County Department of Transportation, Road Services Division, and the King County Office of Cultural Resources, a CLG. Another important member of the Project Steering Committee is the County Tribal Liaison.

The “digital library” is based upon one comprehensive project database that is designed to accommodate a variety of cultural resource data types: ethnographic places, archaeological sites (recorded and suspected), TCPs, historic structures, and cultural resource survey reports.

Although this project has experienced the usual “scope creep,” this occurrence has been a benefit in this instance. We have been able to take advantage of opportunities to take on numerous tasks related to, but not specifically addressed in the original scope.

Some pluses: First, because we have been working closely with the three tribes with the most interest in our County, we have increased our regular project tribal consultation more than three-fold. Previously, if the project had no Section 106 nexus, tribal consultation was generally not conducted. Now it is *de rigeur* for all projects, regardless of funding or permitting. Personal relationships are being forged between engineers and tribal cultural resources personnel.

Second, we have been able to produce the first seamless digital soils coverage for the entire county, and we are disseminating that to all who need it. This will benefit many agencies, including our own.

Third, we have digitized GLO maps and scanned GLO notes. The cultural features on the GLO maps have been digitized as separate ArcView themes, and the GLO notes have been scanned and are being bundled by Section, Township, and Range. Again, not only will this be useful for the CRPP, but King County land surveyors are excited to have this information readily available for the first time.

Fourth, we partnered with the Burke Museum. The museum holds archaeological records and collections dating from the 1890s. The collections and records not associated with formally recorded sites have never been analyzed or disseminated in any sort of meaningful way. From the museum records and collections, we were able to identify over 150 as-yet unrecorded archaeological “places” in King County. This nearly doubles the number of recorded pre-contact archaeological sites with which we began the project (n=161).

Other tasks performed for this project include an intensive review of ethnographic sources, and the extraction of ethnographic places (n=472). These have all been digitized and entered into the main project database. Obscure sources have been scanned.

The project database holds cultural resource report data, recorded and otherwise “known” archaeological site data, TCP records, historic structures data, and ethnographic resource data. Locational data for all of these classes of data are in GIS themes for use in ArcView.

Next steps include completion of an in-depth historic context/research design for archaeological sites and ethnographic resources to 1860 for a wide region around our county (contact was 1851 for this area), and development of an archaeological sensitivity model. Unlike the

## Preservation Notes...

("Cultural Resource Protection Project Continued...")

MnModel and other large modeling projects, the King County archaeological model will be deductive, based upon the historic context. Initial testing of the model will be completed using the recorded sites. This approach is expected to help address issues of eligibility under Criterion D by

providing a detailed discussion of existing and missing data types.

The model is expected to be completed by the end of this year, and procedures will be developed during the first half of 2003. Expect to hear more about the project in the near future!

---

### **DON'T FORGET.....**

To please take a moment to verify that the name, title, and address on your mailing label are correct. Then send an email to Mary either confirming that your information is correct or supplying your updated information!

[malfson@chrsinc.com](mailto:malfson@chrsinc.com)

Thank you!!!!

### **AND DON'T FORGET.....**

**To register for the Summer Meeting**

**“The Historic Context and Context-Sensitive Design”**

**In Kansas City, Missouri**

**July 18<sup>th</sup> – 20<sup>th</sup>**