Heritage in the Landscape
Contents

VOL. 32, NO. 3

Cultural Landscapes and the National Register
BARBARA WYATT ......................................................... 3

Large-Landscape Conservation: A New Frontier for Cultural Heritage
BRENDA BARRETT ................................................... 13

Honoring and Preserving Hawaiian Cultural Landscapes
BY DAVIANNA PŌMAIKĀ’I MCGREGOR ............................. 22

Stewarding and Activating the Landscape of the Farnsworth House
SCOTT MEHAFFEY, .................................................. 30

Tribal Heritage at the Grand Canyon: Protecting a Large Ethnographic Landscape to Sustain Living Traditions
BRIAN R. TURNER ............................... 41

Meshing Conservation and Preservation Goals with the National Register
ELIZABETH DURFEE HENGEN AND JENNIFER GOODMAN ....... 50

Adapting to Maintain a Timeless Garden at Filoli
KARA NEWPORT ..................................................... 61

Cover: Beach Ridges on the Shore of Cape Krusenstern, part of Cape Krusenstern National Monument in Alaska
PHOTO COURTESY OF NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

The National Trust for Historic Preservation works to save America’s historic places for the next generation. We take direct, on-the-ground action when historic buildings and sites are threatened. Our work helps build vibrant, sustainable communities. We advocate with governments to save America’s heritage. We strive to create a cultural legacy that is as diverse as the nation itself so that all of us can take pride in our part of the American story.

Forum Journal, a publication of the National Trust for Historic Preservation (ISSN 1536-1072), is published by the Preservation Resources Department at the National Trust for Historic Preservation, 2600 Virginia Avenue, NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20037 as a benefit of National Trust Forum membership. Forum members also receive four issues of Preservation magazine. Annual dues start at $195. Send email address changes to members@savingplaces.org. Copyright ©2019 National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States. Of the total amount of base dues, $6.00 is for a subscription for Preservation magazine for one year. Support for the National Trust is provided by membership dues; endowment funds; individual, corporate and foundation contributions; and grants from state and federal agencies. The National Trust Forum Journal is a channel for expressing opinions, encouraging debate, and conveying information of importance and of general interest to Forum members of the National Trust. Inclusion of material or product references does not constitute an endorsement by the National Trust for Historic Preservation.
Cultural Landscapes and the National Register

BARBARA WYATT

Efforts to recognize and preserve cultural landscapes date to the earliest days of America’s preservation movement. Consider Ann Pamela Cunningham’s work to save Mount Vernon, which began in 1853. Familiar to every preservationist, the story of Miss Cunningham’s crusade may have focused on George Washington’s house, but she and the organization she founded—the Mount Vernon Ladies’ Association of the Union—also anticipated restoring the gardens and wider landscape that Washington was known to have loved. Similarly, the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation sought to restore the landscape of Monticello after acquiring the property in 1923.

An aerial view of the landscape surrounding Thomas Jefferson’s Monticello.
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When the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) was passed in 1966, the historic parks of the National Park System were listed in the National Register of Historic Places, as were the National Historic Landmarks that had previously been designated. Approximately 800 such properties, ranging in area from 2 million acres to less than one acre, were listed in the National Register in 1966—and a number of these first listings had landscape significance.

Like all properties nominated to the National Register, landscapes must correspond with the five property types specified in the NHPA: a building, site, district, structure, or object significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture. Landscapes are generally nominated to the National Register as sites or districts, although many are listed because they contribute to the significance of a building or structure. In such cases, the landscape is included within the nominated boundary and the nomination addresses its significance.

Properties must have boundaries drawn according to the guidance established for all nominations—acreage not directly related to the significance of the property and buffer zones intended to “protect” the property should not be included. The area that retains integrity should be included and boundaries should be natural or human-made features, depending on the property.1

It may not be widely understood, but the National Register has always accepted nominations for significant landscapes, and listing them is neither onerous nor unusual. Nonetheless, listings of cultural landscapes lag well behind those of other resources.

SPECIFIC GUIDANCE FOR CULTURAL LANDSCAPES

The term “cultural landscape” is difficult to find in National Register regulations and guidance materials. This may be surprising, given that one of the most frequently quoted definitions of “cultural landscape” is found in National Park Service (NPS) materials. Per the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes, a cultural landscape is:

“A geographic area (including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein),
associated with a historic event, activity, or person or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values. There are four general types of cultural landscapes, not mutually exclusive: historic sites, historic designed landscapes, historic vernacular landscapes, and ethnographic landscapes.”

Several years before the Secretary of the Interior’s guidelines for cultural landscapes were published, the National Register had opted to use the term “historic landscapes,” with a focus on designed and rural historic landscapes, because of evident public interest. National Register bulletins were prepared for both categories of landscapes in 1987 and 1989, respectively, and included explanations of typical designed and rural landscapes as well as specific guidance for documenting, evaluating, and registering them. The two broad categories are intended to encompass nearly any type of historic landscape, although the rural landscapes bulletin focuses on agricultural properties. A designed historic landscape might be a park, a zoo, an estate, or a campus. A rural historic landscape might be a single farm or broader agricultural area, an industrial site, a natural reserve, or a conservation area.

Historic orchards at Filoli, a site of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, in Woodside, CA. The extended landscape of the property is a key component of the estate’s National Register nomination.
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But the National Register’s guidance also acknowledges that the significance of landscapes is varied; thus, the terminology for identifying landscapes is not rigid. A nomination can use descriptors that are not included in the bulletins, so long as they are accompanied by explanations and context. Nominations for vernacular landscapes, evocative landscapes, cultural landscapes, and so on have been accompanied by statements of significance explaining the terminology.

UNINTENDED NEGLECT
Although not deliberately intended to exclude landscapes from consideration for the National Register, common early practices by state historic preservation officers, the NPS, and academic preservation programs have had that effect. Landscapes have often been excluded from consideration in windshield and intensive surveys, boundaries have been drawn too tightly around building clusters in National Register nominations, and attention has not been invested in developing a standard vocabulary or instructions for describing and evaluating landscapes. No doubt, many communities were focused on ameliorating the building losses suffered with Urban Renewal and the effects of post-war development. By the 1980s landscapes were not on all preservationists’ front burners. Today, however, most federal, state, and tribal historic preservation offices, as well as many local historic preservation programs, consider landscapes important cultural resources.

DIVERSE CULTURAL LANDSCAPES ON THE NATIONAL REGISTER
A huge variety of landscapes are listed in or determined eligible for the National Register. They vary in age and size, and they reflect national, state, and local significance.

The Eugene De Sabla, Jr., Teahouse and Tea Garden in San Mateo, California, was listed in the National Register in 1992.4 About an acre in size, the garden is an early expression of the influence of Japanese culture on the development of California design at the beginning of the 20th century.
The Heritage Park Plaza, listed in the National Register in 2010, is a small site in Fort Worth, Texas, designed by Lawrence Halprin and completed in 1980. According to the National Register nomination, “The plaza design incorporates a set of interconnecting rooms constructed of concrete and activated throughout by flowing water walls, channels, and pools. ... This park represents one of Halprin’s most significant projects and embodies his mature theories and philosophy of landscape design.”

Other designed landscapes include components of state and national parks, such as the Gettysburg National Military Park in Pennsylvania; parkways and boulevards, such as the George Washington Memorial Parkway in Washington, D.C.; estates, such as the Biltmore Estate in North Carolina; urban plans, such as the L’Enfant Plan of the City of Washington, D.C.; and national monuments, such as the Chiricahua National Monument Historic Designed Landscape in Arizona. Only historically significant national monuments are eligible for National Register listing—those with natural resource value for which historical significance has not been determined are not listed.

Landscapes that are not considered designed but are significant for their association with tribal history, archaeology, or conservation are also listed in the National Register. Many of these are listed under National Register evaluation Criterion D for their “information potential”—that is, for having yielded or being likely to yield.
information important to history or prehistory. Burke’s Garden Rural Historic District in Tazewell County, Virginia, is an example of a rural historic district. The Cape Krusenstern National Monument, an archaeological district in Northwest Arctic County, Alaska, and the Adirondack Forest Preserve in New York State are among the largest properties listed in the National Register. The Tarryall Rural Historic District in Park County, Colorado, is nearly 40 miles long and encompasses ranches, conservation and recreation sites, and schools and cemeteries—all bordering the historic Tarryall Road.

Traditional cultural places (TCPs) are listed in the National Register for their meaning to an American culture group—frequently, though not exclusively, one or more American Indian tribes. Lands associated with American Indian history can be significant for various aspects of tribal history. The Menominee Tribe, for example, is considering nominating land that is significant for the tribe’s innovative forestry management and conservation efforts. On the other hand, TCPs are not always associated with tribes. The Green River Drift Traditional Cultural Property in Wyoming is associated with generations of ranchers who have used it to herd livestock to higher ground in the summer and bring them back in the fall. The ranchers’ ongoing use of the drift is a cultural practice that has persisted for more than 100 years.

MORE LISTINGS TO COME
Interesting properties with cultural landscape significance have recently been listed in the National Register or come to the attention of National Register staff. The University of Wisconsin Arboretum was listed in the National Register in January 2019. Nominated primarily for its national significance in conservation, the 1200-acre property was home to pioneering prairie restoration work. The city of Tucson is conducting a streetscape survey in order to amend the Barrio Historic District National Register nomination. Landscape and streetscape information that was not originally included will be added to the National Register documentation. An interesting designed landscape, the Winged Foot Golf Club in Westchester
County, New York, was listed in the National Register in June 2019 for landscape architectural and architectural significance. The club has two 18-hole courses designed by Albert Warren Tillinghast, a seminal figure in American golf course design. Dating to the 1920s, the courses were recently restored, maintaining the strategic course design that Tillinghast pioneered.

Federal agencies are also preparing or updating nominations to add landscape information. Section 110 of the NHPA requires them to nominate eligible properties under their jurisdiction, and if a property’s landscape was inadequately addressed in the original nomination, that requirement was not met.5 Minong, more commonly known as Isle Royale National Park, was listed in the National Register in January 2019. The Michigan archipelago is significant as a TCP connected with the beliefs and practices of the Grand Portage Band of Lake Superior Chippewa (Ojibwe). The Ojibwe know the archipelago as “Minong”, meaning “the good place”. The TCP encompasses some 210 square miles in Lake Superior.

CULTURAL LANDSCAPES GAIN WIDER ATTENTION
The growing interest in cultural landscapes is also evident among professional groups. Major preservation organizations in the United States that embrace landscape topics and address cultural landscape issues include the National Trust for Historic Preservation, Main Street America, and the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions. Other scholarly and professional organizations have long considered cultural landscapes. For example, the Association for Preservation Technology International states that it is “a multidisciplinary, membership organization dedicated to promoting the best technology for conserving/preserving historic structures and their settings.” The homepage of the Vernacular Architecture Forum explains that it “is the premier organization in North America dedicated to the appreciation and study of ordinary buildings and landscapes.” And the Alliance for Historic Landscape Preservation, the oldest organization dedicated to landscape research, has recently added the subheading “Conserving Cultural Landscapes” on its website. The organization formerly known as the Pioneer America Society is now known as the International Society for
Landscape, Place, & Material Culture. Meeting agendas and journals of national archaeological associations also include landscape topics. Both the Society for Historical Archaeology and the Society for American Archaeology have sponsored conference sessions devoted to landscape history and analysis. For a number of years, The Cultural Landscape Foundation has advocated for cultural landscape preservation and conducted important cultural landscape research.

FOSTERING LANDSCAPE NOMINATIONS

Despite the considerable progress of recent years, many significant cultural landscapes remain unidentified and are not listed in the National Register. Landscape resources and their nominations are frequently misunderstood, with problems revolving around determining significance, developing contexts, delineating boundaries, and structuring nominations. The designed and rural historic landscapes bulletins are excellent sources of general and specific information, but they need to be updated and expanded to encompass the very broad range of eligible landscapes that can be and are being nominated to the National Register.

In recent years, National Register staff launched the National Register Landscape Initiative (NRLI) to study cultural landscapes and the National Register. Through this webinar series, they met with staff from the NPS and federal, state, and tribal historic preservation offices to discuss landscape interests and recurring issues with the development of National Register nominations. The NRLI provided an excellent format for sharing information and
identifying common problems. The results are being used to develop a forthcoming white paper that will clarify several aspects of nomination preparation. The NRLI has already yielded other resources. **Acknowledging Landscapes** compiles the NRLI webinar materials. It addresses several categories of landscapes and approaches to landscape evaluation by federal, state, and tribal agencies. **Proceedings of the Maritime Cultural Landscape Symposium**, also inspired by the NRLI webinars, is a compilation of papers presented at a 2015 conference in Madison, Wisconsin—a collaboration between the NPS, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, and the Wisconsin Historical Society.

These efforts by the NPS and partners will ideally continue to raise awareness of America’s historically significant cultural landscapes and promote their further inclusion in the National Register, as well as in other preservation programs and projects. FJ

---

BARBARA WYATT, ASLA, works for the National Park Service where she is a landscape specialist for the National Register of Historic Places and National Historic Landmarks Program.
1 For more detailed instructions on National Register criteria and the nomination process, see the National Register website: https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/how-to-list-a-property.htm

2 The reference to “the wildlife or domestic animals therein” has caused confusion about the definition. Animals are not eligible for the National Register, nor are they considered contributing features; however, natural features—such as topography, vegetation, and hydrology—contribute importantly to the environmental description in a nomination. The Organic Act, which created the NPS, charges that agency “to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein [emphasis added] and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.” NPS responsibilities under the NHPA should not be confused with those in the Organic Act.

3 The Rural Historic Landscapes bulletin deliberately focused on agricultural landscapes, which results in a perception of the guidance as more restrained than intended. The National Register landscape guidance sidesteps the need to provide more explicit definitions or categories of historic landscapes, and the existing system has worked reasonably well for more than 30 years.

4 The National Archives is the permanent home of National Register records, and nominations can now be found on the National Archives (NARA) website. NARA’s holdings can be searched by reference number or property name. Finding aids are available for each state and territory: https://catalog.archives.gov/search?q=%22national%20register%20of%20historic%20places%22

5 “The head of each Federal agency shall assume responsibility for the preservation of historic property that is owned or controlled by the agency” (54 U.S.C. 306101) and “Each Federal agency shall establish (except for programs or undertakings exempted pursuant to section 304108(c) of this title), in consultation with the Secretary, a preservation program for the identification, evaluation, and nomination to the National Register, and protection, of historic property” (§30601(a)) and “The program shall ensure that historic property under the jurisdiction or control of the agency is identified, evaluated, and nominated to the National Register” (§30602(b)(1)).
One of the big stories in the world of conservation is the significant rise in efforts to conserve resources on a landscape scale. This approach brings partners from different geographies, sectors, and cultures together to collaborate on conserving important landscapes for the ecological, cultural, and economic benefits they provide. The Network for Landscape Conservation, an organization dedicated to supporting this work, now has a membership of more than 100 organizational partners and 2,000 individual practitioners representing hundreds of large landscapes. In a 2018 survey, “Assessing the State of Landscape Conservation Initiatives in North America,” the network gathered in-depth information about more than 130 initiatives in North America and found that 90 percent of them had been established after 1990 and 45 percent since 2010.

As cultural heritage practitioners become aware of this increasingly widespread holistic landscape approach and consider integrating it into their work, it might be helpful to examine the origins of the movement.

THE BEGINNINGS OF LANDSCAPE CONSERVATION
The history of the landscape-scale conservation movement has not yet been written. However, there is a long tradition in the United States of managing fish and wildlife habitats with the understanding that species preservation requires conserving wider ecosystems across jurisdictions. As noted in a 2015 National Academy of Science report on landscape conservation cooperatives:

“With advances in landscape ecology over the past quarter century, conservation planners, scientists, and practitioners began to place a greater emphasis on conservation efforts at the scale of landscapes and seascapes. These larger areas were...
thought to harbor relatively greater numbers of species that are more likely to maintain population viability and sustain ecological processes (e.g., fire, migration) and natural disturbance regimes—viewed by most ecologists as critical factors in conserving biodiversity.”

States have worked for decades to protect fish and wildlife within their borders, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has long focused on preserving refuges for migrating and breeding wildlife populations. The first refuge—established in 1903, the era of President Theodore Roosevelt—was Florida’s Pelican Island, an important rookery and feeding site for migrating birds. Today there is a system of 564 wildlife refuges across the nation. In 1986, recognizing the continental scope of the challenges, the U.S. Secretary of the Interior and the Canadian Minister of the Environment signed the North American Waterfowl Management Plan, which called for establishing Migratory Bird Joint Ventures.

The Yellowstone to Yukon initiative is an even more recent international wildlife conservation effort. Initially aimed at preserving grizzly bear habitats, it has become a model of collaborative wildlife management focused on the vast mountain ecosystem stretching from Yellowstone National Park to the Yukon. Its partnerships to conserve land and steward the region’s natural resources now encompass five American states, two Canadian provinces, two Canadian territories, and the traditional lands of more than 30 Native governments.

This is important work: the architects of landscape-scale initiatives are confronting some of the greatest environmental challenges of our time—threats from climate change, habitat fragmentation, energy development, and urban sprawl. These issues transcend political and disciplinary boundaries and demand solutions to match the scale of the threats. All of this, it should be noted, impacts cultural as well as natural resources.
THE ROLE OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

The National Park Service (NPS) has emerged as a leader in the landscape-scale approach to resource management. National parks were set aside to protect their special qualities within clearly defined boundaries, but conceiving of each park as an island rather than part a larger ecosystem ultimately hampers efforts to conserve its value. As early as 1964, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall wrote to the director of the NPS that “effective management of the National Park System will not be achieved by programs that look only within the parks without respect to the pressures, the influences, and the needs beyond park boundaries.”

The 1960s saw an overall national policy shift toward conserving natural and cultural resources reflected in such laws as the Wilderness Act of 1964, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. The NPS began experimenting with new ways to conserve larger landscapes, particularly ones that provide natural and recreational experiences near population centers. Cape Cod National Seashore, created in 1961, was an early test of this new kind of park. Its boundaries, which extend into six cape communities, were authorized with the understanding that the designated 43,500 acres would always have a mix of federal, state, municipal, and private owners. To address the issues of mixed ownership, the authorizing legislation included innovative approaches to integrating the new park into the community. It established the first citizen’s advisory board and prohibited the NPS from condemning private improved property so long as the local government adopted land-use controls consistent with the park’s purpose.

Cape Cod National Seashore auditorium at Provincetown.
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Created in 1978, the Santa Monica National Recreation Area was another test of introducing a national park presence into a complex landscape—in this case, the highly urbanized Los Angeles Basin. Stretching from the Santa Monica Mountains to the Pacific Ocean, the area encompasses one of the largest and most significant examples of Mediterranean-type ecosystems in the world. To protect this important resource, the NPS adopted an innovative “green line” approach: setting a boundary around the resource to be conserved and limiting the federal dollars for land acquisitions. To ensure effective and affordable management, the founding legislation directed that the park be collaboratively managed by both state and local governments that already owned property within its boundaries.

Building on the idea of protecting large landscapes through partnerships, in the 1970s the NPS proposed creating a system of National Reserves. Also known as Areas of National Concern, these multilayered governmental partnerships are connected by jointly prepared management plans that provide for land protection by local controls and for limited federal property acquisition. In the end, only a few reserves were created. The best known are Eby’s Landing National Reserve in Washington state and Pinelands National Reserve in New Jersey, both dating to 1978. Both reserves feature the tradition of long-standing human use that residents wanted to see carried forward: agriculture uses in Eby’s Landing and harvesting cranberries and other natural resources in the Pinelands.

In the 1980s changes in national policy that discouraged federal spending, land acquisition, and new parks halted the expansion of the National Park System. However, the NPS adapted earlier innovations such as limited federal investment, landscape scale boundaries, and citizen commissions into a new approach to conserve the cultural, natural, and recreational resources of a region with limited federal involvement: the National Heritage Areas program. The program established boundaries that included multiple property owners, developed management plans with the local community, and valued places as lived-in landscapes. The biggest change from previous approaches was that, while the federal government
invested limited dollars in stabilizing and interpreting resources, the management of those resources became the responsibility of local entities.

Recently, the NPS has explicitly articulated a focus on large-landscape initiatives to protect both natural and cultural resources. Action #22 of its 2016 strategic plan, "The Call To Action," directs the agency to:

“Promote large landscape conservation to support healthy ecosystems and cultural resources. To achieve this goal, we will protect continuous corridors in five geographic regions through voluntary partnerships across public and private lands and waters, and by targeting a portion of the federal Land and Water Conservation Fund to make strategic land acquisitions within national parks.”

**TOWARD A NATIONAL POLICY**

The boldest effort to launch a national policy initiative for landscape-scale conservation was a 2009 secretarial order from the U.S. Department of the Interior that established Landscape Scale Cooperatives (LCC). These were a network of 22 individual, self-directed conservation regions throughout the United States as well as on some Pacific and Caribbean islands and in parts of Canada and Mexico. The LCCs were defined as “landscapes capable of sustaining natural and cultural resources for current and future generations.” The network focused on providing scientific expertise—in particular, on climate change issues and building the capacity to mobilize conservation planning across multiple jurisdictions.

Under the current administration, the LCC initiative has been defunded, but Interior agencies such as the NPS and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are continuing to conduct scientific research and planning for landscape-scale conservation. In addition, landscape-scale initiatives are embedded in other federal agencies; the 2015 National Academy report identified 10 other programs in agencies ranging from the Department of Defense to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.
NETWORK FOR LANDSCAPE CONSERVATION
With its rapid growth, the movement to conserve large landscapes has spawned an organization with the exclusive mission of documenting and advancing this work. In November 2017 the new Network for Landscape Conservation and partners convened the National Forum on Landscape Conservation, gathering 200 leading landscape conservation practitioners from the United States, Canada, and Mexico. The network has just released a report, “Pathways Forward: Progress and Priorities in Landscape Conservation,” that documents the growth of the movement not just by the number of landscape-scale projects but, more importantly, by the growing understanding of what it means to successfully sustain them. The report tackles critical topics such as the need for effective communication, wide-ranging collaboration, and targeted investments. It also explores the role of science and the challenge of gaining the necessary support from policymakers.

It breaks new ground for a report on the future of conservation by fully recognizing the essential role of human activity in all landscape-scale efforts and by acknowledging that preserving traditional American communities and their cultural values is integral to our nation’s future. As the report poetically states, landscape-scale conservation can “reweave the natural and cultural fabric of the larger landscapes that define and sustain our character and quality of life.”

CONSIDERING CULTURAL LANDSCAPES
Although most recent landscape-scale efforts do reference cultural resources, the intersection of this burgeoning movement with the established world of historic preservation remains ill defined. Remember that the landscape-scale approach is rooted in the need to protect wildlife habitat for migrating birds; anadromous fish—those that travel from salt water to fresh to spawn; monarch butterflies; and species that need a large land base, such as bison and grizzly bears. Shifting gears to incorporate cultural sites has not always been easy.

Data availability and formatting is just one example of the barriers between the two fields. The large-landscape movement
has taken off in part thanks to the availability of big data, exploiting the power of geographic information systems to map large regions and use science-informed datasets for setting conservation priorities. Having cultural resources data available in this format would go a long way toward integrating the practices. However, the National Register of Historic Places is still an imperfect tool for identifying the range of cultural resources present in a landscape, due in part to the fact that many regions have not been adequately evaluated. Local and state historic inventories that should be the first place to consult are aging, sometimes inaccurate, and often incomplete—and not all states have invested in providing state-of-the-art computerized digital access to their data. Funds to redress these problems are in chronically short supply. In addition, existing data are often very particularistic—building by building or archaeological site by site. While the National Register does define the cultural landscapes property type, this classification has seen limited application. State historic preservation officials who administer the National Register program in partnership with the NPS have been wary about designating landscapes, often concerned about the effort required to document and oversee them and the reality of political pushback.

While the lack of data has hindered the inclusion of the cultural dimension in landscape-scale conservation, there is some good news: The NPS has undertaken a study of the nomination of cultural landscapes to the National Register as part of a new initiative to develop improved guidance. Another strategy for promoting the conservation of cultural landscapes would be making more effective use of other large-landscape designations, such as National Heritage Areas. Efforts to preserve long-distance trails can also complement this goal. For example, the Appalachian Trail Conservancy has a new large-landscape initiative aimed at recognizing and preserving not just the footprint of the trail, but also the lands surrounding it. The Chesapeake Bay Partnership also has great promise, positing that, while ecological resources are important, cultural and recreational connections are also critical in any conservation approach. Using a layered approach, the partnership has helped pioneer a model that conserves multiple resources types and incorporates
many values. The project also leads with a ground-breaking approach to Indigenous Cultural Landscapes, recognizing the natural and cultural resources that supported Native American lifeways and settlements in the early 17th century in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Native American places were not confined to the sites of houses, towns, or settlements, so a holistic understanding of their homelands must include entire landscapes.

SEIZING THE OPPORTUNITY
Landscape-conservation initiatives are increasingly including cultural and human dimensions and creating partnerships to do so. Such efforts are underway across the country, from the Chesapeake Bay watershed to the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. However, as positive as this trend may be, serious challenges remain. The resource conservation and preservation communities are still mired in the nature/culture split. Going forward, it is critical that preservationists recognize the applicability of “natural” resource scholarship and tools to cultural resources, especially cultural landscapes. This means a change in perspective from the traditional preservation criteria, which focus on the integrity of cultural resources, to an approach recognizing that natural environments are inevitably dynamic, especially in this era of climate change. The natural resource community also needs to move beyond just lip service to including cultural resources in landscape planning. Practitioners on both sides need to think bigger and be more flexible. Today this discussion is still a work in progress.
The bottom line is that historic preservation is about saving places, and the opportunities to do so jointly with our natural resource partners are expanding. As my co-authors and I noted in a recent issue of The George Wright Forum, connecting the practices of culture and nature conservation is an increasing consideration for the global conservation community. Preservationists have a critical role to play by articulating the value of all landscapes; telling powerful, people-based stories; and, most importantly, engaging communities in the process of conserving place. This emerging approach provides one more important opportunity to engage new partners and funding prospects to preserve cultural landscapes, historic properties, and the communities that give them life. FJ

BRENDA BARRETT is the editor of the Living Landscape Observer. She has held leadership positions with the Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, and the National Park Service and is a trustee of US/ICOMOS.
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Honoring and Preserving Hawaiian Cultural Landscapes

BY DAVIANNA PŌMAIKA‘I MCGREGOR

Wahi pana is the Hawaiian name for cultural landscapes, which are legendary, noted, and celebrated places. They are named, as families are named, to reflect the spirit, features, elements, and significance of their locations; their natural elements; and their relationships to great persons, families, and events.

The prominent professor and kupuna—honored elder—Edward Kanahele explained:

In ancient times, the sacred places of Hawai‘i, or wahi pana of Hawai‘i, were treated with great reverence and respect. These are places believed to have mana or spiritual power. For Native Hawaiians, a place tells us who we are and who is our extended family. A place gives us our history, the history of our clan, and the history of our ancestors. We are able to look at a place and tie in human events that affect us and our loved ones. A place gives us a feeling of stability and of belonging to our family—those living and those who have passed on. A place gives us a sense of well-being, and of acceptance of all who have experienced that place. A wahi pana is, therefore, a place of spiritual power which links Hawaiians to our past and our future. Our ancestors knew that the great gods created the land and generated life. The gods give the earth spiritual force or mana. Our ancestors knew that the earth’s spiritual essence was focused at wahi pana.¹

Native Hawaiians, then and now, love and care for cultural landscapes as an integral part of our ‘ohana—our extended families and communities—especially in the rural areas of our islands. They also distinguish and reserve special lands as sacred places and realms to acknowledge the extraordinary mana that converge there.
While the land of the Hawaiian Islands is fundamental to the multilayered cultural and social history of its peoples, in many areas the landscape has been transformed over time—by natural forces as well as by those who have lived on it, cultivated it, and developed it for various purposes.

Early Native Hawaiians cleared expanses of native plants along coasts and streams, and from lowlands and slopes, in order to cultivate taro and sweet potatoes, bananas and breadfruit. A joint study by Sam Gon III, a biologist with The Nature Conservancy Hawaii, and the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) estimates that the pre-1778 ecological footprints range from 7.8 percent of Hawai‘i Island, to 11 percent of Maui, 12.5 percent of Kaua‘i, and 14.1 percent of O‘ahu. Alterations to the landscapes provided for the subsistence of the Native Hawaiian people under a self-sufficient social system that sustained a population estimated to range from 400,000 to as high as 800,000.

The original features of Hawaiian landscapes are now difficult to distinguish, except through our imagination. The landscape is layered with relationships: first, those established by our Native Hawaiian ancestors, and later, those created by waves of European and American settlers and Asian and Pacific Islander immigrants.
Not all of these relationships have been beneficial for the land, and today, many threats to the quality and integrity of Native Hawaiian cultural landscapes hamper their access and use.

TRANSFORMATION AND EVOLVING THREATS
The advent of a capitalist system alienated Native Hawaiians from their ancestral lands as productive food gardens and lowland rainforests were cleared and naturally flowing streams diverted for sugar and pineapple plantations, cattle ranches, and military bases. In the decades after Hawai‘i became a state in 1959, development focused on resorts along coastlines and housing subdivisions and shopping malls on agricultural lands. The study by Gon and OHA concluded that the contemporary ecological footprint is 41 percent of Hawai‘i Island, 70 percent of Maui, 96.4 percent of Kaua‘i, and 83 percent of O‘ahu. Hawai‘i’s population is 1.37 million, and in 2016, 8.9 million tourists visited the state. Hawai‘i imports 80 percent of its food and 91 percent of the energy that it consumes.

Contemporary threats to Hawai‘i’s cultural landscapes stem from the international capitalist economy’s demands for profit and United States’ reliance on a strong military presence to maintain its global prominence.

MULTIPLE HEIRS AND OFFSHORE LANDOWNERS
Important cultural landscapes that have survived into the 21st century are now threatened because they are on lands owned by Native Hawaiian ‘ohana, or extended families, with multiple heirs—in some cases, multiple heirs with unclear titles—who can more easily divide money from the sale of land than divide the land itself. Some lands are owned by offshore transnational corporations that purchase properties, make improvements, and then sell them at a profit.

The largest and oldest heiau—temple—on the island of Moloka‘i is the ‘Ili‘ili‘pae Heiau, which stands on 1,824 acres. In September 2018 the multiple heirs of that property listed it for sale for almost $4 million. Although both the Trust for Public Land and Moloka‘i Land Trust have been in conversation with the heirs regarding conserving the heiau, its future stewardship remains uncertain as long as it is on the market.
Many exquisite cultural landscapes on Moloka‘i are located on the 55,575 acres of Moloka‘i Ranch, which covers 35 percent of the island. The ranch belongs to GL Limited, part of a portfolio of global investments that also includes a chain of hotels in Great Britain and a resort in Fiji. The company is headquartered in Singapore, is registered in Bermuda, and has its largest stockholder in Malaysia. In 2017 GL Limited listed the ranch for sale for $260 million. The Native Hawaiian community of Moloka‘i have asked the Office of Hawaiian Affairs and the Kamehameha Schools to buy the land. Failing that, the community is prepared to negotiate the protection of and access to the cultural landscapes with any new landowner.

The potential for multiple heirs and offshore landowners to sell lands poses similar threats to properties on every island, from Grove Farm on Kaua‘i to Hawai‘i Commercial and Sugar lands on Maui and Kukaiau, to Monoha‘a Ranches on Hawai‘i Island.

ALTERNATIVE ENERGY AND GEOTHERMAL DEVELOPMENT

Efforts to develop alternative energy sources have also endangered Hawaiian cultural landscapes. Geothermal energy comes from what Native Hawaiians have revered for centuries as the akua—god or elemental life force—named Pelehonuamea. Whereas the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) protects sites of religious worship, it does not protect deities or life forces themselves. By contrast, Hawaiian chants speak of natural laws, kānāwai, that mandate the protection of the creative force of the volcano. He Kua‘ā Kānāwai is the law of the burning back. According to Dr. Pualani Kanakaʻole Kanahele, respected scholar, educator, and practitioner of Hawaiian dance and cultural traditions,
The concept behind this idea is that if the earth is hot it still belongs to the Goddess and if it belongs to her it is sacred. If the earth steams or if any other sign of heat still exists on the land or the water surrounding the land because of volcanic activities, then the effect of the law exists.5

The heat and the steam signify a place in the landscape where creation is occurring, and humans must allow the natural processes of creation to continue in order for life on the islands to continue. Disruption of the natural laws has severe consequences.

Proposals to generate 400 megawatts of wind power on Lāna‘i and Moloka‘i islands and transmit them to O‘ahu through an undersea cable threatened expansive cultural landscapes, cultural sites, areas for hunting and fishing, and ocean resources on both islands. Community opposition managed to defeat these plans.

Proposals for the development of geothermal energy also met with opposition on Hawai‘i Island. An initial proposal for geothermal energy development at Kahauale‘a, an area adjacent to the Hawai‘i Volcanoes National Park, was thwarted when Kīlauea, a volcano at the center of the lands to be drilled, began erupting in January 1983—an eruption that continues to this day. A subsequent proposal suggested generating 500 megawatts of electricity in the volcanic rainforest of Wao Kele O Puna, located in Kīlauea’s rift zone. A broad coalition of Pelehonuamea spiritual practitioners; residents of Puna; and the Rainforest Action Network, Earth First, Sierra Club, Friends of the Earth, and Greenpeace International opposed that proposal from 1983 through 1994, ultimately defeating it. However, Puna Geothermal Venture—a smaller geothermal plant that generated 38 megawatts at peak production—was completed in 1993 by Ormat, an Israeli corporation in the rift zone at Pahoa. On May 3, 2018, Kīlauea’s ongoing eruptions grew massive, and lava covered three of the plant’s wells, burning a substation and warehouse. The future of the geothermal plant remains uncertain.

The Kīlauea volcano is Pelehonuamea’s realm and a sacred landscape for those who honor her. That includes all the elemental forms associated with the volcano: the rocks and cinders; the flowing and fountaining lava; the fire; the projectiles; and the
steam, which is considered her life force, as blood is the life force of humans. The extraction of the steam, then, will deplete the life force of the volcano, and the deity will no longer manifest to future generations. According to Dr. Kanahele,

“Pele has always been a very vivacious deity that has been alive for us and has been kept alive because of the activity of the volcano. As long as there is steam in the air any of us who are practitioners or who live in the Puna/Kaʻū area will know that the deity is alive. And once this steam is cut off from us and taken elsewhere, this part of our culture will die.”

As Peleho‘onuamea continues to create new land, expanding her realm in Hawai‘i, new chants and hula will honor her, and her overwhelming presence will inspire and perpetuate the Native Hawaiian cultural and spiritual beliefs, customs, and practices.

MILITARY USE OF LANDS

U.S. military bases and training areas have seriously impacted Native Hawaiian cultural landscapes. On the island O‘ahu, the construction of the Pearl Harbor shipyards and drydocks destroyed the fishponds and fishing shrines at Keawalauapu‘uloa; the construction of the Marine Corps Base Hawai‘i damaged sacred burial sites and rich fishing grounds at Mokapu; live fire training condemned the rainforest and ancestral lands, heiau, springs, and shrines at Mākua valley; and the homelands of Lualualei were confiscated for ammunition storage and communication towers. Military bases now cover 25 percent of the island. The Department of Defense also controls 108,863 acres at Pohakuloa on the island of Hawai‘i for live ordnance training and runs an observatory at Haleakalā on Maui. It also owns the Pacific
Missile Range at Barking Sands on Kaua‘i, which includes a 1,100-square-mile underwater range and 42,000 square miles of controlled airspace. Within that missile range are the sacred burial sites at Nohili. The sacred island of Kaho‘olawe was taken over for bombing and live ordnance training exercises.

**THIRTY METER TELESCOPE ON MAUNA A WĀKEA**

Mountain summits are sacred places, and the summit of Mauna A Wākea—“Mountain of the sky father Wākea,” the world’s tallest mountain when measured from its base under the ocean—is one of the most sacred places in Hawai‘i. Since 1970, 13 telescopes have been built on its summit, by the U.S. Air Force and private corporations, as well as Canada, France, and Japan, under the management of the University of Hawai‘i. In 2009 an international consortium of astronomy institutes intent on developing an extremely large Thirty Meter Telescope (TMT) began the process of building one on Mauna A Wākea, sparking prolonged resistance. Protectors of the mountain disrupted the official groundbreaking ceremony, blocked construction from 2014 through 2015, and have stalled building permits through a series of legal challenges.

**STEWARDS AND PROTECTORS**

Since the 1970s, communities throughout Hawai‘i have organized to protect their natural and cultural lands and resources. For example, the Protect Kaho‘olawe ‘Ohana has revived and popularized Aloha ‘Āina as a practice of cultural and spiritual stewardship of cultural landscapes. This Native Hawaiian practice refers to loving, caring for, and respecting the land through customs that support sustainable stewardship. ‘Āina means “that which feeds us,” and in caring for the land and surrounding ocean, Hawaiians protect the resources needed to sustain our families and communities.

The Edith Kanaka‘ole Foundation is an intellectual and spiritual powerhouse rooted in the Pele and hula traditions, that guided the renewal of cultural practices on Kanaloa Kaho‘olawe, and leads in the revival of Hawaiian scientific methodology and knowledge. Kua‘āina Ulu ‘Auamo sustains a network of 25 communities providing
stewardship of their lands and waters, including stewards for 38 fishponds and complexes and a network of 30 gatherers and keepers of the traditional uses of limu—seaweed. Hawaiian advocates have also invoked federal laws such as the NHPA, Environmental Protection Act, and American Indian Religious Freedom Act to prevent damage to cultural sites and natural resources and to demand access to them for religious practices.

Native Hawaiians succeeded in stopping the bombing and military use of the island of Kanaloa Kaho‘olawe—thanks to a movement led by the Protect Kaho‘olawe ‘Ohana. Through the rededication of religious sites, spiritual ceremonies to heal the land, and cultural stewardship of the island, they have elevated the island to its original status as a sacred center for training in cultural customs and practices. Native Hawaiian advocacy and initiatives provide inspiration and hope that future generations in Hawai‘i will be able to connect with and experience the great centers of natural and spiritual power throughout the Hawaiian islands. FJ

DAVIANNA PÔMAIKA‘I MCGREGOR is a professor in the Department of Ethnic Studies at the University of Hawai‘i.

2 The pre-contact ecological footprint for the other islands are: Moloka‘i: 8.5 percent; Lāna‘i: 13.6 percent; Kaho‘olawe: 14.3 percent; and Ni‘ihau: 72.1 percent.
4 The contemporary ecological footprint for the other islands are: Moloka‘i 84 percent, Lāna‘i 78 percent, Kaho‘olawe 83 percent, Ni‘ihau 72.1 percent.
Stewarding and Activating the Landscape of the Farnsworth House

SCOTT MEHAFFY

In 1945 Chicago physician-scientist Edith Farnsworth commissioned renowned architect Ludwig Mies van der Rohe to create a weekend getaway approximately 50 miles southwest of Chicago. Ultimately built between 1949 and 1951, the Farnsworth House would become one of the most celebrated works of 20th-century architecture.

Since the Farnsworth House opened as a public site in the mid-1990s, the interpretive focus—and the primary maintenance investment—have been on the iconic house and not its setting. As a result, the relationship between the architecture and the landscape remains largely unappreciated or misunderstood by many visitors. But the evolution of that landscape is integral to the history of the site, from 20th-century development and adaptation, to 21st-century conservation, education, and enjoyment. Effective stewardship and interpretation of historic sites requires that we understand the evolution of their landscapes.
Over the past decade, the stewards of the Farnsworth House have begun devoting increasing attention to its landscape. They have commissioned studies of the landscape, prioritized its maintenance needs, made different interpretive choices, and planned improvements—notably to address the site’s flooding risk and to enhance the visitor experience. Ingenuity, resiliency, and adaptation will continue to be guiding principles as the Farnsworth landscape is rehabilitated and the site improved.

THE MCCORMICK FARM BECOMES THE FARNSWORTH HOUSE

Recent research has revealed that the first 10-acre parcel of what would become the Farnsworth landscape, purchased by Dr. Farnsworth in 1945, had been a large garden, most likely one growing vegetables—part of Col. Robert R. McCormick’s experimental Tribune Farm. McCormick, a gentleman farmer as well as owner and editor of the Chicago Tribune, owned 1,332 acres west of Yorkville, Illinois, and used that land for “conducting tests and searching for new and superior crops, breeds of animals and profitable methods and practices in the production of live stocks and feeds.”

In 1945, Edith Farnsworth purchased 10 acres of Robert R. McCormick’s experimental farm, later purchasing 50 additional acres (where 6 and 7 are shown on map). Farnsworth House was built above the iron truss bridge near the word “garden.”

MAP COURTESY OF TRIBUNE COMPANY ARCHIVES
Throughout the Great Depression, the *Tribune* published frequent reports from Tribune Farm to convey practical advice and humor. Several named animals made recurrent appearances in these columns,² capturing the wholesome rural character increasingly idealized by Depression-era urban readers. Perhaps this rural ideal also appealed to the urbane Edith Farnsworth, who sought relaxation and the restorative powers of a country setting located a convenient distance from Chicago.

The Farnsworth House was sited at the south edge of an open meadow near the intersection of two main roads that bisected the Tribune Farm. Photographs taken during its construction show a tree-covered slope with a cluster of barns—which would be removed sometime during the 1950s—at the top. The house was nestled between existing trees—both for the pragmatic benefit of shade in summer, since the house originally had no air conditioning, and for the aesthetic benefit of showcasing the ever-changing natural scenery.

Built only yards from the generally slow-moving *Fox River*, the house was immediately northeast of a large iron truss bridge. This bridge may have been a factor in Mies’ site selection—the structure of the house echoes the rectangular framework and clear openings of the bridge. Because the Fox River was known to occasionally overflow its banks, Mies elevated the house more than five feet above grade to allow for periodic flooding.

Documentation suggests that Edith Farnsworth called upon Mies’ friend, colleague, and sometime employee—and noted Prairie School landscape architect—Alfred Caldwell for occasional advice. Early on, Farnsworth asked Caldwell to advise on a garden area located northwest of the house. Later, she wanted suggestions for screen plantings near the sleeping area of the house and a stone path to connect her parking area to the steps of the lower terrace.³

Following McCormick’s death in 1955, a building contractor bought the remainder of Tribune Farm. But after the new owner failed to pay taxes, the state of Illinois foreclosed on the property, and most of the land eventually became Silver Springs State Park—thereby preserving the surrounding open space, natural setting,
and viewsheds surrounding the Farnsworth House. Conservation easements and county forest preserves help protect additional lands adjacent to Farnsworth.

Photographs from the 1950s show a meadowlike landscape with scattered trees and hedgerows, and oral histories confirm that a local farmer continued to cut hay from the original 10-acre parcel as well as from 50 acres of adjoining meadows that Farnsworth had purchased. By the 1960s, however, much of the acreage around the house had become overgrown with weedy species such as tree of heaven and multiflora rose. The influence of the ecology movement—which encouraged a return to natural landscapes—may have stopped the haying of the meadows. Or perhaps it was due to Dr. Farnsworth’s growing need for privacy, as her glass house was increasingly visited by architects, design enthusiasts, and curiosity seekers.

**THE FARNSWORTH LANDSCAPE DURING THE PALUMBO ERA**

In the late 1960s, as Farnsworth neared retirement, a county highway improvement program outlined plans to replace the historic iron truss bridge with a larger concrete bridge to be located 175 feet closer to the Farnsworth House. Farnsworth sued several times to prevent the change, but in 1969 the county used eminent domain to acquire nearly two acres of the site. Very soon afterward, she put the house up for sale. Peter Palumbo—a British lord, real estate developer, and collector of fine arts and architecture—purchased the property in 1972.

Lord Palumbo hired Lanning Roper, a noted British—and originally American—landscape architect, to improve the Farnsworth House grounds. Together they planted several hundred trees and shrubs, as well as thousands of hardy perennials and groundcovers, generally following the British Landscape Garden tradition. Palumbo and his family used the Farnsworth House and site during their annual summer visits to Illinois. Over time, he installed a boat house with direct access to the Fox River, an in-ground swimming pool, and a tennis court; he also improved and extended the Farnsworth-era garage building.

Following Roper’s death in 1983, Palumbo continued to develop the landscape with the professional guidance of Bernadette Doran,
who had worked with Roper as head gardener at another of Palumbo’s estates: Bagnor Manor in Berkshire, England. Doran helped create a garden of spring wildflowers in Roper’s memory and continued the development of an 18-acre sculpture walk that Palumbo and Roper had begun a few years earlier. The sculpture collection began along a loop path near the house, then expanded east into the former meadow.

While sculptures located along the first loop path were close together and visible from the house, the second, larger loop through the meadow allowed them to be spaced further apart, with trees planted to provide additional separation. The sculptures, which reflected Palumbo’s tastes and interests, included works by many modern masters such as Henry Moore, Andy Goldsworthy, and Jim Dine. Works by George Rickey, Harry Bertoia, and Michael Warren echoed the architecture of the site—as did the salvaged cupola from the junction of Poultry and Queen Victoria streets in London’s financial district. The latter, as well as a collection of familiar red British telephone boxes, while somewhat incongruous, may have held personal meaning for Palumbo.4

By 1995, after completing a thorough restoration of the house and filling it with Mies-designed furniture, acquiring and installing the sculpture collection, and improving the overall landscape, Palumbo began construction of a visitor center and parking area—and soon
opened the property for limited public tours. Unfortunately, extreme floods in 1996 and 1997 filled the house with more than five feet of water. The considerable restoration cost and other personal matters prompted Palumbo to offer the property for sale to the state of Illinois in 1999.

After several years of inaction by the state, Palumbo decided to remove the sculptures and sell the Farnsworth House at auction. The Landmarks Preservation Council of Illinois (now Landmarks Illinois) and the National Trust for Historic Preservation solicited private contributions to purchase the property, which they won in a dramatic bidding war in 2003. Landmarks Illinois operated the property until 2012, when it was transitioned to the National Trust. Landmarks Illinois continues to hold a preservation and conservation easement on the west half of the property, where the Farnsworth House, outbuildings, and cultural landscape are located.

**TAKING STOCK: LANDSCAPE STUDIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

In 2008 landscape architecture students from the Illinois Institute of Technology, working under landscape historian Barbara Geiger, completed an assessment of the Farnsworth landscape. Their report includes a brief description of the site’s natural history and
indigenous vegetation and documents the evolution of the landscape from 1945 to 2008. It recommends returning the house setting—the principal Roper landscape—to its more “natural” Farnsworth-era appearance, but returning the larger sculpture walk area to its Palumbo-era appearance and use, as well as installing pads for changing shows of outdoor sculpture. The report does not address outbuildings, farmland, or the visitor center.

In 2013 Retail & Development Strategies, Urban Design Associates, and Gallagher & Associates created a site use master plan for the property. The plan identifies several opportunities for developing and interpreting the site, including adding a new visitor center north of the sculpture walk, improving and more actively programming and interpreting the landscape, and exploring alternative uses for the existing visitor center and the farmland—such as on-site lodging and an educational farm.

In 2015 Krueck + Sexton Architects; Wiss, Janney, Elstner Associates, Inc.; and Liz Sargent, HLA, completed a preservation plan and cultural landscape study. The study was intended to assess Farnsworth’s current conditions and integrity and to make preliminary treatment recommendations for all structures and landscapes, including alternatives for flood protection and mitigation.

No landscape studies exist aside from an “as-built” tree survey completed in the late 1990s. However, many private collections of
photographs that include the Farnsworth House landscape are currently being digitized for documentation and further research. In addition, the National Trust has commissioned digital copies of Farnsworth-related papers from the Lanning Roper Collection at the Royal Horticultural Library in London.

CURRENT LANDSCAPE CONDITIONS AND PLANS
Supporting its role as a historic site, the active maintenance and interpretation of the Farnsworth landscape have focused primarily on the area around the visitor center and the house itself. Site staff manage and interpret the Roper landscape near the house, hiring contractors to do most of the mowing, tree work, and occasional site improvements. The rest of the site receives minimal maintenance. Since 2003, portions of the loop walks have been discontinued. The boathouse, swimming pool, and tennis court remain unused, uninterpreted, and largely unmaintained. Many trees and shrubs have been lost from storms, floods, disease, or neglect—sometimes creating openings for more aggressive and often invasive species.

However, more recent decisions about the ongoing conservation of the Farnsworth House include preservation treatments of its outbuildings and cultural landscape. The inclusion of the McCormick era, which previous histories of the Farnsworth House had omitted, in interpretation at the visitor center—and in a future guidebook—will help explain the rural setting and provide context for visitors. Staff are planning new trails and seating overlooks along the river, with additional interpretation about the riverine ecology and natural history. Canoe and kayak groups will be encouraged to access the site by appointment, and the farm land will be studied for other possible uses. The naturalized landscape where Palumbo’s sculptures once stood will be conserved and more intensively managed, and the designed landscape setting surrounding the Farnsworth House will be rehabilitated and actively interpreted.

Recent site inspections by groups such as The Morton Arboretum Natural Resources program, the Chicago Botanic Garden Plants of Concern program, and The Conservation Foundation have identified several desirable native species—some indigenous to the site,
others introduced—that are surviving despite a dense canopy of largely invasive tree and shrub species that blocks sunlight and competes for moisture and nutrients. While many of these offending woody plants were introduced by wind, flooding, bird droppings, or animal scat, others were planted by Palumbo and Roper decades before their invasive characteristics were known. In recent years, this is being addressed through volunteer efforts to remove invasive trees and brush as well as fundraising for a landscape conservation management plan.

It is a continuous concern that two-thirds of the Farnsworth site is located below the 500-year flood level of the river. Its watershed comprises 2,658 square miles that are becoming increasingly developed, producing more storm water runoff and more frequent flood events. While the Farnsworth House itself has not experienced a severe flood since 2008, the site—and much of the landscape—must endure low-level flooding throughout much of the year. Since 2015 the National Trust, supported by Landmarks Illinois, has developed detailed designs for a concealed hydraulic lift system that will temporarily raise the Farnsworth House an additional nine feet during severe flood episodes.

Reinvesting in and reactivating the Farnsworth House landscape is integral to a more broadly defined site history and more inclusive
visitor experience that relate modern architecture and modern living to nature. Active and passive recreation, visual and performing arts, increased environmental awareness, and more forward-looking agricultural and land-use practices will foster greater opportunities for partnerships and programming, making the site more dynamic and engaging.

Mies van der Rohe himself penned the guiding vision for the Farnsworth House, no matter its use or ownership, when he said: “Nature, too, shall live its own life. We must beware not to disrupt it with the color of our houses and interior fittings. Yet we should attempt to bring nature, houses, and human beings together into a higher unity. If you view nature through the glass walls of the Farnsworth House, it gains a more profound significance than if viewed from outside.”

Edith Farnsworth’s minimalist nature retreat seems especially prescient in the context of today’s stress-filled urban lifestyle. Through ongoing efforts to steward and interpret the landscape, the vision of van der Rohe, Farnsworth and Palumbo is shared to enhance the understanding, inspiration, and enjoyment for modern visitors. FJ

---

**SCOTT MEHAFFEY** is the executive director of the Farnsworth House. A registered landscape architect and Fellow of the American Society of Landscape Architects, he teaches design history at the Illinois Institute of Technology.

---

**TAKEAWAY**
Learn about a 2017 design competition at Farnsworth

**TAKEAWAY**
Flood Mitigation: Choose Your Own Adventure (featuring Farnsworth)
3 Interviews with architect T. Paul Young, who worked for Dirk Lohan during the 1972 restoration of the Farnsworth House and taught with Alfred Caldwell at IIT.
6 The auction is well documented in the 2007 PBS documentary by Geoffrey Baer, Saved from the Wrecking Ball, available online from numerous sources.
Tribal Heritage at the Grand Canyon: Protecting a Large Ethnographic Landscape to Sustain Living Traditions

BRIAN R. TURNER

The Grand Canyon is not only a geological wonder but also sacred land with an essential role in maintaining the cultural identity and sustaining the living traditions of at least 11 Native American tribes. The storied landscape is the traditional setting for ongoing cultural practices that long predate the European presence in the Americas.

Grand Canyon National Park (GCNP), established in 1919, is one of America’s “Crown Jewel” national parks and a World Heritage Site. Visitation has increased dramatically in recent years: the National Park Service (NPS) tallied 6.3 million visitors in 2018, more than double the number from 30 years ago. This surge and...
associated interest in developing the park’s tourism potential have placed unprecedented pressure on the region’s fragile resources. At the same time, the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Forest Service are processing applications for mining projects on the landscapes surrounding the park, which have the potential to damage groundwater resources that feed the Grand Canyon’s seeps and springs.

These threats have stimulated inquiry into the significance of the land to tribes. The encroaching pressures have also compelled some tribes to share knowledge about the significance of this landscape with federal land managers in hopes of informing long-term management strategies that emphasize cultural resource protection. It is now incumbent on federal agencies to use this privileged information to sustain tribal traditions. This should include considering the eligibility of the landscape for listing on the National Register of Historic Places with an emphasis on protecting intangible cultural practices, which are commonly overlooked in National Register nominations.

In 2014 the National Trust for Historic Preservation listed the Grand Canyon as a National Treasure, bringing national attention to the threats it faces. The National Trust conducted this campaign in close coordination with local partners and tribes to sensitively highlight the significance of the cultural assets in the canyon, support sustainable economic development, and take strategic action in accordance with the organization’s expertise in federal law and policy.

TRIBAL PERSPECTIVES ON THE GRAND CANYON

The 1,902-square-mile GCNP contains evidence of more than 12,000 years of human occupation across more than 4,000 known archaeological and historic properties. Adjacent lands outside the park boundary hold thousands more such properties in federal, state, tribal, and private ownership; they are also important parts of this cultural landscape.

Oral traditions identify the Grand Canyon as the place of origin for the Hopi and Zuni tribes; the place where the Pai people—Havasupai, Hualapai, and Yavapai—and the bands of the Southern
Paiute—San Juan, Kaibab, Shivwits, Las Vegas, and Moapa—were taught how to live; and an ancient storied landscape with sacred qualities to the Diné (Navajo). The 1979 World Heritage nomination stressed the significance of the Grand Canyon as a cultural resource, stating that “perhaps nowhere else in the [United States] can such a finely tuned adaptation to the land be seen.”

While each tribe traditionally associated with the Grand Canyon has a unique perspective, the landscape is commonly viewed as more than the sum of its parts. The preservation of tangible resources such as artifacts and petroglyphs is a means for preserving the intangible values that give these places meaning and context.

**RECENT THREATS TO THE GRAND CANYON**

Accelerating energy development and culturally insensitive tourism are creating mounting pressures on the Grand Canyon’s resources.

**Uranium Mining**

Uranium mining is permanently harming aquifers that feed Grand Canyon springs and streams, and many wells now contain uranium concentrations that exceed federal drinking water standards. In January 2012 the U.S. Department of the Interior issued a 20-year ban on all new uranium claims on 1 million acres of public lands adjacent to GCNP. Existing claims, however, are still being processed, despite being a danger to the Grand Canyon and its surrounding communities. In July 2018 UNESCO expressed significant concerns about the threats these mines pose to the canyon’s outstanding universal values.

**Grand Canyon Escalade**

Confluence Partners LLC proposed a massive resort to the Navajo Nation. The Grand Canyon Escalade would have been built at the...
confluence of the Colorado and Little Colorado rivers at the edge of a boundary between federal land and tribal land. Its main attraction was slated to be a rim-to-river gondola tramway that would have transported up to 10,000 people per day to the bottom of the canyon.

Many Diné, as well as members of other tribes, who consider the confluence uniquely sacred and its protection essential to the preservation of their cultures, vigorously opposed the project. The Navajo Nation has thus far rejected the proposal, but permanent protections for the land will be needed to thwart future threats.

**Tusayan Resort**
The Forest Service has received an application for road and utility easements to facilitate a $500-million commercial development in the newly incorporated town of Tusayan, Arizona. Construction would occur about a mile from the south entrance to the GCNP. The development has no identified local water source, and the applicant has not ruled out using the aquifer that sustains culturally and ecologically significant springs on the South Rim and is the source of all water for Havasu Falls, the cultural foundation of the Havasupai tribe.

The Forest Service—at the urging of the National Trust, among many others—has thus far rejected the proposal. However, 2018 news reports indicate that the developers are likely to return with a revised application for a resort that would include high-end lodging, dining, and retail space.

**Overflights**
In parts of the Grand Canyon near the national park boundaries, the quiet natural soundscape is disrupted by overflights from the nearly 100,000 airplane and helicopter air tours offered each year. In 2012 the NPS was on the verge of approving a plan that addressed the noise pollution, but Congress responded to industry concern by curtailing the agency’s authority and putting a hold on plans to further regulate overflights.
THE GRAND CANYON AND THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

The NPS has determined that the Grand Canyon is eligible for listing on the National Register under traditional cultural property (TCP) guidance, but to date its recognition has been only informal, a result of project-level review. In the early 2000s, a draft Colorado River Management Plan proposed experimental water releases, which triggered review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). The process resulted in a consensus determination that the Grand Canyon is significant under all four National Register criteria: association with historic events, association with historically significant persons, distinctive design/construction, and historic information potential. The review also led several tribes to develop their own individual determinations of eligibility based on their particular views and ongoing religious practices.

This determination of eligibility was an important acknowledgment of tribal views in assessing how and why the Grand Canyon should be recognized as a historic place. Since 1990 the Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties, as outlined in National Register Bulletin 38, have been the primary tool for recognizing the eligibility of historic places based on their role in maintaining the continuity of a community’s cultural identity. While the National Register regulations remain unchanged, the publication of Bulletin 38 allowed for consideration of a wider range of property types. It affirmed that properties could

Petroglyphs attributed to ancestral puebloan artists adorn the rocks in Marble Canyon, once threatened by a dam.

PHOTO BY BRIAN TURNER
be eligible because of their linkage to the continuation of contemporary traditions. While places of traditional and religious importance to Native American tribes had previously been included on the National Register, their significance to Native peoples had not been adequately emphasized. Bulletin 38 gave federal agencies a stronger basis for defending listings of nontraditional property types that reflect diverse worldviews. Courts have acknowledged the significance of this change, holding federal agencies accountable for failure to consider TCPs during Section 106 reviews.

Further, the 1992 amendments to the NHPA provided a firm legal foundation for federal agencies to recognize tribal values in assessing the eligibility of a place for the National Register. While Congress did not adopt the TCP terminology, it did confirm that properties of “traditional religious and cultural importance” to a Native American tribe or Native Hawaiian organization are eligible for inclusion on the National Register.

THE CONTEXT STATEMENT AND BEYOND

Despite its work to recognize the Grand Canyon’s validity as a cultural landscape, the NPS currently lacks information about cultural resources that would help guide sustainable development at the Grand Canyon. In its 2010 Foundational Statement for the park, a review of the General Management Plan, it found that only about 5 percent of the park’s land had been subject to archaeological inventories. Moreover, ethnographic inventories are incomplete “and most information is gleaned through project consultation.” The agency acknowledged that “this limited knowledge hampers staff ability to appropriately manage resources and values.”

Fortunately, in the past several years NPS cultural resources staff have secured agency-wide agreement on the need for a more proactive survey of cultural resources. In 2017 the GCNP received funding to enter into a cooperative agreement with the University of Arizona and the 11 tribes traditionally associated with the region to better document the Grand Canyon as a place of traditional cultural significance. The specific aim is to generate a Multiple Properties Documentation Form (MPDF), also known as a “context statement,” which will empower each tribe to submit its own
individual nomination to list the Grand Canyon and its associated features on the National Register. Park staff expect the MPDF to be completed in 2020.

For the purposes of Section 106 review, the MPDF will not create an immediate change. Precedent has been set to consider the Grand Canyon as an eligible historic district, and since eligible properties are protected under the law, further documentation is not technically necessary to confer additional legal protections during project review.

However, the new documentation is certain to be more comprehensive than previous efforts and has the potential to build stronger relationships that can inform future land-use decisions. Consistent with Section 110 of the NHPA, which encourages federal agencies to survey lands in their jurisdictions for cultural resources, the MPDF will help build broader appreciation for the ongoing relationship between tribes and federally owned ancestral lands.

The consultation process for developing the MPDF also creates an opportunity for the NPS to discuss information that is outside the specific context of National Register eligibility but is essential to understanding tribal perspectives on the landscape. While National Register eligibility has clear benefits as the basis for the regulatory protections conferred by Section 106, it has been criticized for constraining perspectives on significance to tangible places, largely ignoring the role of intangible heritage such as
storytelling, rituals, songs, and dance, which give places context and meaning. U.S. law has not embraced, for instance, UNESCO’s definition of intangible heritage. The GCNP has an opportunity to look beyond National Register criteria and pay added attention on the role of intangible heritage at the Grand Canyon.

The MPDF can also help resolve different views of boundaries. As commonly happens with TCPs, tribes near the Grand Canyon have expressed significant discomfort about setting firm jurisdictional lines around the places that are significant to them within a large and complex ethnographic landscape. Some are discouraged by the National Register requirement that resources must be defined as district, site, buildings, structure, or object. While regulators want clear jurisdictional lines, TCPs may simply not fit any of those categories. Proactive identification efforts should allow tribes to describe boundaries by referencing the characteristics that define a place in their worldview.

Confidentiality is another concern that the MPDF can address. In the Section 106 context, sites must be identified, but some tribes are reluctant to document privileged knowledge. We assume that the park’s decision to prepare a context statement—as opposed to a National Register nomination—was a response to these concerns. Based on the context that is established, each tribe will be able to make its own decision regarding whether and how to advance National Register nominations. The context statement will empower tribes to use the National Register when appropriate, but also to use discretion when the Register is an inadequate tool for telling a complete story.

Some tribes may continue to feel that the National Register is an inadequate tool to sufficiently reflect their values. Nonetheless, these concerns should not deter federal agencies from meeting their obligations to consider and respect the viewpoints of indigenous people connected to the region in future management planning efforts. Complicated discussions surrounding the adequacy of the National Register can be avoided by emphasizing the Grand Canyon’s role as an “ethnographic landscape,” a term of art under NPS Management Policy (Section 5.3.5.3) and the Guidelines for
the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes. In other words, NPS staff have a process for documenting such resources, which can create a strong foundation for landscape treatment plans.

Full consideration for tribal viewpoints in planning efforts at the Grand Canyon is a matter of respect for the indigenous people connected to the region. While the nomination process is complex and imperfect, the context statement for the Grand Canyon as a National Register resource has the potential to provide federal agencies with crucial information to guide future planning. Sensitive use of the knowledge tribes have chosen to share can enhance the experience of the Grand Canyon for all who visit and provide a basis for long-term stewardship in accordance with the values of the people who have stewarded the Grand Canyon from time immemorial. FJ

BRIAN R. TURNER is a senior field officer and public lands attorney for the National Trust for Historic Preservation.
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Meshing Conservation and Preservation Goals with the National Register

ELIZABETH DURFEE HENGEN AND JENNIFER GOODMAN

The watershed-wide initiative for the Squam Lakes provides a ground-breaking preservation road map for an approximately 40,000-acre region of central New Hampshire that encompasses five towns, three counties, and three bodies of water just south of the White Mountains. Project leaders’ close alliance with conservation interests and robust public outreach were key to raising local interest and support for a multiyear effort—2010 to 2018—to create a National Register Multiple Property Documentation Form that has led to both many short-term preservation successes and promising ongoing efforts. The project yielded the largest geographic and first watershed-wide National Register for Historic Places listing in New England.

The project design and National Register process identified and documented Squam’s historical resources, raised awareness of the inter-connectivity between the built and natural landscapes, and continues to encourage their preservation. The initiative’s innovative strategies were successful in preserving a cherished place and way of life and offer practical ideas for large- and small-scale projects with similar goals.

This watershed-wide initiative provides a unique preservation “road map” for a region that encompasses five towns and approximately 40,000 acres in central New Hampshire south of the White Mountains. The boundary relies primarily on natural features, but employs town lines and lot lines when appropriate.

CREDIT: SQUAM LAKES CONSERVATION SOCIETY
HISTORIC SQUAM LAKES
Since the late 19th century, people have gathered in the Squam Lakes area in the warmer months to enjoy the beauty, serenity, and recreational opportunities afforded by the lakes and surrounding mountains. This highly distinctive cultural landscape is defined by rustic camps; summer cottages, both modest and architect designed; farmsteads surrounded by fields, pastures, and woodlots; village centers; former hotels and inns; children’s summer camps; stone walls; burial grounds; and cellar holes. Squam is the site of Camp Chocorua, the first organized children’s summer camp in the United States. Founded in 1881, it established a template for those that followed throughout the Northeast. After the camp closed in 1889, the same site evolved into the open-air Chocorua Island Chapel. Most of the resources are clustered around Squam Lake and its more than 60 miles of shoreline, but the smaller Little Squam Lake and White Oak Pond are also integral to the watershed’s history and natural context.

In a May 2013 article, architectural historians James Garvin and Nancy Dutton described the private camps and cottages as “deliberately rustic and evocative of the era before electrification, automobile travel and powerful motor boats.” They noted, “Their camps and cottages and the summertime activities they sheltered were often a complete antithesis to the home life of their builders, among whom were some of the most successful entrepreneurs and most distinguished teachers, clergy, writers and scientists in the Northeast.”

Despite more than 200 years of active habitation, the landscape remains remarkably unspoiled—thanks to a strong conservation ethic among the residents and an unspoken adherence to low-impact development, which have kept the shoreline essentially free of the mid- and late-20th-century commercial and multi-unit residential development that typifies lake communities throughout much of the country. Betsy Whitmore, chair of the committee that spearheaded the Squam Lakes initiative, marvels at the lake’s seemingly pristine shoreline: “When gazing down at the lake from a surrounding ridgeline, the shoreline appears undeveloped, even though there are numerous small cottages tucked in among the trees here and there.”
PIOneering the CampsteaD easement

Working with other conservation partners, the 100-year-old Squam Lakes Association and the somewhat younger local land trust—the Squam Lakes Conservation Society—have long led efforts to protect 30 percent of the watershed through the acquisition of conservation easements and land in fee. However, little had been done to identify and preserve the historic built environment. Meanwhile, the area’s desirability and high property values had made Squam’s older camps, cottages, and farmsteads vulnerable. Soaring property taxes forced some families to sell, and high sales prices increased the pressure to remove and replace the rustic camps with larger, year-round dwellings.

To meet these challenges, the Conservation Society worked with the New Hampshire Preservation Alliance to create an innovative tool: a campstead easement. Its legal framework is that of a typical conservation or preservation easement, but its objectives relate more closely to planning goals. Conservation Society staff work with the owners of each prospective property to identify character-defining features and long-term property objectives. These stakeholders craft a legal agreement that promotes preservation of the camp or cottages; requires use of natural materials for repair or replacement; and restricts future alterations to building height, footprint, and materials. Society staff offer guidance and monitoring to reinforce the easement terms, bringing in preservation advisers as needed. Campstead easements provide long-term stewardship for these resources and protect the shoreline. And the restrictions on future land use can reduce property values, which in turn can keep property taxes lower than they would be on an unencumbered property.”
While campstead easements help preserve and protect individual properties, they aren’t the solution for the larger-scale issue. “Preserving these intertwined resources is critical to preserving the low-impact, rustic quality of life and the cultural landscape that has defined the Squam Lakes watershed for over a century,” said Roger Larochelle, executive director of the Conservation Society. “Just as a forest defines the natural landscape, farmsteads, fields, stonewalls, and rustic camps define its human landscape. Preserving these cultural resources also helps to conserve the watershed, minimize development, and ensure that the traditions of Squam are passed along for future generations.”

**NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATION PROJECT DESIGN AND PROCESS**

The Squam Lakes National Register Multiple Property Documentation Form submitted in 2012 was unusual and innovative, weaving historical data into a narrative that explains how and why the Squam watershed evolved into a pristine natural area with a rich cultural heritage. It not only details the historical evolution of the area over a period of 250 years but also articulates the character-defining elements of both the buildings and built landscapes, thus laying the groundwork for managing future growth. Further, the form establishes a framework for producing subsequent National Register nominations within the watershed, which has proven to be of great interest to property owners and local groups.

While planning the National Register Multiple Property nomination, project leaders kept both organizational goals and on-the-ground protection objectives in mind. They felt confident that the project would help them build or strengthen relationships with local groups and property owners, increase membership and financial support for their work, and enhance conservation and preservation activities. The project was a citizen initiative, while the Conservation Society served as its fiscal agent. The Society also worked with the New Hampshire Preservation Alliance and the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources (the state historic preservation office) to develop a multifaceted project.
Whitmore, a member of the Society’s board, served as the chair of a committee of conservationists, historians, and historical society representatives from each of the five towns in the Squam Lakes. The committee raised funds to hire Elizabeth Durfee Hengen of Concord, New Hampshire, to produce the National Register nomination and consult on other aspects of the project. Hengen had 30 years of experience with diverse cultural and historic resource planning projects and had helped develop the campstead easement model. In addition, she had recently completed a National Register nomination for the watershed of Chocorua Lake, another well-loved New Hampshire lakeside community, at the time the largest nomination geographically in New England.

The multiple property nomination consists of an overarching cover form and individual registration forms. The cover form functions as an umbrella: it identifies and comprehensively lays out the two historic contexts—Settlement & Development and The Summer Influx—and describes the property types that illustrate those contexts. It also establishes the geographic limits and the time periods they cover, thus allowing individual properties and districts to be evaluated for eligibility within the overarching nomination.

Hengen determined, and the committee agreed, that the Squam viewshed was the most appropriate boundary. Much of

Framed views of lake and mountains, as well as dark exterior colors and careful vegetative screening, were central to the siting and design of both larger country houses and more modestly-scaled camps.
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Squam’s three lakes are ringed by peaks, ridges, and other focal points of the natural landscape that are visible from the water. In areas without such focal points, the boundary follows a mix of the watershed limits, town lines, topographical lines, conservation lands edges, and rear lot lines along roads.

Having established a geographic boundary, identifying property types that had not previously been formally defined in New Hampshire and describing their associative features became the next major task. Based on Squam’s evolution and physical character, Hengen developed definitions to distinguish its camps from cottages, organized camps from private camps, farmhouses from farmsteads, and country houses from country estates—work that will serve others nominating similar resources. She also analyzed recreational resources such as boathouses, town beaches, trails, and bridle paths. Per Hengen’s definitions, a typical Squam camp was:

- Built without formal plans and without an adherence to an architectural style;
- Cobbled together over time;
- Located on the shorefront and oriented toward the water;
- Traditionally approached from the water—road approach brings one to a back entrance into the kitchen; and
- Built on a ledge or footings of stone, granite, or concrete.

The camps’ site characteristics include:

- Trees and shrubs along the shoreline for screened and framed views and natural sightlines;
- Unpaved footpaths that weave through the woods to link the buildings and provide access to the water;
- Unpaved driveways;
- Hand railings along paths made from logs and saplings found on the property;
- Buildings sited to harmonize with and cause minimal disturbance to the landscape;
- A few trees and boulders left close by the buildings and sometimes protruding through a porch; and
- A lack of formal landscaping.
And their physical characteristics include:

- Low rooflines with gable or gambrel roofs and exposed rafter tails;
- No cellars;
- Wooden siding painted dark or earthen colors—or left to weather—with trim in a similar or subtly contrasting color;
- Posts, brackets, railings, and other details fashioned from logs or twigs, usually with bark left on;
- Window sash that is double-hung, casement, sliding, or drop-down with divided muntins to frame views and reduce glare from water; and
- A major porch on the lakeside functioning as an extension of the living room, sometimes separated by a hinged wall, and a minor porch at the kitchen entrance.

The multiple property approach streamlines a large nomination like this one, providing economy of scale, as information that is common to both the multiple-resource nomination and individual nominations does not need to be repeated, merely referenced on the latter forms. The nomination also allows individual owners to elect whether—and even when—to participate. It can easily be expanded to include more property types or amended as additional research information becomes available.
Included with the cover form were individual registration forms for five highly recognized and well-loved properties on the lake. Since 2012, another 12 have been submitted for nine individual properties and three districts. These have been funded by owners, about half of whom also received aid from a donations-based grant pool.

**ROBUST PUBLIC OUTREACH**

People inspiring other people, families inspiring other families were at the heart of all communications about this project. At the outset, committee members met with and secured support from multigenerational owners who played prominent roles in the region. Once those owners signed on to support the initiative, others paid attention. According to Whitmore, “These families embraced the idea of preserving the old barns, farms, and lakeside cottages that their grandparents had built and subsequent generations cherish. They understood that this was a way to preserve the heritage of Squam and their own beloved summer places. Listing on the Register became a means to celebrate [each family] for their careful and diligent stewardship of their Squam property.”

Public presentations focused on the history and significance of the area and explained what the National Register is and is not. Coupled with finalized campstead easements, these presentations generated interest and enthusiasm. Two scholarly and accessible books that had been published a few years earlier—Rachel Carley’s...
Squam and Derek Brereton’s Campsteading—also drove momentum for the project.

The project committee’s strategic communications plan ultimately reached property owners, selectmen from all five towns within the project area, heritage and historic district commissions, historical societies, land trusts and conservation commissions, local media, chambers of commerce, the hospitality community, and all the major local nonprofit organizations. The plan reinforced these audiences’ deep connection to Squam while also providing information about the project’s goals and popular topics such as property values and taxes.

Once the National Register work was underway, committee members introduced the project to friends and neighbors and set up meetings that allowed Hengen to view their properties. Convincing these residents that the National Register listing wouldn’t invade their privacy or increase tourism in the area was an ongoing challenge. Communications therefore emphasized the benefits of the National Register listing, including:

- Enhancing pride in the region and showing how to maintain its low-impact character;
- Providing a database to guide growth and development;
- Encouraging additional conservation and preservation work around the lake;
- Offering a proactive approach to, and early seat at the table through, the Section 106 process for federally funded, licensed, or permitted projects, such as cell towers and wind farms, that could be out-of-character with Squam’s landscape;
- Providing some flexibility in complying with building codes and American with Disabilities Act regulations;
- Honoring privacy and offering the ability to redact some information within the nomination; and
- Imposing no restrictions on private actions nor any requirement to open up to the public.

In addition to garnering community support for the nomination, this robust outreach led to fundraising success. The project received funding from more than 150 donors and several foundations. The committee also ran a successful fundraising auction that helped launch the project.
Hengen slightly reformatted and richly illustrated the National Register nomination cover form to make it suitable for public distribution. It has proven so popular that the Squam Lakes Conservation Society offers the 80-page report for sale, with proceeds going into the grant pool that helps owners cover the costs associated with individual property nominations.

**ONGOING POSITIVE IMPACTS**

The National Register Multiple Property Form has provided the first in-depth, comprehensive scholarly documentation of the Squam region’s most iconic properties, building on generations of conservation activity and affection for this special place. The process of developing the form and building community interest in preserving the cultural landscape has exceeded the project leaders’ expectations, yielding many short-term successes and laying a strong foundation for many more.

To date, 17 properties, three of them districts, have been listed on the National Register. They include more than 335 resources on more than 1,300 acres, most of them undeveloped but associated with local history. Listed properties include farmsteads with significant agricultural outbuildings and family cemeteries, rustic shorefront and island camps, a hilltop cluster of 18 cottages that represents the earliest summer development on the lake, country houses, and several family camp enclaves. Two of the properties—Chocorua Island Chapel, an outdoor chapel with well-attended weekly services, and Rockywold-Deephaven Camps, a large organized camp for families that dates to 1897—are Squam’s primary gathering spots. These early phases offer a model for the protection of other properties.

**Camp interiors have rustic features, such as stone fireplaces, decorative logs, exposed-stud walls and simple built-in furniture.**
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A variety of significant initiatives has grown out of the project’s strong foundation of robust outreach and use of the National Register:

- The Squam Lakes Association now hosts an archival repository for the preservation of Squam documents—such as photographs, maps, and guest logs—that historically have been mostly in private hands and typically stored in unprotected, seasonal buildings.

- The master plan for one of the five towns in the watershed includes a new chapter on historic resources that will serve as a good model for the other towns.

- Subsequent conservation easements have made reference to the National Register nomination and the watershed’s historic significance in their purpose statements.

- The Squam Lakes Conservation Society now regularly presents the “Passing It On” program, which offers stewardship strategies for property owners.

This project has inspired several owners of waterfront historic properties outside the Squam watershed, including an early boys’ camp, to produce National Register nominations. Concerned about the impacts of large-scale development, leaders in other parts of the state have also looked at the Squam project as a model for action.

With scores of large-scale energy projects in development around the country, it is more important than ever to help citizens and decision-makers as they identify and protect large cultural landscapes. While this rustic place in New Hampshire is distinctive and even unique, elements of this project could be replicated in a range of other communities. Tapping into people’s connection to place is still at the heart of generating both short-term successes and positive momentum over time. FJ

ELIZABETH DURFEE HENGEN is a historic preservation consultant based in Concord, New Hampshire. Jennifer Goodman is the executive director of the New Hampshire Preservation Alliance. For a copy of the Squam watershed National Register cover form, contact Roger Larochelle at roger@foreversquam.org or 603-968-7900.
Adapting to Maintain a Timeless Garden at Filoli

KARA NEWPORT

A historic landscape tells the story of a place dynamically—it will not allow for a static tale. Landscapes are living, and thus they evolve through the intentions of the people who carve them from the land; through interaction with the environment, both natural and designed; and through the influence of those who continue to use, maintain, and enjoy them over time. These times of rapid evolution—hastened by factors such as climate change—require both careful evaluation and decisive action from the stewards of historic landscapes such as the one at Filoli, a historic house and garden in Woodside, California.

THE CREATION OF FILOLI’S GARDEN
Filoli was built for Mr. and Mrs. William Bowers Bourn II, prominent San Franciscans whose chief source of wealth was the Empire Gold Mine in Grass Valley, California—though Mr. Bourn was also owner and president of the Spring Valley Water Company. Construction

Mr. Bourn chose the unusual name of Filoli by combining the first two letters from the keywords of his credo: Fight for a just cause, Love your fellow man, Live a good life.

CREDIT: FILOLI
of Filoli began in 1915. Bruce Porter, a talented stained-glass artist, painter, muralist, landscape designer, and art critic, was enlisted to help the Bourns plan the layout of the extensive formal garden, which was built between 1917 and 1929.

Many artists, all working to fulfill Bourn’s vision, collaborated to create the garden. Along with the rest of the house, Willis Polk designed the terraces, but much of the final garden structural hardscape was architect Arthur Brown’s vision. Porter then created the more intimate garden rooms, with designer Isabella Worn choosing many of the plants to fill these spaces.

Mr. and Mrs. William P. Roth, owners of the Matson Navigation Company, purchased the estate in 1937. Under the Roths’ supervision and maintenance, the formal garden gained worldwide recognition. Through a shared vision, Mrs. Roth and a team of international gardening staff stewarded the estate, continuing to build on its remarkable footprint.

Mrs. Roth made Filoli her home until 1975 when she donated 125 acres, including the house and formal garden, to the National Trust for Historic Preservation for the enjoyment and inspiration of

A key historic viewshe is over the Sunken Garden into the Santa Cruz mountains shown here with a temporary modern sculpture exhibition.
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future generations. The remaining acreage was later gifted to the nonprofit Filoli Center, which ensured the preservation of the critical viewshed.

Today Filoli is known for an awe-inspiring garden that attracts more than 200,000 guests each year. Large, old coast live and valley oaks surround the house. Sixteen acres of formal gardens are divided into a number of separate rooms and spaces that feature daffodil fields, fruit orchards, perennial border, flower beds edged in boxwood parterres, lawns, tall hedges, and specimen trees and shrubs. Camellias, rhododendrons, magnolias, Irish yews, olive trees, and other rare and unusual plants can be found throughout the garden.

The garden has always had an artistic flair, and it contains many art objects. Elaborate custom-created reliefs adorn the Garden House: plaques, cast stone bouquets, and ornate gates combine to create a “Secret Garden” feel. These original pieces are considered part of the National Trust’s collection, and Filoli staff work to preserve the aging, weather-worn artifacts while maintaining them as integral pieces of the garden experience.

DETERMINING AND MAINTAINING INTEGRITY

One of the challenges of historic landscape management is striking a balance between retaining original plants and preserving landscape intent.

Preserving the garden remains a driving force behind the horticulture at Filoli; maintaining traditions ensures that the site continues to reflect its early-20th-century roots. The layout and structure of the garden—its hedged rooms, garden walls, and designated paths and beds—has remained largely unchanged over 100 years. Plantings occur within the framework of these intricate bones. The 1920s greenhouses still display the original tropical plants and produce the seed-grown bedding plants used for the seasonal plantings. Continuing to propagate “historic” plants—like boxwood, yews, and wisteria—allows us to preserve their original genetic material.

Nonetheless, we have to make adaptations and choices. Several of the historic plants and trees have far exceeded their originally intended sizes. They now block walkways, their roots
causing the brick paths to heave and obscuring intended viewsheds. Thus, we are forced to balance preserving germplasm through propagation with carefully removing and replacing the original plants when necessary.

Thanks in part to having had only two prior owners, both of whom held substantial documented history, Filoli has amassed a large collection of photographs that help us maintain the intended integrity of the estate. We use these images to identify particular specimens from the Bourn era, track significant plant changes, and reference details such as preferred hedge height. The more than one mile of groomed hedges, for example, requires constant maintenance and systematic reductions in size to maintain its form. Photo documentation indicates that both the Bourn and Roth families faced the same challenges of maintaining the dynamic landscape over time: the same hedge sometimes grew to knee height and sometimes overspilled the walkway.

Stewards of Filoli have also been cataloging the plant collection since the 1970s, and we recently dramatically improved our plant collection system. Not only did we upgrade the database but we also developed a specific bed-tracking system that allows us to note plant locations on a map. This information will soon be available to the public, enabling visitors with a special interest in horticulture to better identify and appreciate the plantings.

NEW AND EXPANDED LANDSCAPE USE
While maintaining integrity guides our preservation choices, the intended purpose of a living landscape may change over time. For generations, the families that owned Filoli used the garden to play tennis on the courts, picnic and play games on the lawns, swim in the pool, and hold outdoor events and parties. But, of course, they didn’t host hundreds of thousands of people a year, as we do now, and experience the corresponding strain on the landscape.
On the other hand, presenting the garden as a static place that does not allow some level of use would dramatically limit our ability to vividly tell its stories. There must be a balance between protecting the resources of the landscape and allowing visitors to develop a greater understanding of the space by interacting and connecting with it. Filoli has created property-use guidelines that allow access while limiting damage. For staff, volunteers, and those who rent the garden for events, these guidelines are the basis for managing visitor access.

One of the parts of the garden that has become increasingly accessible in modern times is its lawns. While the carefully maintained lawns were an important element of the garden’s initial design—and while they enhance its viewsheds—they are also replaceable. In a region where fewer and fewer children have yards, it is delightful to see kids playing old-fashioned games like badminton. We have even integrated a game of croquet into the interpretative story for school programs, allowing students to play just as the Bourn grandchildren did nearly a century ago.

**FILOLI’S VIEWSHEDS AND THE HIGH PLACE RESTORATION**

Viewsheds are critical to creating a sense of place. How a space is meant to be experienced against a distant backdrop is an important part of the overall design intention. The views are one of the remarkable features that create a magical experience at Filoli. As they meander down the intricate paths enclosed in walls and
hedges, visitors might turn a corner to reveal a dramatic view that allows them to imagine living on the estate 100 years ago, far from the hustle and bustle of the city.

Filoli is fortunate to have been gifted surrounding land, which has allowed the original views to survive. Maintaining them is plenty of work nonetheless. Filoli is developing a mechanism for documenting our vistas and viewsheds to ensure their long-term preservation. Staff will be able to use this documentation to develop necessary amenities such as restrooms or visitor centers without compromising the important sense of place.

The High Place, constructed in the 1920s at the far end of the garden, was noted as Mr. Bourn’s favorite area in part for its view; from there, he could see the entire estate as well as Crystal Springs Lake. It is also an outdoor amphitheater with an upper and lower lawn terrace enclosed by hedges, trees, and an Irish yew backdrop. When initially constructed, the site had the further drama of a line of Lombardy poplars behind the Irish yew to help it stand out from anywhere else on the estate.

The High Place has lost its original detail and suffers from issues of declining plant health. The main goal of the ongoing restoration project is to improve the site’s growing conditions and return it to its original design, including restoring plants that were lost as the landscape grew and was modified due to other priorities.

To return the High Place to its original grandeur, we will need to undertake several major projects. Removing a number of forest trees will provide the area with adequate light for plant health and
design integrity. Replacing the Lombardy Poplars will create the grand end cap for the formal garden. Grading will help slope land away from the Irish yews and wisteria, to create optimal growing conditions. Pruning the original Irish yews heavily will reduce their size and their proportion in relation to other landscape features. Reconfiguring the irrigation system will enhance soil moisture conditions. Replanting the former lawn terraces—which we recently mulched during a series of drought years—with a turf blend that we identified through trials will leave the lawn better suited for high traffic, drought tolerance, and cool seasons.

Such a restoration project provides a perfect opportunity to integrate modern conveniences to best engage the visiting public. To focus foot traffic and reduce lawn compaction, we will add a gravel path to join the High Place to two adjacent path systems. Installing landscape and pathway lighting will provide better accessibility and facilitate use of the site for planned programs and other revenue-earning functions.

**ADDRESSING CLIMATE CHANGE AND OTHER MODERN CHALLENGES**

In the drought-ridden western United States, climate change is causing shorter, dryer winters; more frequent fires; and shrinking water resources. Filoli’s formal garden design did not consider limitations on water availability, and the exotic cultivars could not survive the harsh California summers without ample water resources.

Filoli’s first nod toward being more water conscious came after a series of significant droughts in the 1970s and ’80s. Over the next decade, Filoli staff installed a complete irrigation system designed to distribute exactly the amount of moisture that different plants—trees and shrubs, annual beds, turfgrasses—need. Since then, we have made further strides to prevent the overuse of water. Our irrigation schedules are based on the California Irrigation Management Information System, which uses historic weather data to recommend a precise volume of water that keeps our plants thriving without waste.

While restoring the orchard, we installed water-saving microsprinkler technologies. We have also integrated new **MP Rotator**
sprinklers to increase irrigation efficiency in the formal garden. We expanded our visitor center in 2005, and since it is not in a historic area, we chose to enhance the California native landscape surrounding the building. We opted for beautiful, drought-tolerant plants instead of the more water-dependent varieties found in the formal garden.

After back-to-back drought years in 2014–15, Filoli embarked on a trial to determine whether there were varieties of drought-tolerant turfgrass that would work well in our specific micro-climate, match the aesthetic of the garden, and require less irrigation. In all, we tested 12 varieties before settling on the No Mow Fescue from Prairie Nursery. This variety requires 40 percent less water, needs mowing only once or twice a month, and works well in the setting of our somewhat less formal yew allée.

The impacts of climate change extend beyond just drought and watering concerns. We have experienced increases in plant diseases that are likely linked to warmer conditions, such as bacterial blights and root disease fungi. Warmer winters have also affected budding and bloom times. Filoli is renowned for our bulb display, and each year the season begins earlier and earlier; we are now forced to encourage guests to come in January and February for traditionally “spring” displays.

One of the most important resources in the battle against these changing conditions is a highly qualified horticulture staff.
Just as in the days of the Bourn and Roth families, the staff are central in the story of the garden. They are the first line in creating efficiencies in water use, identifying disease, and exploring new techniques for modern applications.

Filoli strives to serve as both a national example in garden preservation and use and a place of beauty and respite for all who visit. An entrepreneur and an innovator, Mr. Bourn would have embraced the modern tools and techniques that set Filoli apart as a leader. FJ

KARA NEWPORT, who has a considerable background in public garden management, has been the chief executive officer of Filoli since 2016.
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