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Preservation Heroes’ Ongoing Fight to Protect Mount Taylor

JERRY ROGERS

At 11,301 feet, Mount Taylor dominates a large part of the west-central New Mexico landscape. Symmetrical and exceptionally beautiful, the mountain makes weather, collects rain and snowfall, and then stores the moisture in snowpacks and aquifers, thereby supporting year-round life by human creatures and others. The ecological zones created by its rising elevation host a wide variety of life forms upon which humans depend. Its volcanic origin caused the concentration of minerals, most notably high quality uranium ore. Not surprisingly, the mountain holds great cultural significance for American Indian tribes in the region; and not surprisingly, it holds great economic significance for many others. It has been determined eligible for the National Register, and in 2009 it was listed in the New Mexico State Register following nomination by the Pueblos of Hopi, Zuni, Acoma, and Laguna, plus the Navajo Nation.

This action prompted lawsuits to overturn the state listing and also legislative proposals with such extreme requirements for owner consent that no large traditional cultural properties could be listed in the future. A small band of experienced preservationists quickly coalesced, joining these tribes and others to defeat the legislation, but no one believes the fight is over. Jerry Rogers rallied others to the cause in an April 8, 2011, address, excerpted here, to the New Mexico Heritage Preservation Alliance. For deeper background, see Katherine D. Slick, “Stewardship Challenges on Public Lands,” Forum Journal, Vol. 22, No. 4 (Summer 2008), pp 15–28.

Sometimes just doing one’s job requires courage of heroic dimensions—especially when that job is applying criteria for cultural properties to large tracts of land and when evaluating kinds of significance not widely recognized by America’s dollar-driven culture. This presentation celebrates the heroes on the Cultural Properties Review Committee who two years ago, in 2009, showed the courage and professional integrity to list Mount Taylor in New Mexico’s State Register of Cultural Properties. It was politically difficult. Powerful mineral industries didn’t want it done, many private landowners didn’t want it done (even though their lands were excluded if they objected), the local legislator didn’t want it done, the governor didn’t want it done, and the Secretary of Cultural Affairs recommended dodging the issue on a technicality.

Virtually all of this resistance was based upon either erroneous or vastly exaggerated notions of the practical effect of listing, but being wrong did not diminish the opponents’ sense of
uncertainty about having been wronged. About the only people who supported the listing were five American Indian Tribes whose traditional reverence for the mountain over several centuries had made it culturally significant. Listing the mountain in the State Register was an act of professional responsibility and of political heroism.

**EFFORTS TO WEAKEN THE CULTURAL AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT**

We knew there would be retribution, and boy was there ever when the legislature next convened after the listing! Legislators introduced a bill that proposed to reorganize state government by combining the cabinet-level departments of Tourism and Cultural Affairs in a manner that did not promise the best future for heritage preservation. The same bill would have deprived the Cultural Properties Review Committee of its decision-making authority, made it an advisory and policy-setting body, lodged the decision-making authority with an official who serves at the pleasure of the governor, and made the state historic preservation officer an advisor to rather than a participant in planning of projects that affect listed historic places. Let’s take a closer look at what might happen when you administratively mix tourism and history.

It takes a particular type of creative mentality to get people in New York and London and Hamburg and Los Angeles and Hong Kong to come to New Mexico and to spend money here. History for these advertising geniuses can sometimes become mere raw material to be processed—just another subject to be hyped like nude beaches and casinos, and when facts get in the way, the facts may get modified to fit the excitement that must be created. Of such creativity come legends such as that of the Comanche warrior named Tucum and his beloved “princess” named Cari, who, if they really had existed and really had jumped off Tucumcari Mountain in romantic despair, would have died as a result of tumbling down a slope through cactus, because there is no suicide-scaled cliff there. From such creativity come stories of an outlaw who killed 21 men before his 21st birthday, of lost mines and buried treasure, and of saintly strangers who build miraculous staircases and then disappear into the desert. It is bad enough when that stuff gets into advertising, but it has no place being associated with serious matters like our social memory.

Historic preservation, on the other hand, requires people who are devoted to historical truth as best it can be understood, who are devoted to saving six inches of wood or a handful of mud that went into a building originally, even though using a new section of wood or handful of mud would be cheaper, faster, and maybe stronger. Historic preservation requires people to whom such things are matters of principle and of professional integrity, people who will sacrifice their careers rather than sacrifice their integrity. The combined department would not have been a good match, but organizational structure was not the main issue.

**WE KNEW THERE WOULD BE RETRIBUTION, and boy was there ever when the legislature next convened after the listing!**
uranium deposits, and right out of the ingrained belief that any burden upon enterprise or property is an unconstitutional taking—came the main attack: a bill to fundamentally revise the Cultural Properties Act itself. Identical bills in the House and Senate, clothed in a mantle of patriotism, proposed to put an end to imagined abuses of property rights such as the Mount Taylor listing by requiring advance written consent by 100 percent of owners, before a place could be listed in the State Register.1

Committee after committee heard people testify that even though their private lands had been excluded from the listing, their houses had declined in value and become unsalable, they had been unable to drill a water well just so they could have indoor plumbing, they were unable to drive cattle across a leased parcel of public land that separated their two privately owned

The zinger was the innocent-sounding step of vesting the Cultural Properties Review Committee’s decision-making authority in an individual. Under law, the committee must make its decisions in open public meetings, but an individual would be able to make the same decisions behind closed doors. The decision to list Mount Taylor in the State Register was made in a meeting that was very open and very contentious. Does anyone believe it would have been easier for a closeted individual somewhere in the Historic Preservation Division and out of the public eye, whose livelihood depended on the pleasure of the governor, to have made the right decision about Mount Taylor?

**ATTACKS ON THE CULTURAL PROPERTIES ACT**

Then from out of the oil patch—I mean, right out of those salt domes and layers of frackable rock, right out of those
pastures. These witnesses were not there on their own behalf, they said; they just wanted to make sure no other hardworking Americans would ever again suffer such abuse at the hands of this out-of-control Cultural Properties Review Committee. Never mind that virtually every house in America had declined in value during the same period, never mind that the State Engineer had never denied anyone a well permit based on this listing, and never mind that nothing in the law really interfered with driving cattle. It seemed true to these people, and so they made it true in their minds and declared it true in the legislative process.

Oh, and by the way, “owner” was defined not only as owners of the surface of the earth, where the cultural significance is (including for practical purposes archeological deposits). The owners to be identified and notified included owners of interests in subsurface mineral rights beneath public and private lands. Listing would also require advance consent from 100 percent of these “owners.” Not only would this have made any listing of any place utterly unfeasible, in the never-ending struggle between mineral owners and surface owners, it, for the first time, would have enabled a single subsurface owner to deny all other owners access to the pleasures and benefits and truly patriotic rewards of participation in state programs for preservation of heritage. The implications were beyond imagination, for heritage preservation and for every environmental program of any kind on the books.
PRESERVATION “HEROES” RESPOND

Heroes were needed, and heroes arose like minutemen from nowhere. At the risk of omitting someone I want to celebrate Mac Watson, Tim Maxwell, Victor Johnson, Tom Merlan, Lois Snyderman, National Trust for Historic Preservation Advisors Ernesto Ortega and Theresa Pasqual, plus tribal leaders from Acoma, Laguna, Tesuque, Pojoaque, Picuris, Navajo, and probably others. Jonathan Poston, director of the National Trust’s Southwest Office, did terrific supportive work from his office in Fort Worth, and retired State Representative J. Paul Taylor worked the phones from his home in Mesilla.

The two houses of the New Mexico legislature are miraculously versatile. Bills get referred to multiple committees, and those committees can refer the bills to yet other committees. Committee agendas are set on short notice, are subject to change, and committee meetings are unpredictable. It makes playing a defensive game against a bad bill like a gigantic game of whack-a-mole. When you think you have killed a bill by whacking it down in one committee, it pops up in another, and if you whack it over there it pops up in yet another.

When you think you have killed a bill by whacking it down in one committee, it pops up in another, and if you whack it over there it pops up in yet another. It took day after day of getting up early to check committee agendas, appearing at 9 a.m. hearings, comparing notes over lunch, and appearing in other hearings that ended at 10 p.m. It was a spontaneous defense, amazingly well organized for an ad hoc operation—and it was heroic.

The other side, in addition to its mantle of patriotism, also wore a disguise of reasonability and willingness to compromise. It was a disguise because it was not real, and in fact was deceptive. Opponents to the listing had begun with such an extremist position that they could make concession after concession after concession, and still have an absolutely crippling hold over historic preservation with their deadly precedent of subsurface control over surface cultural resources.

Upon being told that the bill would end the listing of historic business districts in cities like Clayton and Portales, they exempted urban districts and said, “Look how reasonable we are—now pass this watered-down bill.” Still meeting resistance, they exempted individual buildings on small acreages, and asked the stubborn preservationists to meet them halfway, even though the bill would still have absolutely prevented any listing of cultural landscapes significant to traditional cultures. Then they reduced the owner consent requirement from 100 percent to 51 percent and declared themselves consistent with the federal standard for the National Register of Historic Places—even though the federal standard does not require any advance owner consent at all. They even managed to get one of the Main Street programs to declare support, a position inconsistent

In April 2011 tribal representatives signed a Memorandum of Agreement with the New Mexico State Land Office to set forth a process of consultation on proposed activities on New Mexico State Trust Lands located within the boundaries of the Mount Taylor Traditional Cultural Landscape. Shown here, from left to right, are Hopi Tribe Vice-Chairman Herman Honanie, Zuni Tribe Governor Arlen Quetawki, New Mexico State Land Commissioner Ray Powell, Pueblo of Acoma Governor Randall Vicente, and Pueblo of Laguna Governor Richard Luarkie.
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New Mexico Was Not Alone
BY SUSAN WEST MONTGOMERY, DIRECTOR, INFORMATION AND TRAINING

While New Mexico can boast one of the more egregious efforts to turn back preservation protections, preservation advocates there were certainly not alone in fending off attacks this spring. By January the economic realities of the federal budget crisis were hitting state legislatures full on, and by mid-July the National Trust and its statewide and local partners had faced some 61 legislative assaults on preservation protections, funding, and incentives. And those were only the ones we knew about.

The National Trust and its allies employed a range of tried-and-true advocacy techniques. Between January and June, the National Trust sent 23 advocacy e-alerts to our members in various states and districts asking them to take action, along with producing op-eds to run in local newspapers and sign-on letters. The response was tremendous. This spring these alerts averaged an unprecedented 19 percent open rate and when folks took action it resulted in hundreds of letters to state legislatures. In the New Mexico campaign alone, open rates reached 25 percent and resulted in 182 letters to elected officials.

What all these efforts had in common was the willingness of citizens to roll up their sleeves and do the hard work of lobbying their elected officials. On-the-ground advocates walked the halls of state capitols, lurked outside committee rooms, and showed up whenever and wherever they were needed. They researched and wrote one-page leave-behind sheets for legislators and made sure that a wide swath of constituents had the talking points they needed to make the case. They sought allies locally, regionally, statewide, and nationally.

In Houston preservationists turned back efforts to undermine their historic preservation ordinance, and in Alabama a bill that would have removed important protections for underwater cultural and historic artifacts was narrowly defeated. Most advocacy efforts involved defending funding for state preservation offices and Main Street programs. While disappointing, in this economic climate most budget cuts could not be avoided. In the final tally, the average cut to state preservation office budgets hovered around 11 percent, on par with other state programs, and almost welcomed by advocates who feared much worse. In some states, rehabilitation tax credits ended up on the chopping block, but only Michigan lost its important revitalization tool when its governor called for the abolishment of all tax credits in the state.

Jerry Rogers’ eloquent acknowledgement of the work of preservation advocates in New Mexico could be applied in many states. So too, his plea for more preservation heroes in the months and years ahead.
Officers and boards of many statewide preservation organizations have faced enormous challenges just to keep their organizations alive, to release an annual list of endangered places and to hold an annual conference. I know what that is like. I personally planned two such conferences, and twice when I was president our statewide organization ran out of cash when it had salaries and rent to pay. Those who have kept such organizations going have my deepest respect and admiration, and are among the heroes I celebrate. But we need new life while there is still time—if there is still time. My pitch is to all of us, more accurately to each of you individually.

All across America, for a long time now, people who hate any impediment to instant enrichment—meaning people who hate government action whether for education, nutrition, clean air, clean water, endangered species, or historic preservation—have been dominating the public discourse. Those of us who care about the greater public good have stood by too quietly, maybe exhausted, maybe intimidated, and have let the anti-government, anti-collective, anti-preservationists have the microphones.

Those of us who care about the greater public good have stood by too quietly...and have let the anti-government, anti-collective, anti-preservationists have the microphones.
to come back, this time wounded, angrier, and more determined; and if they are smart they will come with a bill less ridiculously unworkable and better calculated to be enacted than last time. And if, by some miracle, they do not come back, I promise you someone else will. We need some new heroes—and we need lots of them.

DON’T LET NEGATIVE CHARGES from the other side go unanswered, but be so positively engaged that the other side cannot get its negativism in edgewise.

What can I do, you ask?
Invite two people to join your local and statewide preservation organizations. Participate in statewide and local preservation conferences.

Think of a pro-preservation subject on which you will write a letter to the editor or an op-ed piece, or a subject you will arrange to discuss on local radio or television some time during the next six months, and then do it.

Now think of a publicly visible preservation activity you will hold before winter sets in again. It could be as simple as a bake sale or a picnic. It could be a forum at your school or church. It could be a preservation fair. It could be a raucous street demonstration with picketers and signs and honking horns—but it needs to be something that will draw public attention to the part of the preservation cause that most excites you.

Now think of an endangered historic place, and ask yourself whether it should be on the next list of endangered places. Research the place and nominate it—or better yet, enlist other people from your local civic club to do so.

Get the concept of heritage preservation as patriotism—the idea that our national heritage is what the Defense Department exists to defend—on the air and in print as often as you can. But don’t try to hog the limelight—hep praise upon other organizations who helped us in this struggle. Engage like-minded organizations and make our cause a vital part of something much bigger.

It is said that the New Mexico governor intends this year to review state regulations in general to see if they are business friendly. We don’t know whether Historic Preservation Division regulations will be among those chosen for review, but let’s not be surprised if they are. Most historic preservation happens in the private sector, so that means historic preservation needs to be business friendly. Let’s be ready in advance to defend preservation regulations, but let’s also be ready to adapt them if they can be made more business friendly without impairing their effectiveness.

Above all, take the initiative. Create the public discourse, and make it about the value of heritage and the good that is done by preservation. Don’t let negative charges from the other side go unanswered, but be so positively engaged that the other side cannot get its negativism in edgewise. Do whatever it takes to maintain the tribal leadership and involvement that was so vital in the recent struggle.

And remember that I am not just talking to the officers and board of the organization—I am talking to me, and to you. Exactly you. We need some new heroes. Who else is it going to be? FJ

JERRY ROGERS is former National Park Service associate director for cultural resources. This speech was also excerpted in the Spring 2011 issue of the Chronicles of the Trail, the quarterly journal of El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro Trail Association (CARTA), www.caminorealcarta.org.

1 The New Mexico Cultural Properties Act is silent on owner notification and consent, so the Cultural Properties Review Committee has followed the standard in the National Historic Preservation Act.
n May 1864, almost 186,000 Union and Confederate troops endured two days of desperate fighting during the Battle of the Wilderness in Virginia’s north central Piedmont region, halfway between Washington and Richmond. One of the most significant engagements of the Civil War, it was the first time that generals Robert E. Lee and Ulysses S. Grant faced off against one another, eventually leading to a tactical draw, with heavy casualties, that marked the beginning of the end of the Civil War.

Nearly 150 years later, preservationists, historians, and national park advocates were distressed by a proposal by Walmart to seek a special use permit from the Orange County Board of Supervisors to construct a 240,000-square-foot superstore on privately owned land at the gateway to the Wilderness Battlefield National Park and immediately adjacent to the Fredericksburg & Spotsylvania National Military Park. The 52-acre development site would also include other chain retail stores.

The Wilderness Battlefield Coalition formed in June 2008 to press for an alternative site. The National Trust, Friends of Wilderness Battlefield, Civil War Trust, and Piedmont Environmental Council were key Coalition partners, along with the National Parks Conservation Association, Preservation Virginia, and a number of other conservation organizations.

The Coalition first tried to communicate directly with the Orange County Board of Supervisors and Walmart representatives. But with early indications that a majority of the Supervisors had already made up their minds in favor of Walmart, and with no positive response from the corporation, the Coalition then launched a campaign to raise local and national awareness. Their activities included presentations to local groups; letters to the editor, state and federal politicians, prominent historians, and others with an interest; and media and public events at the Wilderness Battlefield National Park.

The National Trust named the Wilderness Battlefield one of America’s 11 Most Endangered Historic Sites in 2010. Walmart’s plan was also publicly criticized by the National Park Service, Virginia’s governor and other state and county officials, local and national media, a group of more than 250 American historians, local and national heritage groups, and thousands of individual Americans, including actor Robert Duvall, a Virginia native and resident.

But despite these protests, in August 2009 the Orange County Board of Supervi-
sors voted 4-1 to approve Walmart’s application. With the pro bono legal assistance of Arnold & Porter, the non-profit Friends of Wilderness Battlefield and a group of citizen coplaintiffs vigorously pursued a lawsuit against Orange County to overturn the special use permit. At that point, the Coalition groups actively prepared for the court case by gathering data to back up legal arguments, and recruiting experts to testify, including from among their own ranks.

But on January 26, 2011—just before trial proceedings were due to start in Orange County circuit court—Walmart announced that it would drop its plan to obtain the special use permit and instead work with the local community to identify an alternative development site in the county. On May 23 the corporation announced that it plans to build three miles west of the contested site. It has since announced that it will purchase the original 52-acre site and protect it from development.

**Q:** Why did you object to the proposed Walmart site? After all, it’s outside of the Wilderness Battlefield National Park.

**CAMPI:** Most novices think that the boundary of a national park is where history ends, but that’s more frequently not the case, especially for the Civil War battlefield parks in the East where you’re only protecting a small percentage of the overall battlefield.

The Walmart site is the perfect example. Here we had what was the nerve center of the Union Army. It was the headquarters site; it was an artillery encampment; very likely there were temporary prison camps there for Confederate soldiers; there was a hospital on the site; almost certainly there were temporary graves on the site. Because there are so few physical remains of what happened there, it was easy to downplay the history of the site. But we know that there was quite a bit going on there, outside the park boundary.

**HOLMES:** This was one of the biggest challenges—getting people to understand the difference between national park boundaries and battlefield boundaries. Walmart prided itself on saying, “We’re not in the battlefield.” The county acted shocked and amazed that we suggested, no, they’re actually building on battlefield land.

From what I understand, in 1993 the American Battlefield Protection Program looked at delineating the battlefields and in doing so identified the entire area that played a role in the battle. That was the “study area” and if it’s part of the study area, it’s still battlefield land.

The national park boundaries were drawn over core battlefield lands—land

---

**SO THIS WOULD HAVE BEEN:** “Welcome to Orange County. Here’s the top of our Walmart—and, oh by the way, welcome to the Wilderness Battlefield and the edges of Chancellorsville Battlefield.”

Coalition members were quick to commend Walmart’s decision.

In telephone interviews, three highly involved Coalition members were invited to reflect on this challenging fight and its positive outcome: Zann Nelson, president, Friends of Wilderness Battlefield (www.fowb.org); Jim Campi, policy and communications director, Civil War Trust (www.civilwar.org); and Dan Holmes, director of state policy (and also Orange County field officer), Piedmont Environmental Council (www.pecva.org).
where we know there was fighting, where we know blood was shed. However, the study area is still an integral part of the battlefield. These were areas where you’d have staffing, troop movements, hospitals.

In actuality, Walmart would have been building on two battlefields, because in 1863, about a year earlier than the Wilderness Battle occurred, Chancellorsville Battle was going on, and that area of the battlefield actually extends all the way up in Orange County. So this land was a high point on this route down to the Chancellorsville Battlefield, as well as a high point that had a commanding view of the Wilderness Battlefield.

Walmart was going to build 38-foot-tall building, at its highest point, on a knoll that stands 55 feet above the intersection. Walmart was going to cut 20 feet off the knoll—I won’t even say my comments about destroying every historic resource that’s underneath that 20 feet—but that would still be 18 feet higher than the existing topography, not to mention destroying what is the gateway entrance to the community.

When you come from Spotsylvania County heading from the Chancellorsville Battlefield into Orange County, the first thing you see is the Walmart site. So this would have been: “Welcome to Orange County. Here’s the top of our Walmart—and, oh by the way, welcome to the Wilderness Battlefield and the edges of Chancellorsville Battlefield.” We just didn’t feel that was an appropriate type of development to welcome citizens and tourists, especially at a time when we’re getting ready to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Civil War.

NELSON: What surrounds a national park often serves as a gateway and is an integral component of the experience. The condition, look, and feel of the immediate area surrounding a historic park impacts the message and experience. If surrounded with inappropriate development, the vision is tainted and the visitor is simply not going to “get” the significance. Unfortunately, there are not a lot of ordinances in place that can advise a Walmart or a local gov-
government that, here is how you should treat that area.

But this was more than merely the gateway. Letters, maps, diaries, and official reports indicate that this particular area was “command central” for the Union forces during the battle. Artistic illustrations from the period depict a hub of activity: troop movement, command headquarters, ambulances between battles and the hospitals located on the hillside. Sadly, it is an uphill battle to convince the non-historian of the enormous significance, especially when so often the prevailing effort by most preservation groups is to save land where “opposing armies fired upon one another.”

Here was an opportunity—no, a mandate—to stand up or accept a permanent loss.

Q: Did you have other concerns about the proposed site?
CAMPI: The Civil War Trust had been working with Spotsylvania County, which is also right across Wilderness Run from the Walmart site, for several years, working on protecting the Route 3 corridor and trying to prevent development west of Chancellorsville—trying to protect the rural character and give visitors the experience that travelers would have had at the time of the Civil War. So this proposal to build the Wilderness Walmart at the intersection of Route 3 and Route 20 not only had direct impact on the Wilderness Battlefield but essentially would undermine those efforts to try to protect the Route 3 corridor.

HOLMES: We have to remember that this wasn’t just a Walmart being proposed, but two additional commercial sites being considered just below the Walmart on that same 52 acres, which would have brought the total to somewhere along the lines of 220,000 square feet of commercial space with Walmart as the anchor store. We already saw other commercial development proposals spring up nearby, so we saw the potential for this thing to spiral out of control really fast.
And at that point, you’ve already had some huge blows over the course of history to the Wilderness Battlefield and the integrity of the resource, and we felt that additional impacts could not be sustained. It was our opinion that by siting this much commercial activity at that intersection of Route 3 and Route 20, the road that bisects the battlefield, you were almost demanding, begging, for the realignment and widening of Route 20.

One of the largest residential developments on Route 3, this growth area, is Lake of the Woods which now contains approximately a third of the population of Orange County. About a third of it is in core battlefield land. They built houses on what were some of the most important northern troop positions during the battle. And in fact, I think there were a large number of residents who remained silent about the proposed Walmart site because they were concerned that an alternative location would mean that it would be pushed somewhere else in the corridor, and they weren’t particularly excited about having a big-box store located near their residential community.

**Q:** How did you communicate your concerns?

**CAMPI:** The first thing the Coalition did in 2008 was write a letter to Walmart asking them to consider alternative sites away from the battlefield.

Even going back further, in the summer of 2006, the Civil War Trust had gotten a communication from Walmart asking if we would oppose a Walmart next to a Civil War battlefield. And we did indicate at that time we would have serious concerns about that, but they wouldn’t tell us what battlefield. So we didn’t know for certain until the storm started brewing in 2008. None of the preservation groups were consulted before the project was formally announced.

**QUITE FRANKLY** we could not have asked for a better attorney to represent our needs. Without the law firm of Arnold & Porter, this ultimate victory would have never been possible.

We tried to communicate both with the Board of Supervisors and with Walmart, and the Coalition’s message was consistent throughout: We weren’t opposed to Walmart in Orange County, we were just opposed to Walmart at that site. We felt all along that a compromise could be reached that would move the Walmart down Route 3 and protect the battlefield.

**HOLMES:** I think it was important that we didn’t just come out outright and say “No.” The Coalition started off with a very principled decision that, as far as our ability, we would work with state legislators and other interested parties—so that we wouldn’t be automatically dismissed as a bunch of naysayers and NIMBYs. We were saying, we can show you how you can have this economic development that you desire and still protect another economic engine that happens to be a national treasure.

**NELSON:** As far as any historic fact, we would not issue any statement that could not be documented. And from us you would not hear name-calling or negative statements. All our messages—whether they were in speeches, presentations, or letters to the editor—were all positive. We continually repeated the theme that we are not opposed to Walmart being in Orange County, but we believed that there were other locations that would be acceptable.
**Q:** Tell me about your dealings with the Board of Supervisors.

**NELSON:** Shortly after Walmart had submitted its application, three of the board members—before the first hearing—stated how they were going to vote. So from the get-go, it didn’t appear to be an open dialog. And of course, it’s much more difficult to change a decision that’s already been made.

Some folks would get angry stating, “We’ve elected these people (the Board of Supervisors) to work on our behalf, so you need to get out of the way.” We would get chastised about it. But in my estimation this is not the way our government works: We don’t elect them and then just walk away. We still have to do oversight. That’s our responsibility as citizens.

Certain members of the board complained about all the e-mails and calls, and ranted that it was simply outsiders trying to tell Orange County how to run things. But Friends of Wilderness Battlefield is very much a local organization with hundreds of local supporters. We were tireless in conveying that message.

**CAMPI:** Ultimately, I think it had more to do with pride than good policy. The Supervisors had made up their minds and weren’t going to be pushed around—although certainly our message couldn’t have been more conciliatory and cooperative. We said all along we wanted to work with the county. We had indicated that we were willing to put money into a study to identify better locations and protect the corridor, but it was not a message that was being received. I think the Supervisors were under the impression that it was a delaying tactic, and an attempt to get the Walmart deal to fall through entirely, so it was a message that wasn’t taken at face value.

**Q:** Why was the make up of the Coalition important?

**NELSON:** There were three basic components to the Coalition—national, legal, and local. All three components are essential for success in an endeavor of this sort.

The Civil War Trust and the National Trust brought a broader scope of contacts, the ability to communicate with larger numbers of preservationists, and the all-important national clout vital to working with mega corporations. They (the mega corps) are simply not going to answer the phone if Friends of Wilderness Battlefield were to call.

Even in the absence of a lawsuit there is a benefit to having a strong and savvy legal team. With the legal firm of Arnold & Porter in our corner and Bob Rosenbaum at the helm, we had absolutely the best legal team available. Without a doubt, had Mr. Rosenbaum not been passionate about the cause and willing to work pro bono, we would not be where we are today.

To bring the team full circle, there must be a viable local face and voice. It is much more difficult to dismiss one’s friends and neighbors than a faceless entity from somewhere else. Certainly, there will be differences of opinion, but with a local perspective that opinion becomes more viable.

As a local force, we worked diligently to raise the awareness of the contributions our group makes to quality of life issues, tax revenue through tourism, and the breadth of local citizen involvement. We increased the number and scope of public events held at Ellwood [historic house in the park] and surrounding battlefield. The purpose? “Get to know us—your neighbors—and your historic park land.”

**HOLMES:** The different organizations in the Coalition brought different strengths, and in this case I think we had just about the best mix we could ever ask for.
All of the partners contributed to this victory. The National Trust and Civil War Trust provided leadership and information on the history of Wilderness, and were responsible for communicating with Walmart. The Piedmont Environmental Council provided local land-use and conservation expertise as well as legal assistance on local land-use law, and Friends of Wilderness Battlefield provided a local voice and conducted most of the outreach to the Board of Supervisors.

I want to credit another organization, National Parks Conservation Association, which identified Bob Rosenbaum who represented us in the case. Quite frankly we could not have asked for a better attorney to represent our needs. Without the law firm of Arnold & Porter, this ultimate victory would have never been possible.

**Q:** Why do you think Walmart was so resistant to moving a few miles?

**HOLMES:** If you were a commercial entity that had already read in the newspaper that three out of the five decision-makers on this issue were in favor of you, as presented, as you originally proposed, not even calling for any additional protections, there really wasn’t any motivation for the corporation to make changes to their plan to suit the community’s needs. They already have a certain amount of money invested in not only the site plan and site design but also in gaining approval from the county. Why spend another dollar?

**CAMPI:** I think that we weren’t making an impact on the local representatives of Walmart because they had a financial interest in seeing the re-zoning be a success and weren’t necessarily concerned about the black eye that Walmart was getting over this. In most of these fights, you’re dealing directly with the decision-makers, but we weren’t until pretty late in the game.

**NELSON:** Walmart had made its decision based on the information it gathered. It does not retreat readily from a publicly held position. Unfortunately, the existing process did not allow for all stakeholders to weigh in at the time of fact-finding.

**Q:** Do you think that Walmart learned anything from this?

**CAMPI:** I hope so. I think we’ve dealt with them in good faith, and I think they’ve ultimately left with an understanding that they can work with the preservation groups—that we’re not unreasonable people. So my hope would
be that the next time something comes up, they would work with us first. And we’re seeing evidence of that.

NELSON: Given access to accurate and complete facts, I believe Walmart will make smart decisions. Here’s hoping they have decided it is better to be a partner than an antagonist in questions of American heritage.

Let’s face it, they are in the profit-making business; extended delays, lawsuits, and changing horses in mid-stream do not bode well for high quarterly reports.

Q: What lessons have you learned? What advice would you give to others?
NELSON: If the gate to the barnyard hangs on rusty hinges, fix it now! Don’t wait until the cows are out and destroying the neighbors’ flower beds.

Look to the future and determine what needs to be done now. Work with your local governments on issues relevant to historic sites and natural assets, to develop policies that protect them. Partner with the people who are making these decisions. Join the chamber of commerce; offer to serve on committees such as the planning committee or the department of tourism. Where possible, support the election and appointment of like-minded individuals. Get involved before there is a crisis!

When a crisis does present itself, take a position, even if you do not win. We were frequently hit with, “Where were all these preservationists when McDonald’s [and other chain retailers] built their stores at the Wilderness intersection?” The preservationists did argue against those earlier places, but we were a day late and a dollar short and we lost that battle. Had we been able to take a stronger position then—visibly, on record, in opposition—then the next situation would have appeared more consistent. At least there would have been a strong precedent.

An advocacy group must maintain a positive, reasonable position. It is counterproductive to be characterized as radical or inflammatory or simply as obstructionist. A good plan requires consensus. Be the first one out the door with a positive attitude and a plan that addresses everyone’s issues. Sometimes advocates must take a tough stand, but that alone is not sufficient. They must also bring solutions to the table. The Coalition did that, over and over, until someone finally started listening.

A challenge such as this is not for the weak of heart, and an incredible amount of discretionary time is demanded. Not everybody is going to agree with the position, even internally. Low morale can be an issue. Not everybody is willing to sacrifice their social standing in the community.
or risk making their neighbors angry. It’s a balancing act, but it is important to find a good fit for all supporters.

**HOLMES:** One lesson would be the importance of reaching out and finding allies, perhaps even nontraditional allies. Bringing different perspectives to the table actually brought about a stronger coalition, a better result.

Never give up! That’s another big lesson.

**CAMPI:** We should try to be more proactive in these communities, to engage them and educate them on the benefits these historic sites bring—the tourism benefits, the benefits of working with preservationists to try meet their economic development goals while still preserving historic lands. It’s so important to get local governments to understand how fragile these historic places are.

---

**Wilderness Gateway Visioning Study**

As part of this advocacy effort, the Wilderness Battlefield Coalition has also been engaged in exploring the best way to protect the battlefield and its surroundings for the future. Zann Nelson, president of Friends of Wilderness Battlefield, explains:

*We understand that you can’t lock all the land of historic and natural value away from all kinds of development, but we believe there is a reasonable distance at which point one can start employing quantifiable standards for what is acceptable nearby. There is ample material that can be studied to develop a suggested model of what is acceptable for buffers and borders adjacent to national parks, including viewscape, noise, artificial light levels, and vegetative buffers as well as types of development. The model should include arguments that support the necessity and benefit of such action, and suggestions of types of development that would be complementary to the national park and an economic boon to the locality. Once a model is developed, it could be marketed to local communities and local governments, maybe as overlay districts that lie within a specific proximity to a national battlefield.*

The Coalition has undertaken the Wilderness Gateway Visioning Study, underwritten in part by a grant from the National Park Service (American Battlefield Protection Program), to develop such a model. The study will propose ways to enhance the gateway entrance into Orange County, preserve important battlefield resources, and identify compatible economic development opportunities for the project area. Since April 2011, a diversified team of landscape architects, planners, economists, transportation engineers, preservationists, and representative public and private stakeholders have been meeting, and also hosting open house forums, to explore these topics.

The study will be completed this fall.
Another lesson is, when dealing with large, multinational corporations, try to get to the national leadership as soon as possible, because I think they ultimately have a better understanding of the company’s image than perhaps the folks on the ground. We had correspondence with the national level but the meetings were with local representatives. We ultimately found that members of the Coalition did have some personal and professional contacts higher up that we didn’t fully utilize until later in the game.

One of the things that was extremely helpful, and is always helpful in these struggles, is to get people out to the sites. Give them a tour, explain the events that happened there. I think almost everyone we took out to the historic Route 3–Route 20 intersection came away with a better understanding of how important these sites are, having walked the grounds. So the more often you can get people out there—whether it’s elected officials, representatives of developers, members of the media—the better.

Q: Any final thoughts?
CAMPI: I think that in most cases when you’re offering a reasonable compromise, there is a receptive audience, but here, with the Supervisors and with the local representatives of Walmart, there just was none. For Walmart, moving their site would have meant a less controversial application, less local and national opposition, and they still will have met their goal of putting a store in Orange County on Route 3. For Orange County, any economic benefits they would get from a Walmart they would still get if the store was moved down the road a mile or two.

So it ultimately looks like that’s going to be the result now. But it was a message that we had been pushing from the very beginning. And I think if the preservation community had been consulted early on, most of this controversy could have been avoided.

HOLMES: Getting Walmart to move away from the historic resource was a huge victory. But I’d say the biggest victory was the opportunity to educate people about a resource that they knew little about even though it was right down the road. You had some 186,000 troops between the two sides gathered, over two days of fighting, in a county whose current population is only 32,000. It was astounding to realize how little residents of the very county in which the resource is located knew about the Wilderness Battlefield and how critical this battle was to the overall outcome of the Civil War.

NELSON: Proponents of the vast commercial development on this remarkably historic site declared repeatedly, “This is our county and we get to make decisions about it”—failing to grasp the idea that the Wilderness Battlefield is a national park and belongs to all Americans. Orange County has the privilege and duty to be good stewards—a role most localities would consider a plum.

At the recent Civil War Trust banquet, the plaintiffs were awarded the Carrington Williams Preservation Award, and they asked me to make a few comments. I said, “I hope one day that the children of those who opposed us will thank us for taking the position that we did.”

KERRI RUBMAN, who conducted and compiled these interviews, is assistant editor of Forum Journal.
once had a professor who argued that historic preservation benefits from economic decline. It seemed logical at the time. Economic decline removes all the pressures of new development and leaves communities with little incentive to destroy what they have. According to the professor, it was economic decline of Southern seaports after the Civil War that caused places such as Charleston and Savannah to retain the traditional buildings that give them their authentic charm today. He saw that effect again in river towns such as Madison, Ind., and Galena, Ill., where local economies based on extractive industries and river traffic were left behind by the development of the railroads.

So by that standard, shouldn’t industrial cities suffering from job loss and long-term outmigration just sit tight until we come to appreciate the residue of their once-robust 20th-century character?

It turns out, on reflection and analysis, that the professor was only partly correct. It is not decline that is good for preservation, but stability. “Bear” economies are not our friend, but Goldilocks is. While booming economies make preservation tough, too much decline makes wholesale preservation untenable. We should want it just right. Preservation benefits from an equilibrium. When the economy of a community or region is deeply altered by events beyond its control, it must seek a new purpose for being. Preservation can help. Savannah’s charm contributes mightily to its high quality of life today, helping to attract new jobs and residents, and it attracts thousands of tourists too.

With 20th-century industrial cities, however, such adaptation is more difficult than it once was. Industrial cities were often clustered around one or two related industries, so when change occurs it affects the entire region; there is no buoyancy from economic diversity. Early 20th-century cities grew rapidly with huge manufacturing complexes which are not easily adapted to other uses. In the industrial boom, such cities built housing for workers quickly and cheaply, making the buildings more vulnerable to the effects of deferred maintenance. Add the facts that populations in the 20th century are far more mobile, and the social stresses of crime and poverty much deeper than in the past, and it is clear that sustained economic decline, with accompanying population loss, leaves in its wake a large quantity of excess real estate that must be addressed. Equilibrium at that scale is hard to find.
RIGHTSIZING
All of these conditions exist today in the manufacturing cities of Michigan and Ohio, in pockets of the Northeast, and in a few cities in the South and West. The numbers are staggering. Detroit, built for a peak population of 2 million in 1960, today has just 800,000 people, and 40,000 abandoned structures. Youngstown was a thriving steel center in that same year, with a population of 170,000. Today it has about 70,000 people, 4,500 abandoned buildings, and 22,000 vacant lots. Industrial cities, large and small, with sustained population losses of 60 percent or more and no prospect that their industries are about to come roaring back, are turning to a concept called “rightsizing”—which may be defined as the practice of shrinking a city to a more manageable footprint and infrastructure in response to sustained population loss by demolishing vacant and abandoned property and curtailing services in neighborhoods beyond redemption, to concentrate investment in other neighborhoods through rehabilitation and new construction.

Though this notion is obviously foreign to the American psyche, cities that are shrinking are considering such drastic action because the levels of vacancy and abandonment have decimated their tax base. Not only does a long-abandoned property have no value, it actually has a negative value—for studies show that a long-vacant property reduces the value of every house nearby, even as it adds to the cost of public services to address the social ills it harbors. The effect is that the costs of a local government go up as its source of revenue plummets. Remaining residents also experience a deteriorating quality of life, hastening outmigration and fueling the cycle of decline.

Rightsizing seeks to remove some real estate in search of equilibrium in the market and concentrate revitalization efforts in places with the best chances of yielding a quality of life that will stem the departures and tame the social ills, while simultaneously scaling back municipal government to reduce the infrastructure it must service. Rightsizing calls for developing strategies by which to manage the significant quantities of vacant land. It seeks a new image for the city. Toward these ends it employs vision and planning, selective rehabilitation, widespread demolition, and some strategically placed infill construction—ideally (but too rarely) in that order.

To be successful, rightsizing requires a community consensus that shrinkage is the only viable way to survive. To forge that consensus, a visionary leader must build the political will by bringing the citizenry into the process. Given the displacement caused by Urban Renewal and interstate highway construction in the 1960s, residents are rightfully suspicious of clearance programs and tend to dispatch leaders whom they do not trust to have their best interests in mind. Gaining that trust requires participatory planning and wise and coordinated management that moves just fast enough to convey a sense that things will get better, but that is done deliberately and transparently enough to avoid any impression of force. It’s a delicate balance that few leaders have been able to strike.
The National Trust and the Michigan Historic Preservation Network are collaborating on a pilot project in Saginaw, Mich., to make sure that historic resources are considered as part of any overall rightsizing plans.
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Preservationists’ Role

So what are preservationists to do when confronted with a city intending to right-size? Face it, and embrace it. I know our aversion to widespread demolition, but we actually have something to contribute to this process, and if we alienate and obfuscate, it will only result in marginalization of the preservation approach. Years ago we learned that opposing new construction driven by real growth was counterproductive, so we have not opposed growth, but we have helped to manage it. We should do the same with shrinkage. We should lend our expertise to the process of rightsizing, to focus on what gets rehabilitated and what gets demolished. The numbers in either category are irrelevant as long as the vision is right, the process is transparent, and the goal is equilibrium.

We have experience and tools proven to be effective at managing change, and when the change is driven by decline unprecedented in America and no other tools and experience exist, we have much to offer. By working with and not against community leaders in rightsizing efforts we can educate them on what preservation really is all about and reinforce the growing recognition of the role historic areas play in a healthy city. To the degree leaders are open to some preservation, let’s help them do more, and do it well.

This is not to deny that there sometimes exists a prejudice against older and historic properties among those charged...
to implement the plan. In fact, driven by the need to spend federal Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) funding before the end of 2012, there often is yet no plan, and often too, no real community consensus. Because demolition seems easy and rehabilitation laborious, the rush to spend federal money is causing some communities to adopt clearance policies and call it rightsizing. Indiscriminant clearance without a plan for targeted reinvestment is not rightsizing. That should be opposed before a new demolition juggernaut morphs into Urban Renewal II. Rightsizing has a place in selected cities with real sustained population loss; it is not a remedy for routine blight in every community.

LESSONS FROM SAGINAW AND ELSEWHERE
When there is a real need and a thoughtful process to shrink a city, it too is likely being driven right now by NSP timing. When that is the case—as it is in Saginaw, Mich., where the National Trust and the Michigan Historic Preservation Network are collaborating on a pilot rightsizing intervention strategy—the first challenge is to earn the respect and trust of locals driving the process. That requires being on the ground; rightsizing is not easily addressed from afar. Our first role in Saginaw was to expedite demolition of properties beyond redemption and those that clearly had no historic significance—or those that had lost it since being surveyed in the 1980s—even as we argued for preservation of all that was redeemable. Our role has moved on to assistance with the interpretation of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the treatment of buildings in designated historic neighborhoods, the reestablishment of a local regulatory capacity for enforcing the preservation ordinance, and application of programs like Main Street®.

By being involved in Saginaw, and by watching carefully what is happening elsewhere in the nation, we are steadily learning what preservation organizations can do in rightsizing situations:

Enhance Awareness and Understanding
- Update and post available historic building survey data to the internet to improve awareness and enhance transparency
- Highlight opportunities and successes for rehabilitation when they are not perceived by planners
- Represent preservation in master planning and detailed neighborhood planning
- Present “Historic Preservation 101” talks before community organizations
- Conduct workshops on use of historic preservation tax credits
- Coordinate exhibits and lectures on the history of the community, and how that history can serve as a basis for planning the community’s future
Provide Technical Assistance

- Identify key properties for rehabilitation with neighborhood advocates
- Develop and present rehabilitation strategies for key projects
- Identify absentee owners to aid in acquiring control of the site
- Brainstorm ideas for reuse and explore feasibility of new uses
- Help identify appropriate developers to undertake rehabilitation of key properties
- Consult on use of historic preservation tax credits
- Provide, or advise on, specifications for rehabilitation work and infill

Strengthen Historic Preservation Delivery Systems

- Encourage adoption of or recommend ways to strengthen historic preservation ordinances
- Recruit members for and train historic preservation commissions
- Create/adopt programs to stabilize neighborhoods at tipping points, such as
  - marketing strategies targeting neighborhoods based on historic character
  - revolving loan fund
  - residential stabilization lending
  - teaching and promoting Main Street® principles

Build Organizational Capacity

- Build or strengthen nonprofit preservation advocacy
- Connect with neighborhood associations to instill a historic preservation ethic
- Reach out to other rightsizing communities to learn and share through conferences, webinars, blogs, etc.

CONCLUSION

Much of this is similar to what historic preservation organizations already do, so it requires few new ideas. It is really just refocused preservation commonsense, accompanied by a reality check and some attitude adjustment. The goal is to identify neighborhoods and structures worthy of preservation that might become focal points for rehabilitation investment, and also identify neighborhoods where demolition can take place with little or no adverse effect on historic resources. In the latter case, where there are single structures or small pockets of valuable resources, it might be possible to retain those in a different context as touchstones of history or anchors for future new development.

As in all planning experiences, there will be complexities in the details of implementation, but it is important to not let rightsizing seem like some two-headed monster. Preservationists should vehemently oppose senseless demolition initiated in the name of rightsizing. We should embrace rightsizing when warranted as just another exercise in the change management we have been doing for years.

By demonstrating our value to the process, by earning the respect of the leaders with a supportive contribution, and by focusing on the community’s new vision, we can contribute our expertise to creating a smaller but smarter 21st-century community with its historic assets as anchors. FJ

ROYCE YEATER is the former director of the National Trust’s Midwest Office in Chicago where he led that regional office in addressing emerging threats to historic resources in eight Midwestern states.

“Moving Modern”: Modern Architecture as “Moveable” Heritage

MARY KAY JUDY

Modern buildings—which may be too young to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places, or unappreciated by those who think they are too close to the recent past to be significant or not suitable for today’s living standards—frequently lack protections that older neighboring structures enjoy. Too often these buildings, many designed by influential architects, are demolished to make way for larger homes. Moving these buildings to a new site, however, offers a way to save them. And since many of these buildings are made of prefabricated parts, dismantling and moving them presents a feasible preservation option.

But in addition to moving buildings to preserve them, there can be another motivation at work. An emerging trend—treating Modern architecture as works of art that can be acquired by collectors—is another reason why these buildings are being packed up, transported, and reassembled on a new site. (Of course, while it is possible to move many types of buildings, older structures are not currently being sought out as collectibles to the same extent.)

These actions raise many nuanced questions. What are the implications if Modern architecture becomes a collectible commodity like artwork or is treated as “moveable” heritage? Can a Modern building’s significance be maintained if it is taken from its original site? Does a Modern building’s design significance stand independent from its original site, as does a work of art or sculpture? If a building were to be sold to a private collector to be moved, could a condition of sale include provisions to maintain it appropriately and to allow scholarly and public access?

The following article explores the concept, the recent trend, the future implications, and the possible preservation opportunities of treating Modern architecture as “moveable” heritage.

ART VERSUS BUILDINGS

In the United States, unlike most other countries, there are few heritage protection laws that govern and define “moveable” cultural objects, such as fine art, sculpture, and historic relics, with the exception of certain limitations on archeological finds and Native American artifacts. Shaker furniture, for example, is widely considered significant and collectible; however, there is no legal restriction that it be kept in the country as American cultural property. Further, there is no American equivalent to an antiquities registry that would govern American moveable heritage.¹

DOES A MODERN BUILDING’S design significance stand independent from its original site, as does a work of art or sculpture?
In contrast, “immoveable” objects include architecture, built heritage, and landscapes. The most comparable immovable heritage protection laws in the United States are local historic preservation regulations governing individual landmarks and historic districts. It has been taken for granted that these laws would protect built heritage, since it is considered “immoveable.”

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation also speak to this. They highlight the importance of a site’s integrity and call for making minimal changes to both the building and setting. The Standards cite both the importance of the relationship of the buildings to the landscape and the danger that a moved building can create a false historic appearance. The Standards also do not recommend moving buildings to an existing historic site or ensemble since their introduction may diminish the historic character of the existing site or complex.

However, both the criteria for determining eligibility for National Historic Landmark (NHL Exception 20) and National Register listing (Criteria Consideration B) identify exceptions for evaluating moved properties. This option for future listing after a move is important because 20th-century buildings less than 50 years old are not yet eligible for NHL or NR listing unless they meet the criteria of having exceptional significance.

MOVING BUILDINGS FOR PRESERVATION

In the overwhelming majority of cases, buildings have been moved—or proposed to be moved—because that was the only...
possible way to save them. Here lies the crux of the compromise: Moving a building from its intended site can seriously harm its integrity and context—but the building is saved. Moving Modern buildings is especially problematic since the surrounding landscape was often specifically designed by the architect in conjunction with the building (such as Philip Johnson’s Glass House in New Canaan, Conn.), or the house was designed in response to the specific setting (such as Richard Neutra’s Kaufmann House in Palm Springs, Calif.). Separating a building from its landscape significantly alters the design intent, the experience of the building itself, and its overall integrity. As such, it is understood that Modern buildings should be preserved in situ whenever possible, and moving should only be considered when all other options have been exhausted.

There are many successful cases of moving Modern homes in order to preserve them. A number of houses designed by Frank Lloyd Wright, in particular, have been moved for that reason, often with the assistance of the Frank Lloyd Wright Building Conservancy, which has raised awareness of the endangered buildings and sought solutions through networking and advocacy.

Wright’s Pope-Leighey House, for example, was constructed in Falls Church, Va., in 1940 and was moved in 1964 to Woodlawn Plantation in Alexandria, approximately 20 miles away, after it was slated for demolition to allow a road widening project. In 1985 advocates dismantled and moved Wright’s 1957 Arnold Jackson House approximately 50 miles from Madison, Wis., to Beaver Dam after it was threatened with demolition to make way for an office park. The Gordon House, completed in 1963 on the Willamette River in Wilsonville, Ore., was threatened in 2002 when the owner proposed demolition for the construction of a larger house on the site. In a last-minute negotiation, it was agreed that the house would be moved 25 miles to the Oregon Garden Foundation’s property in Silverton. Wright’s Duncan House, built in 1957 in Illinois, was moved more than 500 miles to Acme, Pa., in 2004 where it now serves as a guest house near Kentuck Knob and Fallingwater.

Wright’s Bachman Wilson House in Millstone, N.J., which has suffered repeated flood damage from the adjacent river, is now up for sale—a moving sale. In this unusual situation, the house, the move, and reconstruction at a new site on Long Island with upgraded energy-efficient mechanical systems are being offered under one single purchase price. Preservation New Jersey included the house on its “10 Most Endangered” list in May 2011 urging that all possible options should be fully explored prior to moving.
but conceding that “If relocation is the only viable course of action, this distinctive building, the work of one of the twentieth century’s greatest architects, should remain on a site as comparable as possible to the original in setting, orientation, and geography.” (www.preservationnj.org/site/ExpEng/index.php?/ten_most_11/index_detail/Bachman_Wilson_House)

There are several other examples of mid-20th-century houses being moved for preservation. The stainless-steel prefabricated Aluminarie House, designed by Kochner & Frey, was constructed in 1931 for an architectural exhibition in New York City. After the close of the exhibition, it was purchased by a private owner and moved to Long Island by boat. Several decades later, a new owner proposed demolishing the structure to make way for a small subdivision on the estate. In 1988 the house was saved when the owner agreed to donate it to the New York Institute of Technology’s Islip Long Island Campus. The New York State Department of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation provided a grant to underwrite moving costs. The campus where the Aluminarie House is located was recently sold, putting the house back in jeopardy. At the time of writing, there is a proposal to move it to a new site in Queens.

Committed individuals, not necessarily from typical preservation advocacy organizations or backgrounds, led many of these successful moves to save threatened buildings. In two cases the efforts were led by second- and third-generation family members of the original architect.

Unfortunately, saving a building by moving it will not work if the building cannot be matched with a new owner and site. Often finding a new owner and location is complicated by the pressures of a strict time limitation and the lack of technical expertise in evaluating the viability of conservation and moving for preservation.

For example, the 1933 Chicago Century of Progress Exposition featured architect Howard Fisher’s International Style, steel, prefabricated house commissioned by General Homes, Inc., and designed for middle- and upper-class living. Two years later, one of Fisher’s prefab homes was built in Cambridge, Mass. The house remained on its original site until the owner proposed demolition for construction of a new house on the lot. The Cambridge Historical Commission mounted a campaign in 2004 to save the building by having it moved to a new site, but unfortunately a match was not found and the building was demolished in 2006.

Another recent loss is the John Lautner Shusett–designed house in Los Angeles, built in 1951. Local preservation groups including the John Lautner Foundation proposed moving the building to a new site when the owners planned to demolish it for a larger house on the same site in 2010. The owners were not open to negotiation and proceeded ahead quickly with demolition.

**MOVING BUILDINGS FOR PRIVATE COLLECTION**

Modern buildings are also being moved from their original sites because they are sought out by collectors of 20th-century design who are knowledgeable about

---

**[THE HOMES SOLD by auction houses] were handled as art objects—as opposed to architecture or even as real estate.**
An early example of architecture treated as movable art is the house designed in 1949 by Marcel Breuer for an exhibit at the Museum of Modern Art, called “A House in the Garden.” The building was designed to be a model for post-war family living. When the exhibition was over, the Rockefeller family arranged for the house to be moved to the grounds of the family estate, Kykuit, in Westchester, N.Y. It was reassembled and has been used over time as a guest house and for an artist-in-residency program. The house recently underwent a full exterior and interior restoration. It is their importance in both design and architectural history. Collectors have collaborated with major auction houses, such as Sotheby’s and Christie’s, which have set the appraisal value and publicized sales, while turning the buildings themselves into an investment commodity. Neither auction house maintains an architecture department; rather the recent sales of Modern buildings were conducted by the “20th-Century Decorative Art and Design” departments. Thus, they were handled as art objects—as opposed to architecture or even as real estate.

Andrew Geller’s 1959 Pearlroth House, built on a beach in Long Island, N.Y., is being moved approximately 40 feet to allow room for new construction. The architect’s grandson is spearheading the move that will save the building.
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three prototypes, was originally shipped from France and erected in Brazzaville, Congo, in 1951, then a French colony. Before the auction, the *International Herald Tribune* stated: “The Maison Tropicale is the biggest trophy in modern and contemporary design.” The auction catalogue contained a lengthy disclaimer and conditions of sale stating that the house would be delivered, dismantled, and stored for several weeks for the new owner, but the new owner would be fully responsible for claiming and moving it thereafter. The house sold for nearly $5 million to a private owner who has loaned it to the Tate Modern in London where it was displayed on the banks of the Thames River. The owner plans to ultimately move it to the Caribbean. A second Prouvé prototype house that was brought out of the Congo was purchased and restored by an American collector who donated the house to the Pompidou Center in Paris after exhibiting it at the Hammer Museum in Los Angeles.

Shortly after the sale of the Maison Tropicale, the owners of the Kaufmann House in Palm Springs, which was designed by Richard Neutra and completed in 1946, put the house up for auction by Christie’s in May 2008. The owners and the auction house hoped to capitalize on the momentum of the Farnsworth and Maison Tropicale sales. A large part of that momentum, as they saw it, was to continue “promoting architecture as a collectible art worthy of the same consideration as painting and sculpture.” (Edward Wyatt, “A

Marcel Breuer’s “House in a Garden”—designed for a 1949 exhibit at the Museum of Modern Art in New York and moved to Kykuit, the Rockefeller family estate in Westchester, N.Y., shortly after—is an early example of architecture treated as moveable art.
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During this period, before the recession slowed the pursuit of these houses, an innovative approach for architectural collection was proposed in the spring of 2007 by Michael Govan, the director of the Los Angeles County Museum of Art. Citing architecture as inseparable from art and noting the high degree of significance of local mid-century architecture, he proposed acquiring local landmark houses by notable architects such as Rudolf Schindler for the museum’s collection. The houses would be preserved and maintained as museum pieces and also serve as housing for curators. To date, apart from the purchase of a John Lautner office interior, the museum has yet to acquire any properties.

In August 2010 an article appeared in the Los Angeles Times about two of Frank
Lloyd Wright’s textile-block houses in that city, La Miniatura and the Ennis Brown House, both of which were for sale. Neither house had found a buyer despite steep price reductions. According to the article, the Realtor for La Miniatura was reportedly in discussions with Japanese art collectors who had proposed dismantling the house and shipping it to Japan. The Realtor was quoted as saying: “With my position in the preservation community, I will probably be crucified for saying this, but we have to consider all options. We moved the London Bridge to the Colorado River. Why couldn’t we move this house to Japan?” (Jori Finkel, “Dramatic, Historic and Prices Slashed, Yet No Buyers Are Biting,” Los Angeles Times, Aug. 27, 2010) However, in late July 2011 it was announced that the Ennis House had been purchased by a private owner committed to its restoration in situ. At the time of writing, La Miniatura is still on the market.

**PRESERVATION ISSUES—THE ELGIN MARBLE DEBATE**

The uncertain future of these two properties have left many in the local architecture and preservation communities asking what would it would mean for Los Angeles if they were to lose a Wright house to an international collector.

The Los Angeles situation raises a number of questions: Shouldn’t a Modern building’s heritage belong to the identity and community in which it was originally built? If you take buildings out of Brazzaville, Congo, for auction in New York would that be comparable to the now highly questioned act of taking the Elgin Marbles (or, more appropriately, the Parthenon Marbles) out of Greece? Or if you were to purchase and move the Farnsworth House, would you be denying Illinois its heritage? These issues are also reminiscent of the claims over the past decade made against North American museums for repatriation of national treasures to their country of origin. Such questions are not new, of course. Historic buildings, or sections of them, have been collected and moved for centuries—but the fate of endangered Modern buildings is a particularly pressing concern.

For prefabricated houses or those that have been moved more than once, the preservation issues are not clear-cut. Since prefabricated houses weren’t designed for a specific site, it may be more acceptable to move them than a house that was created with its setting in mind. In addition, it may be more appropriate to move a house that has already been moved more than once since it has lost any association with its setting. But at what point does its setting become significant to the house and to local history? Borrowing a concept from National Register criteria, should a building be on a site for at least 50 years to be considered significant to its location?

Certainly when moving the building is the only option to save it, then it should be moved. However in many cases buildings are lost at the 11th hour because there is not enough time to mobilize. To prevent these loses, should moving Modern buildings be a more established, accepted solution for saving them? Should a Modern preservation advocacy organization maintain an online listing of threatened Modern properties eligible for moving?
“MOVING MODERN” ROUNDTABLE
To respond to this growing trend and the issues it raises, the Neighborhood Preservation Center in New York sponsored a roundtable of interdisciplinary preservation professionals to discuss “Moving Modern” in June 2011. It was agreed that each situation must be evaluated individually, but that the guiding philosophy for all cases is that Modern buildings should not be moved unless that is the only option for preservation.

However (barring economic limitations, construction deadlines, and the failure to match a proposed move with a new site), from an engineering standpoint, these buildings can be moved. One participant, Nancy Hudson, a structural engineer at Robert Silman Associates, pointed out: “Anything is possible.” Eva Subotnik, professor of law at St. John’s University, was then quick to highlight UNESCO’s massive undertaking of dismantling and moving six temple complexes—nearly 30 buildings, including Abu Simbel—under the Save Nubian Heritage Program from 1959 to 1979.

Additionally, it was agreed that owners, potential buyers, and advocacy organizations, as well as preservation professionals, need to be better prepared to evaluate suitability for moving and offer technical advice. As it is, technical resources on how to move a historic building are rare, since this is considered an option only in extreme circumstance, and none address the special challenges or considerations of Modern buildings. The most comprehensive guide to date is Moving Historic Buildings by John Obed Curtis, published in 1975 in cooperation with NPS in the Technical Note series. Curtis uses several case study examples, all of which were masonry or wood-frame buildings from the late 1800s to the turn of the 20th century. While this is an excellent guide for older buildings, it does not address modern building materials, technology, and systems such as curtain walls and prefabrication. A guide for moving Modern architecture would continue to build on established knowledge in the same way the field of technical building conservation has drawn from previous experience to address new challenges for restoring and preserving Modern architecture.

As such, the recommendation was to create a “toolkit” specifically tailored to Modern heritage resources. It will provide such information as criteria to evaluate a modern building’s suitability for moving and its proposed new site; technical guidelines on means, methods, and estimated costs; a template RFP for moving contractors; and a template legal contract to define the scope of work and responsibility for the owner and buyer of the property to be moved. Additional roundtables and discussions are also needed to keep this topic a focus of attention.

Watch for further developments. FJ

MARY KAY JUDY is an architectural conservator based in Brooklyn, N.Y. She is currently working as a restoration consultant on several Modern houses including Philip Johnson’s Glass House, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe’s Farnsworth House, and Philip Johnson’s 9 Ash Street House. Please send information on other “Moving Modern” case studies to info@marykayjudy.com.

1 In countries such as Peru, Mali, Czech Republic, and China, among others, there are restrictions on exporting cultural heritage or antiques over a certain age. Typically items ranging from 50 to 100 years old must be approved by the local antiquities department of the Ministry of Culture or in-country customs office for export.

2 The criteria for eligibility as either an NHL or NR property agree that a moved building must be significant primarily for its architectural merits and embodied values while retaining a very high amount of integrity. Further, the moved location must be in keeping with the original site in terms of orientation, setting, and environment.
Miami Marine Stadium: Making the Case for Exceptional Significance

Jorge L. Hernandez

More and more Mid-Century Modern masterworks face uncertain futures as they “show their age.” After decades of heavy use, they may now require extensive repairs, alterations, and upgrades. Often misunderstood, public opinion regards these structures as either no longer the prominent exuberant symbols they once were, or not “sufficiently historic.” The Miami Marine Stadium—once a vibrant cultural center for the young city of Miami, but now shuttered and abandoned—is one such example.

A Remarkable Design

In 1962 the Chicago planning firm of Ralph H. Burke, led by J. L. Donoghue, submitted a master plan to the City of Miami for a recreational landscape on Virginia Key—the Miami Marine Stadium. The firm’s proposal for the stadium, envisioned as the world’s finest speedboat racecourse, consisted of a shaped and dredged aquatic basin similar to one built in Long Beach, Calif., for the Olympics of 1932 and a waterside grandstand structure modeled after the one built at Jones Beach Theater in Wantagh, N.Y., in 1952.

The combination of grandstand and basin was unique and remains so to this day. An aerial rendering that accompanied the Burke Master Plan depicts the basin—6,000 feet long and 1,400 feet wide—configured as an aquatic circus maximus, dredged from Biscayne Bay and surrounded by land on three sides yet open to the west framing views of Miami’s skyline. The rendering also shows how the planners had envisioned the architecture of the grandstand, resembling a straightened section of a ball field grandstand, with a vaulted metal roof—an expected formal response for the design of a grandstand structure.

Nothing about this early rendering suggests the masterwork that would be produced when the architectural commission was granted to the Miami firm of Pancoast, Ferendino, Skeels and Burnham in 1962. Upon receiving the commission, the partner in charge of the project, Andrew Ferendino, tapped a 26-year-old Cuban architect, Hilario Candela, as the lead designer. Hilario had joined the firm just a year earlier.

The grandstand structure that Candela designed is a masterpiece among Miami’s Modern works of architecture. The structure, which is 326 feet long and 126 feet wide, consists of eight bays of “V” shaped columns supporting a thin-shell concrete roof with a 65-foot cantilever. The undulating planes of the roof structure are formed by hyperbolic paraboloids (a continuous flowing double-curved form) and appear to float over the 6,500 seats of the stands below. The view...
from the nearby causeway presents a forceful pattern of “chiaroscuro” caused by the deep sculptural recesses of the structure awash in strong Florida sunlight. On the other side of the basin, the structure is open to the sky and sea as the lower rows of seats project over and hover above the waters of the basin.

In the words of Hilario Candela, “The stadium is an architecture for that place where the land and the sea kiss.” The form of this monumental yet graceful structure resembles a giant work of origami in concrete. It suggests waves, wings, sails, clouds, shells, kites—all evoked by the skillful use of geometric forms. The architecture of the grandstand lends a presence at once brutal and fragile in contrast to the natural serenity of the protected waters of the basin. Architecture and designed landscape (grandstand and basin) together give rise to a truly memorable place—the Marine Stadium.

**ROLE IN MIAMI’S CULTURAL LIFE**

Since its opening night, December 27, 1963, the stadium was a place of spectacle and celebration, a social nexus for the community. Over the years, the mix of activities was astounding: high-speed boat races, rowing regattas, swimming competitions, beauty pageants, water skiing exhibitions, opera, movies, classical concerts, rock concerts, political rallies, Easter sunrise services, flotillas for the Patroness of Cuba, performances by Mitch Miller, Arthur Fiedler, Ray Charles, Aretha Franklin, Bonny Rait, El Puma, and many others. At the Marine Stadium, Elvis Presley shot his movie *Clambake* and Sammy Davis hugged Richard M. Nixon during a political rally.

No event has become so inextricably linked to the venue as the Jimmy Buffet concert in 1985. The youthful abandon of Buffet’s lyrics and the spirit of this setting were a perfect complement. Where else but here, under a Miami sky, could the performer and one-third of the audience be afloat? That’s because of a custom at the stadium that had evolved over time: Just before a concert, for a small fee, boats were allowed to coast into the basin and moor.
to one another around the floating stage to enjoy the show. Yet even as this most memorable of concerts took place, the stadium’s heyday was already nearing its end.

ABANDONMENT BY THE CITY
Mismanagement and the city’s unrealized hopes for private development of the public site, coupled with the assault of Hurricane Andrew in 1992, brought about the stadium’s current derelict state. The City of Miami, claiming that the hurricane had irreparably damaged the structure, closed the facility and sought funds from FEMA and the insurance carrier to demolish it. However, the structural engineering company hired by the insurance company to evaluate the City’s claims found evidence to the contrary. The plan to demolish the grandstand failed. Still, the grandstand was fenced in and abandoned for 19 years. It was left to rot—a clear case of demolition by neglect.

In 2008 the City was set to begin the approval process for a new master plan for all of Virginia Key, including the stadium and surrounding property. This plan, authored by the firm of Edward Durrel Stone and Associates, proposed demolishing the Marine Stadium grandstand, filling the basin with a marina containing permanent dock slips and mooring points, and allowing commercial over-development of the site. If realized, the plan would have destroyed the cultural, social, natural, and aesthetic fabric of the site’s history and created a pallid replacement of the vibrant original.

FRIENDS OF MARINE STADIUM
In February 2008 a new group, Friends of Marine Stadium (founded by Hilario Candela, Becky Matkov, Donald Worth, and myself) was established under the auspices of the Dade Heritage Trust. In less than three years, the organization has rallied the community behind the cause to save the stadium and return it to vigorous public use. The organization sought and obtained local historic designation from the City’s Historic and Environmental Preservation Board. (Although the City withheld its consent for the designation, the local ordinance allows the Board the authority to grant designation anyway.) This was quickly followed by the inclusion of the Marine Stadium on the lists of endangered historic sites of the most prestigious preservation organizations at state, national, and international levels including the Florida Trust and the National Trust for Historic Preservation in 2009. This recognition led
The World Monuments Fund to include the stadium on its list of 100 worldwide sites under watch in 2010. The nation and the world joined the local community in recognizing the unique historic character of the Marine Stadium.

**THE CHALLENGE OF DESIGNATING RECENT-PAST PLACES**

In securing the local designation, Friends of Marine Stadium had to confront a problem that is all too familiar to advocates for recent-past resources—overcoming the resistance in national, state, and local historic designation criteria to recognize places that are less than 50 years old. The Criteria Considerations for the National Register of Historic Places state that “properties that have achieved significance within the past 50 years shall not be considered eligible for the National Register” unless the property is of “exceptional importance.”

This restriction has been picked up by most state and local registers as well, and is often (arguably, too strictly) used to dismiss all “underage” resources. But the National Park Service publication *Guidelines for Evaluating and Nominating Properties that Have Achieved Significance Within the Past Fifty Years* adds that “An understanding of the context of the historic resource is based on the knowledge of the time, historic theme and geographic area with which the property is associated.”

Further: “The 50 year period is an arbitrary span of time, designed to ensure that enough time has passed to evaluate the property in a historic context…[It] was not designed to be mechanically applied on a year by year basis. Generally our understanding of history does not advance a year at a time, but rather in periods of time which can logically be examined together.”

At the time the Friends group was seeking designation, the age of the stadium was five years short of the 50-year mark. The Friends group, however, successfully established that the Miami Marine Stadium had truly achieved “exceptional importance” within the past 50 years. Here’s why:

The concept of the significance of history being revealed in “periods of time…examined together” allowed for the interpretation of the architecture of the stadium in connection to a lineage of works in exposed structural concrete that begins at the dawn of the 20th century with the work of Auguste Perret, the French engineer. Later mid-century works by Luigi Nervi (Italy), Oscar Niemeyer (Brazil), and Eero Saarinen (USA) provided a context for comparing the stadium to contemporary works already recognized nationally and internationally as masterpieces of Modern architecture.

More important is the story of a trio of master architects sharing and elaborating ideas with regards to Pan-American Modernism of the mid-century. The Marine Stadium plays a major role in that story.

Before completing his education at the Georgia Institute of Technology in 1957, Hilario Candela, the designer for the Marine Stadium, had interned in the office of Max Borges Jr. in Havana. Both Max Borges Jr. and his brother Enrique Borges were heirs to their father’s legacy as an important Cuban architect. Max Borges Jr. began his career under the sober influences
of rationalist architecture but by 1951 had designed his masterpiece, the exuberant yet haunting Salon de los Arcos de Cristal (salon of the crystal arches) at the Tropicana nightclub in Havana.

The affinity between Borges’ new direction and the work of Spanish-born Mexican architect Félix Candela (a distant cousin to Hilario) caused Borges to invite Félix Candela to collaborate with him in Havana. Félix Candela was the accomplished master of thin-shelled structural concrete forms. His sculpturally expressive structures seemed to defy gravity, or at least challenge it. Around the mid- to late 1950s the collaboration of these architects had produced important works in the history of Cuban Modernism—the Banco Nunez in 1957 and the Antilla Flower Shop in 1956.

In the mid 1950s, at Georgia Tech, the young Hilario Candela met the master, Félix Candela, who was a visiting lecturer. The creative aura of collaboration between the elder Pan-American masters filled the air during Hilario’s internship in Max Borges Jr.’s studio. The aesthetics of this collaboration found fertile ground in the imagination of the younger Candela and its influence would bear fruit on the shore of Biscayne Bay where “the land and the sea kiss” in Hilario Candela’s design of the Marine Stadium grandstand.

This story of the interconnections among masters of Pan-American Modernism provides “[a]n understanding of the context of the historic resource… based on the knowledge of the time, historic theme and geographic area with which the property is associated.” Because the story demonstrates historic significance that is connected to “a period of time” and based on inter-related history and geography, it dismisses the strict application of the 50-year threshold in evaluating the Marine Stadium.

**FUTURE PROSPECTS**

Friends of Marine Stadium, now an independent nonprofit organization, has staved off the bulldozer. After obtaining local designation for the stadium, the nomination to the National Register is now in process. On behalf of the Friends organization, Hilario Candela, Catherine Lynn from the University of Miami School of Architecture, and I conducted a public planning process with the University of Miami School of Architecture students and 30 community groups. The resulting plan was adopted in July 2010 as the official City of Miami Master Plan for Virginia Key and the Stadium. The organization also sponsored an international ideas competition for the Floating Stage and meets with future stadium promoters. It receives grants and broadens public support for the project by working in partnership with the National Trust and the World Monuments Fund. The Friends organization is now negotiating with the City of Miami to implement the renovations by 2013. The organization continues the advocacy, fundraising, and public relations campaign to return the stadium to vital public use. For more information go to www.marinestadium.org.

Jorge L. Hernandez is a professor at the University of Miami’s School of Architecture, a trustee of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, of Dade Heritage Trust, and a founder of Friends of Marine Stadium. A version of this article appeared in Preservation Today for Dade Heritage Trust, 2009.


2 For more on this, see Elaine Stiles, “50 Years Reconsidered” (*Forum Journal*, Vol. 24, No. 4 [Summer 2010]).

The community development field, like the historic preservation field, has a long and evolving history, continuing to broaden its approach and develop complementary partnerships. My recent thesis study1 of several Midwestern communities—in particular two Chicago urban neighborhoods, North Lawndale and Pilsen—indicates that preservationists and those interested in community development have much to offer each other, and by working together increase their chances of success. However, certain practices are more successful than others. This article briefly describes the basis of complementary roles as observed in the case studies, as well as lessons learned that can help guide the process of these two fields working together to more effectively accomplish each one’s goals.

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BACKGROUND AND EVOLUTION**

The roots of the community development field go back to the early urban settlement houses established to help immigrants adapt to their new life and the tenement house reform movement of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The field’s modern approach crystallized in the 1950s and 1960s due to the convergence of the Civil Rights Movement and community organizing strategies, such as those first championed by Chicago’s Saul Alinsky in the 1930s. This was followed by the subsequent groundswell of urban grassroots community-led organizations attempting to counteract urban problems including poverty, racism, arson, riots, inadequate housing, redlining, disinvestment, or urban renewal which frequently tore apart communities.

Many of the grassroots, community-based, nonprofit organizations that sought to improve their neighborhoods became known as Community Development Corporations (CDCs). While initially focused on job creation, they soon also worked toward the community-led creation of affordable housing and other services. A small number of CDCs got started during the 1960s and 1970s but that number increased rapidly during the 1980s and 1990s. It is estimated that about 3,600 CDCs now operate in the United States.

During the 1970s and 1980s, several national nonprofit organizations, known as “intermediaries,” were established to provide increased funding, technical assistance, training, and advocacy for the individual CDCs. The three major

---

1. Trent Nichols

---

**PROTECTING THE NEIGHBORHOOD: HISTORIC PRESERVATION AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

Trent Nichols
ones are NeighborWorks America, Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC), and Enterprise Community Partners.

**COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY INITIATIVES (CCIS)**

During the late 1980s and 1990s, these national organizations and large private foundations, which frequently funded community development efforts, identified the need for a more comprehensive approach to community development. They saw that serious solutions to urban poverty require attention to a wide range of community factors, including physical infrastructure, economic and social opportunities, education, health, race, and culture. Additionally, a community-based democratic approach—one in which residents have greater control over their decision-making process at the local level—was deemed necessary.

This new community development strategy, which relies on both comprehensive and community-based approaches, came to be called “comprehensive community initiatives” (CCIs). One early and influential CCI focused on the South Bronx of New York City, and from 1992 to 1998 was known as the Comprehensive Community Revitalization Program (CCRP). This became a model for an even larger and more defined CCI, run by LISC, which works in 16 Chicago neighborhoods. Known as the New Communities Program (NCP), it began in 2003 and has obtained funding through 2015. This CCI is one of the most comprehensive, well-funded, and cutting-edge of any community development strategy in operation.

Chicago’s New Communities Program engages each neighborhood in community-led planning to identify and preserve “quality of life” features which are then documented in a quality of life neighborhood plan. Several of these plans address the historic built environment, heritage, and cultural history, seeking ways to
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**Key to Acronyms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCI:</td>
<td>Comprehensive Community Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRP:</td>
<td>Comprehensive Community Revitalization Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC:</td>
<td>Community Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESDC:</td>
<td>(Pilsen neighborhood of Chicago) Eighteenth Street Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCBI:</td>
<td>Historic Chicago Bungalow Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCGI:</td>
<td>Historic Chicago Greystone Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPI:</td>
<td>(Pilsen neighborhood of Chicago) Historic Preservation Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISC:</td>
<td>Local Initiatives Support Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCP:</td>
<td>(Chicago) New Communities Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS:</td>
<td>(Chicago) Neighborhood Housing Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
preserve these while also trying to avoid widespread displacement of current residents, mostly low- and moderate-income.

While community development organizations are primarily concerned with the people they seek to serve, they increasingly recognize that their work is also dependent upon the community’s context and the physical and other assets therein, which include the community’s history and historic built environment developed over time. These assets can serve the purposes of community development if they are recognized, preserved, and fully utilized—a process which is typically the role of historic preservation.

However, some community development groups are also now engaging in such heritage preservation work. The historic preservation community, particularly those organizations working in urban neighborhoods, would do well to recognize this shared interest and seek out opportunities for partnerships, since some of these same practices can be used across many urban communities that face similar challenges.

**CASE STUDIES**

**North Lawndale’s Historic Chicago Greystone Initiative (HCGI)**

One unique community development entity working in Chicago is using preservation as a focal point in its work, and is already experiencing early success. Neighborhood Housing Services (NHS) of Chicago is a nonprofit member of NeighborWorks America, which provides funding, financing, investments, information, advocacy, training, and technical assistance to CDCs, primarily to local NHS offices, whose central mission and programming is focused on home ownership.

NHS of Chicago was established in 1975 and seeks to create opportunities for people to live in affordable homes, improve their lives, and strengthen their neighborhoods through home ownership and foreclosure education, lending, and technical assistance. NHS currently works in eight Chicago neighborhoods, including North Lawndale. Despite its cultural assets, North Lawndale has been plagued for decades with serious challenges, in the form of residential decline, deindustrialization, and racial inequality and antagonism. The *Chicago Tribune* popularized a negative view of North Lawndale through its series of articles on the neighborhood, which were later collected in the 1986 book *American Millstone*, characterizing the community as a prime example of what was wrong with American society.
The NHS North Lawndale Office is helping to change that perception through its creatively developed preservation-based approach, concerned with not just one building, district, or even a particular neighborhood, but with a building type, locally known as the Greystone. The name “Greystone” refers to the distinctive grey limestone-fronted brick buildings, usually including ornately carved cornices, column capitals, and/or courses directly above the lintels, most of which were built from 1890 to 1920. Today, North Lawndale alone has nearly 2,000 Greystones, one of the city’s largest remaining concentrations of this distinctive, largely residential, building type spread across the city.

In partnership with other local community organizations and individuals, the NHS North Lawndale Office developed a strategy called the Historic Chicago Greystone Initiative (HCGI) to encourage the preservation of Greystones. It was launched in 2006 with the hiring of staff to implement the initiative. Taking a cue from a City of Chicago effort to preserve bungalows, known as the Historic Chicago Bungalow Initiative (HCBI), the HCGI adapted strategies from the bungalow initiative to suit the unique characteristics of North Lawndale’s population and history.

NHS and the HCGI are working to both indirectly and directly encourage home ownership through a variety of programs. In addition to preserving buildings by providing technical and financial assistance, NHS and the HCGI seek to promote pride in place and a more positive image for the community—shedding light on the community’s significant historical movements, people, and architecture to encourage residents to celebrate their built environment, culture, and history.

The HCGI takes a comprehensive approach that has included several elements: extensive research and documentation including oral histories; utilizing that research to create a widely attended exhibit and to successfully nominate a subsection of the neighborhood to become a National Register historic district in 2010; and publication of several volumes to explain, illustrate, and promote the initiative, including design guidelines for Greystone rehabilitation.

The community-led HCGI was a natural component for residents to include Raising appreciation for North Lawndale’s collection of Greystones has played a key role in promoting residents’ pride in place and a more positive image for the community.

PHOTO BY CHARLES LEEKS, NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSING SERVICES OF CHICAGO
in North Lawndale’s quality of life plan. Combining the forces of preservation and community development clearly increased the strength of the HCGI program.

Charles M. Leeks, the neighborhood director of the North Lawndale office of Neighborhood Housing Services of Chicago, and one of the founders of the HCGI, notes that the HCGI is positively changing the image of the neighborhood. “Identifying a community asset such as the Greystone has been hugely important to help residents, the city, and media begin to focus on North Lawndale as something other than an ‘American Millstone.’ That ubiquitous moniker has influenced generations of residents, policy makers, and scholars to see North Lawndale as a lost cause. The Greystone Initiative has begun to play a significant role in altering that narrative.”

**Pilsen’s Historic Preservation Initiative (HPI)**

The Pilsen neighborhood of Chicago has a strong tradition of active community organizations. The Eighteenth Street Development Corporation (ESDC) was formed in 1976, and its role has continued to evolve since then. First established to promote housing development and offer construction trades training for its low- to moderate-income community to counter lack of jobs and disinvestment for a largely immigrant population, it has since expanded to include commercial and industrial business retention development and historic preservation.

From 2007 to 2010 ESDC undertook preservation activities that have become part of a larger strategy to fulfill the Pilsen quality of life plan. ESDC’s key historic preservation activity relates to marketing the economic incentives of the Pilsen Historic District, which was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 2006. It is believed to be the largest National Register historic district in Illinois and encompasses much of the service area of ESDC.

Interest in obtaining the National Register listing originated with the local Chicago alderman and his staff, who were attracted by the economic benefits to property owners, which include a state property tax freeze program for rehabilitated owner-occupied historic buildings and the federal historic rehabilitation tax credit program. The designation and incentives were seen as meeting a strongly desired goal of the community (as expressed in its quality of life plan) to attract economic investment while
still retaining affordability for its largely Mexican working-class residents. The alderman convinced ESDC to provide staff to help promote the incentives to Pilsen area residents and market these as the Historic Preservation Initiative (HPI), which it did from 2006 to 2010.²

**TOWARD A COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT/HISTORIC PRESERVATION PARTNERSHIP**

These examples illustrate that both the community development and historic preservation fields empower individuals to shape their communities and, thus, their sense of identity. Both fields have increasingly become “place-based,” and focus on improving places and surrounding community. Both fields seek to enhance underutilized assets, whether material, human, or both. And each field is often responding to the same historic challenges: negative consequences of urban renewal, suburbanization, and the disinvestment in urban neighborhoods.

With these important similarities, CDCs can legitimately accomplish their mission by including preservation activities as a part of their overall agenda, while preservation organizations can legitimately work to assist these preservation efforts. This is another successful way in which preservationists can respond to pleas from preservation leaders such as Mary Means, Donovan Rypkema, Richard Moe, and others to become more relevant to greater numbers of people (see especially *Forum Journal*, Spring 2010 and Winter 2011).

Organizations or individuals that seek to promote preservation, particularly in the context of low- to moderate-income urban neighborhoods, will benefit from an awareness of the practices and lessons noted below.³

**MODEL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES THAT SUPPORT PRESERVATION**

**Integration in a CCI or Quality of Life Plan**

In communities where traditional preservation activities, such as a local district designation or National Register nomination, might initially be considered suspect by local residents, it is likely that the inclusion of a CDC’s preservation initiative in a CCI type of grassroots quality of life planning process will lead to more widespread acceptance and use of such preservation initiatives and tools.

While a preservation-minded CDC’s involvement in a CCI, such as the NCP and its quality of life plan, is not a “silver bullet” for preservation in low- to moderate-income residential urban neighborhoods, neither should it be considered unimportant. It has several immediately identifiable benefits for preservation and the CDC.

First, it allows preservationists to build alliances with the community development industry and its participants. Second, it initiates or strengthens the CDC’s link to an intermediary, which typically helps build the overall health and capacity of a CDC, and ultimately allows it to be more effective in its efforts, including preservation-related ones.

Third, it can help unite a community around a common purpose, and help solidify or formalize preservation as a commonly agreed-upon goal. This can be valuable, especially if the plan includes other community organizations or individuals who might otherwise tend to oppose preservation—an especially relevant concern in low- to moderate-income communities because of the real or perceived threat of gentrification and displacement. In theory, and as seen in the
Chicago examples, a quality of life plan helps the non–preservation-minded CDC say to the preservation-minded CDC: “Promotion and rehabilitation of older and historic buildings is important for you and your work to improve the community. We want our community to be improved so I will support (or at least not impede or denigrate) your work, which includes preservation.”

Additionally, the quality of life planning process, developed by and with the community, provides a natural starting point for CDCs to better understand their community’s concerns and dreams, and how to engage in preservation activities that enhance and assist that community’s overall goals.

Finally, when such a preservation initiative is included in the quality of life plan, the plan can serve as another marketing tool, a case for support, an avenue for seed-funding, and a networking and coordinating tool for the preservation initiative.

**Networking Capacity**

The development and establishment of a robust CDC’s preservation initiative usually requires the involvement of a variety of individuals, such as executive leadership of local CDCs, local politicians, scholars, residents, an outside facilitator, and interested funders. While each case will look different, in general, the greater the number of individuals involved and supporting the initiative across the community, the greater the likelihood that it will enjoy success.

Norman Glickman and Lisa Servon, urban studies and community development scholars who have completed several important studies of the field, describe “networking capacity” as a CDCs ability to interact and work with other institutions or organizations. This, they say, has become increasingly important given the trend of comprehensive approaches in community development. By design, the NCP quality of life plans force the networking capacity of CDCs to grow if the plans are to take shape and be implemented. The recognition of this is what allowed the second Pilsen quality of life plan to be formulated with a much deeper level of community cooperation. However, it is clear from the case studies that some CDCs already have greater degrees of networking capacity than others. The HCGI could not have been accomplished without NHS of Chicago’s North Lawndale office demonstrating a high degree of networking capacity. The partnerships of the HCGI are a key factor in its success, for this helps increase the potential for success in all the other areas of Glickman and Servon’s capacity components: resource, organizational, programmatic, and political.

**Multidimensional Approach and Marketing**

As mentioned before, the HCGI uses a comprehensive strategy that employs many complementary activities to build community pride and promote home ownership. Since the initiative was formulated through the consultation of multiple organizations and individuals, they also, in turn, recommended and market it through their own multiple channels of influence.
Thus, we see that it is best to make the preservation initiative as multidimensional as possible. The fact that Pilsen’s HPI had not developed any other preservation-related or heritage-related programmatic activities, publications, or marketing since the National Register nomination (or ever apparently conceived of them initially) makes it clear that the HPI was developed primarily for the economic factors of the preservation incentives. This less-than-comprehensive approach has limited effectiveness. This is in contrast to the much more multidimensional HCGI, utilizing the inherent role of preservation and heritage as a positive identity- and community-building force. Thus, the HCGI appears to be a more truly historic preservation initiative, which includes the educational and social dimensions of preservation, compared to the Pilsen HPI, which so far includes only the economic dimension.

**Incentives for Preservation**

However, the economic dimension is not to be neglected. Although recent market conditions have minimized the current impact of incentives for preservation in the case study communities’ residential properties, historically, incentives are an important part of the equation to attract individuals and organizations to pursue a local or National Register designation. In Illinois, homeowners can benefit from financial incentives such as the property tax assessment freeze for rehabilitated historic residences, while CDCs involved in preservation of affordable housing or who own income-producing historic buildings may use the federal historic rehabilitation tax credit, the Low Income Housing Tax Credits, New Markets Tax Credits, or some leveraged combination of these.

**CONCLUSION**

Both the historic preservation field and the community development field have much to offer each other, particularly when working in low- to moderate-income urban neighborhoods. Through case studies mentioned in this article, we see how some initiatives can serve as models for other communities interested in harnessing the complementary strengths of each field. Although every community is unique, integrating preservation and community development can increase the chance of success for achieving each field’s goals.

---

TRENT NICHOLS currently works at Feeding America in Chicago and serves as chair of the Wheaton, Ill., historic commission. He can be reached at tnmidwest@gmail.com.

For more information on the Historic Chicago Greystone Initiative, see [www.nhschicago.org/site/3C/category/greystone_history](http://www.nhschicago.org/site/3C/category/greystone_history); for the New Communities Program and the quality of life plans of each of the 16 neighborhoods, see [www.newcommunities.org](http://www.newcommunities.org).


2 Due to staff and policy changes and budget cuts, ESDC discontinued staffing the HPI in 2010, and the alderman’s office took on this role to continue the program.

3 My thesis examining several case studies, along with a literature review, provides an analysis of several effective practices which other CDCs might use to develop their own historic preservation-related initiatives or programs in similar contexts, along with lessons for preservation. The themes of this article were also discussed at the 2010 National Preservation Conference session “Preservation Strategies in Low-Income Communities.” The National Trust website includes a blog report of the key findings from the session. They are worth noting for the overlap of recommended approaches from my own research. See Eli Pousson, “Preservation in Low-income Urban Neighborhoods Driven by Partnerships,” December 22, 2010, accessed June 2010, [http://blog.preservationnation.org/2010/12/22/preservation-in-low-income-urban-neighborhoods-driven-by-partnerships](http://blog.preservationnation.org/2010/12/22/preservation-in-low-income-urban-neighborhoods-driven-by-partnerships).
