

Historic Resources Board Meeting
Minutes
Thursday, September 9, 2021 at 10:30 AM
Community Service Center, 1st floor Conference Rm

1. Call to Order by Gayla Hess at 10:36 AM.
Present: Rose Nyman, Lynette Foulger, Planning Director Carl Hamming, Kate Hampton of SHPO, Renee Kelly of SHPO and Kerrie Berger of the Washoe Park Trout Hatchery, and Chair Mary Lynn McKenna (arrived at 10:52 am). Excused absent: Vice-Chair Bob Wren

2. New Business

- 3.1 Montana State Historic Preservation Office Presentation: National Register of Historic Places process and Certified Local Governments, including ADLC CLG Review

Kate Hampton explained that she is the Coordinator for the 17 CLGs in the state which are local preservation programs. Grantees are eligible for up to \$6,000 a year through the local historic preservation programs

Kate spoke of how the National Register is the official list of properties worthy of preservation as enacted by 1966 National Historic Preservation Act. Nominations can be for a specific place or for a whole district. Property owners or authors prepare a nomination. SHPO reviews and helps with suggestions until a nomination is complete. Notifications, including property owners, is required as part of the process. The National Historic Preservation Act was in response to highway legislation where historic places were being affected.

Lynette Foulger asked how many places are listed. Kate Hampton estimates about 35,000 listings nationally with around 1200 individual listings in Montana, including districts like Anaconda's West Side, Commercial and Goosetown areas. These districts are part of the Butte-Anaconda National Historic Landmark District which includes more than 3,000 properties within the district that are listed as contributors.

Kate summarized the criterion for a place's significance with some examples:

- A. Events or Patterns of history. A singular event, like Battle of Little Big Horn on a specific day, or a farmstead that conveys history of agriculture in a particular place for the homestead area (longer period of significance). Fish Hatchery would have a longer significance period.
- B. People. It can be difficult to explain significance of people; e.g., Gary Cooper house- deemed ineligible; however, people can be significant for local development like Dr. Parberry of White Sulfur Springs where his office is listed. This can be the hardest criterion to prove.
- C. Design/Construction, Architectural & Engineering. Representative not necessarily biggest or best- group of buildings may have a specific style or construction.
- D. Archeological. Important to national, state, or local story.

One criterion must be met and this can be at a local or statewide level, but many can represent more than one like the [Parberry Block](#) listed for significance to community development, association with Dr. Parberry, and its Romanesque revival architecture. Kate mentioned the Fish

Hatchery may be eligible per Criteria A and C. A National Historic Landmark (NHL) District tells a national story to all Americans like the Butte-Anaconda NHL.

Kate Hampton talked of how NRHP listings must also have integrity:

- Location. Is it in the same place? Moved buildings are generally not eligible.
- Setting. Can it still convey historic associations? For example, a wonderful, historic barn if now surrounded by a subdivision would no longer have an agricultural setting.
- Design.
- Materials.
- Workmanship.
- Feeling. Does it evoke the same feelings or understanding of a period of time? Or can it no longer tell the story?
- Association. Is it still connected to its use in the past? Is it a hospital building used as a community center? This would be a diminished case, but the building is still serving a purpose for the community.

A listing does not have to meet all aspects of integrity. Communal grouping is needed in a district, but for an individual listing it must have the majority unless it is an exceptionally rare association; e.g. [McCormick Neighborhood District](#) in Missoula has a house that sticks out. This house is encased in vinyl, has an enclosed front porch, but turned out to be the home of a significant newspaper so it was considered a contributor even though its integrity was compromised.

Kate explained more about the nomination form

- Section 7 of the form is where to describe the property, its architecture, place and setting, landscapes, historic roads, etc.
 - If the nomination is for a district, this can be more of an overview rather than focusing in depth on individual elements
 - If an individual nomination, be detailed about the property (its siding, windows, etc.)
 - Write what you see- SHPO can help edit and will offer suggestions
 - Active voice is recommended! "Five Windows punctuate the façade" rather than "There are 5 windows."
- Section 8 focuses on history. You need enough to tell the story completely from the time the property begins its existence through its conclusion in its role. This section explains what happened, and how it meets criteria for the NR.
- The nomination form must show that the place is important and meets the criteria.
- Document could be used as an educational tool as well as a celebration of the place's story

Rose Nyman asked if a property is moved if that is a strike against nomination. Kate agreed that it would be considered a strike but wouldn't necessarily be unfixable. She spoke of a rebuilt airplane from the Mann Gulch Fire at the Missoula airport. It's not in the location where the event took place, but it is in an appropriate setting- can make an argument that the new setting is associated and appropriate. [Mann Gulch Wildfire Historic District](#)

Another example offered by Kate was a farmstead listed as a historic district where a granary was moved. This would still be ok as it is still within its historic setting and there are multiple elements to the district. Schools are another example of buildings that often had been moved even during its use. In these cases, special criteria considered in the nomination to justify that the movement doesn't preclude its listing.

Rose Nyman asked about individual buildings in a district and how it affects eligibility. Kate responded that even if not all structures have integrity. "Is there enough there to tell the story?" Majority of resources within the boundary contributors to the place. Homestead example: enough of original homestead buildings even if there is a 1970s house in the midst as a non-contributor.

Kate spoke of how religious properties are generally not eligible. Churches can be eligible under Criterion C for its architecture. Cemeteries or final resting places are generally not eligible; but if it is the only place for the story, it may be eligible like the [Silver City Cemetery](#).

For listing, authors/property owners work with SHPO, and Kate explained the required notifications 60 days before the state review board meeting. CLG commissions get a copy of nominations in their areas for comments and concurrence. Property owners who are not the authors, must also be notified by the State Review Board; for example, every property owner in Goosetown was notified for that district. If the majority of property owners do not object, the listing process can proceed. If the majority object, nomination cannot proceed.

Kate told of how next week the State Review Board will hear presentations for 3 nominations. The Board meets 3 times a year. The 9 member board may recommend a nomination to the Keeper. The NRHP nomination document must make the case so reviewers in DC can determine its eligibility. Numerous reviewers work in the Keepers Office, overseeing several states each. Our representative has reviewed for our area for ~30 years. After final edits, the listing is signed by the National Parks Service Keeper.

Kate mentioned a myth about National Register listing and that once it's listed, property owners no longer have control over what can or can't be done with the property. Property owners manage their properties as they see fit. The only exception, if a federal undertaking- using federal money or need a federal permit for a project, then there is a review process between SHPO and the Federal agency funding or issuing the permit known as the Section 106 Compliance process. It is not between SHPO and owner, unless owner is the Federal agency. If ADLC chooses to use CLG money for a brick and mortar project, Secretary of Interior standards must be followed.

She further explained that the process occurs for a listed property or if it is eligible for being listed- by virtue of being historic and eligible the process occurs. Listing does not impact that process, any undertaking that a federal agency has will be examined for if it affects historic properties. If there is an adverse effect, there are suggestions for offsetting or mitigating that impact. A local example is of the Saddle Club project to redo the grandstands (contributors to the [Saddle Club Historic District](#)). SHPO was consulted and found the proposed change effected design and integrity, but a compromise was found for the reuse of materials. State-owned properties subject to state Antiquities act for another layer of review.

Kate spoke of demolition of historic buildings and how a review can take place at the local level by virtue of a local ordinance. Some CLGs have demolition review process written into their local ordinance or design review process might be required for local funds (TIF or urban renewal as examples). Gayla Hess noted that demolition and design review is more informal and that property owners are invited to join the HRB meeting to discuss their projects. Kate said that this could be considered when reviewing the local ordinance- Butte and Missoula per their ordinances can stop a project with appeal that can be brought to the Commission.

Preservation guidelines and consultations can be encouraged. We can have incentives and celebrations like the National Register sign program to encourage participation and best use practices. When people understand importance and meaning, people are more inclined to factor in the historic nature of a property. Kate cited the “Philipsburg effect” where the candy store sparked façade restoration along the street.

Rose Nyman asked about Warm Springs State Hospital (State Hospital) and if the Mound is listed. Kate Hampton told of trying to list the Mound- significant to five Native American Nation for various reasons; some used it as a marker on the landscape; a trading space, and even a sacred space. Not all the Nations wanted to share their history, some of which are oral stories related to the Mound. The Mound could be listed individually, as part of a district, or it could be listed with the story of the Mound is related to the hospital and its healing properties for convalescent patients. Or the mound could be listed for its ties to the Anaconda community (separate from the Native American story). It’s an interesting example where numerous entities (Tribal Preservation Office, SHPO, locals) could nominate.

Carl Hamming asked about the educational component of the SHPO office mentioned. Is there a partnership with FWP for tourist aspect? Stack State Park was mentioned as an example as an example. Kate Hampton replied that State Parks and SHPO have coordinated on nominations, such as listing [First Peoples Buffalo Jump](#) as a landmark. Fort Owen, a trading post near Stevensville, has accessibility issues and SHPO and FWP coordinate. The narrative of a place and having interpretation is an important part of the process. Between a third and half of all MT parks are historic state parks.

Carl Hamming inquired about funding. Kate explained that bed tax money is applied to the historic sign program: writing the signs and is used as a subsidy to offset the cost to the property owner to encourage heritage tourism. New Bed tax money from 2 years ago, established the bricks & mortar grant program to physically restore properties. SHPO reviews the applications and the Department of Commerce administers that grant. The past legislature was the first to vote on these applications and \$350,000 was funded for a total of 7 project. Due to emergency funding through the last legislature, an additional \$500,000 was allocated to supplement state fund- leading to about 25 projects being funded.

Renee Kelly of SHPO gave the group an overview about CLG funding and how the Secretary Of Interior (through the National Park Services) gives funding earmarked for Historic Preservation to the State Historic Preservation Office. A minimum percentage of the funding must go to local governments as CLG funding. Each year CLG funding is set based on Federal funding. The amount of grant funding varies throughout the CLGs. Renee noted that some Historic Preservation Officers are on more of a volunteer basis while some community’s have full-time preservation officers. She also mentioned how advocacy groups can be partnered with to help communities/property owners on projects.

Kate reminded the group of the requirement to report to NPS twice a year. Match is 60-40 required. State provides 3% funding. CLGs help with that match, especially with the volunteer hours, to match the NPS funds.

To wrap up their presentation, Kate Hampton offered congratulations on the Historic Preservation Plan and noted that this would be a highlight included in the NSP this year. She also reminded the group that annual CLG training will be held 9/23. This year it will be a half-day

session with Ellen Crain sharing information on a mapping project in Butte which will show historic and existing roads in Butte. CLG Training occurs during the [Montana History Conference](#). Kate then asked attendees to fill out a questionnaire as part of the 4-year CLG review.

Rose Nyman thanked the presenters and said that she learned a lot.

Note: Lynette Foulger and Mary Lynn McKenna had to leave before the end of the presentation; no HRB quorum.

~~3. Previous Minutes~~

~~Documents:~~

~~———— [08-05 HRB MINUTES DRAFT.PDF](#)~~

~~4. Unfinished Business~~

~~4.1 Speaker Series~~

~~5. Miscellaneous/Announcements~~

~~a. Board~~

~~———— b. Public~~

~~6. Public Comment – This is the time for the public to comment on items not appearing on the agenda that fall within the board’s jurisdiction~~

~~7. Next Meeting:~~

8. Adjournment (11:52 AM)

Minutes approved at 10/07/21 meeting. GH

LOCAL PRESERVATION PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

1. Have there been specific preservation issues that the commission has dealt with? If so, please explain the issue and the outcome.

2. What preservation issues does your commission consider to be most significant in your community at this time?

3. How is your historic preservation program and the greater community addressing these issues?

4. Do you feel that the local response by your program is effective? What ways might you improve your responsiveness?

5. What other kinds of activities would you like your program to be more involved with?

6. What additional resources might enable your program to be more effective?

7. Are there organizations on a state, local or national level that you can partner with in addressing these issues?

8. Please feel free to discuss other factors of your local preservation program not listed above.

MONTANA SHPO INVOLVEMENT

We also invite your opinions on the role of MT SHPO in coordinating CLG programming and the support you receive for your preservation efforts. Please share with us your perspective on how well we are meeting the needs that you have on a local level, whether we are responsive to your requests for information, whether the annual conferences are worthwhile, what kinds of training and technical assistance would better equip you to operate an effective preservation program in your community.