

# CHAUTAUQUA AMPHITHEATER

## Report of the Historic Preservation Panel

Respectfully Submitted to Thomas Becker, President, Chautauqua Institution

6 August 2015

### Part I: Introduction

#### What is a historic resource?

A historic resource is a building, structure, object or site that has a tangible connection to a person, event, or theme that was important in our past. Historic resources can also be groups of properties (districts) that together form a distinctive entity that represents a historic theme. Historic properties document many different aspects of social and cultural history, architecture, and/or archeology. They represent periods and themes as diverse as native village sites from centuries ago and the struggle for lesbian and gay civil rights in the 1960s and 70s. They document important movements in fields such as art, music, politics and education and advances in fields such as science, technology and engineering. They are associated with the lives of great Americans, as well as with the lives of everyday women and men – including our own ancestors – whose stories collectively make up the fabric of American history. The landmarks of the past included meeting places to celebrate shared history (the church, the town hall, the courthouse) and signposts that helped people to find their way home (turn left at the school, the store, the farm). We call them landmarks today because they link us to those who went before and they help us to find our place in history.

A building or site is historic if it represents a significant aspect of American history *and* if it retains the physical qualities that illustrate that history. A resource must have a tangible association with the past and it must be able to illustrate its significant theme. It must be “the real thing.” At Gettysburg, one of the most memorable American landmarks, the mid-nineteenth century landscape has been preserved to a remarkable degree. Various ridges, hills, woods and fields remain today and contribute to our sense of place, allowing us to see and understand exactly how the battle took place. Ebbets Field, where Jackie Robinson integrated baseball, was also the site of an important historic event, but there is no baseball field on the site now. This event can be remembered, commemorated, and written about, but there is no historic resource that we can preserve, no physical field where we can stand and imagine what he saw, what the spectators saw, what the physical interaction might have been like. An historic resource must be tangible and it must be authentic. It cannot be a replica or a reproduction and still be historic. At the same time, buildings are not static; they evolve. Buildings change over time to meet new needs and uses: families grow and wings are added to houses; pioneers become settlers and log houses are covered in clapboard; tastes change and an overlay of decorative embellishment is added to an earlier building; technology becomes more sophisticated and mills are fitted with new machinery. The record of change becomes part of that building’s history. Rather than making buildings less historic, it enriches them by adding new layers of meaning. Buildings that

do not change often do not survive. However, if a building is so changed that its history can no longer be understood, it is no longer historic. Likewise, if a large percentage of a building is new, it is no longer historic – it has lost its authenticity. A replica can never be historic because it has lost its association with the long chain of events over time that connects a building to the past. You can build a reproduction of the house you grew up in but it will never be your home.

## **Rehabilitation**

From a historic preservation perspective, rehabilitation means to preserve or repair a building for continuing or compatible use. In a rehabilitation, building materials and character defining features are protected, but features that have deteriorated over time can be repaired or replaced with compatible new materials. The removal or alteration of historic materials, features and spaces should be avoided. Rehabilitations should be limited and sensitive in nature and the key is to repair rather than replace and to replace in kind when necessary. Changes that create a false sense of historical development should be avoided [see addendum, *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*]. Rehabilitation is done to make a building safer and more functional for programmatic goals, but that work must be balanced with protecting the authentic features and materials that make it historic to begin with. This is not an easy task, which is why preservation architects and others who specialize in this work are often called upon to lend their expertise to such projects.

## **Chautauqua Amphitheater**

The Chautauqua Amphitheater embodies Chautauqua's significance as a place of assembly by serving as the central gathering place for institution programs. As one of the most important structures in the Chautauqua Historic District, it has been associated with the tradition of social, religious, educational, cultural, and performance-based artistic programs of Chautauqua Institution for more than century. The amphitheater expresses both continuity and change: it dates to the early days of the institution, serves its founding purpose, and retains the majority of its character-defining qualities; yet, it has been modified many times to reflect changing culture, as influenced by the evolution of Chautauqua Institution's programs.

The Chautauqua Amphitheater evokes the feeling of an informal outdoor communal gathering place for educational and cultural activities in a summer community, manifests the passage of time and a sense of history through the evolution of its form and design, and represents a continuity of original materials and later additions.

The amphitheater is a genuine and important part of the Chautauqua Institution National Historic Landmark District. As with any historic building, it has a history of change, reflecting the fact that it has been used intensively over its long history and it continues to be used today. This incremental evolution over time does not make it less historic. Rather, respecting the authenticity of the amphitheater's historic space, setting, structure and materials is essential to respecting everything significant that has happened under its roof over its lifetime.

## **Part II: Analysis**

### **Amphitheater Historic Preservation Panel**

In spring 2015, Chautauqua Institution (CI) requested the Department of Interior's assessment and assistance with the amphitheater project based upon the institution's longstanding designation as a National Historic Landmark District and its commitment to historic preservation and rehabilitation. After an initial suggestion from Bonnie Halda, Chief, Preservation Assistance, with the National Park Service's regional office in Philadelphia, a historic preservation panel was formed. Tom Becker, President of Chautauqua Institution, invited each of the following professionals in historic preservation and architecture to serve:

Julian Adams, Director, Community Preservation Services Bureau

New York State Historic Preservation Office, Waterford

Jay DiLorenzo, President, Preservation League of New York State, Albany

Peter Flynn, Partner, Flynn/Battaglia Architects, Buffalo

Co-Chair/Trustee, Preservation Buffalo Niagara

Kathleen LaFrank, National Register Coordinator

New York State Historic Preservation Office, Waterford

Theodore Lownie, Partner, HHL Architects, Buffalo

Caleb Pifer, Executive Director, The Historical Society of Erie County, Erie, PA

The panel received the following formal charge from CI:

.... working with the architect of record and making recommendations to support the institution's intention for the amphitheater project design to retain the historical vibrancy and significant character-defining qualities of the amp's place and purpose. Specifically, the panel was asked to:

1. Review relevant reports and historic documents regarding the amphitheater and evaluate in what manner the report findings are realized in the current design; Reports to include: the 2011 Chautauqua Institution (AMP) Study Group report, the 2013 Chautauqua Amphitheater Historic Rehabilitation Analysis and Scope Report and any other relevant historic documents, as well as a structural engineering report (when available) on the current condition of the amphitheater
2. Offer overall recommendations that help the final design decisions for the amphitheater preserve the amphitheater's historic physical place in the community, its sense of space, and its unique characteristics which have evolved over the decades. Panel recommendations will support the amphitheater's continued use as the community's central place of assembly for worship, issue centric education and debate, and cultural arts programming in context to the priorities of the approved Institution strategic plan. In addition, the panel will:

1. Create a formal list of the amphitheater's most significant "character defining qualities"
2. Review work to date to determine if and how the project designs currently incorporate any of the panel's list of character-defining qualities. In context to this list, review the CJS suggestions and ideas recently reported in the regional media for possible solutions and concepts that may offer solutions; and
3. Offer recommendations for each of the qualities on the panel's formal list for how the characteristic might in some manner be included as part of the project. Any options the panel may suggest for reinstalling historic features as part of the new design will be welcome—including innovative re-use and new use of such features, where appropriate.

The panelists were honored to be invited by Mr. Becker and made a commitment to become familiar with the history of Chautauqua Institution, the structural history of the amp and its perceived inadequacies, both physical and programmatic, the institution's programming history, and CI's goals for the amp in the future. The panel also studied the proposal by Marty Serena in order to better understand the basis for decisions made by his team and questioned him intensively about why decisions were made; that is, what need led to what decision; what solutions were attempted, etc.

The panel met seven times between April 9, 2015 and August 3, 2015. Two meetings were held in person at Chautauqua Institution and five were held via phone. Panelists also communicated via written word, circulating documents, comments and discussions among ourselves. At all but our final meeting we were led by a facilitator, Elliot Fishman, Vice President, Ricochet Group, LLC, New York City. At all but the final meeting, one or more of the following was on hand to provide background and answer questions: Martin Serena, Partner, Serena Sturm Architects, Chicago (architect for current proposal), John Shedd, Director of Facilities, CI, George Murphy, Vice President for Communications and Chief Marketing Officer, CI. One of the panel members, Ted Lownie, had also served as a consultant to Chautauqua Institution on the original design.

The final meeting, on August 3, 2015, was held for the purpose of deciding the format and content of this report, which was subsequently drafted between August 3-5. This meeting was held independently and, as such, the content and recommendations in this paper are the panel's alone and have not been reviewed, edited or influenced by anyone connected with CI.

### **Panel Stipulations and Methodology**

The panel received most of what it asked for from CI; we were given access to the facilities manager, marketing director, and program director; we consulted with the engineer preparing the report on the roof structure; we also received a comprehensive tour of the amp; all of our questions received thoughtful and thorough answers

Knowing that the amphitheater was the subject of substantial controversy, the panel chose to ignore, as much as possible, all of the newspaper articles, letters, emails, billboards, phone calls and campaigns, by both supporters and opponents of the proposed amphitheater project.

Kathleen LaFrank and Julian Adams consulted with Bonnie Halda (NPS) several times and asked her advice; however, in general we spoke to no one outside of the panel. As a panel we made it our mission to remain as neutral and unbiased as possible while retaining our commitment to preservation principles. As individuals, we also chose to pursue, and worked hard to achieve, an honest and trustworthy relationship with CI and its staff. We feel that we achieved this and thank CI for its cooperation.

The panel chose to focus directly on the task we had been assigned; therefore, we take no position on any process or decisions that came before us. We are not qualified either to confirm or to dispute anything that happened outside of our panel. We took it as a given that by postponing its decision and engaging the panel, CI was reexamining its earlier choices to some degree, and we believe that our task as preservationists and practitioners was to help CI find a way for the historic amphitheater to be rehabilitated in a way that would allow it to be useful to the Chautauqua community for many years to come and to suggest that CI consider changes to the amp's program as one possible path to historic preservation. Whether or not that was outside of our charge, we felt that it was the highest service that we could provide as preservationists.

The panel began by using the National Register criteria and integrity requirements to establish a list of the amp's character-defining features [see addendum, National Register Criteria, National Register Integrity Requirements, and Chautauqua Amphitheater, Character Defining Features]. We were then asked to apply these to the proposed Serena design. We did this because it was part of the assigned duties; however, the panel felt that this was not a worthwhile exercise because the Serena design is a NEW building. While the new design can replicate, reproduce or reference the original, it cannot embody the character-defining features of a *historic building*. Therefore, we have not included this analysis in our report. What Chautauqua Institution is currently proposing is not a rehabilitation of the amphitheater. It is, with the exception of the Massey Organ House, a complete demolition and new construction in which some current features of the amphitheater will be replicated in order to recreate the "look and feel" of the historic building. In our view the result would lose its authenticity. Perpetuating the "look and feel," or the "intangibles," of the amphitheater, while incorporating some of its features, is different from rehabilitating the authentic article.

The panel spent a great deal of time discussing CI's needs for the amp; we analyzed each of the listed needs and discussed how the amp could or could not meet them in its current configuration and how it might be altered to meet them without losing its integrity as a historic building. The panel spent extensive time discussing a range of possible architectural ideas/solutions based on the character-defining features of the amp and the goals and objectives of the current program. These suggestions were made to Marty Serena and John Shedd (both of whom have studied the site and site conditions extensively), who responded as to their feasibility. In some cases these suggestions had already been considered; in other cases they were new. At the time they were discussed in the panel sessions, these suggestions were rejected: either because the current design team had already explored and rejected them or because CI felt that they would require tradeoffs with priority program objectives that it was unwilling to make.

These ideas included:

- Reconfiguration of the seating plan to permit additional capacity and accessibility without changing the overall shape of the bowl.
- Preserving the original roof in place during renovation, while reinforcing it and possibly reducing some of the total columns to improve sight lines to meet current codes, and at the same time preserving the feel and proportion of the roofed space under it.
- Pushing the back of house farther down the hill, reconstructing it to add additional space and opening up space between the current roof and the back of house for enhancing functionality and safety of operations over the stage.
- Studying the existing access ramp design in the horseshoe, with an eye to provide improved accessibility, while retaining the existing configuration of the horseshoe shape of the seating.
- Alternative placement of the orchestra, either to the side, under the lip of a redesigned stage or in an alternate space off stage so as to increase seating capacity in the orchestra seating.
- Further studying the rake of the seating at the orchestra level only; with the intent to increase the seating capacity, improving access, exiting, sightlines, orchestra location and capacity.
- Adjustment of the height of the planned stage and its relationship to the orchestra-level seating.
- Consider the feasibility of limited private box seating within the attic of the existing roof space.
- Consider moving the organ house intact if necessary to create more space for functional space in the front of house
- Removal of the existing bleachers as in the current design to return the access and openness of the edge of the structure.
- Retaining the bench seating, while studying how to modify to better accommodate the audience ergonomics while retaining important components of the historic fabric

Although a few of us are architects, we could not approach this exercise with all the analytical tools that an actual designer would. Nevertheless, we feel that some of these have potential and, if explored further, may point the design towards rehabilitation. On the other hand, some of CI's program requirements are difficult to accommodate in the current amp. Perhaps a skilled preservation architect with complete access to all current design materials could find a solution that would meet all of CI's program needs *and* preserve the amp; however, to the extent that we studied the problem and with the information that we had, the two seem extremely hard to reconcile.

### **Part III: Recommendations**

**Recommendation 1:** The panel strongly recommends that the institution hire a qualified preservation architect with experience in the rehabilitation of historic theaters and performance spaces to consult with and/or work with the current architect to fashion a rehabilitation for the amphitheater. The panelists have the greatest respect for Marty Serena. However, all of us know, from decades of preservation experience, that the hands-on skill gained through working with historic materials and under the constraints of historic preservation provides preservation architects with a specialty akin to that of an art conservator. We feel that at least a consultation with such a person might provide insights or suggestions that others may have missed.

**Recommendation 2:** The panel recommends that institution delay its decision on a renovation plan for the amphitheater until it has ample time to review and consider the completed engineering report. This should include the ability to question the members of the engineering firm involved in the report's production directly.

Throughout our deliberations we have been informed of the possible, long-term structural instability of the amphitheater. In fact the institution has diligently performed annual testing on the structure to gauge ongoing movement in its support structure. We are convinced that this movement is happening and needs to be continuously monitored. However, absent a completed engineering report by a qualified engineering firm, it is difficult for us to assess the building's stability accurately. Happily, we are told this report is nearing completion, and we hope that it will provide alternatives to the current plan that would allow the amphitheater's roof structure to be rehabilitated and stiffened in place.

**Recommendation 3:** The institution should reassess future programming of the amphitheater if that programing means the loss of the amphitheater.

During our deliberations, the institution was forthcoming in its goals for the amphitheater in the years ahead. Those goals include improving patron safety, opening obstructed views, accommodating guests with accessibility issues, and improving comfort. There are also serious issues at the back of house that need to be addressed for the comfort of performers and speakers, including creating more flexible performance spaces and increasing the safety and comfort of those who work at the events. These are all laudable goals that have been addressed at similar facilities using preservation-based rehabilitation strategies.

What is more difficult to address are the institution's goals aimed at increasing the audience capacity of the amphitheater and changing its historic use so significantly that the current stage, orchestra, and choir spaces would no longer suffice. Some of these issues might be addressed with a newly designed back of house (see below), but it was clear to the panel that for the institution, the desired programming for the amphitheater and need for greater capacity have superseded the desire to rehabilitate the structure. This is, of course, an organizational decision that the board and the staff are free to make. However, given our roles as professionals who care deeply about our shared historic places, we are concerned that as a steward of a nationally

significant place, the institution's commitment to historic preservation is not clear and unambiguous.

We feel that if the institution truly wishes to preserve the amphitheater as a historic building, it will have to limit programming in it. There are a number of ways that this could occur and we offer only a few examples:

-- cut back the kind of programs that tax the amp in general and return it to its original purpose; embrace the kind of experience that is common to outdoor summer festivals: subject to weather, some sight line interference, not the most comfortable seats, *entertainment in nature*, not a theater that just happens to have open sides

--build a second structure on a different site in which to stage productions that are not appropriate for the amp, while continuing to use the amp for all of its traditional functions

--restrict occupancy in the amp: first come; first served, or make all events ticketed

--the institution could partially achieve its program goals *and* preserve the most important part of the amp by compromising on the number of program features that it requires. For example, the panel concluded, after studying the structural history of the amp, that the existing back of house structure has been altered so many times that it should now be considered a non-historic addition from the 1980s. There is not enough historic fabric there to preserve. Thus, most preservationists would agree that this feature could be demolished and a new, compatible back of house constructed (preserving the organ and organ house or moving it intact) that could potentially meet all of CI's needs in this area. Constructing a new back of house while preserving and rehabilitating the amphitheater proper is an appropriate rehabilitation goal that would be considered a win for preservation.

**Recommendation 4:** If CI decides that *every* program goal must be met in the existing building, there may be no way to preserve the historic amp. In that case, we recommend that CI acknowledge its choice of program over preservation and announce that it is replacing the old amp with a new structure on the same site. The new design should be compatible with the surrounding architecture, but it should not mimic the old amp. An "imitation" amp may be less desirable than a beautiful modern design.

**Recommendation 5:** The panel agrees with the National Park Service's call for a new master plan for the Chautauqua campus. This could include a formal process for early involvement by Chautauqua residents in projects that impact buildings like the amphitheater that are owned by the institution.

**Recommendation 6:** The panel recommends that the Chautauqua Institution Board of Trustees consider a revision of the current (1974; revised 2000) mission statement to include language referencing historic preservation and the historic architecture of the Chautauqua Institution. Without such language, the Chautauqua Institution will likely find itself grappling with issues similar to this one in the near future. While the current mission statement clearly embodies the founding program-centric purpose of the Chautauqua Institution, we believe that programs and preservation can co-exist as two equally important aspects that make the Chautauqua Institution such a unique place. Further, historic preservation is highlighted as a priority in the organization's strategic plan. Yet, a strategic plan should always relate back to its mission. The

preservation section of CI's strategic plan does not relate in any way to the mission as it's currently written.

#### **Part IV: Conclusion**

To preserve, to rehabilitate, to build anew – all complicated questions with many possible, sometime conflicting answers. Ultimately, what is the value to the community of preserving the amphitheater? What will be lost if it goes? What are you willing to give up to keep it? These are the questions Chautauqua Institution must ask itself. As preservationists who have been in this field for many decades, each of us knows that there are no easy answers. Yet, each of us has also seen the effect of losing a major landmark (Penn Station) or saving one (Grand Central). This is a pivotal moment in the life of Chautauqua Institution. A wrenching decision must be made; but, if that decision is to demolish the amp, it cannot be reversed, only regretted. Our hope is that you will exercise your judgement with care and with prudence.

#### **Acknowledgements**

The panelists would like to thank Tom Becker for his invitation to assist CI sort through these complicated issues and for giving us the opportunity for open and honest discussion with CI staff and consultants on a wide range of relevant information. We also wish to thank George Murphy and John Shedd for the wealth of knowledge they shared and to commend Elliot Fishman for a terrific job remaining unbiased and focused on the goals. In particular, we wish to express our admiration for Marty Serena, who responded to every question, every proposal, and every challenge to his design with dignity and grace.

## ADDENDUM

### 1. Chautauqua Auditorium – Character Defining Features as defined by the panel

**Location:** within the Chautauqua Institution; near the lake, centrally located and easily accessible; over the ravine that creates a natural bowl

**Setting:** informally sited amid trees and paths, with lake views, immediately accessible from the core of campus and integral to the daily life of the institution

**Design:** constructed over a bowl or ravine in the tradition of using natural hollows of hills and terraced seating (amphitheaters); open air pavilion with broad sheltering roof supported by columns and trusses (mix of steel and wood columns; wood have simple bracketing and bracing); sweeping beaded-board ceiling with subtle curve over main floor; seating tiers or “platforms” carved into earth; simple seats ample light and ventilation; stage with balconies at side and rear, thrust or speaking stage altered to accommodate performance; backhouse with organ house and addition toward lakeside

**Materials:** wood, steel, iron, brick

**Workmanship:** simple, stock materials used in a straightforward manner without elaboration of enrichment

**Feeling:** evokes the feeling of an informal outdoor communal gathering place for educational and cultural activities at a summer community; manifests the passage of time and a sense of history through the evolution of its form and design; represents a continuity of original materials and later additions. One can feel the weight of history; as stated in the NHL nomination, “few podiums in the country have held such a distinguished group of speakers and performers”

**Association:** associated with the tradition of social, religious, education, cultural and performance programs of the Chautauqua Ins. for 100+ years

### 2. National Register Criteria

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:

**A.** That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

**B.** That are associated with the lives of significant persons in or past; or

**C.** That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

**D.** That have yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.

### **3. National Register Standards for Integrity**

Integrity is the ability of a property to convey its significance. To be listed in the National Register of Historic Places, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the National Register criteria, but it also must have integrity. The evaluation of integrity is sometimes a subjective judgment, but it must always be grounded in an understanding of a property's physical features and how they relate to its significance.

Historic properties either retain integrity (this is, convey their significance) or they do not. Within the concept of integrity, the National Register criteria recognizes seven aspects or qualities that, in various combinations, define integrity.

To retain historic integrity a property will always possess several, and usually most, of the aspects. The retention of specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance. Determining which of these aspects are most important to a particular property requires knowing why, where, and when the property is significant.

#### **Location**

**Location is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.** The relationship between the property and its location is often important to understanding why the property was created or why something happened. The actual location of a historic property, complemented by its setting, is particularly important in recapturing the sense of historic events and persons. Except in rare cases, the relationship between a property and its historic associations is destroyed if the property is moved.

#### **Design**

**Design is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.** It results from conscious decisions made during the original conception and planning of a property (or its significant alteration) and applies to activities as diverse as community planning, engineering, architecture, and landscape architecture. Design includes such elements as organization of space, proportion, scale, technology, ornamentation, and materials.

A property's design reflects historic functions and technologies as well as aesthetics. It includes such considerations as the structural system; massing; arrangement of spaces; pattern of fenestration; textures and colors of surface materials; type, amount, and style of ornamental detailing; and arrangement and type of plantings in a designed landscape.

Design can also apply to districts, whether they are important primarily for historic association, architectural value, information potential, or a combination thereof. For districts significant primarily for historic association or architectural value, design concerns more than just the individual buildings or structures located within the boundaries. It also applies to the way in which buildings, sites, or structures are related: for example, spatial relationships between major

features; visual rhythms in a streetscape or landscape plantings; the layout and materials of walkways and roads; and the relationship of other features, such as statues, water fountains, and archeological sites.

## Setting

**Setting is the physical environment of a historic property.** Whereas location refers to the specific place where a property was built or an event occurred, setting refers to the *character* of the place in which the property played its historical role. It involves *how*, not just *where*, the property is situated and its relationship to surrounding features and open space.

Setting often reflects the basic physical conditions under which a property was built and the functions it was intended to serve. In addition, the way in which a property is positioned in its environment can reflect the designer's concept of nature and aesthetic preferences.

The physical features that constitute the setting of a historic property can be either natural or manmade, including such elements as:

- Topographic features (a gorge or the crest of a hill);
- Vegetation;
- Simple manmade features (paths or fences); and
- Relationships between buildings and other features or open space.

These features and their relationships should be examined not only within the exact boundaries of the property, but also between the property and its *surroundings*. This is particularly important for districts.

## Materials

**Materials are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.** The choice and combination of materials reveal the preferences of those who created the property and indicate the availability of particular types of materials and technologies. Indigenous materials are often the focus of regional building traditions and thereby help define an area's sense of time and place.

A property must retain the key exterior materials dating from the period of its historic significance. If the property has been rehabilitated, the historic materials and significant features must have been preserved. The property must also be an actual historic resource, not a recreation; a recent structure fabricated to look historic is not eligible. Likewise, a property whose historic features and materials have been lost and then reconstructed is usually not eligible.

## **Workmanship**

**Workmanship is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory.** It is the evidence of artisans' labor and skill in constructing or altering a building, structure, object, or site. Workmanship can apply to the property as a whole or to its individual components. It can be expressed in vernacular methods of construction and plain finishes or in highly sophisticated configurations and ornamental detailing. It can be based on common traditions or innovative period techniques.

Workmanship is important because it can furnish evidence of the technology of a craft, illustrate the aesthetic principles of a historic or prehistoric period, and reveal individual, local, regional, or national applications of both technological practices and aesthetic principles. Examples of workmanship in historic buildings include tooling, carving, painting, graining, turning, and joinery. Examples of workmanship in prehistoric contexts include Paleo-Indian clovis projectile points; Archaic period beveled adzes; Hopewellian birdstone pipes; copper earspools and worked bone pendants; and Iroquoian effigy pipes.

## **Feeling**

**Feeling is a property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.** It results from the presence of physical features that, taken together, convey the property's historic character. For example, a rural historic district retaining original design, materials, workmanship, and setting will relate the feeling of agricultural life in the 19th century. A grouping of prehistoric petroglyphs, unmarred by graffiti and intrusions and located on its original isolated bluff, can evoke a sense of tribal spiritual life.

## **Association**

**Association is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.** A property retains association if it is the place where the event or activity occurred and is sufficiently intact to convey that relationship to an observer. Like feeling, association requires the presence of physical features that convey a property's historic character. For example, a Revolutionary War battlefield whose natural and manmade elements have remained intact since the 18th century will retain its quality of association with the battle.

Because feeling and association depend on individual perceptions, their retention *alone* is never sufficient to support eligibility of a property for the National Register.

#### **4. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation**

The Standards (Department of Interior regulations, 36 CFR 67) pertain to historic buildings of all materials, construction types, sizes, and occupancy and encompass the exterior and the interior, related landscape features and the building's site and environment as well as attached, adjacent, or related new construction. The Standards are to be applied to specific rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility.

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.
4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.
8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.