State Parks' Cultural Resources — Taking Historic Steps
By Roberta Deering

California State Parks and its Historic Sites, Historic Parks, Museums and collections, is one of the richest in the country in terms of the historic and cultural resources. In recognition of that, State Parks Director Rusty Areias ten months ago created the Cultural Resources Division within State Parks, and appointed Steade Craigo, FAIA, as the Division’s Chief.

Looking at the past ten months, a very short time for a new agency, and the division chief’s aspirations for the future, the commitment to do the right thing by the state’s cultural resources is very much there. But with the state’s economic downturn, worries abound that this new leadership and its commitment to State Parks’ cultural resources may not have the funding and staffing needed to do the work.

“I think that my strongest impression over the past ten months in this new position is of the staff’s true dedication and passion for the parks,” Craigo said. “It has been a joy and real pleasure to work with them.” But, he readily admits, there are enormous challenges.

There are 1,500 historic structures in the State Parks holdings. Many historic structures throughout the system, such as those at Angel Island State Park, which has numerous historic structures in addition to the better known Immigration Station, are in need of stabilization and rehabilitation, as well as plans for their future uses.

There are 6,800 recorded archaeological sites in the State Parks system. Archaeological sites throughout the State Parks System, such as at Gaviota State Park near Santa Barbara, Lake Oroville State Recreational Area near Chico, and Patrick’s Point State Park and Humbolt Lagoons State Park in northwestern California, have been impacted by recent marijuana eradication activities and need to be protected.

The Department’s enormous collections (continued next page)
and museums are in serious need of more attention, both physically and in terms of their ability to display and interpret the materials. According to the Department’s own rating system for museum environments, it is estimated 4.5 million objects are stored or displayed in conditions that score only a failing 47% grade. Finding the resources for much needed staff training is also high on the new Chief’s list of priorities.

To advise and assist the division in meeting these and the departments’ many cultural resource challenges, a Cultural Resources Cabinet in the department is being formed, which will include the State Librarian Dr. Kevin Starr and State Historic Preservation Officer Dr. Knox Mellon. The Cabinet’s charge will be to provide focus and guidance for significant planning issues and challenges affecting the Department’s cultural and historical resources. Planning also has begun for Spring a 2002, “Cultural Resources Summit,” that will bring together key people in the state, as well as national expertise, to help develop the vision and approach needed to best realize the vast potential and deal with the challenging needs of California’s State Parks’ cultural resources. The Summit represents the future. So, what has been happening over the past ten months?

Priorities have focused on museum initiatives within State Parks, particularly the establishment of an Indian Museum of statewide importance, and curation facilities that improve both preservation and access to the varied collections that the department manages.

Craigo also has emphasized the need to take a new look at cultural landscapes, an integral part of the State Parks system. Historic landscapes were a focus of a recent week-long cultural resource-training workshop. And, Paula Boghosian, a former State Historical Resources Commission member and architectural historian, has been hired to prepare a National Historic Landmark application for Big Basin Redwoods State Park, California’s oldest state park.

The Department’s and the division’s leadership also have expressed a desire to forge a strong active partnership between Parks, the California Office of Historic Preservation, the California Preservation Foundation and other preservation organizations throughout the state. Initially, this effort is exemplified in new procedures, being pursued by Parks and OHP, for the Public Resources Code 5024, and the Memorandum of Understanding between Parks and OHP and the State Historic Preservation Officer. This agreement will establish procedures for reviewing work affecting historic and cultural resources in State Parks. The current out-of-date 1990 agreement and procedures are being updated to reflect the current department’s organization and to streamline and clarify the review process.

The Cultural Resources Division also has been directly involved with Will Rogers and Crystal Cove State Historic Parks. A model cultural landscape management plan will be prepared for Will Rogers State Historic Park. Craigo and Mellon are closely monitoring the Department’s commitment to preserve the historic cottages at Crystal Cove.

Prop. 12, the Parks Bond that passed in the March 2000 election, allocated $1.2 million annually for seven years to Parks’ cultural resources projects. For the first year, Craigo has earmarked funds for priority historic buildings, such as the John Marsh House, and collection projects. A comprehensive survey of the departments’ cultural resources is being considered in the coming year.

Another Park Bond issue will be on the upcoming March ballot. Proposition 40 has been endorsed by the California Preservation Foundation. Efforts to pass this bond issue and steer some of its $2.6 billion in funding to the State Parks system are key goals of many organizations and individual campaigns.

With the State’s projected budget deficits and enormous funding needs in education and social services, it will be a challenge to secure adequate funding to preserve and protect our rich California State Parks system. Areias and Craigo, and the Department of Parks and Recreation in general, face huge challenges, but finding the funding for the many important priorities may be the toughest of them all.
President's Report — Carolyn Douthat

Happy New Year to all! The year 2002 starts with a great opportunity for historic preservation in California. For the March election, the legislature has placed on the ballot Proposition 40, the California Clean Water, Clean Air, Safe Neighborhood Parks and Coastal Protection Act for voter approval. The Board of Trustees and I are asking for your individual and organizational support for its passage.

And why? Proposition 40 is a bond act which would provide support for not only the areas mentioned in its rather unwieldy title, but also over 267 million dollars for the acquisition, restoration, preservation and interpretation of resources which make up the story of California's historic and cultural legacy. Non-profit organizations and government organizations would qualify for funding.

Passage of the act would signal a real commitment by the voters to historic preservation, and, by working together for its passage, we can let the legislature know the strength of the historic preservation community in California. The California Preservation Foundation has joined with the National Trust, the Los Angeles Conservancy, San Francisco Heritage and other local organizations in forming the California Heritage Coalition, A Committee for Proposition 40, to create a network of preservation support for the proposition.

What can you do to help?

- complete the endorsement form which is in this newsletter, and on the Coalition website and send or fax it to the Coalition, care of the National Trust Western Regional Office. (contact information provided below)
- contact your local preservation, historical and interested local organizations and ask for their endorsement
- identify projects in your community which would benefit from the financial support
- contact local media to highlight local projects, and raise the profile of the benefits of the proposition to your community
- urge your local Commission, City Council and Board of Supervisors to adopt resolutions in support
- contact your state representatives about projects you think are important — if the proposition passes, they will be making decisions on how some of the money is spent.

Where do I get more information?

- There will be a website up soon with endorsement forms, information, and sample resolutions at www.californiaheritage.org. For general Prop. 40 information, go to www.voteyeson40.org.
- Send endorsements to the California Heritage Coalition c/o Anthony Veerkamp, National Trust Western Regional Office, Suite 400, 8 California Street, San Francisco, CA. 94111. Phone 415.956.0610, fax 415.956.0837, e-mail prop40@nthp.org.
- If you want e-mail updates on the campaign to pass Prop. 40, e-mail your address to both the Coalition (prop40@nltph.org) and CPF (cpf@californiapreservation.org).

Proposition 40 is an opportunity to provide a major source of funds for historic preservation projects statewide. Let's see what we can do to get it passed.

A Letter from Friends

Dear CPF Board and Staff members,

Thank you again for bestowing a President's Award on the San Carlos Heritage Association for its work related to the Hacienda Garden Apartments. It was such a tremendous honor. We proudly display our certificate and photos of the ceremony in our booth at various public events. We continue to meet with the developer and city staff regarding progress of the restoration work and landscaping. We could not have come this far without your unwavering support. We're so lucky to have an organization like yours with such wonderful and dedicated people.

Best Wishes for the New Year 2002!

Cara Vook and Nancy Oliver
San Carlos Heritage Association
OHP Grants Available
California Heritage Fund Grant Program
1st Cycle Application Deadline: March 1, 2002

In March 2000, the California electorate passed Proposition 12, The Safe Neighborhood Parks, Clean Water, Clean Air and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2000, which allocated $8,506,000 in funding to the California Heritage Fund (CHF) Grant Program. The Office of Historic Preservation administers this competitive statewide grants program, under the Park Bond Act of 2000. The program provides funding for the acquisition, development, rehabilitation, restoration, and interpretation of archeological and historical resources that are listed or formally determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historical Resources, California Historic Landmarks, or California Points of Historical Interest registration programs.

Dr. Knox Mellon, State Historic Preservation Officer, remarked that, “The CHF Grant Program provides the first opportunity in 20 years to distribute grant funds for archeological and historical resource preservation projects throughout California. Local government agencies, nonprofit organizations, and Federally recognized California Indian tribes now have the opportunity to seek funding assistance for preservation projects that will enhance our communities and promote economic revitalization.”

Information on program administration regarding application deadlines, match requirements, grant award amounts and project eligibility is as follows:

To allow grant applicants time to fulfill the listing requirement in the registration programs mentioned previously, the CHF Grant Program has been divided into two grant application cycles, with two different application deadlines. The first cycle deadline is March 1, 2002, with $4,000,000 available for distribution. The second cycle deadline is August 2, 2002, with $4,500,000 remaining to distribute.

Applicants wishing to add properties to a State registration program must submit nominations immediately to OHP in order to be placed on the May 2002 agenda of the State Historical Resources Commission meeting.

The CHF Grant Program requires grant applicants to provide at least 50% of the total project cost as matching funding. Applicants may include matching funds from local, State, Federal, and private sources, as well as, force accounts and in-kind resources.

The CHF Grant Program has established a minimum grant award of $10,000, and a maximum grant award that may not exceed the lesser of $1,000,000 or 50% of the total cost of the Project.

The CHF Grant Program excludes funding for rehabilitation or restoration of privately owned residential and commercial properties.

Interest in the CHF Grant program has been considerable. OHP has sent out almost a thousand CHF Grant Program Grant Application and Procedural Guides to interested parties.

Information about the grant program and grant application / procedural guide is currently available on OHP’s web site at www.ohp.parks.ca.gov. Contact Cheri Stanton, OHP Grants Support, at (916) 653-3640 for general information about the program, or to be placed on the CHF Grant Program mailing list. Technical assistance with the grant application and procedural guide is available from Paula Jow, OHP Grants Manager, at (916) 651-6956.

OHP welcomes all inquiries and encourages all eligible applicants to apply for this not to be missed opportunity for historic resource preservation funding!
Both State and Federal lawmakers had rollercoaster rides at the end of their 2001 sessions, with money issues taking their tolls. Neither the federal Historic Homeownership Assistance Act, involving tax credits, nor AB 166, the state historic rehab tax credit bill, fared well, though HHAA at one point seemed so close. Tax credits in recession economies are not given very good odds of passage by legislative aides who spoke at CPF’s Legislative Roundtable in November. And, with budget deficits looming, the FY’02 federal Historic Preservation Fund appropriation suffered reduced numbers from the prior fiscal year, which meant a 15% reduction for California’s Office of Historic Preservation.

The potential bright spot, moneywise, was from AB 1602 (thanks to State Senators John Burton and Wes Chesbro), which puts a proposal for a $2.6 billion parks bond issue on California’s March 5th ballot (see President’s Report, page 3.) And, other California historic sites, such as the state’s three remaining Japantowns, and the Breed Street Shul in Los Angeles, did garner some state financial assistance through special appropriations. Governor Davis also signed Executive Order D-46-01, which strengthens the potential for historic buildings and downtowns to gain state facilities as tenants.

2001’s dark spot for historic resources was in a December administrative action taken by Interior Secretary Gail Norton. As reported in the San Francisco Chronicle, Secretary Norton eliminated the Bureau of Land Management’s power to stop mining operations even if the Bureau believes the operations would cause irreparable harm to the environment, including cultural sites. It seems there will be plenty needing to be done in the current sessions of Congress and the State Legislature.

Library Bond Act Regulations Approved — Workshops Announced

In late 2001, the Office of Library Construction (OLC) received word from the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) that the Title 5 Library Bond Act regulations had been approved. These regulations became effective on January 4, 2002.

The California Building Standards Commission approved the Title 24 Library Bond Act administrative regulations and building standards. The administrative regulations (Part 1) became effective on January 3, 2002, and the building standards (Part 2) will become effective on June 2, 2002.

These approvals mark the culmination of many months of work by the OLC staff, the California Library Construction and Renovation Board, and interested parties in the public library community. Copies of the “Final (Codified) Library Bond Act Regulations” for both Title 5 and Title 24 are available for downloading on the OLC Web site at the following address: www.olc.library.ca.gov/regs.asp (try www.olc.ca.gov/regs.asp if you experience difficulty accessing the site).

The Office of Library Construction is pleased to announce a series of workshops around the State of California entitled: “How to Apply for a Library Bond Act Grant.” This workshop will provide potential grant applicants with the essential information they need to apply for Library Bond Act funds.

Interested parties may view a course description and register for a workshop by visiting: www.olc.library.ca.gov/workshops/ (or, www.olc.ca.gov, if you experience difficulty accessing the site). The Office of Library Construction staff will review the Application Form page-by-page as well as all other requirements for submitting an application for Library Bond Act grant funds including all necessary supporting documents. Strategies for increasing project competitiveness will also be discussed.

For more information, contact Pat Zografos at (916) 445-9612 or by e-mail: pzografos@library.ca.gov.
Preservation news from Humboldt is a mix—some good and some not-so-good. Several projects reflect dedicated efforts by both public and private entities, but on other fronts, historic preservation is finishing a decided last in the face of development pressures. Here are some brief sketches of a few projects in Eureka and Arcata.

**Fish and Game/City of Arcata**
A truly innovative project is still in the talking stages, but even that is encouraging. The City of Arcata and the California Department of Fish and Game may undertake a cooperative effort to rehabilitate barns and houses on four farmsteads that are part of the incomparable Arcata bottom landscape. Located just inside the 1890s dike bordering Humboldt Bay, there are three barns and two houses on Fish and Game property and a single barn on City land. The two entities are engaged in a collaborative effort to restore wetland and tidal habitats, but both now recognize the value of the cultural resources that come with the land and are looking for funds to repair and maintain the structures as part of the Arcata bottom cultural landscape.

**Zehndner-Gilardoni Barns**
During the recent revision of Arcata's General Plan, an 18-acre piece of farmland adjacent to a subdivision and a lumber mill was designated to remain in open space. The 1930s dairy barn, milking barn, and storm shed and the 1950s dairy are testimony to an agricultural land-use that spans a good 125 years on the Arcata bottom. Instead of dairy cows, the land will soon support a goat creamery, where world-renown Cypress Grove cheese will be produced and in the process, the wonderful barns will remain part of Arcata's landscape.

**Old Methodist Parsonage in Arcata**
Alexandra (Alex) Stillman, known locally and throughout the state for her visionary work to save old buildings, has just completed the restoration of the old Methodist parsonage in Arcata. Alex and her contractor son Kelly Carlin removed a modern storefront, rebuilt the Colonial porch, and refurbished the entire house to create a multi-shade pink beauty that is a showpiece.
Landmarking Oakland's Claremont Hotel

In the spring of 2000, the Berkeley/Oakland Neighbors of the Claremont (BONC) began the process to landmark the Claremont Hotel. With the assistance of the Oakland Heritage Alliance, BONC prepared a “Notice of Intent to Nominate” document and submitted it to the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board. Mindful that the Hotel had already been identified as an Oakland Historic Resource and carried with it a very high “A” rating, the LPAB accepted the Notice of Intent to Landmark.

The building itself is an excellent example of Tudor Revival-Craftsman style architecture and is an exemplary work of Charles W. Dickey, who was a significant architect of the early 20th century. The building and site offer a rare example of a grand historic garden hotel located in an urban area.

The BONC Request to Landmark the Claremont Hotel was submitted to the Landmarks Board in May of 2001. The Board members reviewed the application and on July 9, 2001 held a presentation and public hearing meeting. At that meeting the Board voted unanimously to recommend landmarking the property.

In their resolutions, the LPAB resolved that “the setting of the building on the hillside and within an open, landscaped area contributes not only to the architectural significance of the historic building but to making this one of the most visually prominent buildings in Oakland and in the entire East Bay. The LPAB believes that because of the unique and exceptional circumstance of the interrelationship of this building with its site it is appropriate for the grounds and the building to receive landmark status, with the knowledge and understanding that the site will change and evolve.”

At this time of writing, the recommendations of the Landmarks Board are on the way to the Planning Commission for public hearing and discussion. If the Planning Commissioners agree with the recommendation for Landmark designation they will in turn forward it to the Oakland City Council. It is the Oakland City Council that will make the ultimate decision whether to designate the Claremont Hotel as the “Landmark” it deserves to be.

Hotel Del Coronado's Power Plant to be Saved

The famous “Hotel Del,” as the locals refer to their historic grand resort hotel on Coronado Island just off shore from San Diego, is in the midst of a preservation and restoration plan aimed at enhancing its appearance and long-term viability. As part of this effort, the Save Our Heritage Organization has been working with the Hotel Del Coronado to save “…the original 1888 power plant with attached office, marble switch board, artifacts, the original service tunnel, the front portion of the Ice House and the smoke stack,” as part of a December agreement announced in Reflections, SOHO’s newsletter. Also part of the agreement is for a display using historic materials to interpret the role of these service structures relative to the hotel, and other original supporting functions for the hotel. According to Reflections, the power plant, installed by Mather/Westinghouse, was once the largest installation of its type in the world when it opened in 1888. SOHO is pleased also that design elements from the power plant will be used in the new construction being built adjacent to the Power Plant, and new structures will not span over any portion of the historic facility. Congratulations to SOHO, the Hotel Del, and to Coronado city officials, for their roles in giving the respect that this great resort’s historic structures deserves.
"Silicon Valley" Pressures California's Coyote Valley

Last Chance Landscapes

Some of America's most beautiful communities and countryside face immediate threats from damaging outdoor advertising and haphazard development. "Last Chance Landscapes of America the Beautiful 2001," Scenic America's annual list of 10 of the most endangered places, shows that communities across the country face continuous threats from public and private actions that destroy vistas and community character.

Eight-story high billboard advertising wall signs are desecrating the beauty of the nation's capital, and a Cisco Systems office park is on the verge of replacing one of California's most scenic landscapes. "Last Chance Landscapes 2001 illustrates the tremendous challenge of protecting the beauty of our communities and country-side," said Meg Maguire, President of Scenic America, a national conservation organization. "Growth is inevitable; ugliness is not. True patriotism includes saving the places we love." "Last Chance Landscapes of America the Beautiful 2001" were chosen in a nationwide competition.

Coyote Valley

In Coyote Valley, a rural area 11 miles south of San Jose, California, Cisco Systems is proposing to replace a scenic and historic rural landscape with a 688-acre office park including parking for 20,000 cars. Residents say the development should happen in an existing urban area, where infrastructure already exists.

For more information on Scenic America, visit http://www.scenic.org.

The 10 "Last Chance Landscapes of America the Beautiful 2001" include:

- The State of Oregon
  (including the Central Oregon Region and Wallowa Lake, Joseph, OR)
- Washington, DC
- The Marsh Islands of Coastal Georgia
- Red Rocks Scenic Road (AZ 179), Sedona, AZ
- Narragansett Bay, RI
- Coyote Valley, San Jose, CA
- St. Croix Valley Scenic Corridor, MN and WI
- Harpeth River Valley, Williamson County, TN
- Lynville Mountain Landscape, Roanoke, VA
- Woodberry Watershed Forest, Baltimore, MD

Breed Street Shul Project Receives Funding, Recognition

The Jewish Historical Society of Southern California reports "great strides" in its efforts to restore the Breed Street Shul as an educational and cultural center. The advocacy and support of Assembly Member Gil Cedillo and Assembly Speaker Robert Hertzberg, along with that of a variety of local and national groups, including the Boyle Heights Neighbors Organization, is beginning to pay off for the Breed Street Shul located in Los Angeles. The Shul Project has recently received much needed funds including $500,000 appropriated by the State Legislature for urgently needed seismic and roof repairs, as well as grants from the California Endowment and the Getty Trust. The Shul has also been listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Undergraduate and graduate students from USC, UCLA, Hebrew Union College, the University of Judaism, and teens from Proyecto Pastoral in Boyle Heights and Valley Beth Shalom in Encino became involved in volunteer projects at the Shul through the effort. The volunteers helped with everything from clean-up work to architectural and strategic studies.
Benicia Arsenal Update

After the Benicia City Council approved a new housing development on the Benicia Arsenal Historic District's open space and certified the environmental document on the proposal, the Benicia Arsenal Task Force, a group of citizens with a lot of energy and organizing ability, rallied the troops and collected more than enough signatures to place a referendum on the ballot against the decision. Bowing to the groundswell of interest in preserving the Arsenal, the developer of the housing project has withdrawn the proposal. However, the future of the Arsenal Historic District is still in question but, the attention drawn to the officer's enclave has motivated Mayor Steve Messina to start a fund for restoration of the Commandant's residence. And, leading a charge for state funds to rehabilitate the Commandant's Mansion, comes State Senator Wes Chesbro. Chesbro has requested an allocation of $1 million in funds from the Prop. 12 Bond Issue passed in 2000, which allocated funds to the California Heritage Fund, to cover half of the rehabilitation. And the Arsenal Task Force is working to come up with a solution that will permanently preserve the historic district.

To contact the Benicia Arsenal Task Force call Jane Lauder at 707-746-7262, or visit the website: arsenalfriends@cs.com

For additional information on the City of Benicia efforts to preserve the Benicia Commandants residence contact Mr. Otto Guiliani, Benicia City Manager at 707-746-4210

New Preservation Classes Announced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction to Historic Preservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 February 2002 - 3 June 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Trade Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Units — CSU and UC transferable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesdays 6:00-9:10pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Samudio, Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert Guest Lecturers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Registration Information and Map, call: (213) 744-9058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or visit: <a href="http://www.latte.cc.ca.us">www.latte.cc.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation Yellow Pages (National Trust for Historic Preservation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>numerous handouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATTC also offers Associate Degrees in Architecture, Certificates in Digital Design, MAPS/GIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99E @ LATTC Los Angeles Trade Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 W. Washington Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA  90015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Can “Smart Growth” and Historic Preservation Co-Exist?

by Mike Stepner, FAIA, FAICP, FIUD
Diane Kane, Ph.D, AICP

“Smart Growth” and "Livable Communities" is the hip planning jargon of the second millennium. Developers, decision makers and downtown aficionados all agree that a return to the city makes good sense. Disown suburban sprawl, save trees and wildlife, clean up the air, walk to work and spend more time with family. What is not to like under these rosy scenarios? Unfortunately, to decrease sprawl, density must be increased somewhere – and that usually means older city neighborhoods. Older neighborhoods are prime location for National and California Register properties, historic districts and historic preservation overlay zones. An increase in density too often means higher property values that lead to overscaled, insensitive new development, not to mention the outright destruction of irreplaceable historic fabric. To the skeptical preservationist, is “Smart Growth” just the latest code for “redevelop, densify and destroy historic neighborhoods?”

“Smart Growth” really can lead to better cities, where historic preservation is a major component in their livability. The two most recent volumes of Forum Journal, published by the National Trust for Historic Preservation, focused on success stories across the nation where smart growth principles include an impressive preservation agenda. Unfortunately, none of the success stories included California, which tends to be a follower, not a leader in this regard. This leads to the question “Has California embraced ‘Smart Growth’ principles, and if so, where and how have they been applied?” And secondly, “does Smart Growth in California include historic preservation, and if so, where and how?” This article intends to provide a framework for discussion among California’s preservationists and will be followed by case studies from around the state that address these issues.

The first point to make about “Smart Growth” is that it involves planning. Unfortunately, public sector planning in California is notoriously reactive and urban design is minimal to non-existant. Planning guru Bill Fulton notes that “California is a permitting state, not a planning state,” wherein planning is done at the project level through the CEQA process. Under CEQA, the objective is not to discuss the best new use of design for a specific parcel, but to mitigate a poor concept to a politically acceptable level. In California, the public sector sets out broad policies (more often conceived to save time and money in the planning process than to provide direction) and then waits for a developer to submit proposals. The proposals frequently raise questions about details that should have been addressed in the broader policy plans, so litigation and mitigation substitutes for planning. A more pro-active solution is to identify in advance what type of new growth is desirable and determine where to locate it without undesirable spill-over effects. Conversely, specifying where increased density would be inappropriate – like single family residential neighborhoods and historic districts – also needs to be pre-determined prior to project submittal.

Along with ramped up planning activities, “Smart Growth” entails appropriate regulatory tools and trained professional staff to administer them. Urban design guidelines and historic preservation controls are needed to assure that the character of older neighborhoods is considered during the reinvestment process. Performance-based zoning models allow for higher densities and mixed uses, while design guidelines, citizen review committees, and professional urban design and historic preservation staff assure the community gets new development it can love. But, having the controls and policies accomplishes nothing if they are not followed, or if they are ignored, or if they are interpreted so rigidly that every discussion becomes adversarial. The formal situation is born of a lack of community support; the latter, from a lack of public trust.

The most critical component of livable communities is informed citizen participation that elects strong, visionary leaders, creates consensus and provides feedback for elected officials and professional staff. With today’s busy schedules, it is often difficult to get meaningful community involvement. Too often the “public” participating in decision-making are special interests with limited agendas. When civic discussions disintegrate into adversarial free-for-alls, the response is
ordinances that try to address every conceivable situation in order to minimize future discussion and prolonged negotiation. Such ordinances are more often designed to stop what we don’t want rather than to achieve what we do want. Livable Communities are achieved by painstakingly working out the design and development details, not mindlessly following a codified checklist to expedite the process. So, “Smart Growth” includes both meaningful community input and changing the planning process to include more flexible approaches to urban development. In many cities, local government sponsored “citizen participation academies” are tutoring neighborhood activists in the arcane of city hall. Developing strong neighborhood associations not only provides the training ground for future leaders, it creates the civic feedback loop so vital to good government and healthy communities.

“Smart Growth” involves the use of new methods to better track development and its consequences. Geographic Information Systems (GIS) are increasingly popular planning tools that tie electronic databases to specific geographic locations. For example, by clicking on a specific map-based parcel, information can be instantly accessed about the underlying land use opportunities and constraints. Censuses tract data, zoning, natural and environmental hazards, historic status, tax assessments, traffic counts, code violations, building permits and the like can be quickly correlated for a parcel, block or neighborhood. By sharing all known information, city departments can coordinate their various responsibilities to make better, faster and more cost-effective decisions and to more easily distribute critical information to the public. This is good news for preservationists, since historic properties can be easily identified by all city departments, not just the Landmarks Commission.

“Smart Growth” concerns on-going public investment in basic, unglamorous infrastructure. Streets, sidewalk, lighting, parks, water and sewers need to be in good working condition. Too often cities ignore routine maintenance of these very necessary public investments until they are beyond repair. Public disinvestments create neighborhood blight, leading to falling property values and private sector flight. If older neighborhoods are to be densified under Smart Growth scenarios, their public infrastructure needs to be retrofitted to accept the increased density in advance of, or in concert with, new development. Remarkable success stories have emerged from situations where new public investment in older neighborhoods has greatly multiplied private sector activity. Sometimes the solution is as simple as traffic calming busy streets by re-allocating existing public space to favor sidewalks, parking and tree laws over vehicular traffic.

Finally, Livable Communities include excellent schools and libraries, adequate parks and recreational opportunities, thriving commerce and cultural activities and lively community gathering places. But, where do these desirable amenities go? Older neighborhoods are often fully built out, with little room for new activities that may be desperately needed for revitalization. Adaptive re-use of existing structure is a cost-effective, preservation-friendly approach to gaining new amenities while retaining the character and scale of the neighborhood. Another Smart Growth approach is to pro-actively plan for land use conversion where existing uses are obsolete, or properties beyond repair. Often this involves public clean-up of brownfield sites, where decades of industrial waste have polluted land beyond economic return. Environmental restoration and economic reuse are good news for historic areas that often have a few “bad apple” properties spoiling the neighborhood.

So there’s our preservationist’s checklist for Smart Growth and Livable Communities in California. Watch legislation introduced on both the national and state levels by the American Planning Association that will provide resources to local governments to implement the planning reform inherent in Smart Growth initiatives. The congressional legislation is the Community Character Act (H.R. 1433), introduced by Representatives Earl Blumenauer (D-OR) and Wayne Gilchrest (R-MD) and SB741 (Sher) that requires: 1) California to adopt a State Vision; 2) State Agencies to tie their policies and funding to the State Vision; and, 3) local governments to incorporate the vision into their general plans. And watch this space for reports on Smart Growth Initiatives around the state.
I since this time, your name will appear in joined or renewed have contributed are listed.

THANKS FOR RENEWING!

THANKS FOR JOINING!

Members who joined or renewed between 10/21/01 and 1/24/02 are listed. If you have contributed since this time, your name will appear in the next issue.

Preservation Associates
Marvin Bamburg, Marvin Bamburg & Associates, San Jose; Charles Berwanger, La Jolla; Carolyn Douthat, Oakland; Ronald Hamburger, EQE International, Inc., Oakland; Cindy Heitzman, Napa County Landmarks, Napa; Jeffrey Milla, Beronio Lumber Co., San Francisco; Elizabeth Reinhart, Mendo Park; Carol Roland Nawi, Calif. Dept. of General Services, Sacramento; David Wagner, Garcia/Wagner & Associates, San Francisco.

Preservation Friends
Heritage Soc. of Pacific Grove, Pacific Grove; Landmark Heritage Foundation, Berkeley; Pearl Chase Society, Santa Barbara; Rancho Los Alamitos Foundation, Seal Beach; Redlands Area Hist. Society, Redlands; Sacramento Old City Association, Sacramento; Sonoma League for Hist. Pres., Sonoma; Visalia Heritage, Inc., Visalia; Robert Bruce Anderson, Urban Conservation & Urban Design, San Francisco; Wendy Barker, Escondido Historical Society, Escondido; Bruce Bonacker, Bonacker Associates, San Francisco; Scott Brady, Alameda Architectural Preservation Soc., Alameda; Anthony Bruce, Berkeley Architectural Heritage Asn., Berkeley; Colin Busby, Basin Research Associates, Inc., San Leandro; Kathleen Cameron, Mendocino; Patricia Curia, Preserv. Action Council of San Jose, San Jose; Jim DeMersman, Hayward Area Historical Society, Hayward; Katherine Donovan, City of Vallejo Planning, Vallejo; Charles Fisher, Highland Park Heritage Trust, Highland Park; Diane Galt, Casa Del Herrero Foundation, Santa Barbara; Cathy Garrett, Pattillo & Garrett Associates, Oakland; Hillary Gitelman, San Francisco; Craig Hensley, City of San Dimas, San Dimas; Neil Heyden, Palo Alto; J. Daniel Humason, Humason Investments, Haywood; Wilma Humason, Hanford Fox Theatre, Hanford; Vivian Kahn, Kahn / Mortimer Associates, Oakland; Susan Lancaster, Los Angeles; Tony Lashbrook, Truckee Community Devel., Truckee; Cathy Mirreleiz, Gilroy Historical Museum, Gilroy; John Nelson, Hansen/Murakami/Eshima, Inc., Oakland; Nancy O’Neill, Santa Monica; Christine Palmer, City of Santa Barbara Planning, Santa Barbara; Judy Pruden, City of Ukiah, Ukiah; Ted Rabinowitch, Fort Bragg; Deborah Riddle, Petaluma; Nels Roselund, Roselund Engineering Co., South San Gabriel; Jack Rubens, Esq., Sheppard Mullin Richer & Hampton, Manhattan Bench; Jeff Samudio, Design Aid Architects, Hollywood; Thomas Saxby, Thomas Saxby, Architect, Oakland; Sally Schacht, City of Whittier, Whittier; Mike Sheppard, City of Santa Rosa Comm. Devel., Santa Rosa; Susan Snyder, Planning Department San Francisco, San Francisco; Tony Spann, Anthony P. Spann, Architect, Santa Barbara; Ellen Stevahn, Friends of Rodgers Ranch, Pleasant Hill; George Strauss, Berkeley Architectural Heritage Asn., Berkeley; Bob Uyeda, Terra Design, Inc., Los Angeles; Robert Venturi, Philadelphia, PA; David Watkins, City of South Pasadena, South Pasadena; John Watson, Monrovia Old House Pres. Group, Monrovia; Elizabeth Yost, Oakland.

Households
Robert Bruce Anderson, San Francisco; Wendy Barker, Escondido; Bruce Bonacker, San Francisco; Scott Brady, Alameda; Anthony Bruce, Berkeley; Colin Busby, San Francisco; Cathy Garrett, Pattillo & Garrett Associates, Oakland; Hillary Gitelman, San Francisco; Craig Hensley, City of San Dimas, San Dimas; Neil Heyden, Palo Alto; J. Daniel Humason, Humason Investments, Haywood; Wilma Humason, Hanford Fox Theatre, Hanford; Vivian Kahn, Kahn / Mortimer Associates, Oakland; Susan Lancaster, Los Angeles; Tony Lashbrook, Truckee Community Devel., Truckee; Cathy Mirreleiz, Gilroy Historical Museum, Gilroy; John Nelson, Hansen/Murakami/Eshima, Inc., Oakland; Nancy O’Neill, Santa Monica; Christine Palmer, City of Santa Barbara Planning, Santa Barbara; Judy Pruden, City of Ukiah, Ukiah; Ted Rabinowitch, Fort Bragg; Deborah Riddle, Petaluma; Nels Roselund, Roselund Engineering Co., South San Gabriel; Jack Rubens, Esq., Sheppard Mullin Richer & Hampton, Manhattan Bench; Jeff Samudio, Design Aid Architects, Hollywood; Thomas Saxby, Thomas Saxby, Architect, Oakland; Sally Schacht, City of Whittier, Whittier; Mike Sheppard, City of Santa Rosa Comm. Devel., Santa Rosa; Susan Snyder, Planning Department San Francisco, San Francisco; Tony Spann, Anthony P. Spann, Architect, Santa Barbara; Ellen Stevahn, Friends of Rodgers Ranch, Pleasant Hill; George Strauss, Berkeley Architectural Heritage Asn., Berkeley; Bob Uyeda, Terra Design, Inc., Los Angeles; Robert Venturi, Philadelphia, PA; David Watkins, City of South Pasadena, South Pasadena; John Watson, Monrovia Old House Pres. Group, Monrovia; Elizabeth Yost, Oakland.
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CPF ADVERTISING OPPORTUNITIES

Ads reach thousands of readers, including architects, developers, building owners, government officials and preservation advocates.

Business card sized advertisements are accepted for the quarterly newsletter and for materials distributed at the Annual Preservation Conference.

California Preservation:
$50 each, four for $175
Conference Program Book:
$100
All: $250

Contact CPF for rates for larger ads.

All advertising is subject to the approval of the California Preservation Foundation.

For more information, please call CPF at 510-763-0972.

CULTURAL RESOURCE SERVICES

COLIN I. BUSBY
Principal
1933 Davis Street, Suite 210
San Leandro, CA 94577
Voice (510) 430-8441
Fax (510) 430-8443
basinre@printsmail.com

CIRCA:

Historic Property Developments
155 Montgomery Street, Suite 1111
San Francisco California 94104
415 362 7711 ph 415 391 9647 fx

Facilitating the revitalization and development of historic properties and commercial districts

THE WILLIS ALLEN COMPANY

ELIZABETH COURTIER
Historic & Architectural Specialist
858.459.4033
1131 Wall Street
La Jolla, CA 92037
www.willisallen.com

Donna Napoli, Ph.D.
Historic Preservation Planning
National Register Nominations • Historic Resource Surveys
Evaluations for CEQA and Section 106 Compliance
1614 26th Street • Sacramento, CA 95816
(916) 455-4541 • dsnapoli@lanset.com
www.dnapoli.com
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Order with VISA/MasterCard or check payable to California Preservation Foundation. First-Class Postage: $3.00 for first item; add $1.00 for each additional item. Fourth-Class Postage: $1.24 for first item; add $0.50 for each additional item. CA residents please add 8.25% California Sales Tax on price of book(s).

CPF Publications

CPF members receive 15% off all listed prices!

• NEW PUBLICATION!!

Award-Winning Design Solutions
Exemplary Projects – Universal Applications
$23.53

• Building Code Issues in Historic Preservation - Selected Case Studies
($8 shipping charge) $125.00

• Preservation and Property Taxes: Capitalizing on Historic Resources with the Mills Act. $14.00

• Preservation for Profit. (Tax credits, easements.) $13.00

• Avoiding the Bite: Strategies for Adopting and Retaining Local Preservation Programs. $12.00

• Preservationist’s Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act. $14.00

• A Preservationist’s Guide to the Development Process. $12.00

• How to Use the State Historical Building Code. $12.00

• 20 Tools That Protect Historic Resources After An Earthquake: Lessons Learned From Northridge. $10.00

• Preparing for Earthquakes: It's Your Business (for commercial districts). $14.00

• Temporary Shoring & Stabilization of Earthquake Damaged Historic Buildings: Practical considerations for earthquake response & recovery in California $10.50

• Earthquake-Damaged Historic Chimneys: A Guide to Rehabilitation and Reconstruction. $10.00

• Post-disaster preservation ordinance for local governments. $10.00

• Loma Prieta: The Engineers' View. $12.00

Order with VISA/MasterCard or check payable to California Preservation Foundation. First-Class Postage: $3.00 for first item; add $1.00 for each additional item. Fourth-Class Postage: $1.24 for first item; add $0.50 for each additional item. CA residents please add 8.25% California Sales Tax on price of book(s).
President’s Circle

The President’s Circle is a group of committed preservationists who enjoy special recognition, educational opportunities and social activities while supporting the Foundation’s endeavors.

New and renewing President’s Circle members include:

Heritage Benefactor
Millie Mario, Palo Alto

Heritage Patrons
Kathleen Green, Sacramento
Julius Shulman, Los Angeles

Preservation Sponsors
Donna Clandening, Arup & Partners California, Los Angeles; Mary Kay Hight, Marina Del Rey; Nancy Iversen, Las Palmas Ranch, Salinas; Diane Kane, Caltrans, La Jolla; Christy McAvoy, Historic Resources Group, LLC, Hollywood; Dennis Morrone, Hathaway Dinwiddie Construction Group, Santa Clara; Ione Stiegler, IS Architecture, La Jolla; Don Sullivan, Sullivan Masonry, Inc., Walnut Creek.

Preservation Partners
Architectural Resources Group, San Francisco; Montgomery Anderson, Cody Anderson Wasney Architects, Palo Alto; Mark Appleton, Appleton Associates, Santa Monica; John Ash, John Ash Group, Eureka; Terrence Bottomley, Bottomley Design & Planning, Oakland; Susan Brandt-Hawley, Brandt-Hawley & Zoia, Esq., Glen Ellen; Alice Carey, Carey & Co., Inc, San Francisco; Jane Carter Bauman, Colusa Heritage Preservation Comm., Colusa; David Cocke, Structural Focus, Garden; Courtney Damkroger, City of San Jose, Dept. of Planning Building & Code Enforcement, San Jose; Roberta Deering, California Preservation Foundation, Oakland; Paul Dreibelbis, Moonlight Molds, Garden; Alan Dreyfuss, Alan Dreyfuss, Architect, Oakland; Albert Dreyfuss, Sacramento; Burton Edwards, Siegel & Strain Architects, Emeryville; Jeff Eichenfield, Berkeley Landmarks Commission, Berkeley; Myra Frank, Myra L. Frank & Assoc., Inc., Los Angeles; Michael Garavaglia, Garavaglia Architecture, San Francisco; Doug Gardner, Cateslus Development Corp., Los Angeles; Curt Ginther, University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles; Roberta Greenwood, Greenwood & Associates, Pacific Palisades; Marion Grimm, Los Altos; Peyton Hall, Historic Resources Group, Hollywood; Anthea Hartig, La Sierra University, Riverside; George Hayakawa, Hayakawa Associates, Los Angeles; Cindy Heitzman, City of St. Helena, St. Helena; Akira Hiruma, MEHA Consulting Engineers, Los Angeles; Saiful Islam, Saiful/Bouquet, Inc., Pasadena; Christopher Johnson, Johnson Architecture, Fresno; Stephen Johnson, Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer Associates, Los Angeles; Bruce Kirby, City of Monterey, Hist. Pres. Comm., Monterey; Gary Knecht, Knecht & Knecht, Oakland; Ruthann Lehrer, City of Long Beach, Long Beach; Marie Lia, Marie Burke Lia, Attorney at Law, San Diego; Angela Mallett, San Carlos Heritage Association, San Carlos; Timothy McAnany, Randall/McAnany, Los Angeles; Christy McAvoy, Los Angeles; Sheila McElroy, Circa: Historic Property Development, San Francisco; Thomas Neary, Morley Builders, Santa Monica; David Neuman, University Architect, Menlo Park; Peter Norton, Santa Monica; Frances Offenhauser, Offenhauser / Mekel Architects, West Hollywood; Josh Pane, Pane & Pane Associates, Inc, Sacramento; Richard Patenaude, James DeMersman, Hayward; Gee Gee Platt, G. Bland Platt Associates, San Francisco; Dana Graves Ralls, Benicia; James Robbins, Robbins Jorgensen Christopher, San Diego; Monica Rohrer, La Maison, Berkeley; Michael Roy, Citadel Environmental, Glendale; Jeff Seidner, Eagle Restorations & Builders, Inc., Arcadia; Sally Spieß, La Jolla; Alex Stillman, Alex Stillman & Assoc., Arcata; H. Ruth Todd, Stanford Planning Office, Stanford; J. Gordon Turnbull, Page & Turnbull, Inc., San Francisco; Cassandra Walker, City of Napa, Napa; Chris Wasney, Cody, Anderson, Wasney Architects, Inc., Palo Alto; Keith Weber, The John Stewart Co., San Francisco; Timothy Whalen, The Getty Conservation Institute, Los Angeles; Loring Wyllie, Degenkolb Engineers, San Francisco; Buzz Yudell, Moore Ruble Yudell, Santa Monica.

Join CPF and Support Preservation

Send this coupon with your tax-deductible membership contribution to the California Preservation Foundation, 1611 Telegraph Ave. Suite 820, Oakland, CA 94612

Preservation ASSOCIATE $200
Preservation FRIEND $100
Household MEMBER (Up to 2 people) $60
Individual MEMBER $40
F/T Student MEMBER $20

PRESIDENT’S CIRCLE:
Heritage BENEFACCTOR $5,000
Heritage PATRON $2,500
Preservation SPONSOR $1,000
Preservation PARTNER $500

Name(s)__________________________
Organization_____________________
Address__________________________
City________________ State ____________ ZIP __________
Home ( ) __________________ Work ( ) __________
Fax ( ) __________________ E-mail __________
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Board of Trustees

President: Carolyn Douthat (Oakland) 510/763-5370
Vice Pres.: Peyton Hall (Hollywood) 323/469-2349
Christopher Johnson (Fresno) 209/497-9620
Treasurer: David Cocke (Gardena) 310/323-9924
Secretary: H. Ruth Todd (Stanford) 650/725-3734

John Ash (Los Angeles) 310/280-3813
Cindy Heitzman (St. Helena) 707/963-2741
May Kay Hight (Marina Del Rey) 310/305-4101
Diane Grinkevich Kane (La Jolla) 213/897-0782
Bruce Kibby (Monterey) 831/646-3408
Mildred Mario (Palo Alto) 650/473-6949
Sheila McElroy (San Francisco) 415/362-7711
Tom Neary (Santa Monica) 310/399-1600
Josh Pane (Sacramento) 916/447-8982
Deborah Rosenthal (Irvine) 949/476-2111
Ione Stiegler (La Jolla) 858/456-8555
Alex Stillman (Arcata) 707/822-4790
Keith Weber (San Mateo) 415/345-4400
Tim Whalen (Los Angeles) 310/440-8717

Executive Director: Roberta Deering rdeering@californiapreservation.org

Newsletter Editor: Karin Martin
mac@californiapreservation.org

Membership & Development Associate: Sarah Sykes
ssykes@californiapreservation.org

Administrative Assistant: Rosemary DeSena
cpf@californiapreservation.org

Preservation Calendar

Saturday, February 23, 2002
2002 Preservation Design Awards
The Getty Center, Los Angeles

May 2 - 5, 2002
27th Annual California Preservation Conference
"Vintage Sonoma County" — The Flamingo Resort Hotel, Santa Rosa

Visit CPF’s Website! www.californiapreservation.org

Visit CPF’s Website! www.californiapreservation.org

California Preservation Foundation
1611 Telegraph Ave., Suite 820
Oakland, CA 94612-2145
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