

AGENDA  
Kansas Historic Sites Board of Review  
Memorial Building, Topeka  
April 20, 1978 10:00 a.m.

1. Approval of minutes of the previous meeting
2. Consideration of National Register nominations
3. Report of the subcommittee on project priorities
4. Report of the subcommittee on rules of procedure
5. Review of the state historic preservation plan
6. Consideration of a state register of historic places
7. Discussion of the state historic preservation act and the need for amendments
8. Consideration of project allocations previously made for the current federal fiscal year
9. Other business
10. Adjournment

Kansas Historic Sites Board of Review  
April 20, 1978

<u>COUNTY</u>		<u>APPROVED</u>	<u>DISAPPROVED</u>	<u>TABLED</u>
Harper	Harper County Courthouse, Harper	<u>✓</u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>
Graham	Penokee Stone Figure, 14GH308, Penokee vicinity	<u>✓</u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>
Riley	Ulrich House, Manhattan	<u>✓</u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>
Riley	Manhattan State Bank, Manhattan	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>
Anderson	Tipton-Patton House, Garnett	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>
Riley	Bardwell House, Manhattan	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>
Riley	Union Pacific Depot, Manhattan	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>

# REVIEW BOARD TALLY SHEET

Property: Ulrich House, Manhattan

Motion by Trauer to APPROVE DISAPPROVE ☐ TABLE

Seconded by Kiene

Vote

Name	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Bibb		X	
Engstrom	X		
Kiene	X		
Sageser <i>absent</i>			
Smith	X		
Snell	X		
Trauer	X		

Disposition: APPROVED DISAPPROVED TABLED

If disapproved, reasons were: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

# REVIEW BOARD TALLY SHEET

Property: Harper County Courthouse, Harper

Motion by Kiene to APPROVE DISAPPROVE ☐ TABLE

Seconded by Trauer

Vote

Name	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Bibb	X		
Engstrom	X		
Kiene	X		
Sageser <i>absent</i>			
Smith	X		
Snell	X		
Trauer	X		

Disposition: APPROVED DISAPPROVED ☐ TABLED ☐

If disapproved, reasons were: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

# REVIEW BOARD TALLY SHEET

Property: Penokee Stone Figure, Penokee

Motion by Smith to APPROVE DISAPPROVE † TABLE

Seconded by Eng

Vote

Name	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Bibb	X		
Engstrom	X		
Kiene	X		
Sageser <i>absent</i>			
Smith	X		
Snell	X		
Trauer	X		

Disposition:

APPROVED

DISAPPROVED

TABLED

If disapproved, reasons were: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

RULES OF PROCEDURE  
OF THE  
KANSAS HISTORIC SITES BOARD OF REVIEW  
as adopted April 20, 1978

1. The name of this body as established by the Kansas Historic Preservation Act of 1977 (Ch. 284, 1977 Session Laws, the "Act") shall be the Kansas Historic Sites Board of Review (the "Board").
2. As prescribed by the Act, the Board shall be composed of the following members: the State Historic Preservation Officer or such Officer's designee; the Director of the Budget or such Director's designee; and five members appointed by the Governor for three-year terms, a majority of whom shall be professionally qualified in the disciplines of history, archeology and architecture (collectively, the "Members").
3. The five appointive Board Members shall be appointed for three-year terms which shall begin July 1 and expire June 30 of the specified years.
4. Vacancies caused by resignation or death prior to the expiration of a term shall be filled for the unexpired term by appointment of the Governor.
5. As prescribed by the Act, the Board shall have the power and duty to:
  - (a) Approve nominations to the state and national registers of historic places.
  - (b) Review the state survey of historic properties undertaken in accordance with the provisions of the Act.
  - (c) Review the content of the state preservation plan developed in accordance with the provisions of the Act.
  - (d) Approve the removal of properties from the state register of historic places.
  - (e) Recommend the removal of properties from the National Register of Historic Places.
  - (f) Otherwise act in an advisory capacity to the state historic preservation agency.
  - (g) Upon request, to advise the legislature concerning matters relating to historic properties and historic preservation.
  - (h) Elect a Chairman and Vice-Chairman and establish such rules of procedure as it deems necessary.

# FEDERAL FY78 FUNDING

Project	Board Recommendations	Authorization by Legislature	SHPO's Final Recommendation
Kansas Survey and Planning	\$ 45,282	\$ 49,595	\$ 49,595
Ottawa Historic Survey	3,000	3,000	3,000
Wichita Metropolitan Area Archeological Survey	4,000	4,000	4,000
Brown Grand Opera House	70,000	74,117.50	70,000
Old Peoples National Bank	28,500		
Crawford Building	25,000		
Marshall County Courthouse	55,000	225,735	60,000
Spooner Hall	50,000	150,000	50,000
Mahaffie House	50,000	99,700	80,000
Smoky Valley Roller Mill	<u>46,500</u>	<u>125,000</u>	<u>75,405</u>
			\$392,000

KANSAS HISTORIC SITES BOARD OF REVIEW  
April 20, 1978

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. in the GAR Room of the Memorial Building by Joseph W. Snell. Other board members present were James W. Bibb, J. Eric Engstrom, Carlyle S. Smith, and Nancy Jo Trauer. Historical Society staff members present were Robert W. Richmond, Richard Pankratz, Martin Stein, Julie Wortman and Sandra Slider. Ralph E. Kiene, Jr., arrived at 10:30 a.m. and A. Bower Sageser at noon. Two visitors were present at the morning session, Edgar Boles and Dale Nimz from Lawrence.

Julie Wortman gave a presentation on historic preservation which had been prepared for delivery to legislators in February. She emphasized the value historic preservation has in meeting needs of communities and stressed the importance of community surveys and planning in historic preservation. Several groups in Kansas are contemplating surveys of their communities.

Mr. Bibb suggested videotaping Ms. Wortman's presentation for cable television for public education. Mr. Engstrom stated that the Kansas Bar Association views similar videotape presentations at their meetings.

Ms. Wortman stated she was interested in 30-second advertisements for historic preservation as seen on Arkansas television stations. Mr. Snell mentioned that KTSB-TV in Topeka was enthusiastic about doing 30-second public service spots for the Historical Society.

Mr. Kiene stated numerous banks are interested in and responding to the financial needs of historic preservation. He proposed a customized version of the presentation for bankers. He made the point that bankers are directly involved in local construction and could be an asset in the development of historic preservation efforts.

Following this discussion the minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

Richard Pankratz then gave a report on National Register listings in Kansas. Since the last meeting eight properties had been added, making a Kansas total of 259. The new listings are Shedd and Marshall store, Whiting; Cartter Building, Cottonwood Falls; Big Hill Archeological District, Labette county; Mitchell County Courthouse, Beloit; George Washington Carver Homestead Site; Beeler vicinity; North Esplanade Historic District, Leavenworth; Pottorff Archeological Site, Healy vicinity; and Bear Creek Redoubt, Ashland vicinity.

Mr. Pankratz announced plans to hire two temporary summer employees to work on a civil engineering survey in cooperation with the Historic American Engineering Record. This will be the first such specialized survey in Kansas by the Historical Society. A temporary assistant to help Martin Stein in testing archeological sites will also be hired for the summer.



The status of National Register grants projects in progress, as reported on by Mr. Pankratz is as follows: the projects have been completed at the Fort Hays Guardhouse, Hays, and the Goodnow House, Manhattan. Work is underway at the Brown Grand Opera House, Concordia, and at the City Hall and Friends University, both in Wichita. Specifications for removing a non-original silo at the Pottawatomie Baptist Mission are being prepared, and the report on the architectural and archeological research performed at the site should soon be forwarded to Washington.

It was also announced that the Historical Society had changed the name of the Historic Sites Survey office to better reflect its functions and duties. The new title is HISTORIC PRESERVATION DEPARTMENT. The actual duties and operation of the department have not been altered.

Because of new requirements by the Department of the Interior the Kansas Legislature has authorized the Historic Preservation Department to hire an Historic Architect after July 1, 1978. The effort to fill that position has already begun.

The next item of business was the presentation of proposed National Register nominations by Julie Wortman and Martin Stein. It was planned that proposed nominations be considered as time allowed before the lunch break. The board would return to additional proposed nominations only after the other agenda items had been discussed. Time allowed only three proposed nominations to be discussed. Professor Sageaser was not present when the votes were taken.

Harper County Courthouse, Harper--motion to approve by Mr. Kiene, second by Mrs. Trauer, carried unanimously.

Penokee Stone Figure, Penokee vicinity--motion to approve by Mr. Smith, second by Mr. Engstrom, carried unanimously.

Ulrich House, Manhattan--motion to approve by Mrs. Trauer, second by Mr. Kiene, carried. Mr. Bibb voted no.

Discussion of the Ulrich House centered around the fact that it could be an endangered property in the near future. A Manhattan bank owns the property but a developer has an option to buy it. The developer had planned to demolish the house and construct housing for the elderly. Ms. Wortman mentioned that a proposed zoning variance for the block had been voted down by the city planning commission due to community opposition to the demolition of the house. She suggested approval of the nomination because of the comparative significance of the house in the town of Manhattan. It is one of the oldest houses in Manhattan, built in 1868, and relatively unique in style. The fact that it was built of brick also added to its uniqueness in the Manhattan area. Ms. Wortman also stated that the bank which owns the property is interested in selling it to a buyer who would be willing to redevelop the house. The bank had made no comment on the proposed nomination.

There was some discussion on the practicality of nominating an endangered property and the effect demolition of a National Register property would have on the credibility of the board's functions. It was argued by some that more nominations always generate interest in preservation and that National Register listing could make the developer reconsider any proposed destruction of a structure.

Ms. Wortman said she would be in contact with the Manhattan groups that nominated the Ulrich House to keep current on its status.

When the meeting resumed after lunch, Mr. Snell brought before the board the proposed moving of the James Woods Green statue from its location in front of Green Hall on the KU campus. Mr. Snell, acting as SHPO, had issued comments to the effect that moving the statue would damage the National Register property but that he would not oppose the move. The Attorney General's opinion on that letter of comment was requested by a legislator. The ruling was that since Snell had stated the move would damage the National Register property, it could not be moved unless the governor stated in writing there was no feasible alternative to moving it. The University of Kansas was dissatisfied with the end result of the decision and the ruling and asked Mr. Snell to reconsider his official comment on movement of the statue. Mr. Snell sought the counsel of the board in this matter.

The board discussed the matter at length and Mr. Kiene suggested the board issue an opinion supporting the decision of Mr. Snell concerning the James Woods Green statue. Prof. Sageser made a motion that the board go on record as having reached the conclusion that moving the statue would be an inappropriate act and would damage the integrity of the National Register property. Mr. Smith seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Bibb abstaining on the first vote. A second vote was taken with Mr. Bibb voting in favor of the motion so that the decision would be unanimous. The final resolution adopted by the board is as follows:

IT IS THE OPINION OF THE KANSAS HISTORIC SITES BOARD OF REVIEW THAT  
MOVING THE JAMES WOODS GREEN MEMORIAL STATUE WOULD DAMAGE THE NATIONAL  
REGISTER PROPERTY OF WHICH IT IS A PART.

The next item of business was Mr. Kiene's report as chairman of the sub-committee on project grant priorities. Mr. Kiene stated that he and Mrs. Trauer, as members of the committee, met with Mr. Snell and the Historic Preservation Department staff, in January, concerning the ranking of grant applications. A point system for ranking applications was drawn up and some general policy statements agreed upon.

1. Seed grants for a significant phase of a number of projects are generally preferable to one grant which totally funds a project.
2. Funding a Phase I project does not obligate the Board to continued funding.

3. Exterior preservation should generally have priority over interior work.
4. Stabilization work should have the highest priority.
5. Grants to private properties should not be ruled out.
6. A point value system should be developed for ranking project applications.

Mr. Kiene brought up the issue of the state passing on funds to private properties for restoration. He had consulted with the Governor on the issue and the Governor is still opposed to it.

The board discussed the point system for ranking grant applications and made some alterations to the draft proposed by the committee. Professor Sageser then made a motion that the report of the committee be accepted; Mr. Engstrom seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Pankratz led the discussion on the final allocation of federal FY78 funds. Mrs. Trauer made a motion to approve the final recommendations for funding; the motion was seconded by Mr. Kiene and carried. The projects and amounts approved are as follows: Kansas Survey and Planning--\$49,595; Ottawa Historic Survey--\$3,000; Wichita Metropolitan Area Archeological Survey--\$4,000; Brown Grand Opera House--\$70,000; Old Peoples National Bank--zero; Crawford Building--zero; Marshall County Courthouse--\$60,000; Spooner Hall--\$50,000; Mahaffie House--\$80,000; Smoky Valley Roller Mill--\$75,405.

Mr. Engstrom reported on the proposed Rules of Procedure for the Kansas Historic Sites Board of Review. After discussion, Mr. Kiene made a motion to approve them, which was seconded by Professor Sageser. The motion carried unanimously.

Because Mr. Snell had been acting as temporary chairman of the board meetings, it was necessary to elect a permanent chairman. Mr. Kiene nominated Mr. Engstrom; the nomination was seconded by Mr. Bibb. No other nominations were forthcoming and Mr. Engstrom was elected unanimously. Nominations were then taken for vice chairman. Professor Sageser nominated Mrs. Trauer; it was seconded by Mr. Engstrom. No other nominations were made and Mrs. Trauer was elected unanimously.

Mr. Pankratz stated that there was a problem with implementing the protective procedures of the state preservation law. He pointed out the need for changes to bring it into agreement with federal laws and regulations. The issue of whether Mr. Snell should make unilateral decisions on environmental impact statements was again discussed. A number of board members suggested that Mr. Snell should make the decisions and call on the board only if he feels he needs their support in a matter. It was the apparent consensus of the board that their support would be forthcoming.

Mr. Bibb moved that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kiene and the meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

KANSAS HISTORIC SITES BOARD OF REVIEW  
April 20, 1978

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. in the GAR Room of the Memorial Building by Joseph W. Snell. Other board members present were James W. Bibb, J. Eric Engstrom, Carlyle S. Smith, and Nancy Jo Trauer. Historical Society staff members present were Robert W. Richmond, Richard Pankratz, Martin Stein, Julie Wortman and Sandra Slider. Ralph E. Kiene, Jr., arrived at 10:30 a.m. and A. Bower Sageser at noon. Two visitors were present at the morning session, Edgar Boles and Dale Nimz from Lawrence.

Julie Wortman gave a presentation on historic preservation which had been prepared for delivery to legislators in February. She emphasized the value historic preservation has in meeting needs of communities and stressed the importance of community surveys and planning in historic preservation. Several groups in Kansas are contemplating surveys of their communities.

Mr. Bibb suggested videotaping Ms. Wortman's presentation for cable television for public education. Mr. Engstrom stated that the Kansas Bar Association views similar videotape presentations at their meetings.

Ms. Wortman stated she was interested in 30-second advertisements for historic preservation as seen on Arkansas television stations. Mr. Snell mentioned that KTSB-TV in Topeka was enthusiastic about doing 30-second public service spots for the Historical Society.

Mr. Kiene stated numerous banks are interested in and responding to the financial needs of historic preservation. He proposed a customized version of the presentation for bankers. He made the point that bankers are directly involved in local construction and could be an asset in the development of historic preservation efforts.

Following this discussion the minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

Richard Pankratz then gave a report on National Register listings in Kansas. Since the last meeting eight properties had been added, making a Kansas total of 259. The new listings are Shedd and Marshall store, Whiting; Cartter Building, Cottonwood Falls; Big Hill Archeological District, Labette county; Mitchell County Courthouse, Beloit; George Washington Carver Homestead Site; Beeler vicinity; North Esplanade Historic District, Leavenworth; Pottorff Archeological Site, Healy vicinity; and Bear Creek Redoubt, Ashland vicinity.

Mr. Pankratz announced plans to hire two temporary summer employees to work on a civil engineering survey in cooperation with the Historic American Engineering Record. This will be the first such specialized survey in Kansas by the Historical Society. A temporary assistant to help Martin Stein in testing archeological sites will also be hired for the summer.

The status of National Register grants projects in progress, as reported on by Mr. Pankratz is as follows: the projects have been completed at the Fort Hays Guardhouse, Hays, and the Goodnow House, Manhattan. Work is underway at the Brown Grand Opera House, Concordia, and at the City Hall and Friends University, both in Wichita. Specifications for removing a non-original silo at the Pottawatomie Baptist Mission are being prepared, and the report on the architectural and archeological research performed at the site should soon be forwarded to Washington.

It was also announced that the Historical Society had changed the name of the Historic Sites Survey office to better reflect its functions and duties. The new title is HISTORIC PRESERVATION DEPARTMENT. The actual duties and operation of the department have not been altered.

Because of new requirements by the Department of the Interior the Kansas Legislature has authorized the Historic Preservation Department to hire an Historic Architect after July 1, 1978. The effort to fill that position has already begun.

The next item of business was the presentation of proposed National Register nominations by Julie Wortman and Martin Stein. It was planned that proposed nominations be considered as time allowed before the lunch break. The board would return to additional proposed nominations only after the other agenda items had been discussed. Time allowed only three proposed nominations to be discussed. Professor Sageaser was not present when the votes were taken.

Harper County Courthouse, Harper--motion to approve by Mr. Kiene, second by Mrs. Trauer, carried unanimously.

Penokee Stone Figure, Penokee vicinity--motion to approve by Mr. Smith, second by Mr. Engstrom, carried unanimously.

Ulrich House, Manhattan--motion to approve by Mrs. Trauer, second by Mr. Kiene, carried. Mr. Bibb voted no.

Discussion of the Ulrich House centered around the fact that it could be an endangered property in the near future. A Manhattan bank owns the property but a developer has an option to buy it. The developer had planned to demolish the house and construct housing for the elderly. Ms. Wortman mentioned that a proposed zoning variance for the block had been voted down by the city planning commission due to community opposition to the demolition of the house. She suggested approval of the nomination because of the comparative significance of the house in the town of Manhattan. It is one of the oldest houses in Manhattan, built in 1868, and relatively unique in style. The fact that it was built of brick also added to its uniqueness in the Manhattan area. Ms. Wortman also stated that the bank which owns the property is interested in selling it to a buyer who would be willing to redevelop the house. The bank had made no comment on the proposed nomination.

There was some discussion on the practicality of nominating an endangered property and the effect demolition of a National Register property would have on the credibility of the board's functions. It was argued by some that more nominations always generate interest in preservation and that National Register listing could make the developer reconsider any proposed destruction of a structure.

Ms. Wortman said she would be in contact with the Manhattan groups that nominated the Ulrich House to keep current on its status.

When the meeting resumed after lunch, Mr. Snell brought before the board the proposed moving of the James Woods Green statue from its location in front of Green Hall on the KU campus. Mr. Snell, acting as SHPO, had issued comments to the effect that moving the statue would damage the National Register property but that he would not oppose the move. The Attorney General's opinion on that letter of comment was requested by a legislator. The ruling was that since Snell had stated the move would damage the National Register property, it could not be moved unless the governor stated in writing there was no feasible alternative to moving it. The University of Kansas was dissatisfied with the end result of the decision and the ruling and asked Mr. Snell to reconsider his official comment on movement of the statue. Mr. Snell sought the counsel of the board in this matter.

The board discussed the matter at length and Mr. Kiene suggested the board issue an opinion supporting the decision of Mr. Snell concerning the James Woods Green statue. Prof. Sageser made a motion that the board go on record as having reached the conclusion that moving the statue would be an inappropriate act and would damage the integrity of the National Register property. Mr. Smith seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Bibb abstaining on the first vote. A second vote was taken with Mr. Bibb voting in favor of the motion so that the decision would be unanimous. The final resolution adopted by the board is as follows:

IT IS THE OPINION OF THE KANSAS HISTORIC SITES BOARD OF REVIEW THAT  
MOVING THE JAMES WOODS GREEN MEMORIAL STATUE WOULD DAMAGE THE NATIONAL  
REGISTER PROPERTY OF WHICH IT IS A PART.

The next item of business was Mr. Kiene's report as chairman of the sub-committee on project grant priorities. Mr. Kiene stated that he and Mrs. Trauer, as members of the committee, met with Mr. Snell and the Historic Preservation Department staff, in January, concerning the ranking of grant applications. A point system for ranking applications was drawn up and some general policy statements agreed upon.

1. Seed grants for a significant phase of a number of projects are generally preferable to one grant which totally funds a project.
2. Funding a Phase I project does not obligate the Board to continued funding.

3. Exterior preservation should generally have priority over interior work.
4. Stabilization work should have the highest priority.
5. Grants to private properties should not be ruled out.
6. A point value system should be developed for ranking project applications.

Mr. Kiene brought up the issue of the state passing on funds to private properties for restoration. He had consulted with the Governor on the issue and the Governor is still opposed to it.

The board discussed the point system for ranking grant applications and made some alterations to the draft proposed by the committee. Professor Sageser then made a motion that the report of the committee be accepted; Mr. Engstrom seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Pankratz led the discussion on the final allocation of federal FY78 funds. Mrs. Trauer made a motion to approve the final recommendations for funding; the motion was seconded by Mr. Kiene and carried. The projects and amounts approved are as follows: Kansas Survey and Planning--\$49,595; Ottawa Historic Survey--\$3,000; Wichita Metropolitan Area Archeological Survey--\$4,000; Brown Grand Opera House--\$70,000; Old Peoples National Bank--zero; Crawford Building--zero; Marshall County Courthouse--\$60,000; Spooner Hall--\$50,000; Mahaffie House--\$80,000; Smoky Valley Roller Mill--\$75,405.

Mr. Engstrom reported on the proposed Rules of Procedure for the Kansas Historic Sites Board of Review. After discussion, Mr. Kiene made a motion to approve them, which was seconded by Professor Sageser. The motion carried unanimously.

Because Mr. Snell had been acting as temporary chairman of the board meetings, it was necessary to elect a permanent chairman. Mr. Kiene nominated Mr. Engstrom; the nomination was seconded by Mr. Bibb. No other nominations were forthcoming and Mr. Engstrom was elected unanimously. Nominations were then taken for vice chairman. Professor Sageser nominated Mrs. Trauer; it was seconded by Mr. Engstrom. No other nominations were made and Mrs. Trauer was elected unanimously.

Mr. Pankratz stated that there was a problem with implementing the protective procedures of the state preservation law. He pointed out the need for changes to bring it into agreement with federal laws and regulations. The issue of whether Mr. Snell should make unilateral decisions on environmental impact statements was again discussed. A number of board members suggested that Mr. Snell should make the decisions and call on the board only if he feels he needs their support in a matter. It was the apparent consensus of the board that their support would be forthcoming.

Mr. Bibb moved that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kiene and the meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

A G E N D A

Kansas Historic Sites Board of Review  
Memorial Building, Topeka  
June 13, 1978 10:00 a.m.

1. Approval of minutes of the previous meeting.
2. Evaluation and ranking of grant-in-aid applications for federal FY 1979.
3. Review of the state historic preservation plan.
4. Consideration of a state register of historic places.
5. Consideration of National Register nominations.
6. Other business.
7. Adjournment.



Project Applications Received for Federal FY 1979

Anderson County Courthouse, Garnett  
Anderson County Commission \$35,000

Replace wood window sash where needed with new wood. Use 5/8" insulating glass. Repair existing frames. Put wood storm windows on fixed sash windows. Paint exterior window trim. Refinish interior window frames and trim as needed. Insulate attic floor.

Brown Grand Opera House, Concordia  
Brown Grand Opera House, Inc. \$16,042

Balcony rails. Fire detection system for building and sprinklers for stage. Draperies for theater windows and boxes. Carpeting.

Columbian Building, Topeka  
Denis Kenney \$41,558

Handicapped access. Fire alarm system. Storm windows on parts of north, east and west sides. Guttering and downspouts. Air conditioning system.

Frankfort School, Frankfort  
USD 380 \$ 3,400

Remove existing sidewalks. Pour new concrete sidewalk.

Friends University, Wichita  
Friends University \$120,500

Repair or replace sheet metal gutters, downspouts, cornices, etc. on all but north wing. New slate roof on all but north wing.

Harvey House, Florence  
Florence Historical Society \$125

Repair porches. Fix outside doors. Close openings in foundation.

Lane University, Lecompton  
Lecompton Historical Society

\$29,985

Patch and repair plaster walls. Reconstruct missing walls. New concrete basement floor. Replace floor structure and subfloor on part of first floor. Put trusses under reconstructed balcony floor. Steps to balcony, balcony rail. Plumbing and electrical rough-in.

Old Arkansas City High School, Arkansas City  
Cowley County Community College

\$56,433

Tuckpointing. Chimney repair. Paint exterior wood and metal. Rebuild stone steps at entrances. Reconstruct missing tower. Repair exterior windows and replace as necessary. Repair/replace gutters and downspouts.

Old Logan County Courthouse, Russell Springs  
Butterfield Trail Association

\$ 4,985

Repair existing windows. Scrape, sand and paint exterior wood. Replace deteriorated wood. Remove old putty and reglaze. Replace broken glass. Caulk. Replace sash ropes.

Parsons Library, Parsons  
City of Parsons

\$50,000

Replace roof. Repair or replace doors and windows. Paint exterior wood. Tuckpointing. Rewire. Replace steps at entrances. Repair heating system. Interior wall and ceiling repair and paint.

St. John the Baptist Catholic Church, Beloit  
Parish Council

\$15,000

Repair pipe organ.

Spooner Hall, Lawrence  
University of Kansas

\$486,000

(Additional breakdown submitted indicating what they would do if awarded a grant in range of \$50,000 to \$100,000). Main gallery: remove 1950's ceiling, lights, and paneling. Replace with plaster ceiling, period lighting, and recondition the plaster walls. Remove vinyl floor tile and recondition original wood floor. Install doors meeting fire code. Paint.

Warkentin Homestead, Halstead  
Harley J. Stuckey

\$ 13,702

House--new roof, foundation repair, wallpaper, plumbing, heating,  
air conditioning, refinish floors, paint exterior trim.

Barn--new roof, paint; also roof and paint for other outbuildings.

Zimmerman House, Lawrence  
Michael H. Shaw

\$ 9,100

Repair to slate roof. Repair/rebuild windows. Rebuild porches,  
paint exterior.

Point System for Ranking Project Applications  
Draft Prepared by Historic Preservation Department Staff

SIGNIFICANCE.....Maximum 50 points \_\_\_\_

National Historic Landmark.....50  
National significance.....35  
State significance.....25  
Local significance.....10  
District member without special merit....0

INTEGRITY OF THE PROPERTY.....Maximum 20 points \_\_\_\_

(points to be assigned on the percentage of the  
property which is unaltered)

PRESERVATION URGENCY.....Maximum 40 points \_\_\_\_

Work immediately necessary for the continued  
existence of the property.....40

Work necessary to prevent further deteriora-  
tion only.....30

Protection through acquisition  
by public bodies.....30  
by non-profit bodies.....20  
by private firms and individuals.....10

EXPANSION OF GEOGRAPHIC REPRESENTATION.....Maximum 10 points \_\_\_\_

New county.....7  
New city or rural township....3

FIRST TIME ASSISTANCE.....Add 10 points \_\_\_\_

MATCHING CAPABILITY.....Maximum 15 points \_\_\_\_

100% of applicant's match available as cash in hand...15

50% of applicant's match available as cash in hand....10

25% of applicant's match available as cash in hand.....5

INDICATED ABILITY TO COMPLY WITH PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS...

Maximum 10 points \_\_\_\_

(Familiarity with historic preservation standards,  
employment of a qualified professional, proper  
accounting procedures, etc.)

RELATIONSHIP TO DEMONSTRATED COMMUNITY OR STATE NEEDS...

Maximum 20 points \_\_\_\_

Will help meet high priority need.....20

Will help meet medium priority need...12

Will help meet low priority need.....5

(Applicant must document from community master  
plans, state plans, development plans, etc.,  
how his project will meet a community need.)

ENCOURAGEMENT OF SELF-SUSTAINING PROJECTS.....Add

20 points \_\_\_\_

(Economically self-sustaining projects are those  
that will pay their own way without further  
state or federal grants)

RELATIONSHIP TO DEMONSTRATED SCIENTIFIC NEEDS.....Add  
(archeological sites)

20 points \_\_\_\_

DEMONSTRATED INEFFECTIVENESS.....Deduct

20 points \_\_\_\_

(Demonstrated inability of applicant to utilize  
grants in an effective manner or to execute  
projects in a satisfactory and professional  
manner.)

TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_

No. 3  
June 2, 1978  
Point System for Ranking Project Applications  
Draft Prepared by Historic Preservation Department Staff

SIGNIFICANCE.....Maximum                      20 points \_\_\_\_

National Historic Landmark.....20  
National Register Property.....10  
District member without special merit....0

PRESERVATION URGENCY.....Maximum                      60 points \_\_\_\_

Work immediately necessary for the continued  
existence of the property.....maximum 60

Work necessary to prevent further deteriora-  
tion.....maximum 45

Work necessary to make property functional..maximum 30

Protection through acquisition  
by public bodies.....30  
by non-profit bodies.....20  
by private firms and individuals...10

EXPANSION OF GEOGRAPHIC REPRESENTATION.....Maximum                      10 points \_\_\_\_

New county.....7  
New city or rural township.....3

FIRST TIME ASSISTANCE.....Add                      10 points \_\_\_\_

INDICATED ABILITY TO COMPLY WITH PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS  
Maximum                      20 points \_\_\_\_

(Familiarity with historic preservation  
standards, employment of a qualified  
professional, proper accounting pro-  
cedures, demonstrated inability of  
applicant to utilize grants in an  
effective manner or to perform pres-  
ervation work in a satisfactory and  
professional manner, etc.)

ACTIVE USE OF PROPERTY.....Maximum 20 points \_\_\_\_

(20 points for all uses except museums, churches,  
and other limited, specialized uses, which will  
receive 10 points.)

RELATIONSHIP TO DEMONSTRATED SCIENTIFIC NEEDS.....Add 20 points \_\_\_\_

(archeological sites)

TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_

\*\*\*\*\*

In the event that two or more projects receive the same point rating, these  
categories will be used to differentiate.

1. Relative integrity of the properties.
2. Relative matching capability of applicants.
3. Potential spin-off effects of projects.

## Background Information on the Grants-in-Aid Program

Early indications were that Kansas would be allocated \$403,000 for federal FY 1979, which begins October 1, 1978. It appears now that the national historic preservation program will be funded at a higher level than originally anticipated, and the Kansas apportionment will probably be increased. There is also the possibility that Congress or the Department of the Interior may change the priorities for funding projects or the types of projects that are eligible; however, nothing is known for certain at this time.

The federal share of the operating costs of the historic preservation department is presently estimated at \$70,000 for the following fiscal year and that funding will be taken off the top. The state survey and planning operation is not included in the project rankings. However, the final figure needed for funding that operation will probably change (up or down) and will affect the funding of one or two of the development projects.

Fourteen applications were received for preservation assistance, totaling \$871,831.

Each property for which assistance was requested was visited during April and May by Richard Pankratz and Julie Wortman. Notes were made, photographs were taken, and after each visit a work sheet was filled out. It was not until all properties had been visited that efforts were made on May 31 to assign point values to each application.

It soon became evident that problems existed in implementing the point system discussed at the board meeting on April 20, 1978. The weighting given to certain factors appeared to be faulty and the inclusion of some factors seemed questionable. Point values were figured for all projects, but it was apparent to the staff that all of the better projects were not rising to the top.

Problems were detected in several categories: significance, integrity of the property, preservation urgency, matching capability, community needs and self-sustaining. Temporarily setting aside the point system, the staff simply discussed the projects they had visited, which ones they regarded as good, and the factors that made them good projects. The elements that these projects had in common were (1) proposed work to make the building functional, (2) an active use after the project is completed, and (3) an applicant who inspired confidence in his ability to carry out the project. First time assistance was also considered to be a major factor in weighing projects.

On that basis, the staff on June 1, 1978, drew up a revised point system for ranking applications. A point by point discussion of the changes using the old system as a base will explain the staff rationale.



1. Significance: reducing the categories to three means 20 points for properties that are National Historic Landmarks, and 10 points for all properties listed on the National Register, regardless of level of significance. All properties that are listed on the National Register are worth preserving; further distinctions need not be made at this point.
2. Integrity: moved to the status of tie breaker. A property must have integrity to be listed on the National Register in the first place.
3. Urgency: as written, this category left no place for economic aspects, i.e., energy conservation, code compliance, or other necessary work items; consequently, a level was added for work necessary to make the property functional. Point totals were increased on the previous two categories to continue to reflect levels of urgency.
4. Geography: unchanged.
5. First time assistance: unchanged.
6. Match: all applicants certify when signing their applications that they will have a match available. Requiring cash in hand more than 15 months in advance of any possible assistance is not reasonable. Also, some applicants will get funds to match federal preservation grants from city governments through CDBG programs, and those funds are not available at the time of the application. Even though the cities had confirmed they would make the funds available, the applicants had to be penalized here. Moved to tie breaker status.
7. Professionalism: possible point total increased to 20; combined with the negative category of demonstrated ineffectiveness; admittedly this is a somewhat subjective category, but yet one we feel is necessary.
8. Community Needs: this category did not work out as originally intended. The one answer we generally received from city governments asked to comment on project applications dealt with "the need to preserve their past." The relevance of the project to other community needs was seldom if ever addressed. Substituted for this category is one of active use of the property in which 20 points would be given for all active full-time uses and 10 points for museums, churches, and other limited, specialized uses.
9. Self-sustaining: the category doesn't mean what it was originally intended to mean, and in effect it became unworkable. Anyone phasing or staging his applications, regardless of whether the project would later pay its own way, was denied points. Applicants who did not indicate staging would get points regardless of the potential for later fiscal problems. Changed to tie breaker status and altered to the potential for spin off results.
10. Archeological sites: unchanged.

From the staff's point of view the revised point ranking system yielded a more accurate representation of the relative merits of the 14 applications.

Something for the board to consider is setting an unofficial minimum amount for a historic preservation grant in aid to receive serious consideration. One request this year was for \$125.00. A grant that small is not feasible to fund because of the requirements placed on the applicant and the state in its implementation.

After visiting and evaluating all applications, the staff recommends three of the projects--Frankfort School, St. John the Baptist Catholic Church, and the Harvey House--not be considered for funding at this time, for reasons which will be discussed later. We recommend that the other projects be ranked and full funding approved where the applicant's work items meet preservation criteria, with the exception of the half million dollar request for Spooner Hall. All recommendations made shall be conditional on the availability of federal funds and are subject to amendment if federal funding levels are changed and if criteria for assisting projects are changed at the federal level.

All projects recommended for funding shall be included in the budget which the Kansas State Historical Society will begin preparing in July for the state's fiscal year beginning July 1, 1979. Inclusion in the agency's budget request is not a guarantee of funding.

## Exhibit II

## Ranking On Basis of Original Evaluation System

Point Total	Property	Request	Recommendation
129	Anderson County Courthouse, Garnett	35,000	
126	Old Logan County Courthouse, Russell Springs	4,985	
120	Parsons Library, Parsons	50,000	
108	Warkentin Homestead, Halstead	13,702	
95	Zimmerman House, Lawrence	9,100	
94	Columbian Building, Topeka	41,558	
89	Friends University, Wichita	120,500	
88	Old Arkansas City High School	56,433	
85	Lane University, Lecompton	19,986	
85	Harvey House, Florence	125	
79	St. John the Baptist Catholic Church, Beloit	15,000	
67	Brown Grand Opera House, Concordia	16,042	
66	Frankfort School, Frankfort	3,400	
59	Spooner Hall, Lawrence	486,000	

## Ranking On Basis of Revised Evaluation System

Point Total	Property	Request	Recommendation
105	Parsons Library, Parsons	50,000	
100	Old Arkansas City High School	56,433	
100	Old Logan County Courthouse, Russell Springs	4,985	
95	Zimmerman House, Lawrence	9,100	
90	Anderson County Courthouse, Garnett	35,000	
87	Columbian Building, Topeka	41,558	
87	Friends University, Wichita	120,500	
75	Spooner Hall, Lawrence	486,000	
73	Lane University, Leocompton	19,986	
63	Brown Grand Opera House, Concordia	16,042	
63	Warkentin Homestead, Halstead	13,702	
60	Frankfort School, Frankfort	3,400	
48	St. John the Baptist Catholic Church, Beloit	15,000	
40	Harvey House, Florence	125	

Project requests, including state survey and planning	\$941,831
Kansas proposed apportionment for Federal FY79	403,000
Less state survey and planning	70,000
Available for development projects	333,000

<u>Recommendations based on revised ranking system</u>			<u>Cumulative</u>	<u>Private Projects Deleted</u>
1. Fund projects 1 to 7 @ 100%	\$317,576		\$317,576	\$266,918
2. If funding available, project 8 (partial)	50,000		367,576	316,918
3. If funding available, project 9	19,986		387,562	336,904
4. If funding available, project 10 (partial)	5,000		392,562	341,904
5. If funding available, add to project 8 up to	50,000		442,562	391,904
6. If funding available, add to project 10 up to	11,042		453,604	402,946
7. If funding available, project 11	13,702		467,306	

# REVIEW BOARD TALLY SHEET

Property: Manhattan State Bank, Manhattan

Motion by Born Seger to APPROVE DISAPPROVE TABLE

Seconded by Kiene

Vote

Name	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Bibb			
Engstrom			
Kiene			
Sageser			
Smith			
Snell			
Trauer			

Disposition: APPROVED DISAPPROVED TABLED

If disapproved, reasons were: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

# REVIEW BOARD TALLY SHEET

Property: Union Pacific Depot, Manhattan  
*Kiene move table*

Motion by Kiene to - APPROVE DISAPPROVE TABLE

Seconded by B. G. G. Consensus — no vote taken

Vote

Name	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Bibb			
Engstrom			
Kiene			
Sageser			
Smith			
Snell			
Trauer			

Disposition: APPROVED DISAPPROVED TABLED

If disapproved, reasons were: \_\_\_\_\_

---



---



---

## KANSAS HISTORIC SITES BOARD OF REVIEW

June 13, 1978

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. in the GAR Room of the Memorial Building, Topeka, by Eric Engstrom. Other board members present were James W. Bibb, Carlyle S. Smith, A. Bower Sageser, Ralph E. Kiene, Jr., Nancy Jo Trauer and Joseph W. Snell. Historical Society staff members present were Robert W. Richmond, Richard Pankratz, Martin Stein, Julie Wortman and Sandra Slider.

A. Bower Sageser moved that the minutes of the previous meeting be approved. The motion carried.

Richard Pankratz reported that funds tentatively allocated to Kansas for historic preservation grants-in-aid for federal FY 1979 by the Department of the Interior total \$403,000. It was estimated that survey and planning in Kansas would require \$70,000 for federal FY 1979. Fourteen applications were received for assistance to historic properties. Richard Pankratz and Julie Wortman inspected all properties for which grant applications were received and evaluated each, using the point rating system approved at the last board meeting. However, that system proved defective in accurately rating the projects. The point totals of the projects with the most obvious merit did not reflect their worthiness; consequently, the staff prepared a revised system to submit to the board for approval. The staff presented a detailed comparison of the two ranking systems. The board then decided to first review the work program of each applicant before voting on a system.

The staff used slides to indicate the work for which each applicant was requesting assistance.


The board broke for lunch at 11:45 and resumed the meeting at 1:00 p.m., at which time the rankings of specific projects under both point systems were reviewed.

Prof. Sageser moved to adopt the revised ranking system for grant applications. The motion was seconded by Prof. Smith and carried unanimously. The adopted ranking system is as follows:



Priorities for funding grant applications for federal fiscal year  
1979 after setting aside \$70,000 for the state survey and planning

Recommendation 1: Full funding for projects 1 through 7

<u>Property</u>	<u>Recommended Funding</u>	<u>Cumulative</u>	<u>Cumulative-Private Projects Deleted</u>
1. Parsons Library, Parsons	\$ 50,000		\$ 50,000
2. Old Arkansas City High School	56,433		106,433
3. Old Logan County Courthouse, Russell Springs	4,985		111,418
4. Zimmerman House, Lawrence	9,100		
5. Anderson County Courthouse, Garnett	35,000		146,418
6. Columbian Building, Topeka	41,588		
7. Friends University, Wichita	<u>120,500</u> <u>317,576</u>	<u>317,576</u>	<u>266,918</u>

Recommendation 2: Partial funding for project no. 8 if the funds are available

8. Spooner Hall, Lawrence	40,000	357,576	306,918
---------------------------	--------	---------	---------

Recommendation 3: Full funding for project no. 9 if the funds are available

9. Lane University, Leocompton	19,986	377,562	326,904
--------------------------------	--------	---------	---------

Recommendation 4: Full funding for project no. 10 if the funds are available

10. Brown Grand Opera House, Concordia	16,042	393,604	342,946
---	--------	---------	---------

Recommendation 5: Additional partial funding for project no. 8 if the funds are available

11. Spooner Hall, Lawrence	50,000	443,604	392,946
----------------------------	--------	---------	---------

Recommendation 6: Full funding for project no. 11 if the funds are available

12. Warkentin Homestead, Halstead	13,702	457,306	392,946
-----------------------------------	--------	---------	---------

No funding was recommended for applications for Frankfort School, Frankfort;  
St. John the Baptist Catholic Church, Beloit; and the Harvey House, Florence

SIGNIFICANCE.....Maximum 20 points \_\_\_\_  
National Historic Landmark.....20  
National Register property.....10  
District member without special merit....0

PRESERVATION URGENCY.....Maximum 60 points \_\_\_\_  
Work immediately necessary for the  
continued existence of the property...Maximum 60  
  
Work necessary to prevent further  
deterioration.....Maximum 45  
  
Work necessary to make property  
functional.....Maximum 30  
  
Protection through acquisition  
by public bodies.....30  
by non-profit bodies.....20  
by private firms and individuals....10

EXPANSION OF GEOGRAPHIC REPRESENTATION.....Maximum 10 points \_\_\_\_  
New county.....7  
New city or rural township.....3

FIRST TIME ASSISTANCE.....Add 10 points \_\_\_\_

INDICATED ABILITY TO COMPLY WITH PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS....Maximum 20 points \_\_\_\_  
(Familiarity with historic preservation standards,  
employment of a qualified professional, proper  
accounting procedures, demonstrated inability of  
applicant to utilize grants in an effective manner  
or to perform preservation work in a satisfactory  
and professional manner, etc.)

ACTIVE USE OF PROPERTY.....Maximum 20 points \_\_\_\_  
(20 points for all uses except museums, churches,  
and other limited, specialized uses, which will  
receive 10 points)

RELATIONSHIP TO DEMONSTRATED SCIENTIFIC NEEDS.....Add 20 points \_\_\_\_  
(archeological sites)

TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_

In the event that two or more projects receive the same point rating, these categories will be used to differentiate.

1. Relative integrity of the properties
2. Relative matching capability of applicants
3. Potential spin-off effects of projects

The point totals assigned to each application on the basis of the approved point ranking system are given below with the amount of each applicant's request:

Point total	Property	Request
105	Parsons Library, Parsons	\$ 50,000
100	Old Arkansas City High School	56,433
100	Old Logan County Courthouse, Russell Springs	4,985
95	Zimmerman House, Lawrence	9,100
90	Anderson County Courthouse, Garnett	35,000
87	Columbian Building, Topeka	41,558
87	Friends University, Wichita	120,500
75	Spooner Hall, Lawrence	486,000
73	Lane University, Leocompton	19,986
63	Brown Grand Opera House, Concordia	16,042
63	Warkentin Homestead, Halstead	13,702
60	Frankfort School, Frankfort	3,400
48	St. John the Baptist Catholic Church, Beloit	15,000
40	Harvey House, Florence	125

The point totals assigned to each application on the basis of the approved point ranking system are given below with the amount of each applicant's request:

Point total	Property	Request
105	Parsons Library, Parsons	\$ 50,000
100	Old Arkansas City High School	56,433
100	Old Logan County Courthouse, Russell Springs	4,985
95	Zimmerman House, Lawrence	9,100
90	Anderson County Courthouse, Garnett	35,000
87	Columbian Building, Topeka	41,558
87	Friends University, Wichita	120,500
75	Spooner Hall, Lawrence	486,000
73	Lane University, Leocompton	19,986
63	Brown Grand Opera House, Concordia	16,042
63	Warkentin Homestead, Halstead	13,702
60	Frankfort School, Frankfort	3,400
48	St. John the Baptist Catholic Church, Beloit	15,000
40	Harvey House, Florence	125

Mr. Engstrom questioned Julie Wortman on the status of the Ulrich house in Manhattan, which was approved for nomination to the National Register by the board at the last meeting. She reported that efforts were still underway in the community to determine a feasible reuse.

Mr. Pankratz was asked for his recommendations of projects for funding and distributed a sheet on which staff recommendations were presented. Using the accepted order of ranking as a basis for discussion, the board considered a number of possibilities for change. Prof. Sageser moved that the order of priority of Lane University and Spooner Hall be interchanged. Mr. Engstrom seconded the motion. Mr. Bibb called for discussion and following discussion Prof. Sageser withdrew his motion. Mr. Kiene then moved that proposed funding to Spooner Hall be reduced from \$50,000 to \$40,000 with the stipulation that the funds be used first to restore the main gallery. Mr. Sageser seconded the motion; Prof. Smith and Mr. Bibb passed; the other members voted in favor.


Mr. Bibb suggested stipulating that part of the grant funds to Lane University be used to formulate a master plan and set priorities on specific restoration work, since it appeared to the board that the project lacked direction. The master plan would be subject to the approval of the State Historic Preservation Officer. Mr. Kiene so moved and Mr. Engstrom seconded the motion. Some discussion followed about the correct term for the plan and how it would fit into Department of the Interior guidelines. Mr. Pankratz stated that the Department of the Interior would call such a document a "Historic Structure Report." It was the consensus of the board that this report would be necessary to implement the present project as well as to outline future needs at the project. The maximum amount of federal matching funds to be used for such a report would be \$1000. The motion to require the report carried unanimously.

Mr. Pankratz reviewed the totals for funding grant applications approved by the board. The figures took into consideration the distinct possibility of additional funding and the possibility that the governor would again delete all private projects.

Prof. Sageser moved that the figures presented be approved. Mrs. Trauer seconded the motion; Mr. Bibb passed; the rest voted in favor. The approved recommendations and figures are as follows:

Priorities for funding grant applications for federal fiscal year  
1979 after setting aside \$70,000 for the state survey and planning

Recommendation 1: Full funding for projects 1 through 7

<u>Property</u>	<u>Recommended Funding</u>	<u>Cumulative</u>	<u>Cumulative-Private Projects Deleted</u>
1. Parsons Library, Parsons	\$ 50,000		\$ 50,000
2. Old Arkansas City High School	56,433		106,433
3. Old Logan County Courthouse, Russell Springs	4,985		111,418
4. Zimmerman House, Lawrence	9,100		
5. Anderson County Courthouse, Garnett	35,000		146,418
6. Columbian Building, Topeka	41,588		
7. Friends University, Wichita	<u>120,500</u> <u>317,576</u>	<u>317,576</u>	<u>266,918</u>

Recommendation 2: Partial funding for project no. 8 if the funds are available

8. Spooner Hall, Lawrence	40,000	357,576	306,918
---------------------------	--------	---------	---------

Recommendation 3: Full funding for project no. 9 if the funds are available

9. Lane University, Lecompton	19,986	377,562	326,904
-------------------------------	--------	---------	---------

Recommendation 4: Full funding for project no. 10 if the funds are available

10. Brown Grand Opera House, Concordia	16,042	393,604	342,946
---	--------	---------	---------

Recommendation 5: Additional partial funding for project no. 8 if the funds are available

11. Spooner Hall, Lawrence	50,000	443,604	392,946
----------------------------	--------	---------	---------

Recommendation 6: Full funding for project no. 11 if the funds are available

12. Warkentin Homestead, Halstead	13,702	457,306	392,946
-----------------------------------	--------	---------	---------

No funding was recommended for applications for Frankfort School, Frankfort;  
St. John the Baptist Catholic Church, Beloit; and the Harvey House, Florence

The State Historic Preservation Plan, which had been prepared by the Historic Preservation Department to meet requirements of the 1977 state historic preservation act, was the next item of business. After a few general observations, it was agreed the minutes should reflect that the board had reviewed the plan as prescribed by the law. Any member having additional comments could bring them up at the next meeting or forward them to the staff.

Mrs. Trauer suggested that a program on historic preservation be presented by the Historic Preservation Department to the League of Kansas Municipalities convention to educate cities on eligible grant projects. She stated she would attempt to make arrangements with the League.

The proposed Register of Historic Kansas Places as formulated by the Historic Preservation Department staff was reviewed by the board. Mrs. Trauer moved that the board adopt it; Prof. Smith seconded the motion; it carried unanimously.

Proposed National Register nominations were considered by the board. There was some discussion about insuring that owners of properties proposed for National Register nomination receive notification of the proposed nomination. It was agreed that under certain conditions notifications should be sent by registered letter with a return receipt.

The two properties presented for nomination were the Manhattan State Bank and the Union Pacific Depot, both in Manhattan. The Manhattan State Bank was approved unanimously for nomination, but the consensus of the board regarding the depot was that it should be tabled until the next meeting because no comments had been received from the owner on the proposed nomination.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

## Register of Historic Kansas Places

The Kansas State Historic Preservation Officer supervises the staff of the Historic Sites Survey Office in conducting a statewide survey of historic resources that address every aspect of Kansas history. This continuing inventory of historic resources is an integral part of the State Preservation Plan for it identifies properties that may be worthy of preservation.

Under provisions established by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, (80 Stat. 915, U.S.C. 470) the State Historic Preservation Officer, with the approval of the Kansas Historic Sites Board of Review, may nominate properties contained within the state inventory for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. A property listed in the National Register has met certain criteria of significance and is therefore deemed worthy of preservation. Once listed, the property is afforded a degree of protection from the adverse effects of federally funded or licensed undertakings. It also qualifies for the National Park Service's matching grants-in-aid program, for certain other federal programs, and for certain tax benefits under the Tax Reform Act of 1976.

There are many Kansas properties, however, which may not meet National Register criteria, especially because of diminished integrity, but which still have some degree of importance to the heritage of Kansas and its local communities. In addition, to facilitate historic preservation planning within Kansas, it is desirable to assemble all properties significant to Kansas history on a single register of historic places. Therefore, under authority of the Kansas State Historic Preservation Act of 1977, there has been established a Register of Historic Kansas Places. The state register includes all properties listed in or approved for the National Register of Historic Places as well as those which the review board determines to meet the following criteria:

The quality of significance in Kansas history, architecture, archeology, and culture is present in buildings, structures, sites, districts and objects (including churches and cemeteries) that possess sufficient integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling or association to constitute a valuable contribution to the historical and cultural legacy of the state or locale and that:

1. are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to Kansas history, or
2. are associated with the lives of persons significant in Kansas' past, or
3. demonstrate 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 an important and distinguishable entity even though its components may lack individual distinction, or
4. have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in pre-history.



Generally properties which have achieved significance within the past 50 years will not be considered to qualify for the Register of Historic Kansas Places.

Properties listed in the Register of Historic Kansas Places are afforded a degree of protection from the adverse effect of actions funded by any state agency or by any State or local political subdivision. Those properties contained within the Register of Historic Kansas Places that are also listed on the National Register of Historic Places are also afforded a degree of protection from the adverse effects of federal or federally funded, licensed, or approved undertakings; and can qualify for the National Park Service's grants-in-aid program, for certain other federal programs, and for certain tax benefits.

Nominations to the Register of Historic Kansas Places will be evaluated by the Kansas Historic Sites Board of Review during its scheduled meetings. Nominations may be submitted by the Historic Sites Survey staff, any organization, any individual, or by Review Board recommendation. A correctly completed nomination form, which requires historic, architectural, or archeological documentation, photographs and maps must be provided by those seeking the nomination. Nomination forms are available from the Historic Sites Survey Office of the Kansas State Historical Society.

A certificate stating that a property has been entered in the Register of Historic Kansas Places will be presented to the owner of the property. Periodically, lists of properties included in the Register of Historic Kansas Places will be published in the Kansas State Historical Society's newsletter, The Mirror.

## A G E N D A

Kansas Historic Sites Board of Review  
Memorial Building, Topeka  
October 3, 1978 10:30 a.m.

1. Approval of minutes of the previous meeting.
2. Election of officers.
3. Update on program activities.
4. Report on changes in grant-in-aid program at federal level.
5. Consideration of National Register nominations.
6. Other business.
7. Adjournment.

## KANSAS HISTORIC SITES BOARD OF REVIEW

October 3, 1978

The October 3, 1978, meeting of the Kansas Historic Sites Board of Review was called to order by J. Eric Engstrom at 10:30 a.m. in the GAR Room of the Memorial Building. Other board members present were Nancy Trauer, A. Bower Sageser, Carlyle S. Smith, and Joseph W. Snell. (James W. Bibb arrived following the vote on election of officers.) Staff members present were Richard D. Pankratz, C. Martin Stein, Julie A. Wortman, and Sandra S. Slider.

The motion to approve the minutes of the previous meeting was made by Mrs. Trauer, seconded by Professor Sageser, and approved by the board.

The next item of business was the election of officers. Joseph Snell nominated Mr. Engstrom for chairman; Professor Sageser seconded the motion. Mr. Snell then amended his motion to include reelection of the same slate of officers for the upcoming year; Professor Sageser seconded the amended motion and it was approved by the board. Mrs. Trauer is vice chairman of the board.

Richard Pankratz identified the latest national register listings. He stated the backlog of nominations in Washington, D.C. from Kansas was decreasing.

Martin Stein reported on his summer archeological field season. Harold Beal, a student from Kansas State University, had assisted him in survey and excavation at various locations in the state. Among the sites tested was one in Labette county that contained a burial.

Mr. Pankratz reported on other summer survey work including a cooperative project with the Historic American Engineering Record, an office of the Department of the Interior. Two people inventoried 210 industrial and civil engineering structures in six northeast Kansas counties. The Historic Preservation Department plans to continue the HAER inventory next summer and will try to increase the survey personnel to five.

Julie Wortman reported on her work with local volunteer surveys in various communities. The Manhattan survey has had the most progress and a survey in Abilene is scheduled to begin shortly. There is also some interest in planning local surveys in Independence and Junction City. When asked who coordinates the local surveys, Ms. Wortman replied the Manhattan survey was organized by the Older Manhattan Neighborhoods Association and the Riley County Historical Society and was later assisted by the city. The proposed survey in Abilene is being organized by the Dickinson County Historical Society. In Independence, the local arts council is promoting a survey.

Mr. Engstrom asked if there was some way the board could assist local survey groups. Ms. Wortman replied that it was not practical to plan the surveys from the Historic Preservation Department because local interest and motivation is needed for the surveys to succeed; assistance is given by the department through local groups.

Mr. Pankratz reported that the Historic Preservation Department is still seeking a Historic Architect. Such a person was to have been hired prior to October 1 according to federal regulations. No applications from qualified individuals have been received. The assumption is that the salary being offered is not competitive with other states. The agency had requested help from the Department of the Interior either in finding qualified applicants, or in receiving a waiver on some of the qualifications required. No response has been received from the Department of the Interior regarding these requests.

The budget request for the Historic Preservation Department was submitted last week. New positions requested for the office are listed in order of priority:

1. Grants Officer--to handle all grants.
2. Historian--to research and process national register nominations and assist with local volunteer surveys.
3. Lab Technician (half-time)--to assist Martin Stein in processing artifacts found on archeological sites.
4. Archeologist I (a six month position)--to inventory petroglyph sites in the state.
5. Three additional summer surveyors to continue the HAER inventory.

A request was also submitted for four thousand dollars to assist local volunteer survey groups with their heaviest expenses: photography and publication of results.

A report was given by Mr. Pankratz on current preservation projects. Phase I is completed and Phase II is underway at Friends University in Wichita. The Brown Grand Opera House Phase I project has been delayed by federal processing of the request for funds. Wichita City Hall's Phase I and II projects are completed. At the Pottawatomie Baptist Mission the nonoriginal silo has been demolished and the contract signed for preparation of plans and specifications. Applications will need to be submitted and processed by December 29, 1978, to retain funds approved for the following projects: the Mahaffie House, Olathe; Smoky Valley Roller Mill, Lindsborg; Spooner Hall, KU campus, Lawrence; Marshall County Courthouse, Marysville; and the Pottawatomie Baptist Mission, Topeka.

The Historic Preservation Department recently cooperated with the Victorian Society, the Historic Wichita Board, and the Landmarks Commission of Wichita to

organize a Historic Preservation Conference in Wichita. The conference was held September 22 and 23 at the Scottish Rite Temple. The program for the conference was provided by the Historic Preservation Department. While attendance was not so large as hoped for, Ms. Wortman stated that the quality of the sessions was high. They were geared to home owners and owners of commercial properties, specifically on the proper method of improving old structures.

The Historic Preservation Department hopes to sponsor a conference for planning and government officials next fall. November 3 and 4 are the dates for a preservation conference at Kansas State University for laymen and professionals in the field of historic preservation.

The first newsletter issued by the Historic Preservation Department will appear sometime in October. Also, two articles a month will be released to almost 300 newspapers in the state, to be used at their discretion. A good response is expected from small-town newspapers in particular.

A Grants Workshop for national register property owners has been scheduled by the department for November 18. Julie Wortman will speak at a state P.R.I.D.E. workshop in Hutchinson October 14. The Historic Preservation Department is involved with a number of other organizations in the State Ad Hoc Coordinating Committee on Historic Preservation. The possibility is being explored of coordinating these organizations' activities in specific target communities.

A report on the grant-in-aid program in Kansas was given by Mr. Pankratz. There have been various policy changes at the federal level. Congress has determined that no federal preservation funds can go to public buildings (a term not yet defined but probably meaning buildings still used for administrative purposes.) The current 50-50 matching ratio for grants will likely be changed to 70 federal and 30 state for survey and planning projects, but will remain 50-50 for development projects. The Department of the Interior has been exerting pressure on states to expend funds within the federal fiscal year they are awarded. (There is a risk of losing federal funds to the next year's apportionment.)

Mr. Pankratz discussed an outline which identified the problems in the grants program in Kansas and offered possible solutions. He suggested the board might require future grant applicants or their architects to attend a workshop on grants before their applications will be considered. (This could eliminate many of the problems encountered with applications and finished work.)

Mr. Bibb moved that attendance at a grants workshop be a factor in consideration of allocation of grant funds. The motion was seconded both by Mr. Engstrom and Professor Sageser and was approved by the board.

The meeting was interrupted from 11:45 a.m. until 1:30 p.m. for lunch break.

Upon reconvening, Mr. Pankratz told the board that removal of ineligible applications from the list of approved projects would be necessary in some cases, in order to reallocate funds to other projects. An example before the board is

the Anderson County Courthouse. Mr. Pankratz received a call from the architect of the project informing him the county did not have the funds to match the federal grants. He suggested the board revoke the grant to the Anderson County Courthouse. Mr. Engstrom so moved; Professor Sageser seconded the motion, which was approved.

The next item of business was the proposed national register nominations. Martin Stein presented a Clark County archeological site, 14CK306, suggesting it be considered for the state register only, until it could be determined worthy of national register listing. Information that could be derived from the site would be limited and the site therefore might not merit national register listing. Another reason for wanting it listed on the state register was the fact that the site is under the jurisdiction of the Forestry, Fish and Game Commission. Mr. Stein noted that state listing could make the commission more aware of its responsibility to protect it. Professor Smith expressed his opinion that the site should be on the state register and that national register consideration should be tabled until more information is obtained about the general region, in which case an archeological district might be appropriate. Professor Sageser so moved; Mr. Engstrom seconded the nomination, which was approved by the board. This action constituted the first listing of a property on the state register that was not already listed on the National Register.

A property tabled at the last board meeting pending a response from the owner confirming notification of the proposed nomination was the Union Pacific Depot in Manhattan. Ms. Wortman commented she was concerned about the integrity of the building. Mr. Bibb suggested that it would be a good candidate for the state register instead. Professor Sageser moved that the depot be nominated to both the state and national registers. Mr. Engstrom seconded the motion, which carried.

Following a later discussion on the degree or lack of integrity of some buildings nominated and the difficulty that could impose in a court suit, Professor Sageser offered to withdraw his motion nominating the Manhattan depot to the National Register, suggesting it be nominated only to the state register. Professor Smith stated he had had second thoughts on the nomination of the depot and moved that the nomination to the National Register be rescinded. Professor Sageser provided a second and the motion carried. Professor Sageser then moved it be nominated to the state register only. The motion was seconded by Mr. Engstrom and carried.

Mr. Pankratz asked the board if it would be their policy in the future to put on the state register any National Register nomination submitted to Washington and not approved. Mr. Bibb so moved. Mr. Engstrom seconded the motion, which was approved by the board.

Julie Wortman presented the Bethel A.M.E. Church of Leavenworth to the board. She stated it had been greatly altered and therefore lacked architectural integrity. No unusual historical significance had been documented for the building, although some had been claimed. Mr. Bibb moved that it be nominated to the National Register. The motion died for lack of a second. Mr. Engstrom suggested the board ask those who submitted the nomination to provide documentation of historical significance, at which time the board could reconsider the

church for National Register nomination. Ms. Wortman suggested that the building might be an appropriate state register listing. Mr. Engstrom stated his opinion that the building lacked sufficient integrity to warrant state register status. It was the consensus of the board that with documentation of historical significance, such as it was the first A.M.E. church in Kansas, it might merit National Register or state register listing. Mr. Engstrom moved that the National Register nomination of the building be tabled and the church informed that with additional documentation of its historical significance it would be reconsidered. Mrs. Trauer seconded the motion, which carried.

The Tipton House in Garnett was next presented. Mr. Engstrom moved that it be nominated to the National Register; the motion was seconded by Mr. Snell and carried.

Leavenworth Landing in Leavenworth was approved for National Register nomination. The motion for approval was made by Professor Smith and seconded by Mr. Bibb. The Union Depot in Leavenworth was also approved for National Register nomination. The motion was made by Mrs. Trauer and seconded by Mr. Snell.

Mr. Engstrom read to the board a statement from the new grants manual regarding board members voting on properties in which they have a personal or financial interest. Mr. Engstrom suggested circulating the material before the next meeting and perhaps adopting it as a rule of procedure by the board.

Before adjourning at 3:45 p.m., the board decided to meet again on Friday, November 17, 1978, at 10:30 a.m., principally to consider National Register nominations.



# United States Department of the Interior

HERITAGE CONSERVATION AND RECREATION SERVICE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20240

IN REPLY REFER TO:  
H36-GAD

AUG 23 1978

Dear State Historic Preservation Officer:

This letter is to inform you of a proposed change in Historic Preservation Fund policy intended to encourage prompt commitment of limited grant-in-aid resources for authorized program purposes. Expenditure rates by States have not increased significantly since fiscal year 1976, despite increases in appropriations, addition of an expenditure factor to the apportionment formula and widespread recognition of the need to commit funds promptly. It has become necessary to link apportionments to individual State performance levels.

I am recommending to the Secretary that two apportionments be made in fiscal year 1979. The first apportionment of \$45 million would utilize the formula worked out with the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers for fiscal year 1978 to derive each State's proposed apportionment. Previously awarded funds would not be affected, but the new monies proposed for apportionment to a State would then be adjusted by subtracting the amount of previous years' apportionments not expended or irrevocably committed in fiscal year 1978 and the first quarter of fiscal year 1979. Grant funds carried over from previous years would become part of a State's obligational authority for fiscal year 1979. For example, if the apportionment formula indicates that a State should receive \$1 million in fiscal year 1979, but had a carryover of \$300,000, the State would reprogram the \$300,000 forward into the fiscal year 1979 accounting cycle and would receive \$700,000 in new money. Thus, the State's obligational authority for fiscal year 1979 would total \$1 million.

The second apportionment would be directed to States capable of making the most immediate productive use of available money. I am recommending to the Secretary that the resulting offset plus additional funds appropriated by Congress be awarded for purposes described in State work programs; competitively allocated for priority preservation purposes described in State work programs, or competitively allocated through the Secretary's Discretionary Fund.

Funds apportioned to States prior to fiscal year 1979 will be defined as expended or irrevocably committed by the following methods:

1. Complete, valid, and accurate reimbursement requests (Request for Advance or Reimbursement, OMB Form No. 80-R0183) and reports of liquidations of advance (Federal Cash Transaction Report, OMB Form No. 80-1082) received by the Grants Administration Division not later than Friday,



December 29, 1978. Forms which are not acceptable in the judgment of the Grants Administration Division will be returned to the State without action and the amounts requested or reported will not be considered as expended.

2. Unpaid survey and planning program costs in support of the submitted work program incurred through formally executed written contracts or unpaid orders. A letter listing unpaid contractual liabilities by name of contractor, total Federal share amount, Federal share unpaid, beginning date, end date, and short statement of contract objectives may be submitted to serve as the State's documentation of these costs. Other accrued expenses may be listed by description and Federal share amount unpaid. The letters must be received by the Grants Administration Division by Friday, December 29, 1978. Letters not accepted will be returned without action.

3. Acceptable project applications received by the Grants Administration Division not later than December 29, 1978. States are expected to submit project applications well in advance of this deadline, but if an acceptable application received Friday, December 29 is subsequently approved, the Federal share applied will be considered committed. States will be notified by letter of project applications which are not accepted. These applications will be charged to the State's fiscal year 1979 apportionment.

This proposed change was developed in consultation with the Grants Management Committee of the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers and was endorsed by the Board of Directors of the National Conference at their May meeting in Chicago. Funds reserved by this action will be returned to States through a supplemental apportionment for purposes requested and described in measurable terms in fiscal year 1979 work programs. A small amount would be competitively awarded for priority preservation objectives through the Secretary's Discretionary Fund. The States most able to initiate and complete acquisition and development projects and survey and planning activities will be the principal beneficiaries.

This recommendation will not become official policy unless and until it is incorporated in the Secretary's apportionment of funds, after the fiscal year 1979 appropriations bill has become law. Although most of you have long known of my desire to tie apportionments more closely to performance, the purpose of this letter is to give you the maximum possible opportunity to complete action on pending obligations. Questions should be addressed to the Grants Administration Division.

Sincerely,



Chris Therral Delaporte  
Director

## Historic Preservation Grants-in-Aid Program

### Problems:

1. Slow implementation of projects.
2. Extremely slow expenditure of federal funds.
3. Lack of monitoring capability of existing staff.
4. Loss of federal preservation funds.
5. Change in types of projects eligible for assistance.

### Possibilities:

1. Seek to have funds for contracting for plans and specifications added to the state survey and planning program as a supplemental appropriation to the current fiscal year--we would then have authority in April or May to begin preparation of plans and specifications for projects and they would hopefully be ready to go by July 1.
2. Could seek Finance Council authority in October for any projects of an emergency nature.
3. Could seek supplemental authority for the current fiscal year for all grant-in-aid projects. Work, including plans and specifications, could then begin in April or May.
4. Must begin putting rigid time limits on applicants; allow only a few months to get plans and specifications together and only a specific time from approval of plans to letting of contract; allow a certain time to complete the work or revoke the grant. Cannot allow the three-year time span we have in the past.
5. Must push for a full-time grants officer.
6. Will ask the Governor to review his position on the types of projects he will permit us to assist in the light of the federal prohibition on aid to public buildings.
7. Could seek a no-limit authorization confined to types of projects the State declares we can assist.

Properties to be Considered for National Register Nomination

Listed in order of consideration:

	APPROVED	DISAPPROVED	TABLED
Archeological Site 14CK306 Clark County			
Union Pacific Depot, Manhattan Riley County			
Bethel A.M.E. Church, Leavenworth Leavenworth County			
Tipton House, Garnett Anderson County			
"Leavenworth Landing," Leavenworth Leavenworth County			
Union Depot, Leavenworth Leavenworth County			
Koester Block, Marysville Marshall County			
Belle Springs Creamery, Abilene Dickinson County			
Prospect Park Farm, Chapman vicinity Dickinson County			
Topeka State Hospital Administration Building, Topeka, Shawnee County			
St. Mary's Catholic Church, St. Benedict Nemaha County			

# REVIEW BOARD TALLY SHEET

Property: Archaeological Site 14CK306 Clark County

Motion by Smith to APPROVE DISAPPROVE TABLE

Seconded by Engstrom

Vote

Name	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Bibb			
Engstrom			
Kiene			
Sageser			
Smith			
Snell			
Trauer			

Disposition: APPROVED DISAPPROVED TABLED

If disapproved, reasons were: TO STATE

REGISTER - not a NR nomination

# REVIEW BOARD TALLY SHEET

Property: Union Pacific Depot, Manhattan

Motion by Sageser to APPROVE DISAPPROVE TABLE

Seconded by Engstrom

Motion to rescind by <sup>Vote</sup> Smith  
Sageser 2nded - carried

Name	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Bibb			
Engstrom			
Kiene <u>absent</u>	X		
Sageser			
Smith			
Snell			
Trauer			

Disposition: APPROVED DISAPPROVED TABLED

If disapproved, reasons were: National AND STATE

Register nomination  
VOTE LATER RESCINDED from NR nom  
and put on state register only

# REVIEW BOARD TALLY SHEET

Property: Bethel A.M.E. Church, heavenworth

Motion by Engstrom to APPROVE DISAPPROVE TABLE

Seconded by Trauer

Vote

Name	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Bibb			
Engstrom			
Kiene			
Sageser			
Smith			
Snell			
Trauer			

Disposition: APPROVED DISAPPROVED

TABLED

because of lack  
of integrity  
(architectural)

If disapproved, reasons were: church be informed that  
if provide documentation that it was first  
AME Church in Kansas, it will be reconsidered  
for state or national register nomination

# REVIEW BOARD TALLY SHEET

Property: Lipton House, Garnett

Motion by Engstrom to APPROVE DISAPPROVE TABLE

Seconded by Snell

Vote

Name	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Bibb			
Engstrom			
Kiene			
Sageser			
Smith			
Snell			
Trauer			

Disposition: APPROVED DISAPPROVED TABLED

If disapproved, reasons were: for NR nomination

---



---



---

# REVIEW BOARD TALLY SHEET

Property: Leavenworth Landing, Leav.

Motion by Smith to APPROVE DISAPPROVE TABLE

Seconded by Bibb

Vote

Name	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Bibb			
Engstrom			
Kiene			
Sageser			
Smith			
Snell			
Trauer			

Disposition: APPROVED DISAPPROVED TABLED

If disapproved, reasons were: NR

---



---



---



# REVIEW BOARD TALLY SHEET

Property: Union Depot, Leavenworth

Motion by Tramer to APPROVE DISAPPROVE TABLE

Seconded by Snell

Vote

Name	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Bibb <i>passed</i>			
Engstrom <i>passed</i>			
Kiene			
Sageser			
Smith			
Snell			
Trauer			

Disposition: APPROVED DISAPPROVED TABLED

If disapproved, reasons were: NR nom

---



---



---

## A G E N D A

Kansas Historic Sites Board of Review  
Memorial Building, Topeka  
November 17, 1978 10:00 a.m.

1. Approval of minutes of previous meeting.
2. Consideration of proposed amendment to the rules of procedure.
3. Update on program activities.
4. Discussion of Lane University project.
5. Consideration of National Register nominations.
6. Selection of time of next meeting.
7. Other business.
8. Adjournment.

### Proposed Amendment to Rules of Procedure

A review board member shall absent himself/herself from the meeting during the discussion and review of any application/National Register nomination with respect to which he/she has a personal or financial interest. The application/National Register nomination and any information pertinent to the review of the application/National Register nomination shall not be made available to the member. An adequate record shall be maintained in the board's minutes to demonstrate that the procedures prescribed above were followed.

## KANSAS STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY

### HISTORIC PRESERVATION DEPARTMENT

#### An Analysis of Changes to be made and additional changes needed in the Historic Preservation Grants-in-Aid Program

Because of recent Department of Interior rulings, it has become a matter of great urgency that the Historic Preservation Department of the Kansas State Historical Society improve the rate at which the historic preservation grants-in-aid funds it administers are expended. For the first time in the history of the program, inability to completely expend funds within the authorized expenditure period will result in loss of the federal funds altogether.

The methods for improving the rate of expenditure can be classified according to the causes of expenditure delay. First, delays are caused by slow project implementation. Improving the speed of implementation can be solved by administrative means. Second, the expenditure of funds is delayed by the rate at which the federal funds are presently filtered through the state budgetary process. Improving the rate at which the federal money moves through the state budgetary process can be accomplished by gubernatorial and legislative actions.

The administrative remedies offered here can and will be implemented immediately:

1. A series of deadlines will be established that all grant recipients will be required to follow unless prior approval for waivers has been given by the agency. First, successful applicants will be required to provide complete plans and specifications to the Historic Preservation Department by July 1. If the required materials are not properly prepared and submitted, the grant award will be withdrawn and assigned to the next eligible applicant. This deadline will require applicants to begin preparing plans and specifications as soon as they learn that their projects are included in the authorizing legislation. Second, grants recipients will be required to begin work within 60 days after signing a project agreement with the State Historic Preservation Officer. If the work does not begin and there are no approved waivers for extenuating circumstances, the project will be cancelled and the funds assigned to the next eligible project. This deadline will require the grant recipients to be prompt in their advertising for bids and will compel them in turn to put time constraints on the contractors. Third, grantees will be permitted a maximum time of 18 months from the date when the project agreement was signed to complete the project work and request reimbursement or expend all payments obtained by letter of credit. Failure to complete the work in the stated time without prior written approval of the State Historic Preservation Officer will result in the project being terminated at that point and the federal funds reassigned. This time period (which may have to be further reduced) provides an adequate period for completing the project and also provides a deadline against which all grant recipients must work.

Evaluation: Previously there were no deadlines for successful project applicants except the three year constraint imposed by the Department of the Interior. The establishment of this series of deadlines will lead to a more rapid implementation and completion of assisted projects.

2. All grant recipients will be required to file monthly progress reports with the Historic Preservation Department. The reports will include a statement of work completed during the report period, fiscal information, and photographs. Previously, there was no regular reporting procedure.

Evaluation: These reports will enable the Historic Preservation Department to monitor more effectively the grantees' progress and to identify more rapidly projects where there may be problems. The ultimate effect of this action will be to help insure expeditious and proper completion of projects.

3. All applicants will be required to provide greater verification of their ability to provide their matching shares. At times certain applicants have either misinformed the Historic Preservation Department or have waited to raise their share until well after the federal funds had been made available.

Evaluation: An emphasis in having local matching funds available in a more timely manner should help to bring about more rapid implementation of projects.

4. The Historic Preservation Department will make more frequent inspections of the projects. Previously, inspections were sporadic in nature and were often not timely.

Evaluation: These inspections will not only help to maintain closer contact with the grantees but will also enable the staff to review work performed against the approved plans and will help to keep the grantees' attention focused on their projects. The major difficulty in implementing this measure is the lack of time the existing staff has to perform the additional work.

All of the actions identified above are actions that the Kansas State Historical Society will implement immediately. There are a number of other administrative measures that the agency considers as possible alternatives but which have some drawbacks. Decisions to implement or not to implement have not yet been made.

1. Applicants planning major projects would be required to prepare Historic Structure Reports which met both Department of the Interior and Historic Preservation Department standards and submit them by April 1. A Historic Structure Report presents a complete analysis of a building and its needs and provides a rational basis for preparation of a work program, as well as plans and specifications.

Evaluation: A Historic Structure Report is a necessary tool but the deadline of April 1 is unrealistic for the following reasons--it takes several months to prepare a Historic Structure Report, but under the present funding system it would likely be April before a project applicant knew for certain the governor and legislature would allow his project to be funded. It is unlikely an applicant would be willing to pay for preparation of a report until he knew his project would be funded. Thus, the April 1 deadline could not be met. However, if the Report is to be required, its due date would have to be several months prior to the July 1 deadline for plans and specifications so there would be time for review of the report prior to preparation of plans.

2. Grant-in-aid applications could be accepted for two year periods. Applicants whose projects were approved for funding would then know that they would receive the federal preservation funds during one of the next two state fiscal years so long as neither the state nor federal criteria for funding projects was changed.

Evaluation: Although some project applicants might not be markedly affected by a two year program, it would seem to pose some problems. Because of the possibility of a two year lag, people could lose interest in a project. In fund raising efforts the delay could diminish the enthusiasm of prospective donors. Any application not submitted in time to be considered for the two year cycle would presumably be out of the picture for any assistance for two years instead of open to consideration after one year as at present.

Additional improvements could be made to the historic preservation grants program operated by the Historic Preservation Department through gubernatorial and legislative action. A number of possible alternatives are set forth below and evaluated.

1. Authority could be requested to fund the preparation of Historic Structure Reports, plans, and specifications for approved types of projects separately from the rest of the project work by using survey and planning funds. The agency's budget would set aside an amount of federal funds, which would be matched by project applicants, for the preparation of these materials. The specific projects to be assisted would not be identified, because at budget preparation time the specific projects would not yet have been selected. These projects would be the ones the agency would intend to assist with federal historic preservation funds in the next state fiscal year.

Evaluation: This type of arrangement would enable the agency to insure the applicants' required reports, plans, and specifications were completed and approved by the time the federal funds were made available for acquisition and development. Project work would begin in a more timely fashion.

2. The agency could request the governor and legislature for what might be termed a "no limit" authority to transfer federal funds to the types of projects State government, i.e., governor and legislature, deems acceptable in light of the State's needs and the federal criteria.

Evaluation: This authority would enable the agency to transfer the federal funds received during the state's fiscal year to applicants approved by the Kansas Historic Sites Board of Review as soon as the funds became available. The agency would not have to wait for approval for specific projects during the next legislative session. The funding process would be speeded up as much as seven to eight months if this authority were given in conjunction with the administrative changes the agency intends to make. This would permit a more rapid implementation of projects and quicker expenditure of the federal funds.

3. The agency could request the 1979 legislature to provide supplemental authority to expend new federal historic preservation funds in FY 1979. The supplemental request would be made every year.

Evaluation: If the Legislature acted expeditiously on the request, the federal funds could be expended as much as four to five months earlier. This

would give the grant recipients that much of an advantage over the present and would lead to a more rapid expenditure of federal funds. However, there is no assurance the Legislature will act expeditiously on supplemental requests.

4. The agency could request the Finance Council to authorize the transfer of federal funds to specific project applicants as soon as the funds were made available by the Department of the Interior. This request would be made yearly in October or November when the state's allocation was released.

Evaluation: It is our understanding that the Finance Council prefers to act only on matters of an emergency nature that cannot wait until the next session of the Legislature. It would not seem likely that the Council would agree to deal with all preservation projects on a routine basis. In some circumstances it might be feasible to request Finance Council authority, but this would not seem to be a logical regular practice.

PROPERTIES TO BE EVALUATED FOR NATIONAL AND/OR STATE REGISTER NOMINATION

Listed in the order of consideration:

PROPERTY	APPROVED		DISAPPROVED	TABLED
	State	National		
Koester Block, Marysville				
Belle Springs Creamery, Abilene				
Taylor Farm, Enterprise vicinity				
Topeka State Hospital, Topeka				
Potwin Historic District, Topeka				
Harmon Archeological Site, Labette county				
Keefe House, Elk Falls				
Wakarusa Hotel, Wakarusa				
Bethany Place, Topeka				
St. Mary's Church, St. Benedict				
First Presbyterian Church, Marion				
S.L.K. Library, Troy				



PROPERTIES TO BE EVALUATED FOR NATIONAL AND/OR STATE REGISTER NOMINATION

Listed in the order of consideration:

PROPERTY	APPROVED		DISAPPROVED	TABLED
	State	National		
Koester Block, Marysville	X	X		
Belle Springs Creamery, Abilene	X	X		
Taylor Farm, Enterprise vicinity	X	X		
Topeka State Hospital, Topeka				X
Potwin Historic District, Topeka	X	X		
Harmon Archeological Site, Labette county	X	X		
Keefe House, Elk Falls			X	
Wakarusa Hotel, Wakarusa	X	X		
Bethany Place, Topeka	X			
St. Mary's Church, St. Benedict	X	X		
First Presbyterian Church, Marion	X			
S.L.K. Library, Troy			X	

# REVIEW BOARD TALLY SHEET

*Julia proposed it as district room - of*

Property: Koester Block, Marysville *commercial bldgs + private residences on block*

Motion by Sageser to APPROVE DISAPPROVE TABLE

Seconded by Kiene

Vote

Name	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Bibb			
Engstrom			
Kiene			
Sageser			
Smith			
Snell <i>Bob Richmond his designer</i>			
Trauer			

Disposition: APPROVED DISAPPROVED TABLED

If disapproved, reasons were: for state and NR

---



---



---

# REVIEW BOARD TALLY SHEET

Property: Belle Springs Creamery, Abilene

Motion by Engstrom to APPROVE DISAPPROVE TABLE

Seconded by Trauer

Vote

Name	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Bibb	1		
Engstrom			
Kiene			
Sageser			
Smith			
Snell			
Trauer			

Disposition: APPROVED DISAPPROVED TABLED

If disapproved, reasons were: both state & NR

---



---



---

# REVIEW BOARD TALLY SHEET

Property: (Taylor farm) 8 acres  
Prospect Park Farm, Dickinson County

Motion by Sageser to APPROVE DISAPPROVE TABLE

Seconded by Engstrom

Vote

Name	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Bibb			
Engstrom			
Kiene			
Sageser			
Smith			
Snell			
Trauer			

Disposition: APPROVED DISAPPROVED TABLED

If disapproved, reasons were: NR

---



---



---

# REVIEW BOARD TALLY SHEET

Property: Topika State Hospital, Admin. Bldg

Motion by Bibb to APPROVE DISAPPROVE TABLE

Seconded by Kiene

Vote

Name	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Bibb			
Engstrom			
Kiene			
Sageser			
Smith			
Snell			
Trauer			

Disposition: APPROVED

DISAPPROVED

TABLED

If disapproved, reasons were: for future consideration

# REVIEW BOARD TALLY SHEET

Property: Potwin Historic District, Topeka

Motion by Bibb to APPROVE DISAPPROVE ☐ TABLE

Seconded by Engstrom

Vote

Name	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Bibb			
Engstrom			
Kiene			X
Sageser			
Smith			
Snell			
Trauer			

Disposition:

APPROVED

DISAPPROVED

TABLED

If disapproved, reasons were:

with exclusion of  
St. Thomas - 1217 Hospital's property

# REVIEW BOARD TALLY SHEET

Property: Harmon Archeological Site, Labette county

Motion by Smith to APPROVE DISAPPROVE | TABLE

Seconded by Kiene

Vote

Name	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Bibb			
Engstrom			
Kiene			
Sageser			
Smith			
Snell			
Trauer			

Disposition: APPROVED DISAPPROVED TABLED

If disapproved, reasons were: NR

# REVIEW BOARD TALLY SHEET

Property: Keefe House, Elk Falls

Motion by Sageser to APPROVE DISAPPROVE TABLE

Seconded by Kiene

Vote

Name	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Bibb			
Engstrom	ABSENT DURING VOTE		
Kiene			
Sageser			
Smith			
Snell			
Trauer			

Disposition: APPROVED DISAPPROVED TABLED

If disapproved, reasons were: Lacks historic or architectural significance



# REVIEW BOARD TALLY SHEET

Property: Wakarusa Hotel, Wakarusa

Motion by Engstrom to APPROVE DISAPPROVE ☐ TABLE

Seconded by Sageser

Vote

Name	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Bibb			
Engstrom			
Kiene			
Sageser			
Smith			
Snell			
Trauer			

Disposition: APPROVED DISAPPROVED TABLED

If disapproved, reasons were: both state and NR

# REVIEW BOARD TALLY SHEET

Property: Bethany Place, Topoka

Motion by Smith to APPROVE DISAPPROVE TABLE

Seconded by Bibb

Vote

Name	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Bibb			
Engstrom			
Kiene			
Sageser			
Smith			
Snell <i>Mr Penkretz as designee</i>		X	
Trauer			

Disposition: APPROVED DISAPPROVED TABLED

If disapproved, reasons were: state only

---



---



---

# REVIEW BOARD TALLY SHEET

Property: St Mary's Catholic Church, St Benedict

Motion by Kiene to APPROVE DISAPPROVE † TABLE

Seconded by Trauer

Vote

Name	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Bibb			
Engstrom			
Kiene			
Sageser			
Smith			
Snell			
Trauer			

Disposition: APPROVED DISAPPROVED TABLED

If disapproved, reasons were: state & NR

# REVIEW BOARD TALLY SHEET

Property: First Presbyterian Church, Marion

Motion by Sageser to APPROVE DISAPPROVE TABLE

Seconded by Engstrom + Smith

Vote

Name	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Bibb			
Engstrom			
Kiene			
Sageser			
Smith			
Snell			
Trauer			

Disposition: APPROVED DISAPPROVED TABLED

If disapproved, reasons were: state only

---



---



---

# REVIEW BOARD TALLY SHEET

Property: S.L.K. Library, Troy

Motion by Engstrom to APPROVE DISAPPROVE TABLE

Seconded by Bibb

Vote

Name	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Bibb			
Engstrom			
Kiene			
Sageser			
Smith			
Snell			
Trauer			

Disposition: APPROVED DISAPPROVED TABLED

If disapproved, reasons were: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

## KANSAS HISTORIC SITES BOARD OF REVIEW

November 17, 1978

The November 17, 1978, meeting of the Kansas Historic Sites Board of Review was called to order by J. Eric Engstrom at 10:00 a.m., in the GAR Room of the Memorial Building. Other board members present were A. Bower Sageser, Ralph Kiene, Carlyle Smith, Nancy Trauer and Robert W. Richmond. A letter from Joseph Snell was presented to the chairman naming Robert Richmond his designee for the morning session of the meeting and Richard Pankratz his designee for the afternoon session. James Bibb arrived after the board had approved the minutes of the previous meeting. Staff members present were Richard Pankratz, Martin Stein, Julie Wortman and Sandra Slider.

The motion to approve the minutes of the previous meeting was made by Professor Sageser, seconded by Professor Smith, and approved by the board.

The proposed amendment to the rules of procedure which had been distributed prior to the board meeting was discussed and voted upon. Professor Sageser made the motion to adopt it; Mr. Kiene seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. The amendment reads as follows:

"A review board member shall absent himself/herself from the meeting during the discussion and review of any application/National Register nomination with respect to which he/she has a personal or financial interest. The application/National Register nomination and any information pertinent to the review of the application/National Register nomination shall not be made available to the member. An adequate record shall be maintained in the board's minutes to demonstrate that the procedures prescribed above were followed."

Richard Pankratz reported on current program activities. Two new properties had been added to the National Register since the last board meeting, making a total of 269 in Kansas. They were the Comanche Archeological Site in Stafford county and the Ulrich house in Manhattan.

The Historic Preservation Department has requested the nomination of the Manhattan State Bank building in Manhattan be put on hold in the National Register office, pending review of the work performed on the property since the board approved its nomination.

An analysis of the changes needed in the Historic Preservation Department's grant-in-aid procedures was distributed to the board. The proposed changes had been discussed at the last meeting and were summarized for the board by Mr. Pankratz.

A brief report was given on the progress of the various preservation projects underway around the state. At Friends University the Phase II project is underway.

Reimbursement has been requested for the two projects at Wichita City Hall. Plans and specifications have been sent to Washington for the Marshall County Courthouse and the Mahaffie House projects. Plans and specifications for the dam at the Smoky Valley Roller Mill and for the Spooner Hall project have been received in the Historic Preservation Department office.

Mr. Pankratz informed the board that Congress has banned preservation grants to public buildings for one year. The Department of the Interior has given a verbal explanation of what constituted public buildings ineligible for grants but nothing in writing has yet been received. The new ruling declaring public buildings ineligible will eliminate several projects approved by the board for federal fiscal year 1979. Other eligible projects will have to be substituted in order to spend all funds allocated to Kansas. Professor Sageser suggested that Mr. Pankratz and Mr. Engstrom resolve this matter by telephone instead of calling a special board meeting.

The Keeper of the National Register had sent a letter to the Historic Preservation Department recently, stating that the staff does not meet federal qualifications because the position of historic architect has not been filled. The letter also stated that the Review Board did not meet federal standards because of the lack of an architectural historian on the board. The new requirements have been in effect since October 1. It was noted that the state preservation law would have to be amended in order to provide an additional position on the board. The board discussed the problem of the federal requirements being unrealistic and difficult to meet. It was the consensus of the board that Mr. Bibb and Mr. Engstrom should review the letter of reply that would be sent to the National Register office in Washington, D.C.

The Lane University historic structure report submitted by the architect was distributed to the board several days prior to the meeting. Ms. Wortman gave her evaluation of the report: It was inadequate in both planning and research of original materials used in the construction of the building. The report contained unsubstantiated evidence and incorrect assumptions regarding the physical fabric of the building. She doubted that an interior restoration was possible because of the lack of documentation regarding original materials. To confirm her view, she sent the report to Washington for review; the Department of the Interior concurred with her evaluation.

It was the consensus of the board that the staff had given the architect who wrote the report adequate assistance and cooperation to produce an acceptable report. The staff brought up the fact that work already completed has not been documented as restoration of original materials; i.e., porches added to the building. It was agreed that that the document submitted represented a beginning point. Mr. Pankratz said that a statement was needed from the board to the effect that the report as it stood was not acceptable and that a proper report should be submitted prior to the next board meeting.

The board discussed possible remedies of the situation and decided that the staff should submit its evaluation of the report to the architect and state which items need to be corrected. Mr. Engstrom made a motion that the report be returned for amendment and clarification, to be resubmitted by February 1, 1979 for further

review by the board pursuant to the grant application, because of the following deficiencies:

1. There is insufficient historical documentation of either the original appearance of the property or of subsequent alterations made to it. There is no clear presentation of what historic materials and features survive. (Old photographs referenced are not supplied, some work already done contradicts some of the old photos we have found.)
2. Adequate evaluation of information presented on building history has not been performed---especially with respect to assessing the difficulty of accurately dating old photographs, and of the utility of the oral histories presented.
3. Several references are made to previously performed studies, including a feasibility study, a "comprehensive plan," schematic drawings, condition analysis, etc., but the results of these studies are not presented.
4. Work priorities not sufficiently explained; phases are not provided; cost breakdowns not provided.

Professor Sageser seconded the motion, which was approved. It was also understood that the staff would meet again with the architect to discuss problems with the report.

The Koester Block, Marysville, was the first proposed nomination presented to the board. It was a district nomination consisting of both commercial buildings and private residences. Professor Sageser made the motion to approve the district for both state and National Register nomination; the motion was seconded by Mr. Kiene and passed.

The Belle Springs Creamery in Abilene was approved by the board for both state and National Register listing. Mr. Engstrom made the motion for approval and Mrs. Trauer seconded it.

Professor Sageser made the motion to approve an 8 acre tract of the Prospect Park Farm (also known as the Taylor Farm) in Dickinson county for both state and National Register listing. Mr. Engstrom seconded the motion, which passed.

The board recessed for lunch at 11:30 a.m.

The board reconvened at 1:00 p.m. Mr. Pankratz had been designated by Mr. Snell to vote in his absence.

Topeka State Hospital was presented to the board. Mr. Bibb made the motion to table the nomination. Mr. Engstrom asked Ms. Wortman for her recommendation regarding the property; she replied that it probably did not merit National Register listing but might merit state register listing. Mr. Bibb offered to withdraw his



motion. Mr. Kiene moved to reject the property for both listings. Mr. Pankratz, as Mr. Snell's designee, said he supported tabling the property. It was the consensus of the board to table it. Mr. Kiene stated that he accepted the original motion made by Mr. Bibb and seconded it. The motion carried.

The Potwin Historic District in Topeka was presented to the board. The only objection by property owners within the proposed district came from Stormont-Vail Hospital, which owns an old hospital structure within the district boundaries. Mr. Kiene stated he would abstain from voting on the property since Stormont-Vail was a client of his firm. The board discussed the implications of including or excluding the old hospital from the district as they related to environmental review of proposed hospital projects. The staff declared that it would make little difference either way because the old hospital would always come under review if federal funds were used in a project, because of its proximity to the district.

Mr. Bibb moved that the district be approved with the exclusion of the hospital and the inclusion of additional homes Ms. Wortman suggested could be added to the district. Mr. Engstrom then asked the opinions of individual board members on the matter. Mrs. Trauer declared it did not make any difference to her whether the hospital was included or not. Professor Sageser declared that he was in agreement with Mr. Bibb. Professor Smith stated that either inclusion or exclusion of the hospital was acceptable to him. Mr. Engstrom then seconded Mr. Bibb's motion, which carried.

Martin Stein presented the Harmon Archeological Site to the board. Professor Smith moved to approve the site for National Register listing; Mr. Kiene seconded the motion, which carried.

Ms. Wortman presented the Keefe House in Elk Falls. She said that the owner had been informed by the staff that the property did not merit National Register listing, but that he objected to that opinion and insisted it be presented to the board. Professor Sageser moved to reject the property; Mr. Kiene seconded the motion, which carried. Mr. Engstrom was absent for this vote.

The Wakarusa Hotel in Wakarusa was next presented. Mr. Engstrom moved to approve it for National Register listing; Professor Sageser seconded the motion, which passed.

Bethany Place, Topeka, was approved by the board for state register listing only. Professor Smith made the motion for approval; Mr. Bibb seconded it. Mr. Pankratz, voting as Mr. Snell's designee, cast the only negative vote.

The board reconsidered the nomination of St. Mary's Church, St. Benedict. Ms. Wortman said she had determined since last consideration of the property that its significance stemmed from the interior decoration. She recommended it be listed on the National Register. Mr. Kiene so moved; Mrs. Trauer seconded the motion, which passed.

The First Presbyterian Church, Marion, was approved for listing on the state register only. Professor Sageser made the motion for approval and both Mr. Engstrom and Professor Smith seconded it.

Ms. Wortman next presented the S.L.K. Library in Troy, declaring that there were problems with its integrity, both historical and architectural. Mr. Engstrom moved to disapprove the nomination; Mr. Bibb seconded the motion, which carried.

After discussing a possible time for the next meeting, the board agreed that they would meet again during the week of February 12-16, 1979. The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

## KANSAS HISTORIC SITES BOARD OF REVIEW

November 17, 1978

The November 17, 1978, meeting of the Kansas Historic Sites Board of Review was called to order by J. Eric Engstrom at 10:00 a.m., in the GAR Room of the Memorial Building. Other board members present were A. Bower Sageser, Ralph Kiene, Carlyle Smith, Nancy Trauer and Robert W. Richmond. A letter from Joseph Snell was presented to the chairman naming Robert Richmond his designee for the morning session of the meeting and Richard Pankratz his designee for the afternoon session. James Bibb arrived after the board had approved the minutes of the previous meeting. Staff members present were Richard Pankratz, Martin Stein, Julie Wortman and Sandra Slider.

The motion to approve the minutes of the previous meeting was made by Professor Sageser, seconded by Professor Smith, and approved by the board.

The proposed amendment to the rules of procedure which had been distributed prior to the board meeting was discussed and voted upon. Professor Sageser made the motion to adopt it; Mr. Kiene seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. The amendment reads as follows:

"A review board member shall absent himself/herself from the meeting during the discussion and review of any application/National Register nomination with respect to which he/she has a personal or financial interest. The application/National Register nomination and any information pertinent to the review of the application/National Register nomination shall not be made available to the member. An adequate record shall be maintained in the board's minutes to demonstrate that the procedures prescribed above were followed."

Richard Pankratz reported on current program activities. Two new properties had been added to the National Register since the last board meeting, making a total of 269 in Kansas. They were the Comanche Archeological Site in Stafford county and the Ulrich house in Manhattan.

The Historic Preservation Department has requested the nomination of the Manhattan State Bank building in Manhattan be put on hold in the National Register office, pending review of the work performed on the property since the board approved its nomination.

An analysis of the changes needed in the Historic Preservation Department's grant-in-aid procedures was distributed to the board. The proposed changes had been discussed at the last meeting and were summarized for the board by Mr. Pankratz.

A brief report was given on the progress of the various preservation projects underway around the state. At Friends University the Phase II project is underway.

Reimbursement has been requested for the two projects at Wichita City Hall. Plans and specifications have been sent to Washington for the Marshall County Courthouse and the Mahaffie House projects. Plans and specifications for the dam at the Smoky Valley Roller Mill and for the Spooner Hall project have been received in the Historic Preservation Department office.

Mr. Pankratz informed the board that Congress has banned preservation grants to public buildings for one year. The Department of the Interior has given a verbal explanation of what constituted public buildings ineligible for grants but nothing in writing has yet been received. The new ruling declaring public buildings ineligible will eliminate several projects approved by the board for federal fiscal year 1979. Other eligible projects will have to be substituted in order to spend all funds allocated to Kansas. Professor Sageser suggested that Mr. Pankratz and Mr. Engstrom resolve this matter by telephone instead of calling a special board meeting.

The Keeper of the National Register had sent a letter to the Historic Preservation Department recently, stating that the staff does not meet federal qualifications because the position of historic architect has not been filled. The letter also stated that the Review Board did not meet federal standards because of the lack of an architectural historian on the board. The new requirements have been in effect since October 1. It was noted that the state preservation law would have to be amended in order to provide an additional position on the board. The board discussed the problem of the federal requirements being unrealistic and difficult to meet. It was the consensus of the board that Mr. Bibb and Mr. Engstrom should review the letter of reply that would be sent to the National Register office in Washington, D.C.

The Lane University historic structure report submitted by the architect was distributed to the board several days prior to the meeting. Ms. Wortman gave her evaluation of the report: It was inadequate in both planning and research of original materials used in the construction of the building. The report contained unsubstantiated evidence and incorrect assumptions regarding the physical fabric of the building. She doubted that an interior restoration was possible because of the lack of documentation regarding original materials. To confirm her view, she sent the report to Washington for review; the Department of the Interior concurred with her evaluation.

It was the consensus of the board that the staff had given the architect who wrote the report adequate assistance and cooperation to produce an acceptable report. The staff brought up the fact that work already completed has not been documented as restoration of original materials; i.e., porches added to the building. It was agreed that that the document submitted represented a beginning point. Mr. Pankratz said that a statement was needed from the board to the effect that the report as it stood was not acceptable and that a proper report should be submitted prior to the next board meeting.

The board discussed possible remedies of the situation and decided that the staff should submit its evaluation of the report to the architect and state which items need to be corrected. Mr. Engstrom made a motion that the report be returned for amendment and clarification, to be resubmitted by February 1, 1979 for further

review by the board pursuant to the grant application, because of the following deficiencies:

1. There is insufficient historical documentation of either the original appearance of the property or of subsequent alterations made to it. There is no clear presentation of what historic materials and features survive. (Old photographs referenced are not supplied, some work already done contradicts some of the old photos we have found.)
2. Adequate evaluation of information presented on building history has not been performed--especially with respect to assessing the difficulty of accurately dating old photographs, and of the utility of the oral histories presented.
3. Several references are made to previously performed studies, including a feasibility study, a "comprehensive plan," schematic drawings, condition analysis, etc., but the results of these studies are not presented.
4. Work priorities not sufficiently explained; phases are not provided; cost breakdowns not provided.

Professor Sageser seconded the motion, which was approved. It was also understood that the staff would meet again with the architect to discuss problems with the report.

The Koester Block, Marysville, was the first proposed nomination presented to the board. It was a district nomination consisting of both commercial buildings and private residences. Professor Sageser made the motion to approve the district for both state and National Register nomination; the motion was seconded by Mr. Kiene and passed.

The Belle Springs Creamery in Abilene was approved by the board for both state and National Register listing. Mr. Engstrom made the motion for approval and Mrs. Trauer seconded it.

Professor Sageser made the motion to approve an 8 acre tract of the Prospect Park Farm (also known as the Taylor Farm) in Dickinson county for both state and National Register listing. Mr. Engstrom seconded the motion, which passed.

The board recessed for lunch at 11:30 a.m.

The board reconvened at 1:00 p.m. Mr. Pankratz had been designated by Mr. Snell to vote in his absence.

Topeka State Hospital was presented to the board. Mr. Bibb made the motion to table the nomination. Mr. Engstrom asked Ms. Wortman for her recommendation regarding the property; she replied that it probably did not merit National Register listing but might merit state register listing. Mr. Bibb offered to withdraw his

motion. Mr. Kiene moved to reject the property for both listings. Mr. Pankratz, as Mr. Snell's designee, said he supported tabling the property. It was the consensus of the board to table it. Mr. Kiene stated that he accepted the original motion made by Mr. Bibb and seconded it. The motion carried.

The Potwin Historic District in Topeka was presented to the board. The only objection by property owners within the proposed district came from Stormont-Vail Hospital, which owns an old hospital structure within the district boundaries. Mr. Kiene stated he would abstain from voting on the property since Stormont-Vail was a client of his firm. The board discussed the implications of including or excluding the old hospital from the district as they related to environmental review of proposed hospital projects. The staff declared that it would make little difference either way because the old hospital would always come under review if federal funds were used in a project, because of its proximity to the district.

Mr. Bibb moved that the district be approved with the exclusion of the hospital and the inclusion of additional homes Ms. Wortman suggested could be added to the district. Mr. Engstrom then asked the opinions of individual board members on the matter. Mrs. Trauer declared it did not make any difference to her whether the hospital was included or not. Professor Sageser declared that he was in agreement with Mr. Bibb. Professor Smith stated that either inclusion or exclusion of the hospital was acceptable to him. Mr. Engstrom then seconded Mr. Bibb's motion, which carried.

Martin Stein presented the Harmon Archeological Site to the board. Professor Smith moved to approve the site for National Register listing; Mr. Kiene seconded the motion, which carried.

Ms. Wortman presented the Keefe House in Elk Falls. She said that the owner had been informed by the staff that the property did not merit National Register listing, but that he objected to that opinion and insisted it be presented to the board. Professor Sageser moved to reject the property; Mr. Kiene seconded the motion, which carried. Mr. Engstrom was absent for this vote.

The Wakarusa Hotel in Wakarusa was next presented. Mr. Engstrom moved to approve it for National Register listing; Professor Sageser seconded the motion, which passed.

Bethany Place, Topeka, was approved by the board for state register listing only. Professor Smith made the motion for approval; Mr. Bibb seconded it. Mr. Pankratz, voting as Mr. Snell's designee, cast the only negative vote.

The board reconsidered the nomination of St. Mary's Church, St. Benedict. Ms. Wortman said she had determined since last consideration of the property that its significance stemmed from the interior decoration. She recommended it be listed on the National Register. Mr. Kiene so moved; Mrs. Trauer seconded the motion, which passed.

The First Presbyterian Church, Marion, was approved for listing on the state register only. Professor Sageser made the motion for approval and both Mr. Engstrom and Professor Smith seconded it.

Ms. Wortman next presented the S.L.K. Library in Troy, declaring that there were problems with its integrity, both historical and architectural. Mr. Engstrom moved to disapprove the nomination; Mr. Bibb seconded the motion, which carried.

After discussing a possible time for the next meeting, the board agreed that they would meet again during the week of February 12-16, 1979. The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.