

Documentation related to planning and compliance for actions taken to rehabilitate the Cafeteria (building #570) in Rim Village, Crater Lake National Park

By Stephen R. Mark, Park Historian, February 2014

This paper responds, however belatedly, to a request made on January 26, 2010, by Associate Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer Christine Curran, who asked me about how design alternatives developed by a contracted architectural firm (Leavengood & Associates) might affect integrity of the Cafeteria building at Rim Village. The original building, constructed in 1927-28, has been stabilized in the wake of a construction project (Package 454) that built a new Rim Café and reconfigured parking away from the former plaza area of Rim Village. I previously wrote a chapter of administrative history (“Planning and Development at Rim Village”) printed in 1991, aimed at summarizing changes proposed and made at the site in support of planning efforts that responded to approval of a development concept plan in 1988. Significant changes have occurred since the chapter was written in 1990, including some construction and listing of Rim Village on the National Register of Historic Places. Ms. Curran asked that I prepare something of an update to the chapter, but one highlighting planning and design efforts aimed at the original Cafeteria, in order for SHPO to better understand its relationship to contributing resources in the historic district, and thus inform ongoing consultation. The following begins with summaries of site planning and comparisons with developments elsewhere in order to obtain some necessary context for how the building expanded and where it fit in subsequent efforts to bring historic preservation to Rim Village.

Site planning and initial development

As previously noted in “Planning and Development at Rim Village,” the plaza (as a coherent feature of the site) was triggered by road realignment from Park Headquarters to the rim, which in turn prompted a NPS development plan for Rim Village and investment from the concessionaire. Probably the most important result of the realignment accomplished under the Bureau of Public Roads was shifting the main entry point into Rim Village from where the employee dormitory has sat since 1972 (the service road between it and the Crater Lake Lodge is the only surviving segment of the route built in 1914 that is still used by vehicles) to a new intersection with the Rim Road/Rim Drive. This moved day use away from the eastern portion of Rim Village to what had been a pumice field for developed (paved) parking, and then facilities such as the Cafeteria, two comfort stations, and cabins. It better separated uses, with the hotel at the far eastern end, a campground (which has been a picnic area since 1975) in the middle, and on the western end a cafeteria, cabins (located behind the cafeteria), and a trailhead for pedestrian access to the lake. The realigned vehicular access made for a dead-end roadway, but also a pedestrian walkway called the promenade to unify the site and connected some of the above features, though the “village” also contained a popular viewpoint called Victor Rock and a photo studio in the middle segment.

Overnight facilities dominated the early years of Rim Village due to poor park roads and an evolving state highway system. By the late 1920s, however, automobiles had become faster and heavier along with a road system that allowed day-use to challenge overnight destinations for supremacy at Crater Lake and other attractions throughout the western half of Oregon. The

NPS partnership with BPR provided a systematic way to use available federal funds to improve park roads, such as the one linking Park Headquarters with Rim Village as the main approach to the rim of Crater Lake. As was the case elsewhere, investment by the park concessionaire (in this case, the Crater Lake National Park Company owned by R.W. Price) followed federal investment in roads, so that work on a cafeteria could begin in the late spring of 1928, in concert with construction of numerous cabins to the rear (south) of the building and a restroom (“comfort station,” building 72) funded and constructed by the NPS in 1930. The Cafeteria’s opening in 1928 preceded later work aimed at hardening the day-use parking provided in front of the building in an area called the “plaza.” As the first structure most visitors could see in Rim Village, the vehicular circulation scheme placed the Cafeteria in “central position” among all buildings at the site.

Comparison with other national and state park structures

As a feature of private and public parks, “model” villages go back to the eighteenth century, dating from a time when gardens fused with “landscaped” parks. It is no surprise that this idea furnished a “palette” to develop areas where visitors concentrated when publicly funded road systems made automobile travel to new federal and state parks viable in the early part of the twentieth century. It is not my purpose to trace this evolution to Crater Lake, but to provide some parallel examples in order to help with conceptualizing the Cafeteria and its incorporation with Rim Village. Within the national parks, there are two examples in California that furnish what is likely the best comparisons to Crater Lake, as Giant Forest Village is far larger than Rim Village, and “Meadow Village” in the General Grant Grove (formerly General Grant National Park) of Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks, perhaps slightly smaller. Both have had cafeteria structures designed by the NPS, though neither incorporated stone masonry as a unifying feature.¹

It should be noted that the NPS designed the Cafeteria in Rim Village, but few of either the field sketches or final drawings in the early years of the “Landscape Engineering Division” were signed or initialed by their designers. The drawings used to construct the Cafeteria were recommended and approved in March 1928, so it is likely that the lead designer was John Wosky, or possibly A. Paul Brown.² The concessionaire financed the building’s construction, whose intended season of operation ran from early summer to late October. This is apparently why the comfort station (building 72, or #4, as shown in the early site drawings) occupied a separate site, so that it could also service 19 cheaply built cabins located nearby, should the chamber pots not suffice.

In regard to comparisons with other structures on public land in the State of Oregon, the Cafeteria in its original configuration displays some affinities to two buildings erected subsequently under NPS auspices in Silver Falls and Jesse Honeyman state parks. Both are sited fairly close to natural features that draw automobile tourists on a day-use basis (the “lodge” at South Falls and bathhouse at Cleawox Lake, respectively), providing the same types of amenities (food service with indoor seating and gifts, accessible by a prominent (and obvious) entry, but are rustic in appearance, having conspicuous wood frame and stone masonry, in the form of details or elements. Both state park structures are on the National Register of Historic Places (listed in 1983 or 1984), but lack the overnight use component, mainly because former State Parks Superintendent Sam Boardman was able to prohibit camping in any state park during the

time that both of these parks were developed by the Civilian Conservation Corps with NPS approval.³ Probably next closest for comparative purposes is the Chalet at Oregon Caves National Monument, which originally (in 1923) had a lunch room, space for gifts and overnight accommodation for visitors and staff upstairs; it was reconfigured when reconstructed in 1942. Other concession facilities on federal or state lands bear less resemblance to the Cafeteria, but merit brief mention; these are the Vista House (1918) in Crown Point State Park, the Multnomah Falls Lodge (1925, built by the City of Portland, but now administered by the Mount Hood National Forest), the Union Creek Lodge (1935) on the Rogue River – Siskiyou National Forest, and possibly the Depoe Bay Ocean Wayside (1956), administered by the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department.⁴

Building additions

The Cafeteria appeared to handle the slowly escalating summer crowds during the 1930s and 40s, as many of the photos taken of the site during that period indicate, and the record yields few (if any) calls for expanding the envelope of this building or the parking lot in front of it. Demand for cheap overnight accommodations remained sufficiently high for the NPS to plan for more cabins nearby, or in an entirely separate locale with more units—though the latter would have to be sited south of the lodge due to the steeper topography near the Cafeteria. All that resulted, however, was construction of two additional “deluxe” four room cabins (later dubbed “ponderosa”) by the concessionaire in 1942.⁵ The “deluxe” cabins lasted 45 years, being demolished only after the smaller cabins were burned in 1985.⁶ A new concessionaire who succeeded Price in 1955 spent much of the next few years attempting to increase the value of concession holdings and wanted to sell his leasehold interest before the contract let in 1940 finished its 20 year term. The most conspicuous change made by Harry and “Pop” Smith came in the form of a “winter warming area” added to the Cafeteria in 1957-58, allowing the building to be operated year-round. This captured the food service trade on winter weekends, which had formerly been provided by spouses of NPS employees, who served coffee and sandwiches in the Community House. Having the park concessionaire sell food year-round thus became part of the next contract, to be let in 1960, but postponed until 1967 so that a 30 year term could be negotiated.

Managed by Ralph Peyton and Jim Griffin, the Crater Lake Lodge Company took over in 1959, roughly in the middle of Mission 66. At this point Rim Village had become the subject of several complicated and perhaps contradictory planning efforts, all of them aimed at both accommodating more visitors but also relieving congestion at the site.⁷ Each incorporated a visitor center, but intertwined it with proposed concession facilities, so that little more than moving boat tour parking away from Rim Village actually took place. Slightly more parking resulted from widening the roadway between Crater Lake Lodge and the plaza, then expanding the lot some 20 feet further south toward the Cafeteria in 1960.⁸ In terms of actual physical changes to the Cafeteria, the “winter warming area” accommodated a new kitchen, so the old kitchen space was reconfigured to allow for restrooms inside the building for the first time. Apart from the opening made in the east exterior wall to permit passage between the original building and its addition, other changes are more difficult to track. The only attempt to compare what is shown on the 1928 plans with an as-built situation did not come until 2009 and is in the form of a short report by Katheryn H. Krafft of Krafft & Krafft Architecture/CRM. It contains illustrations and notations about added or altered features and is appended to this paper.

In terms of square footage, the original building of 1928 consisted of 5,703 square feet and its first addition of 3,022 square feet. Peyton and Griffin put another addition of 2,974 square feet—almost as large as the first one—on the original main entry in 1969-70, ostensibly to permit visitors to enter that side of the of the building in all seasons, but also to provide storage for sales items on the upper floor. Another addition to the Cafeteria, this one in 1972, brought about profound changes to the interior. Not only did it (at 12,510 square feet) exceed the combined size of the original Cafeteria and its two additions (something that totaled 11,699 square feet), it brought the food service function to the new addition, with a full-service restaurant on the upper story, a cafeteria on the ground floor, and utilized a 3,600 square foot basement for storage and another set of public restrooms. The latter feature eliminated the concessionaire's need to maintain building 72 for this purpose, so that the comfort station could now house a transformer and maintenance work space.⁹ These uses prevailed until 2006, when contractors restored public restrooms to both parts of the comfort station, once the parking had been shifted south of the Cafeteria.¹⁰ A small snack bar still remained in the original Cafeteria, along with a store, but the latter function slowly moved toward Annie Spring once another concessionaire, the Estey Corporation, built a store near the Mazama Campground in 1991 and then doubled its size a few years later. As this shift away from the store function occurred, almost all the space (some 6,000 square feet) in the original building and its first two additions shifted over to gift sales.

The Crater Lake Lodge Company sold its holdings to the Estey Corporation in 1976, which in turn were replaced by a newly renamed Xanterra Corporation (formerly Amfac) in early 2002. Neither Estey nor Xanterra undertook any further additions before the government extinguished the concessionaire's financial interest in the building prior to the construction project (package 454) that built the Rim Café, reconfigured parking, stabilized the original building, and rehabilitated the comfort station. Krafft has noted both interior and exterior changes in her *Historic Structures Assessment Report* of 2009, especially where they deviate from the original 1928 plans. It is worth noting, however, that Estey also paid a Prospect resident to reroof the Cafeteria with sugar pine shingles in 1990. This is the original roof material and superior to the western red cedar the NPS has often used on buildings for cyclic maintenance projects.¹¹

Historic Preservation and the Cafeteria

Apart from listing the Crater Lake Lodge on the National Register of Historic Places in May 1981 and subsequently producing a historic structure report on the hotel, documentation and assessments in reference to historic preservation of the buildings at Crater Lake National Park were limited to a 1976 field report for the List of Classified Structures before Linda Greene began work on a historic resource study in 1982. Her work preceded an administrative history for the park, and places much emphasis on basic documentation of buildings, somewhat to the exclusion of their broader context, while largely ignoring other types of properties—especially linear ones, such as Rim Drive. The author found the Cafeteria and some other buildings in Rim Village “are not considered historically or architecturally significant,” but did not comment on their integrity either as a structure or as part of a broader designed landscape.¹² It is important to note that Greene's study did not result in nominating any properties to the National Register, but was intended to provide context, both for future nominations and interpreting historic properties by NPS staff.

Agency studies and the nominations that can often follow them sometimes differ, especially in the way they use National Register criteria to make their case. What listing essentially means in a legal sense is that the contributing resource is worth preserving.¹³ Nominating such properties is not intended to be the final word in terms of assessment, and there are many cases where sites, buildings, districts, or objects were reassessed once more information has become available. The nomination of 1988, was first drafted in the wake of Greene's HRS in 1984, and made use of both summary narrative and inventory cards. In its narrative, the author identified the Cafeteria as having lost its architectural integrity and described it thus:

...has undergone major unsympathetic alterations. It could be brought back into closer conformance with its original rustic appearance if altered features were replaced with materials reproducing original components and if additions were removed.¹⁴

In the nomination's inventory card, the author provided some additional detail in the significance section:

"With each successive remodeling, the design quality and integrity of this building has deteriorated, despite attempts to match rooflines and materials. Its architectural significance, therefore, is questionable; however, the original building is basically intact behind the additions, and could be restored. Historically, the structure is significant for its role as a store and cafeteria for park visitors. With its current additions, the structure would not contribute to a nomination of the park's rustic architecture to the National Register of Historic Places.¹⁵

The above calls into question Krafft's assertion made in her report of 2009 that "The former cafeteria and store building, which was constructed in 1928 was not included in the 1988 multiple property document (the nomination) or NRHP listing."¹⁶ It is more correct to say that it was not listed as such, but the door left open for a possible future nomination. The multiple property nomination of 1988 resulted in 18 contributing resources grouped together as the "Munson Valley Historic District" at Park Headquarters plus four others, with three of them in Rim Village. Building 72 (the comfort station) was one of those three, but in the summer of 1989, fieldwork began on a cultural landscape report for Rim Village. In contrast to the HRS, the authors of this CLR threw out the List of Classified Structures completely and instead substituted a typology in order to assess circulation, vegetation, structures, and small-scale features in reference to their significance and integrity, but also placed more emphasis on whether individual features contributed to a designed cultural landscape.

Nominating the Rim Village Historic District

This writer consulted both authors of the CLR (Cathy Gilbert and Gretchen Luxenberg) in writing a nomination for the Rim Village Historic District, one based on how National Register criteria applied to a designed historic landscape. The nomination was written as NPS planning had shifted away from large-scale changes proposed by a development concept plan that was approved by the regional director in 1988, to a visitor services plan whose emphasis lay

in restoring extant structures and using them for their original (and intended) purpose. It is important to realize that the VSP had twin aims: 1) to lay the groundwork for a new concession contract, since the 30 year one issued in 1967 was set to expire; and 2) shift planning for Rim Village away from components such as a second hotel, underground parking, and a realigned road access through the old campground. The superintendent at that time read the CLR, believed it had merit, and then directed me to nominate Rim Village as a *district*, rather than recognizing only four non-contiguous historic properties. I had some previous experience in nominating a district as a cultural landscape having had the Oregon Caves Historic District listed in 1992 as the first one in Oregon.¹⁷ Both Rim Village and Oregon Caves are manifestations of what I described in the Rim Village nomination:

“Naturalistic in appearance, the district’s structures and landscape features clearly reflect National Park Service master plans of the 1930s, which emphasized overall visual consistency and subordination to the surroundings. Extensive use of stone masonry is a unifying characteristic within Rim Village, much as it is in the Munson Valley Historic District...”¹⁸

Elisabeth Potter, the National Register Coordinator at SHPO at the time I nominated Rim Village as a designed historic landscape, called me in the aftermath of reopening Crater Lake Lodge in 1995. She believed that the lodge, as listed in 1981, should be removed from the National Register, since the rehabilitation project there resulted in more than 90 percent loss of historic fabric. There is some basis for this, since the use of like materials was confined only to the exterior and only sparingly in the interior spaces. As I noted in the district nomination, “the drastic changes in the building’s plan, mass, and structural character” brought about the need for a detailed update to the nomination of 1981.¹⁹ Despite these changes, however, the lodge remained a contributing feature to the cultural landscape at Rim Village because

“...the NPS confined the rehabilitation project to the same footprint left by the historic lodge, and specified reuse of historic masonry units, the in-kind replacement of other native materials to face exterior elevations, and the preservation of adjacent designed landscape features such as parking islands and plantings.”²⁰

The nomination also included the Kiser Studio, Community House, and promenade as contributing resources (which the HRS and previous multiple property nomination had not), while retaining the Sinnott Memorial and two comfort stations (buildings 68 and 72). In labeling the Cafeteria as a non-contributing resource because it lacked qualities associated with the original design intent. I described the structure as still functioning as it did in the past,

“...but additions to the building in 1956, 1970, and 1971 tripled the floor space while obscuring the battered stone and other rustic features formerly evident from the plaza. It has lost much of its architectural integrity as a result, and is presently almost unrecognizable from the building constructed in 1928.”²¹

This assessment applied to the time in which it was made, even though authors of the CLR had written, “Although the architectural integrity of the Community House and the Cafeteria has

diminished, the buildings continue to function as they did historically, and [as such,] they contribute to the cultural landscape.”²²

The Cafeteria in recent NPS planning

Listing of the Rim Village Historic District on the National Register occurred on September 18, 1997, before the regional director approved a record of decision for the visitor services plan. At that point (July 6, 1998), the agency direction included “The cafeteria building will be converted to its original 1928 configuration and external appearance and will provide limited food service, sundries, and gifts.”²³ It also directed that parking would be removed from north of the Cafeteria “to a smaller area behind the building,” something that remained in place while the NPS began work on a new environmental assessment for Rim Village less than four years later. This one supposedly aimed at adaptive re-use of the original Cafeteria and its 1972 addition, while removing the 1957 and 1969 additions in the process of relocating the parking lot. The reasoning behind this move to undertake yet another environmental document was that the scope of a new concession contract did not permit an operation confined to the original Cafeteria. A new scenario, one where the concessionaire could utilize the basement of the 1972 addition and then provide food service and a gift shop on its ground floor, took shape and received approval on the strength of a value analysis study completed in 2002.²⁴ Use of the word “rehabilitation” in reference to construction proposed at the Cafeteria seemed to be quite a stretch, since a new building arose in the footprint of the 1972 addition, while the other additions disappeared through demolition, as the original Cafeteria almost became a shell that was connected to the new Café by means of an underground tunnel, a new feature that provided a second winter egress for the new facility.

By 2002, the thinking for how to obtain a new visitor contact facility at Rim Village had shifted from the direction in the visitor services plan, which involved a new building that could permit an expanded offering of interpretive programs, to using the original Cafeteria for this purpose—supposedly at a significant cost savings.²⁵ Having a visitor contact facility in the Cafeteria did not constitute a new idea, since this had been proposed as long ago as 1975 in a master plan draft, and even harkened back to NPS drawings of the 1930s and 40s for a “government contact building” or “museum” to be sited just east of the original Cafeteria. In any event, it had long been the feeling that use of the Kiser Studio as a summer “visitor center” (as had been the case since 1929) made expansion of NPS interpretive service in Rim Village almost impossible, so scoping of “program requirements” related to a new facility began once the NPS received funding for design of a visitor center in 2008.²⁶

Consultation with SHPO

Formulation of the park’s visitor services plan furnished the main reason for execution of the first programmatic agreement specific to Crater Lake with the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office. This occurred in June 1998 and stipulated that the NPS shall afford SHPO the opportunity to comment on all phases of restoration/rehabilitation of Rim Village, providing SHPO with 20 working days to comment, and at minimum, would include notification of design and consultation at completion of schematic design, design development and at 50 percent construction documents.²⁷ The PA became “null and void” on July 10, 2010, at which time “the parties will determine continued applicability,” but for the first few years, served as just backdrop for compliance documentation under 36 CFR 800 related to a construction project

(package 274) of 2000-01. This was largely conducted between the writer and Compliance Specialist Liz Carter at SHPO, focusing on treatments proposed for the Sinnott Memorial, Kiser Studio, Plaza Comfort Station (building 68), and the promenade. Most could be characterized as restoration, or at least preservation—rather than adaptive rehabilitation—with SHPO having few comments or stipulations in concurring with “no historic properties adversely affected” as the recommended finding.

A shift toward adaptive rehabilitation in the next major undertaking at Rim Village, a construction project (package 454) aimed at building the Rim Café, reconfiguring parking on the western portion of Rim Village, and putting restroom fixtures back in building 72, brought more direct involvement on the part of SHPO. Deputy SHPO James Hamrick and Carter visited the park in July 2002 as part of reviewing plans associated with the undertaking, focusing on how a proposed above ground snow tunnel might affect the comfort station (building 72) listed in 1988 as well as the surrounding designed landscape. Hamrick’s concerns shifted toward the original Cafeteria once plans showed an underground tunnel and included a new exit on the buildings west façade, all of which involved more loss of historic fabric.²⁸ His retirement in 2003 and Carter’s move into historic preservation consulting meant that the torch passed to Compliance Specialist Sarah Jalving. She concurred with a finding of “no historic properties adversely affected” on Package 454 in early 2004, but with three conditions—all concerning the proposed snow tunnel, at that point still not finalized.²⁹

In Jalving’s comments, she recommended that the snow tunnel be built with a roof “not flush or engaged, with the south roofline and eave of the *historic* 1928 building [my italics]. In the same letter, the SHPO determination included the following wording in their concurrence:

“There is presently a property [the original Cafeteria] that may be considered eligible for listing in the *National Register of Historic Places* identified at this project site. This property may be affected by the proposed undertaking, but the effect will not be adverse as defined in 36 CFR 800.5(a)(1).”³⁰

The door had been left open by the project plans, which involved stripping the Cafeteria of its additions, for SHPO to reconsider the original building as a contributing resource in the Rim Village Historic District. These plans called for what amounted to a stabilization treatment (since the construction package lacked funding to do anything more than that), so that the main entry could once again be seen, as well as the original dimensions and some finishes. It left a vacant room downstairs, with windows and one door on the east façade blocked up, but a new door through the west façade, as egress from an underground tunnel. This theme of reconsideration emerged as the incumbent superintendent commenced consultation with SHPO, in the opening phase of design review aimed at providing a visitor contact facility in the building.

Endnotes

¹ Giant Forest Village is far larger than Rim Village, even after much of it was removed, as can be discerned by referencing Laura Soulliere Harrison, *Inventory of Significant Structures, Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks* (Denver: Government Printing Office, 1989), 44. It contains site plans for both Giant Forest Village and Meadow Village. Some comparisons with Rim Village are in another volume in this set of three titled *Architectural Guidelines*.

² This follows from a reading of William C. Tweed, et al., National Park Service Rustic Architecture, 1916-1942, working paper produced by the NPS, Western Regional Office, Division of Cultural Resource Management, February 1977, 49-50. Much of the background information in it is based on interviews conducted at the time and no subsequent work on NPS rustic architecture has added to what is known about who worked in the San Francisco field office and on what projects. The original drawings are referenced as CL 82 in the Denver Service Center's Technical Information Center drawing collection; these can be downloaded from ETIC; <http://www.etic.nps.gov>.

³ In addition to the information in these nominations, which are on the NRHP database as districts, there is the masters thesis on the CCC and Oregon state parks by Nancy Niedernhofer and another on NPS involvement in the design of the Oregon state parks by Sueann Brown.

⁴ These four buildings are also on the National Register, though the Depoe Bay structure was only listed in 2012 and has not yet been digitized. The Vista House is also included within a national historic landmark district centered on the Columbia River Highway, while the Union Creek building is part of a larger historic district nominated by Elizabeth Gail Throop of the U.S. Forest Service, more or less derived from Throop's thesis work on USFS rustic buildings in Oregon and Washington.

⁵ See Mark, Planning and Development, 714; these were constructed east of the Cafeteria, whereas the "coldwater" cabins (whose name came from the plumbing added in about 1940) were clustered south of the larger building. NPS master plans of the late 1930s showed larger cabin loops south of the lodge, beyond where the early tent cabins and comfort station were located immediately south of the lodge.

⁶ The narrative and inventory cards associated with the multiple property nomination of 1988 indicate that none of these structures (some of which were reported to be in ruins by 1984) lacked architectural significance, not supposedly being within the "idiom" of rustic architecture; see section 8, page 10 of the nomination. The ponderosa cabins were given building numbers 510 and 511, whereas the Cafeteria is building 570; the coldwater cabins numbered 15 by that time and had building numbers 582-596.

⁷ See "Planning and Development," 719-724.

⁸ P.E. Smith to N.B. Wood, July 27, 1960, Roads and Trails Project Documentation folder, cited in note 59 of "Planning and Development."

⁹ The square footage cited is from a building appraisal conducted during the 1980s, page 26. Actual dimensions of all three levels are on the pages that follow (27-29). Building 72 had been assigned by the NPS to the concessionaire in 1957, immediately prior to the construction project that resulted in the "winter warming area."

¹⁰ The transformer occupied the south end of building 72, while a tool cache was in its north end, an arrangement that had long since passed out of code compliance by the time this writer visited the interior in 2001. At that time a replacement of the roof structure was needed to prevent further damage to the building by snow.

¹¹ For background see Mary Lou Neville King, *The Making and Use of Sugar Pine Shakes*, September 2003, copy in possession of the author. Some NPS structures at Park Headquarters have retained their sugar pine roofs, with the best example of durability being the Superintendent's Residence (a national historic landmark) whose original sugar pine roof lasted 70 years. Western red cedar, especially when untreated with stain and not the top grade, rarely lasts 20 years.

¹² Linda W. Greene, *Historic Resource Study, Crater Lake National Park, Oregon* (Denver: USDI-NPS, June 1984), 256.

¹³ There are also guidelines, such as Kay D. Weeks and Anne E. Grimmer, *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings* (Washington, DC: USDI-NPS, Heritage Preservation Services, 1995) that seek to clarify the law (namely the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended) and regulations. The NPS is the lead agency in history and historic preservation in the federal government.

¹⁴ Pat Erigero, with 1988 update by Stephanie Toothman, *Historic Resources of Crater Lake National Park*, Section 8, Page 10, listed December 1, 1988, has five different NRIS numbers, though the one for building 72 is 88002625.

¹⁵ Patricia C. Erigero, PNRO Inventory, Cafeteria/Store #570, July 27, 1984, item 15 Significance. In Tootman's update of September 1988, she makes note that approval of a development concept plan for Rim Village would lead to removal of the Cafeteria.

¹⁶ Katheryn H. Krafft, *Historic Structures Assessment Report, Historic Cafeteria (1928 Building), Crater Lake National Park, Oregon*, to Leavengood Architects, Contract Number C8078080177, March 27, 2009, 4-5.

¹⁷ Oregon Caves Historic District, listed February 25, 1992, NRIS #92000058. This was accomplished without the benefit of any cultural landscape work beforehand, as some recommendations came afterward.

¹⁸ Stephen R. Mark, Rim Village Historic District nomination, Section 7, 1-2; listed September 18, 1997, NRIS #97001155.

¹⁹ Mark, Rim Village Historic District nomination form, section 7, page 5.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Mark, Rim Village Historic District nomination form, section 8, page 2.

²² Cathy A. Gilbert and Gretchen A. Luxenberg, *The Rustic Landscape of Rim Village, 1927-1941* (Seattle: USDI-NPS, 1990), 139.

²³ USDI-NPS, Record of Decision, Final Environmental Impact Statement, Visitor Services Plan, Crater Lake National Park, Oregon, page 1 (Selected Action). A new superintendent, Charles V. Lundy, began to hedge on whether food service and gifts might be confined to the original Cafeteria in the middle of 2000, specifying that the first addition would be retained at the time the subsequent ones were demolished; Lundy to Regional Director, July 26, 2000, C58, Cafeteria file.

²⁴ USDI-NPS, Environmental Assessment, Rehabilitate Cafeteria and Relocate Rim Parking, Crater Lake National Park, Oregon, May 2003, page 4. The concession contract, however, was bid on the basis of the provisions in the Record of Decision in the Visitor Services Plan; evidently the outgoing Estey Corporation chose not to pursue legal recourse, given how its competitor (Amfac) reaped the benefits of these changes at Rim Village.

²⁵ Ibid., see also Record of Decision.

²⁶ This came through a Congressional "earmark" orchestrated through Representative Greg Walden's office. The congressman's support had proven vital to the Rim Café project of 2004-06.

²⁷ Programmatic Agreement Among National Park Service, Crater Lake National Park, State Historic Preservation Officer, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation regarding Draft Visitor Services Plan/Environmental Impact Statement, Crater Lake National Park, Oregon, [June 1998], 3-4.

²⁸ A series of letters and e-mail messages began in April 2003 and continued through June of that year, centering on the proposed alterations to the original Cafeteria, which at one point, Hamrick and SHPO viewed as an adverse effect, due to their impact on historic fabric. This clearly showed that SHPO did not view the original structure as non-contributing to the district; Hamrick to Mark, May 21 and 23, then June 25, 2003, Cafeteria file.

²⁹ Jalving to Charles V. Lundy, National Park Service, 21 January 2004. It remains something of a mystery why SHPO chose not to comment or negotiate over the relocation of parking in the plaza, especially after the NPS declared in the Record of Decision for its visitor services plan in 1998 that elimination of this circulation feature would constitute an adverse effect on the Rim Village Historic District.

³⁰ Ibid.