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Introduction

An urban area can realize great pride and enjoyment in its cultural resources when they are properly maintained and developed. Historic structures provide a diversity of architectural styles within our visual environment that may be enjoyed by residents and visitors alike. The preservation of historical structures also provides area residents with a tangible connection to their past. This link with history provides a sense of place, permanence, continuity, and perspective to our lives. But, unless a conscious and deliberate effort is made to protect these valuable resources, this important link with the past may be lost forever.

The Historic Preservation Element seeks in part, to foster greater public awareness and appreciation for the heritage of the Roseburg urban area. In addition, it attempts to ensure that sites and structures having local, state or national historical significance, will be identified and measures taken to preserve their existence.

A brief historical outline of the Roseburg urban area has already been provided in the Population Element. Therefore, the main thrust of historical information found within this element, will be associated with the background of the particular sites and structures contained in the inventory.

Historic Preservation - Background

In 1966, the U.S. Congress passed the National Historic Preservation Act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to expand and maintain a National Register of districts, sites, buildings, structures and objects significant in American history, architecture, archaeology and culture. It lists those national, state and local landmarks which constitute the significant evidences of our national heritage. The National Register encourages appropriate action, public and private, to preserve this heritage and it is the legal instrument which ensures that registered properties threatened by federal or federally assisted undertakings will be subject to review and comment in accordance with the procedures prescribed by the Act. In addition, listing
on the Register makes private property owners eligible for federal grants-in-aid for historic preservation through state programs and makes owners who rehabilitate certified historic properties eligible for federal tax benefits.

Prior to the 1966 Act, the National Park Service, under the authority of the Historic Sites Act of 1935, had undertaken a program of identifying districts, sites, buildings, structures and objects of national historical significance which are not part of the National Park System and had accorded them eligibility for recognition as "National Historic Landmarks."

Section 101 of the 1966 Act authorizes an expanded list, including these properties and the historical units of the National Park System, to be known as the National Register. The National Historic Preservation Act also inaugurated a funding program of matching grants to states for survey and planning activities and for acquisition and development projects related to National Register properties and to the National Trust for Historic Preservation for preservation projects, Title 11 established the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to review federal actions related to preservation and to advise the President and Congress on such matters.

To administer the historic preservation responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior, the Department created the Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (OAHP) within the National Park Service in 1967. The Governor of each state was asked to appoint an official to work with OAHP. Thus, the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office was created, as a special program unit of the Parks and Recreation Branch. This office administers:

a) a statewide survey and inventory of historic properties.

b) processing of nominations to the National Register of Historic Places.

c) an environmental review process to ensure that properties either listed in, or eligible for, inclusion in the National Register are not thoughtlessly or needlessly destroyed by federally funded or federally sponsored projects.

d) tax incentives for the development of properties listed in the National Register. Under Oregon Law, the assessed value may be frozen for 15 years, enabling owners to make Lax-free improvements. Under federal income tax law, the cost of improvements may be amortized over five years or the property may be depreciated on an accelerated basis.
There are virtually no disadvantages to private property owners who have their property placed on the Register. The property is not encumbered and the owner can remodel, alter or tear the building down at his discretion. The Register does not require the owner to improve or restore the structure nor does it grant a right of access to the general public.

National Register Criteria

Criteria have been established by the Secretary of the Interior for evaluating the eligibility of properties nominated to the National Register. These criteria are included in the Historic Preservation Element in order to provide an idea of the kinds of sites and structures that may be eligible for nomination to the National Register. National Register criteria have been developed for a broad range of historic resources that exhibit significance in American history, architecture, archaeology and culture.

Criteria of Evaluation

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

(A) that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
(B) that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
(C) that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

(D) that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory, or history.

Criteria Considerations
Ordinarily cemeteries, birthplaces, or graves of historical figures, properties owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes, structures that have been moved from their original locations, reconstructed historic buildings, properties primarily commemorative in nature, and properties that have achieved significance within the past fifty years shall not be considered eligible for the National Register. However, such properties will qualify if they are integral parts of districts that do meet the criteria or if they fall within the following categories:

(A) a religious property deriving primary significance from architectural or artistic distinction or historical importance; or

(B) a building or structure removed from its original location but which is significant primarily for architectural value, or which is the surviving structure most importantly associated with a historic person or event; or

(C) a birthplace or grave of a historical figure of outstanding importance if there is no appropriate site or building directly associated with his productive life; or

(D) a cemetery which derives its primary significance from graves of persons of transcendent importance, from age, from distinctive design features, or from association with historic events; or

(E) a reconstructed building when accurately executed in a suitable environment and presented in a dignified manner as part of a restoration master plan, and when no other building or structure with the same association has survived; or

(F) a property primarily commemorative in intent if design, age, tradition, or symbolic value has invested it with its own historical significance; or

(G) a property achieving significance within the past fifty years if it is of exceptional importance.

The Roseburg urban area presently has two structures listed on the National Register of Historic Sites and Places: the Creed Floed House (Joseph Lane House) located at 544 S.E. Douglas Avenue; and the Judge William R. Willis House, located at 744 S.E. Rose Street. The historical significance of these structures has already been determined by virtue of their inclusion on the National Register. These structures are more specifically described in Appendix A.
Obviously, not all of an urban area's historical resources will be able to satisfy the degree of significance required for nomination to the National Register. Still, they may have attributes that make them worthy of inventory, recognition and protection. Creation of a local register would enable such places within the Roseburg urban area to be noted for their local or regional significance. In order to standardize the selection of significant sites and structures for inclusion in a local register, a basic set of criteria would be necessary. The checklist of criteria provided below, when used in conjunction with established National Register Standards can provide a useful tool for determining whether or not a property should be included on such a local register.

**Historic Considerations**

- Is the structure associated with the life or activities of a major historic person (more than the "slept here" type of association)?

- Is it associated with a major group or organization in the history of the nation, state, or community (including significant ethnic groups)?

- Is it associated with a major historic event (whether cultural, economic, military, social, or political)?

- Is the building associated with a major recurring event in the history of the community (such as an annual celebration)?

- Is it associated with a past or continuing institution which has contributed substantially to the life of the urban area?

**Architectural Considerations**

- Is the structure one of few of its age remaining in the urban area?

- Is it a unique example in the urban area of a particular architectural style or period?
Is it one of a few remaining examples in the urban area of a particular architectural style or period?

Is it one of many good examples in the urban area of a particular architectural style or period?

Is the building the work of a nationally famous architect?

Is it a notable work of a major local architect or master builder?

Is it an architectural curiosity or picturesque work of particular artistic merit?

Does it evidence original materials and/or workmanship which can be valued in themselves?

Has the integrity of the original design been retained or has it been altered?

Setting Considerations

Is the structure generally visible to the public?

Is it, or could it be, an important element in the character of the urban area?

Is it, or could it be, an important element in the character of the neighborhood (either alone or in conjunction with similar structures in the vicinity)?

Does it contribute to the architectural continuity of the street?

Is the building on its original site?
Is its present setting (yards, trees, fences, walls, paving treatment, outbuildings, and so forth) appropriate?

Are the structure and site subject to the encroachment of detrimental influences?

Use Considerations

Is the building threatened with demolition by public or private action?

Can it be retained in its original or its present use?

Does it have sufficient educational value to warrant consideration of museum use?

Is it adaptable to productive reuse?

Are the building and site accessible, served by utilities, capable of providing parking space, covered by fire and police protection, and so forth, so that they can feasibly be adapted to contemporary use?

Can the structure be adapted to a new use without harm to those architectural elements which contribute to its significance?

Cost Considerations

Is preservation or restoration economically feasible?

Is continued maintenance after restoration economically feasible?

FACTORS TO BE EVALUATED IN
POTENTIAL HISTORIC AND CULTURAL CONSERVATION AREAS

Is the area capable of preservation, or has it deteriorated too far?

What are the area's strengths and weaknesses?
Considering the total rather than the partial view, does the area as a whole have unique or distinctive characteristics that cannot be attributed solely to a collection of buildings of the same or related periods?

Does the area have a continuity of architectural resources that are well related to each other? Is this a concentrated pattern of important structures? Or are the principal architectural features loosely clustered or relatively isolated? Does the area "read" as a whole, or is it made up of related but different subareas of differing character?

Can the visual relationships among the important features be enhanced? Can the traditional atmosphere of the area be retained though at the same time new or improved facilities are needed? What are the opportunities for successfully blending contemporary designs with the existing image?

Is there visual harmony in the character of public ways (street and sidewalk materials, street furniture, landscaping, and so on)? Is the treatment of public ways consistent with the architectural character of the area?

Are there opportunities to improve the public view of the streetscape? Can views and vistas be improved?

Are uses and intensities of uses compatible? Can any disrupting influences be removed? Are circulation and community facilities adequate to serve a changing neighborhood?

What modifications in standards are required, if any, to enhance the livability of the area? Today's suburban space values should not be used as the sole basis for judgment. It is important to understand the particular developmental standards in effect during each area's construction. The rules that might apply to a federal period neighborhood will not necessarily apply to a Victorian neighborhood, though both areas may warrant historic and cultural conservation.

Inventory
The inventory of historic sites and structures within the Roseburg urban area includes those properties inventoried by the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office and those nominated to the National Register of Historic Places. The City of Roseburg should conduct a more comprehensive and evaluated survey of these historic sites and structures within the urban area. Examples of the various avenues available to achieve this end include but are not limited to: applications for grant monies that would provide funding for survey work; encouraging interested citizens, organizations and historic preservation societies to support the inventory effort by submitting nominations and utilizing the records of the county museum and library.

This inventory would provide policy makers with a listing of historical sites and structures to be reviewed for possible inclusion in a local register. One accepted means by which a property owner could have his or her property placed on a local or national register would be to make a formal application to a Historic Resource Review Committee. This committee would review the application and determine whether or not the property is a significant historic resource and make a recommendation to the City Planning Commission.

Protection of Significant Historic Resources

At present, the Roseburg urban area has no means of safeguarding its historical sites and structures from destruction or alteration. A Historic Preservation Ordinance is one means available that would provide protection for historical resources. Such an ordinance may be based on the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers model historic preservation ordinance. Basic provisions contained within this proposed ordinance might include but not be limited to:

1) Authorization to create a Historic Resources Review Committee and specific details as to the makeup, functions and duties of this committee.

2) Establishing controls and regulations under which designated historical sites and structures are subject. (e.g. regulations regarding the issuance of permits required prior to exterior alteration or demolition, regulation of uses of a designated historical site or structure, standards regarding the issuing of permits for demolition and building condemnation, etc.).
3) If applicable, designation of areas as Historic Districts (allowing for a Historic District Advisory Council of area residents).

4) Development of standards for exterior remodeling of existing structures or construction of potentially incompatible structures in proximity to a designated historic resource.

Another means of providing further protection to designated historic resources, involves the creation of a Historic Preservation overlay zone. The purpose of this zone would be to permit, after review and subject to minimum standards and conditions, the conditional use of historically or architecturally significant buildings for uses not otherwise permitted in certain zones. This zoning designation will serve to identify historic sites and structures on the official zoning map and help to locate them for future reference. Those sites and structures covered by the Historic Preservation overlay zone will also be subject to the provisions of the Historic Preservation Ordinance. Hopefully such action will help to preserve existing structures where preservation is not possible or practicable with uses now permitted in certain zones.

Because the manner in which the historical resources inventory will be carried out is indefinite at this time, an exact date for completion of the inventory is not available. It is believed that the historic resources inventory should take between one and two years to finish. This does not take into consideration periodic updates following completion.

**Historic Resources Review-Committee**

The Roseburg urban area currently has no mechanism whereby potential sites and structures of historical significance may be reviewed for inclusion on the proposed Roseburg urban area register. One of the most common and effective methods employed by other cities and counties involves the creation of a commission or committee that is responsible for reviewing nominations to a local listing of significant historic sites and structures.
The City of Roseburg could form its own Historic Resource Review Committee or as an alternative, work together with Douglas County in the creation of a joint City-County committee. The advantages of utilizing a joint committee would include the avoidance of duplication of efforts that would occur in the urban area lying outside the Roseburg City limits, as well as encouraging greater coordination and uniformity in identifying historical sites and structures of significance. The primary function of this committee would be to serve in an advisory capacity, providing recommendations to local governing bodies and their agents on all matters concerning sites and structures determined to exhibit historical significance.

More specifically, the duties and responsibilities of the Historic Resource Review Committee might include but not be limited to:

1. Review applications of nominated historic resources for the purpose of determining historical significance and serve in an advisory capacity to the Roseburg Planning Commission, the City Council, and other public or private agencies on all matters dealing with sites and structures determined to have historical significance.

2. Advise governing bodies concerning permits for demolition or alteration of registered historical or archaeological sites.


4. Initiate and support programs and projects that will help to preserve historic resources and make citizens and visitors to the area aware of the history and heritage of Roseburg.

5. Recommend removal from the Roseburg Urban Area Register, historic sites and structures found to be no longer worthy of such designation.

6. Coordinate historical resource protection and inventory efforts with county, state and federal governments and other agencies.

7. Work to seek the donation of funds, easements, buildings, area, etc., for the protection of historic sites and structures, from both public and private sources.

8. Be responsible for monitoring state and federal historic preservation programs and funding sources which are available to owners of historically significant resources.
Archaeological Sites

Archaeological sites represent a valuable resource to those engaged in the legitimate study of the ancient peoples who once inhabited the area. Unfortunately, many such sites, once discovered, have been disturbed by amateurs and "weekend pot-hunters" to such a degree that their historical and scientific value are marginal. In other cases, primarily as the result of construction projects, significant archaeological sites have been completely destroyed before any analysis of the site could occur.

Each archaeological site is unique. The accidental or deliberate destruction of these resources removes forever the opportunity to add to our knowledge of the people who came before us. In order to protect archaeological resources, both federal and state laws have been enacted, some dating back to 1906. Although the State of Oregon has had laws protecting archaeological sites since 1942, the principal statutes in effect today were enacted by the 1977 State Legislature. ORS 273-705 establishes conditions for the excavation or removal of archaeological or historical materials from state lands. ORS 97-740 provides for the protection of native Indian cairns and graves and prohibits the willful disturbance of Indian graves or the possession of artifacts from Indian graves. Statewide Planning Goal No. 5 (Open Spaces, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Natural Resources) requires that local comprehensive plans provide for the protection of identified historical and archaeological sites, structures and objects.

As discussed in the historic section of the Population Element, artifacts found in the Roseburg area suggest the presence of inhabitants as far back as 12,000 years. Although there has been relatively little archaeological research conducted in the Roseburg area, the few sites which have been located are all associated with the South Umpqua River. One village site has been covered by urban development, while other known sites remain relatively undisturbed. As the urban area continues to grow, construction projects will likely unearth additional archaeological sites currently unrecorded.

Both state and federal law require pre-construction cultural resource surveys of sites to be impacted by publicly funded projects. To date, two such surveys have been conducted in the urban area; one for the new Stewart Park Bridge and the other in
connection with preliminary analysis of a regional sewage treatment facility. The findings of these two surveys are on file with the Roseburg Planning Department.

At the present time there are no laws requiring pre-construction archaeological surveys for privately funded projects, nor is there any legal requirement that archaeological sites and objects found on private property be reported. However, surveys thus far conducted indicate certain areas are potentially significant and valuable in an archaeological sense. Those who uncover artifacts and archaeological sites should be encouraged to voluntarily report their discoveries to the appropriate authorities in order for the find to be recorded, and if appropriate, studied. The appropriate local authority to contact is Mr. George Addill of the Douglas County Museum in Roseburg.
Creed Floed House (Joseph Lane House)
544 S.E. Douglas Avenue, Roseburg, Oregon
Entered in the National Register - 12/31/74

This structure, commonly known as the Lane House, was occupied by Joseph Lane's son-in-law, Creed Floed. Constructed in 1853-54, the house has a two-story piazza and its architecture is in the greek revival style. A bay window added before 1880 and other modern revisions have altered the home somewhat, but it remains one of the rapidly diminishing number of structures dating from Oregon's territorial days.

Joseph Lane was born in 1801 in North Carolina. He had an eventful military and political career, serving in both houses of the state legislature in Indiana and earning his military rank in the Mexican War. Appointed by President James K. Polk as governor of the Oregon territory, he arrived in Oregon City in 1849. In 1853 he settled in the Umpqua Valley and was a delegate to the U.S. Congress until 1859, when Oregon achieved statehood. Over the next two years he was a state senator and a candidate for the vice-presidency of the United States. Following the death of his wife, Lane moved to Roseburg and built a cottage on the northwest corner of the block now occupied by the Douglas County Farm Bureau, opposite the Chamber of Commerce parking lot. He took his meals at his daughter's home until his death in 1881.

The structure was given to the Douglas County Historical Society by Mrs. Catherine Bain, a descendent of Joseph Lane and was restored to its present condition in 1961.

Judge William R. Willis House
744 S.E. Rose Street, Roseburg, Oregon
Entered in the National Register - 6/5/75

Built in 1874 by Judge William R. Willis, this structure originally stood at the corner of S.E. Cass Street and S.E. Rose Street. The house features a curved interior staircase, ornate millwork on door casings and window frames, brackets highlighting decorated frieze and box corners and a bay window protruding from the south side. General W. T. Sherman and President and Mrs. Rutherford Hayes are purported to have been guests at the house, which served for many years as the showplace of Roseburg.

William R. Willis was Douglas County Judge from 1860 to 1864. He served many years on the Roseburg City Council and was Mayor of the City of Roseburg for three terms.
The house was used as the Roseburg Public Library beginning in 1924 and continued to do so for a period of over 30 years, until Douglas County established its library in the Court House. Following the explosion of 1959, the Willis home became the location for the chief administrative offices for the City of Roseburg and served as its City Hall for almost 15 years.
NAME: (Common) Alexander Bridge Piers  
(Historic) Alexander (J.M. & J.C.) Bridge
ADDRESS OR LOCATION: West of 1750 S.E. Mill, Roseburg, Oregon
PRESENT OWNER: 
ORIGINAL USE: Bridge Support Piers
DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: 1909
BACKGROUND: James Christian Alexander and J.W. Alexander constructed this bridge in 1909 across the South Umpqua River in south Roseburg to provide access to property which they owned through their Umpqua Land and Water Company. This bridge of four spans collapsed in the 1950's. Remaining are concrete piers on both sides of the river. The piers on the east bank yet have in place wooden beams and a shingled gable roof which covered the timbers. The design of the pier indicates that this bridge may have been a suspension type.

NAME: (Common) Booth Bridge  
(Historic) (same)
ADDRESS OR LOCATION: Winchester, Oregon
PRESENT OWNER: State of Oregon
ORIGINAL USE: Bridge
DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: 1923-24
BACKGROUND: The Booth Bridge at Winchester, Oregon, is a major concrete span crossing the North Umpqua River. It was constructed in 1923-24 to improve travel on Highway 99, the principal thoroughfare between Oregon and California. The bridge served as a major route of travel for the next forty years. It is today in use but is adjacent to a wider and more heavily used bridge on Interstate Highway 5. This bridge has seven major concrete arches. There are bronze markers
mounted in small balconies on both the south and north ends of the bridge in honor of Robert Booth for whom the bridge was named.

NAME:  
(Common) "Confidence Clinic"  
(Historic) Criteser (T.J.) House

ADDRESS OR LOCATION: 393 S.E. Rast Street, Roseburg, Oregon

PRESENT OWNER: Helen Criteser Silvers

ORIGINAL USE: Residence

DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: c. 1905

BACKGROUND: The Thomas J. Criteser house is a one and one-half story building standing near the site of the Roseburg Flouring Mills where Criteser's father-in-law, Isaac Jones, established the first grist mill in Roseburg. The site, near Deer Creek and the junction of the South Umpqua River, is across the street from the 1875 house of John G. Rast who was Criteser's brother-in-law. Nearby also stood Mehl and Rast Roseburg Brewery, founded in 1856 by Schenerman & Fudier.

The house, which has a gable roof, has been altered significantly by window replacement on its west (front) elevation. It has wide eave boards, horizontal tongue-and-groove siding, and a small, open porch on the southwest corner of the front elevation. The porch has turned posts. An exterior fire escape has been added to the second floor on the south elevation. The building is presently leased to Douglas County by Criteser's granddaughter.

NAME:  
(Common) Crafton (Leah) House  
(Historic) Phillips (Reubin) House

ADDRESS OR LOCATION: 1434 S.E. Mill Street, Roseburg, Oregon

PRESENT OWNER: Leah Crafton

ORIGINAL USE: Residence

DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: c. 1890
BACKGROUND:

This one and one-half story building of Gothic style stands in one of the older residential areas of Roseburg. It is situated south and west of the main business district. The building, of wood frame construction, has a very steep gable roof and intricate eave decoration fretwork on the east (front) elevation. Originally the house had two-over-two windows. These have been removed, about 1947, on the first floor, front elevation by the present owner. Part of the porch which extends across the east and north elevations has also been filled in (on the north) for an extension to a bedroom. Diana Graves owned this house from 1910-14 and during this time it was the location of the Graves photo studio. The kitchen wing on the west elevation has a large, glassed-in area that was the location of the studio. The building has horizontal tongue-and-groove siding, a transom over the main entrance, and one brick chimney.

NAME:
(Common) Dent (Jack) House
(Historic) Unknown

ADDRESS OR LOCATION: 1567 S.E. Pine Street, Roseburg, Oregon

PRESENT OWNER: Margaret Dent Dunn

ORIGINAL USE: Residence

DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: C. 1900

BACKGROUND: The former Jack Dent residence is a one story, wood frame building with Queen Anne style elements standing in the older residential area in south Roseburg. The house, in excellent condition, has a hipped roof with a central brick chimney. This square building has horizontal tongue-and-groove siding and a wood apron around the foundation. The eave has a very wide frieze board with ornamental brackets. The corners of the building have vertical boards topped with a small entablature. The windows are one-over-one with a transom above the main doorway. A front porch on the west elevation has a gable roof. There is a small porch on the south elevation and a projecting window bay.

NAME:
(Common) Dysinger (Treaves) House
ADDRESS OR LOCATION: 927 S.E. Mill Street, Roseburg, Oregon
PRESENT OWNER: Alvin H. Berkshire
ORIGINAL USE: Residence
DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: C. 1910

BACKGROUND: The Treaves Dysinger house is a smaller example of a mission style house adjoinning the William L. Dysinger house at 511 S.E. Mosher, Roseburg, Oregon. This two story, wood frame structure with a nearly flat roof, is built, like the larger Dysinger house, to simulate a brick exterior. This house has a porte-cochere on its north elevation (with a bedroom above) and a garage, also in simulated brick, behind the house. A large porch extends along the west (front) elevation. The flat roof has very wide, projecting eaves supported by four-by-four beams. Treaves Dysinger was the son of William L. Dysinger.

NAME: (Common) Dysinger (W.L.) House
             (Historic) (same)

ADDRESS OR LOCATION: 511 S.E. Mosher Street, Roseburg, Oregon
PRESENT OWNER: E. M. Johnson
ORIGINAL USE: Residence
DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: C. 1910

BACKGROUND: The William L. Dysinger house is an unusual, two story wooden frame building which is constructed to simulate a brick building. The exterior of this mission style house is simulated brick. The rectangular house has very wide, projecting eaves supported by four-by-four beams. The house is symmetrical with two-over-one windows. The house has a nearly flat roof, basement, garage under a kitchen wing on the south (back) elevation, and another garage, also in simulated brick, in the alley behind the house. A very large porch extends across the north (front) elevation. The main entrance is surrounded by natural wood panels and moldings (varnished). This house is situated next to a matching structure, the home of
Treaves Dysinger. Dysinger moved to Roseburg in 1892 and in 1894 became a partner in J. G. Flook Company's planing-mill. By 1894 Dysinger was the general manager of the Flook Company.

**NAME:**
(Common) Federal Office Building  
(Historic) U.S. Post Office

**ADDRESS OR LOCATION:** 704 S.E. Cass Street, Roseburg, Oregon  
**PRESENT OWNER:** U. S. Government  
**ORIGINAL USE:** Post Office  
**DATE OF CONSTRUCTION:** 1916  
**BACKGROUND:** The Federal Office Building, formerly the Roseburg Post Office, was constructed in 1916 by the U.S. Government. James A. Wetmore was the supervising architect. This building, in Colonial or Georgian style, is a three story brick building in the business district of Roseburg, Oregon. It has a flat roof with brick piers and open stone railings as a major architectural feature above the third floor. The rectangular building has symmetrical two story window bays, two on either side of the main entrance. These are repeated on the east and west elevations. The brick is a cream-white color; the banding, keystones, and other decorative material is cut, dressed sandstone. The original window cases have been replaced with aluminum frames. The building has a full basement. A pair of cast iron light standards are placed on either side of the main entrance.

**NAME:**
(Common) Hamilton (J.W.) House  
(Historic) (same)

**ADDRESS OR LOCATION:** S.E. Kane & S.E. Lane Streets, Roseburg, Oregon  
**PRESENT OWNER:** Jane Clark  
**ORIGINAL USE:** Residence  
**DATE OF CONSTRUCTION:** c. 1895  
**BACKGROUND:** The J.W. Hamilton house stands on the hill east of the business district of Roseburg and looks over the city
toward the west. It is an imposing two and one-half story building of Queen Anne style. This wood frame building has a hipped roof broken by major gables. A round tower rises on the northwest corner through the first and second floors to have a round room beneath a cone-shaped roof cap. The exterior of the tower room is shingled as are sections of the gables. Timbering and stucco work also decorate the gables. The house has a large porch on the north and west elevations on the first floor and has a balcony on the second floor. The house has a basement and is in excellent condition. The grounds are essentially as landscaped when the house was built. A driveway encircles the building and runs through the gardens. Most of the windows are one-over-one. J.W. Hamilton was a Douglas County judge.

NAME:  
(Common) Howell (M.R.) House  
(Historic) (same)  
ADDRESS OR LOCATION: 843 S.E. Jackson, Roseburg, Oregon  
PRESENT OWNER: Florence Kohlhagen McHenry  
ORIGINAL USE: Residence  
DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: c. 1885  
BACKGROUND: The M.R. Howell house is a one and one-half story, wood frame building which has a mixture of Italianate and Gothic styles. It has horizontal tongue-and-groove siding with vertical boards and small entablatures on the corners. It has a steep pitch gable roof with major and minor cross gables, each with elaborate cut designs in the eave boards. The house has a projecting window bay on the first floor front (east) elevation with semi-elliptical windows. Frieze boards and decorative cornices give an Italianate feeling to this window bay; its roof is nearly flat. A porch extends along half of the front elevation and has a balcony above. The porch has turned, round columns; it extends along the south elevation and is partially glassed-in.

The house has another small porch on its northeast corner. This building has two major brick chimneys. They are covered with stucco and have flaring tops. Most of the windows are one-over-one, double hung
sash. The building has a basement and is set among several old trees. The house is in good condition.

This house was built by M.R. Howell and is occupied by his granddaughter, Florence Kohlhagen McHenry. Howell operated a foundry and later owned a lumber yard in Roseburg, Oregon.

NAME:  
(Common) Hunter 7 House  
(Historic) (same)

ADDRESS OR LOCATION: 613 S.E. Mosher Street, Roseburg, Oregon

PRESENT OWNER: Earl Decker

ORIGINAL USE: Residence

DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: 1894

BACKGROUND: This one and one-half story, wood frame building near the business district of Roseburg, Oregon, bears the date "1894" above its entrance on the northwest (front) elevation. Constructed by a carpenter named Hunter, and later owned by his son Fred Hunter, this residence was many years ago converted into a duplex. It had two front entrances on its northwest and northeast corners. The building is rectangular in shape with major cross gables on its north and south elevations. The front elevation has elaborate eave cutouts on the gable, cross banding moldings, and decorative brackets at the junction of the gable with the house. The general appearance of the structure indicates a Queen Anne style.

The windows are primarily one-over-one double hung sash. The exterior is double tongue-and-groove siding. The house has a new, composition roof and is in excellent condition.

NAME:  
(Common) Jones (Isaac) Grist Mill Site  
(Historic) Roseburg Flouring Mills

ADDRESS OR LOCATION: S.E. Stephens at Deer Creek, Roseburg, Oregon

PRESENT OWNER: Douglas County

ORIGINAL USE: Grist Mill Site
DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: c. 1855

BACKGROUND: The Roseburg Flouring Mills were established near the junction of Deer Creek and the South Umpqua River in Roseburg about 1855 by Isaac Jones. Jones was born October 22, 1816, in Morgan County Ohio. In 1852 Jones emigrated overland to Oregon with his wife Anna and several children. He took a claim of 320 acres on Deer Creek on November 25, 1854. Isaac Jones died in Roseburg on December 7, 1893, at the residence of T.J. Criteser, his son-in-law and partner in the flour mill.

The site of the grist mill is situated at the junction of Diamond Lake Blvd. and Old Highway 99 (S.E. Stephens Street). The area is overgrown with blackberries and small trees.

NAME: (Common) New Era Roller Mills Site (Historic) New Era Roller Mills

ADDRESS OR LOCATION: West of 1750 S.E. Mill Street, Roseburg, Oregon

PRESENT OWNER: Grist Mill Site

DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: 1880

BACKGROUND: The New Era Roller Mills, located at the mouth of Parrott Creek on the banks of the Umpqua River in south Roseburg, were erected in 1880. All that remains at the site in 1976 are the concrete and brick piers and foundations for the mill buildings. These are located between the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks and the Umpqua River.

John G. Flook, one of the owners of the New Era Mills, settled in Douglas County, Oregon in 1860. In 1880 Flook erected the New Era Rollers Mills which, in 1894, had three stands of rollers and a capacity of fifty barrels of flour a day. His millrace and dam (on the Umpqua River) cost him $20,000; the mill cost $10,000. In 1886 Aaron Rose joined Flook as a partner in these operations.

NAME: (Common) Parrott (Moses) House (Historic) (same)
ADDRESS OR LOCATION: 1772 S.E. Jackson Street, Roseburg, Oregon

PRESENT OWNER: Leonard Grensky

ORIGINAL USE: Residence

DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: C. 1900

BACKGROUND: The Moses Parrott house is a two story, wood frame building in Queen Anne style that stands in south Roseburg. It is located near the banks of Parrott Creek and is approximately one-fourth mile east of the South Umpqua River. The house, which consists of three rectangular masses, is dominated by an over-sized three story tower that has a cupola room with eight one-over-one windows. A frieze board surrounds the house at the eaves and is decorated with round medallions between the brackets that are placed under the eaves. The house has horizontal tongue-and-groove siding which is turned on a diagonal on both the first and second floors on the north and west gable ends. The gables are heavily decorated with imbricated shingling and open work. A large porch opens on the first and second stories beneath the tower room. The house is in good condition and has many original plantings in-the yard.

Moses Parrott was born in Wales in 1825. He was a shoemaker in Roseburg at the time of the 1860 census. His wife died in 1904.

NAME: (Common) Parrott (Moses) Wash House
(Historic) (same)

ADDRESS OR LOCATION:
PRESENT OWNER: Leonard Grensky

ORIGINAL USE: Residence

DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: C. 1900

BACKGROUND: The Moses Parrott wash house is the principal remaining outbuilding at the Moses Parrott house in south Roseburg. The wash house is a rectangular, wood frame building of one and one-half stories. It has a gable roof, horizontal tongue-and-groove siding, and one remaining four-over-four paned window in its east gable end. The building has three doors and appears to have been both a woodshed and wash
NAME: (Common) (Historic) Pitchford (Will) House (same)
ADDRESS OR LOCATION: 714 S.E. Mosher, Roseburg, Oregon
PRESENT OWNER: Aggie Pitchford
ORIGINAL USE: Residence
DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: c. 1890
BACKGROUND: The Will Pitchford house is a one and one-half story building with a saltbox style. The building appears to have had significant alteration of its windows, preserving narrow windows only on its west elevation. These are pairs of windows with four panes. The other windows appear to have been replaced about 1910. The house has horizontal tongue-and-groove siding and two brick chimneys. A dormer projects from the roof on the south (front) elevation. This house was the residence of Will Pitchford, long-time editor of the Roseburg Plaindealer.

NAME: (Common) (Historic) Rast (John) House (same)
ADDRESS OR LOCATION: 236 S.E. Stephens Street, Roseburg, Oregon
PRESENT OWNER: Stanley Rast Kidder
ORIGINAL USE: Residence
DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: c. 1875
BACKGROUND: The John Rast house is a one and one-half story, wood frame building standing near the junction of Deer Creek and the South Umpqua River. It is two blocks from the Douglas County courthouse. This house has been occupied by the same family for the past 101 years. The family has resided on this site since it was filed up by Isaac Jones on November 25, 1854, as his Donation Land Claim. Clara Jones, a daughter of Isaac Jones, married John Rast in 1864. John Rast who had this building erected at the time of
his marriage, was born in Switzerland in 1838. Rast became a partner with Gotlieb Mehl in 1864 in the brewery which had been established in Roseburg in 1856 by Schenerman & Fudler. In 1894 Rast was also interested in the Roseburg Roller Mills, the first grist mill in Roseburg which had been erected by his father-in-law Isaac Jones. The house is today occupied by Rast's grandson, Stanley Rast Kidder. This Gothic style house is a "T-shaped" building. It was resited about 1937 at the time of the widening of S.E. Stephens Street. The house was moved west about thirty feet.

NAME: Rentoul & Denholm Mill Site
ADDRESS OR LOCATION: mile north of mouth of Parrott Creek, Roseburg, Oregon
PRESENT OWNER: Mrs. Edith Castle
ORIGINAL USE: Woolen Mill Site
DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: 1888
BACKGROUND: In 1888 James Rentoul and James Denholm constructed a woolen mill on the banks of the South Umpqua River near the business district of Roseburg. This mill, approximately one-half mile north (downstream) from the mouth of Parrott Creek (where the New Era Roller Mills were erected in 1880), stood beside the South Umpqua. The mill was inundated by the flood of 1890 and much of it was washed away. Some of the buildings which were salvaged were later converted into residences which yet stand on S.E. Mill Street. The site of the woolen mill is between the Southern Pacific Railroad Track and the river and is adjacent to the Micelli Park. The site is overgrown with blackberries and brush.

NAME: Rice (Napoleon) House
ADDRESS OR LOCATION: 709 S.E. Kane Street, Roseburg, Oregon
PRESENT OWNER: Mrs. Edith Castle
ORIGINAL USE: Residence
DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: C. 1900

BACKGROUND: The Napoleon Rice House is a one and one-half story building of Queen Anne style on a hill east of the business district of Roseburg, Oregon. The house, which faces west, overlooks the city. It has a hipped roof with cross gables on the north and west (front) elevations. The exterior is covered with horizontal tongue-and-groove siding, except for imbricated shingle work on the gables. A round tower rises on the northwest corner of the house and has an open balcony on the second floor. A porch encircles the house on its west and north elevations. The house has a band of imbricated shingles that girdles it beneath the first and second stories. The gables have cut eave decoration boards. The building has two brick chimneys. An apartment has been made in the back of the house.

NAME: Roseburg Hotel
(Historic) Depot Hotel

ADDRESS OR LOCATION: 513 S.E. Lane, Roseburg, Oregon

PRESENT OWNER: Ralph & Caroline Smith

ORIGINAL USE: hotel

DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: c. 1875

BACKGROUND: The Depot Hotel, a building which faces west on Sheridan Street, is adjacent to the railroad yards and the Southern Pacific depot in Roseburg, Oregon. The building is a two story, wood frame structure with a rectangular shape. It has horizontal tongue-and-groove siding. Originally this building had a porch and balcony along its western elevation. The gable roof has been broken by the addition of two dormers on the west side. The windows have been changed so that there are one-over-one windows on the second floor and two-over-two on the first floor. The transom window, once above the door to the balcony, remains on the second floor, west elevation. Rather prominent window entablatures remain above the window bays on the second floor.

In 1903 this building was adjoined on the north elevation by the brick, two story Roseburg Hotel of which this building became a part. Harvey Jones
purchased the Depot Hotel in 1898 and built the brick building. The Depot Hotel is in poor condition but still serves as a hotel. Its address is that of the Roseburg Hotel to which it is attached.

**NAME:** (Common) Roseburg Hotel (Historic) Roseburg Hotel

**ADDRESS OR LOCATION:** 513 S.E. Lane, Roseburg, Oregon

**PRESENT OWNER:** Ralph & Caroline Smith

**ORIGINAL USE:** hotel

**DATE OF CONSTRUCTION:** 1903

**BACKGROUND:** The Roseburg Hotel is a two story brick building with an "L" shape. It stands near the Southern Pacific Railroad Depot in Roseburg, Oregon and has a corner entrance at the junction of Lane and Sheridan Streets. The second story has pairs of one-over-one double hung sash windows with simple wood surrounds. The exterior of the building is covered with stucco. The first floor has large, plate glass windows for the hotel lobby and former restaurant. A wood frieze with ornamental brackets runs around the building above the second floor. The Roseburg Hotel was built in 1903 adjoining and attached to the Depot Hotel which was built in the 1870's. This building was constructed by Harvey Jones who had purchased the Depot Hotel in 1898.

**NAME:**
(Common) S.P. Railroad Depot
(Historic) Southern Pacific Depot

**ADDRESS OR LOCATION:** 706 S.E. Sheridan, Roseburg, Oregon

**PRESENT OWNER:** Southern Pacific Railroad

**ORIGINAL USE:** Railroad Depot

**DATE OF CONSTRUCTION:** c. 1912

**BACKGROUND:** This one story, wood frame building of mission style architecture stands adjacent to the railroad yards near the business district of Roseburg, Oregon. The building has a gable roof with long, wide eaves. The base of the building is brick, but the upper two-thirds
of the exterior is stucco. Two dormers break the roof on the east elevation, while a major cross gable with a dormer window projects from the roof on the west elevation. The gable ends of the roof have horizontal tongue-and-groove siding. The building has one brick chimney. The window treatment is primarily six-over-one, double hung sash windows. This depot is the third to serve Roseburg, Oregon. It has facilities for freight storage and passengers.

NAME:  
(Common) Winchester Bridge  
(Historic) (same)

ADDRESS OR LOCATION: North Umpqua River, Winchester, Oregon

PRESENT OWNER: Southern Pacific Railroad

ORIGINAL USE: Railroad Bridge

DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: 1906

BACKGROUND: The Southern Pacific Railroad bridge at Winchester is a major span crossing the North Umpqua River. It is of steel construction and has three spans set on concrete piers in the river. The date ’11906” is cut in the steel work on either end of the bridge. This bridge replaced an earlier bridge constructed by the Oregon and California Railroad in 1872. That line reached south from Portland to terminate at Roseburg in 1872. A.G. Walling, writing in 1884, commented: "The advent of this road into Southern Oregon, although it penetrated only to the center of Douglas County, was an event of supreme importance. The whole region brought within the circle of its influence was invigorated and entered upon a season of unwonted prosperity." Commencing in 1882 this line was then extended to the Rogue River Valley, over the Siskiyou Mountains, and into California.

NAME:  
(Common) Winchester Dam  
(Historic) (same)

ADDRESS OR LOCATION: North Umpqua River, Winchester, Oregon

PRESENT OWNER:  
ORIGINAL USE: water power
DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: 1889; ff.

BACKGROUND: The Winchester Dam has existed over the past 87 years. Its early history was described in 1966 by H.F. Pearson:

"The dam was built across the North Umpqua at Winchester in 1889. The first dam was built of logs and reportedly was constructed by a Mr. Briggs, who hauled the logs to the site with oxen. William R. (Billy) Vinson and a man named Vose built a sawmill there. Later Kendall Brothers Lumber Company operated a sawmill just above the power plant on the south side of the river."

In 1890 the Douglas Electric and Water Company was also using this dam. The dam was used to create a fall for generation of electricity.

In 1976 the dam is primarily of concrete construction, though some timbered material remains. The former power station at the south end of the dam has been removed but the concrete footings for the buildings remain. A fish ladder has been constructed at the north end of the dam.
FEDERAL LAWS PERTAINING TO THE PROTECTION OF CULTURAL RESOURCES

1906-- Antiquities Act (P.L. 59-209) Established protection over any "historic or prehistoric ruin or monument, or any object of antiquity situated on government lands . . ."; required permits for their removal. Secretary of the Interior charged with responsibility.

1935-- Historic Sites Act (P.L. 74-292) Congress declared that "it is a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites, buildings and objects of significance . . ." Act empowers the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service to conduct surveys, publish studies and otherwise encourage the preservation of historic properties not federally funded.

1960-- Reservoir Act (P.L. 86-523) Gave the Department of the Interior through the National Park Service major responsibility for preservation of archeological data that might be lost specifically through dam construction.

1966-- National Historic Preservation Act (P.L. 89-665) Established Advisory Council, expanded the National Register of Historic Places, pledged federal assistance to the preservation efforts of state and local groups. Advisory Council given responsibility to comment on effect of federal undertakings on properties entered in the National Register.

1968-- Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968 (P.L. go-495) Amended Section 3 of the Federal Highway Act of 1966 and Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act, and declared that in the development of federally aided transportation plans and programs special effort should be made to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside, public park and recreation lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites.

1969-- National Environmental Policy Act (P.L. 91-190) Title 1, Section 101(b), "... it is the continuing responsibility of the federal government to use all practicable means . . . to preserve important historic, cultural and natural aspects of our national heritage. ..." Under Title 1, Section 102(2) (c), federal agencies were to prepare environmental impact statements for each major federal action having an effect on the environment.

1971-- Executive Order 11593 "Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment." Charged federal agencies with responsibility to survey all lands and nominate properties to the Register. Requires Secretary of the Interior to advise other federal agencies in matters pertaining to the identification and evaluation of historic properties located on lands in their jurisdictions.

1974-- Archeological and Historic Preservation Act (P.L. 93-291) Amended the Reservoir Salvage Act of 1960. Secretary of the Interior to be responsible for coordinating and administering a nationwide program for recovery, protection and preservation of scientific, prehistoric and historic data.
1976-- Tax Reform Act (P.L. 94-455) Section 2124 provided for changes in federal tax
treatment of demolition costs, rehabilitation expenses, depreciation, and
charitable contributions of partial property interests when certified historic
properties are involved.

OREGON LAWS PERTAINING TO THE PRESERVATION OF CULTURAL
RESOURCES

Archeology

ORS §273-705-.742 (1942) governs removal of archeological, historical and other
valuable materials from state land. Permits required from Division of State Lands and
President of University of Oregon. Provision made for finder's fee for discovery of
valuable materials.

Oregon H.B. 2625, 1977 Regular Session. The bill, which provides greater protection
for antiquities in Oregon, classifies removal of archeological, historical, prehistorical or
anthropological materials from state lands as a Class B misdemeanor. It was signed
into law following the last Legislative session.

Oregon H.B. 2626, 1977 Regular Session. The bill prohibiting tampering with Native
Indian cairns and graves also was signed into law in 1977. It requires reinternment of
discovered Indian remains, while permitting scientific archeological study of such sites
and remains.

Archives and Historical Commissions

ORS §358.110-770 (1973) governs city and county museums and county memorials,
monuments and historical funds.

Historic Preservation

ORS §271-710 (1974) authorizes state or any county, city or park and recreation district
to acquire conservation of scenic easements to preserve or maintain all or part of
natural or existing state of historical or other appropriate places of public significance.
Use of power of eminent domain prohibited.

Oregon H.B. 2686, 1977 Regular Session. The Public Buildings Cooperative Use Act
insures that the state government will investigate the feasibility of adapting historic
properties whenever additional space and facilities are required. The state law, signed
by the Governor on July 21, 1977, was a first of its kind at the state level in the country.

Protocol Agreement to implement the Federal Public Buildings Cooperative Use Act of
1976. In 1977, also, the Governor signed a protocol agreement with the federal
General Services Administration. It was the first agreement between the GSA and a
state government to implement the Federal Public Buildings Cooperative Use Act of
1976. The agreement provides that the GSA will notify the State Department of General
Services and the State Historic Preservation Office when there is any major relocation
of federal facilities in Oregon. The agreement provides that priority consideration will be
given to the adaptation of recognized historic properties.
Environmental Quality

ORS §390.310-.368 (1973) establishes Willamette River Greenway to protect, preserve and restore natural qualities and historic sites, structures, facilities and objects on lands along Willamette River; specifies procedures for acquisition of land and scenic easements.

ORS §390.410-.450 (1973) establishes Columbia River Gorge Commission with power to preserve and protect scenic and historic areas of Columbia River Gorge.

ORS §390-805-.990 (1973) establishes scenic waterway system to preserve certain free-flowing rivers and adjacent lands possessing outstanding historical and archeological values.

ORS §273-562-.597 (1974) authorizes establishment of natural area preserves system, including land and water (although altered in character) important for study of historic and paleontological features or appreciation of natural features.

Historic Trails

ORS §376.220 (1971) authorizes citizens of road district or county to establish trails under control of court of county where located.

ORS §376.605 (1971) authorizes Department of Transportation to construct public pedestrian trails and bridle paths connecting legally established streets, roads and public parks with Pacific Ocean shore.

ORS §390-950-.989 (1973) authorizes Department of Transportation to establish Oregon Recreation Trails System. Before establishing trail, department to consider at a public meeting areas adjacent to such trails to be utilized for scenic and historical purposes. Rights-of-way to be of sufficient width and so located as to protect natural conditions, scenic and historic features and any primitive character of trail area.

Parks and Historic Sites

Oregon Constitution, Art IX, § 3 authorizes use of proceeds from tax on motor vehicles or motor vehicle fuel for acquiring, maintaining and publicizing parks and historic places.

ORS §226.110-.400 (1971) authorizes cities to establish public parks and memorials.

ORS §226.010-.590 (1973) authorizes communities to establish parks and recreation districts.

ORS §390.010-.290 (1973) establishes State Parks and Recreation Divisions with power to acquire and develop scenic or historic places. Establishes state policy to preserve and restore for public enjoyment and education structures, objects, facilities and resources as examples of state history, archeology and natural science.
ORS §377-505-.545 (1974) establishes Scenic Area Board with power to designate scenic areas, devoted as areas adjacent to or along segment of public highway within federal or state park, sites of historical significance or sites affording view of unusual natural beauty.

ORS §276.001-.108 (1974) establishes Capitol Planning Commission with power to preserve and maintain capitol area in Salem. Executive residence also to be maintained.

Enabling legislation authorizes State Parks Branch, Department Transportation, to accept conservation or scenic easements on historic property in perpetuity. None have been accepted.

**Taxation**

ORS §208.740-.790 (1974) authorizes assessment of land as "open space" to reduce economic pressure and prevent forced conversion of open space land to more intensive uses. "Open space land" defined as any land area preservation of which in its present use would preserve historic sites.

Oregon H.B. 2342, 1975 Regular Session declares state policy to encourage rehabilitation of existing rental units in substandard condition. Enables cities and counties to establish exemption from ad valorem taxation for five years at 100% of assessed value of qualified rehabilitation improvements to non-owner-occupied rental housing at least 25 years old. Establishes formula to determine when provisions apply and procedure for granting exemptions, including filing agreement with city or county to negotiate rental rates to be charged. Requires that improvements be made before January 1, 1978, to qualify for exemption.

Oregon H.B. 2333, 1975 Regular Session provides that land located in commercial, industrial, or high-density residential zone which is used, and has been used for preceding five years, exclusively for single-family residence, be assessed at its true cash value for single-family residence and not at value if applied to other use.

Oregon H.B. 2344, 1975 Regular Session establishes exemption from assessed valuation of owner-occupied, single-family residential property for amount of increased valuation directly attributable to deferred maintenance performed and completed during period of July 1, 1975, to December 31, 1982. Deferred maintenance defined as repair or replacement to existing dwelling which does not increase square feet of living space.

Oregon S.B. 265, 1979 (H.B. 2476, 1975) Regular Session declares state policy to maintain and preserve properties of state historical significance. Owner of property listed in National Register of Historic Places to apply to county assessor for property tax classification, with review of application by State Historic Preservation Officer. Requires county assessor to assess property classified as historic at its true cash value at time of application for next 15 consecutive assessment years.

**Tort Liability**

ORS §105.655-.680 (1974) establishes standard of care owed by landowners to those they allow to use property free of charge to view historic and archaeological sites.
APPENDIX C
SOURCES OF PRESERVATION FUNDING

There are several publications that preservationists can consult for information on preservation funding. The National Trust for Historic Preservation's "A Guide to Federal Programs" (1974) and the 1976 "Supplement" (current through December 1975) provide a comprehensive survey of federal programs that can be used to benefit preservation (such as Federal Surplus Property, VA, Farmers Home, SBA, National Endowment, HABS, and HAER). Both are available through the National Trust Bookstore, 740-748 Jackson Place N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006. A good source of information on local programs is "Neighborhood Preservation: A Catalog of Local Programs," which can be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The following sample listing summarizes information that is not available in the above publications and includes recent revisions in federal and other programs that create new sources of preservation funding, that extend existing funding resources, or that act to encourage preservation in other ways.

**NATIONAL PARK SERVICE GRANTS.** Matching grants are issued to States, the District of Columbia, Territories, and the National Trust. Funds may be used for surveys of the state for historic properties, preparation of historic preservation plans, preparation of nominations to the National Register, and acquisition and preservation of properties listed in the Register. At the discretion of the Secretary of Interior, grants for up to 70% of costs for survey and planning may be made. However, currently the Secretary is granting 50% funding for survey and planning and acquisition and development projects. Funds may be transferred by State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPO's) to private organizations, individuals, or governmental subdivisions.

**THE ARCHEOLOGICAL AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT OF 1974** authorizes programs of the Interagency Archeological Services Division in the National Park Service, and makes federal construction programs and all programs licensed or otherwise assisted by federal agencies responsible for the damage they may cause to the nation's scientific, prehistoric, historic, and archeological resources. The act provides agencies with specific authority to conduct necessary data recovery
investigations in conjunction with authorized, funded projects. Federal agencies may seek appropriations, obligate existing funds, or use 1 percent of project funds to pay expenses.

**CONSULTANT SERVICE GRANTS**, provided by the National Trust on a matching basis, go to nonprofit or public member organizations to pay for consultants on preservation problems. Grants average $1,000 to $2,000 and support such projects as historic district and property feasibility studies.

**NATIONAL PRESERVATION REVOLVING FUND**, sponsored by the National Trust, provides low interest loans to nonprofit or public member organizations to establish revolving funds for improving properties listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register. The National Trust does not assist single site projects. The original $300,000 fund has been enlarged by a $500,000 grant from the Mellon Foundation. Loans are expected to average between $25,000 and $50,000.

**EDA GRANTS AND LOANS FOR PUBLIC WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT FACILITIES** are authorized by the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. Grants and loans are made to state and local governments, including Indian tribes, and public and private, nonprofit organizations for projects in designated redevelopment areas that will improve opportunities for establishment or expansion of business or industry, create long-term employment or meet pressing needs of the area and provide immediate employment opportunities for long-term unemployed persons. The Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendment of 1976 (PL 94-487) and regulations implementing the amendments allow the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development to waive or reduce the non-federal share of a grant (usually 50%) made to a community development corporation that has exhausted its effective borrowing capacity. Community development corporations are defined as (1) any public organization without power of taxation, created under state or local law to further the development of the area, or (2) any private nonprofit organization whose purpose is to further the development of an area. The non-federal shares of grants to state or local governments may be reduced if the government has exhausted its taxing and borrowing authority.
EDA REDEVELOPMENT AREA LOAN PROGRAM is a new program authorized by Section 204 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended. The funds will be distributed to cities for reinvestment to promote economic development. Because of the small amount of money available for FY 78 and the large amount of money required to have an impact on the economic health of an urban area, the funding will probably go to only a small number of cities in FY 78.

EDA BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT LOANS. This program makes available to individuals, state or local governments and local development groups long-term, low interest loans to help establish new businesses or expand old ones where such activity will expand employment opportunities in the area. As a result of a series of amendments to the authorizing legislation for the program, the scope of the Business Development Loan program has increased considerably. Originally, EDA could make direct loans only for fixed asset development, and in connection with those loans, EDA could guarantee loans for working capital for the same business. Now, EDA can make direct loans or loan guarantees for either working capital or fixed asset development. Loans for working capital may be made independently.

TITLE I HOME IMPROVEMENT LOAN program provides FHA insurance for loans made by private financial institutions to finance property improvements that protect or increase the livability or utility of residential or other properties. Currently, an owner of a single-family home can borrow up to $10,000 for 12 years. Maximum loans on multi-family structures are $5,000 per dwelling unit, not to exceed $25,000.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION LOAN PROGRAM is a new program which expands the existing Title I Home Improvement Loan program by providing FHA insurance for loans to finance the preservation, restoration, or rehabilitation of residential properties listed or determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, including all residential properties within a National Register district. An incidental commercial use, not to exceed 20% of the structure, is allowable. Available from private lending institutions at market rates, (not to exceed 12%), these loans will be for up to $15,000 per dwelling unit (not to exceed $45,000 per structure) for 15 years. (Community development block grants may be used to subsidize the market interest on both historic preservation and Title I loans.) SHPO's must review proposed improvements.
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS (CDBG) supply federal funds directly to communities for projects that will improve urban living conditions through housing and environmental changes. CDBG funded projects must benefit low or moderate income persons, or aid in the prevention or elimination of slums and blight, or meet urgent community development needs. The community can use block grants to fund such preservation related activities as surveys of cultural resources; development of a historic preservation plan; studies for the adoption of regulatory or protective ordinances; establishment of financial programs, including low-interest loans and grants for rehabilitation of historically and architecturally significant structures; establishment of a revolving fund for the acquisition, rehabilitation, and disposition of historic properties; or easement programs. While considered local money for the purposes of the federal matching grant programs (such as the National Park Service grants-in-aid program), block grant funding carries with it the responsibility to comply with federal laws and regulations protecting historic properties.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACTION GRANTS. HUD is now developing regulations for this new program that is expected to be established by the Housing and Community Development Act of 1977, now pending in Congress. Grants will go to severely distressed cities and urban counties to alleviate physical and economic deterioration. Funds are intended to stimulate increased private and public investment, so firm commitments of private and other public funds will be expected from applicants. Commercial, residential and industrial projects will be funded. Projects involving preservation will be eligible; however, projects must be broadly conceived and intended to provide economic stimulus or physical improvements in eligible areas.

HUD SECTION 8 encourages the provision of lower-income housing through rent payment contracts with property owners in which HUD agrees to pay the difference between what a low-income family can pay and the fair market rent on new, substantially rehabilitated or existing rental units owners must find their own sources of funding for construction or rehabilitation and buildings must meet appropriate standards. In the case of existing units, it may be public housing agencies that will contract with property owners. The Housing Authorization Act of 1976 directs HUD to allocate Section 8 funds in accordance with block grant communities' Housing Assistance Plans.
(HAP's). Therefore, the priority assigned to rehabilitation of units is established by the individual community.

**701 (COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANTS)** are made to governmental entities or planning organizations and can be used for the following preservation-related activities, as long as they are part of a comprehensive plan: development of criteria for evaluation of historic properties; surveys; identification of historic properties subject to destruction and/or deterioration; consideration of the relationship of historic properties to other elements of comprehensive planning in the jurisdiction; determination of preliminary cost estimates for the rehabilitation or restoration of significant buildings or districts; preparation of district legislation, model preservation contracts, and general administrative and budgetary measures; and preparation of a historic preservation program outlining action needed. Because of the limited amount of 701 funding available, HUD is expecting cities receiving community development block grants to use block grants to fund comprehensive community development plans, if the cities so desire. Therefore, except for planning activities ineligible for block grants, comprehensive community development plans similar in scope to 701 plans are expected to be funded by block grants.

**HUD SECTION 312 LOANS** are for repairs and improvements needed to bring privately owned property up to minimum property standards. Loans are made only in urban renewal areas, code enforcement areas, areas where CDBG funds are being utilized for rehabilitation, and in urban homesteading areas. Loans can be made for residential, commercial or mixed use properties.

**PROPERTY RELEASE OPTION PROGRAM (PROP).** Through PROP, HUD sells to local governments (for $1) HUD-owned properties with market values less than $5,000 that have been in the HUD inventory for over 6 months and have been offered for sale on the private market. The HUD area or insuring office makes properties eligible for transfer by determining that the cost of maintaining the property will exceed the amount for which the property could be sold. Localities can rehabilitate, demolish, and/or sell them at their discretion. Preservationists can periodically call HUD area offices for a list of available properties, and encourage local governments to acquire appropriate properties to restore or demolish for open space.
**URBAN RENEWAL.** Although the Urban Renewal program has been terminated, some areas still have unexpended Urban Renewal funds for uncompleted Urban Renewal projects. Where such Urban Renewal programs are still in effect, it is still possible for local agencies to write down the cost of historic properties to as little as $1 where circumstances dictate, write down cleared land around historic properties, and provide $90,000 for restoration and/or $50,000 for moving properties listed in or determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be eligible for inclusion in the National Register.

**HUD SECTION 202 LOANS FOR HOUSING THE ELDERLY OR HANDICAPPED.** Long term, low interest direct loans are made to private, nonprofit sponsors to provide rental or cooperative housing for elderly or handicapped persons through new construction or substantial rehabilitation of properties. A $750 million loan authority is expected to be appropriated for fiscal year 1978. A revision of the regulations concerning Section 202 loans published recently ("Federal Register," January 28, 1977) expands the definition of "Elderly or Handicapped families" and makes other technical changes. Also, regulations concerning proposed application procedures for 202 loans were published for comment in the "Federal Register" on January 31, 1977. The proposed changes are intended to make the program more efficient--among the most significant revisions would be that applications would be submitted to HUD Field Offices rather than to the Washington office and preliminary project proposals will be required to be submitted with applications. These changes are expected to be finalized for administration of the program in fiscal year 1978.

**SECTION 202 SEED MONEY LOAN PROGRAM.** Provides no-interest loans to incorporated private, nonprofit organizations that will cover as much as 80% or up to $50,000 of the planning costs of Section 202 projects--e.g., preliminary site engineering, organization expenses and fees for design, loan commitment, legal assistance, and consultations. About $6 million is in the loan fund.

**HUD URBAN HOMESTEADING PROGRAM** provides for the low cost, conditional conveyance of unoccupied residential properties to individuals or families in communities participating with HUD in the program. To attain full ownership, the recipient must occupy the property for a minimum of 3 years, make necessary repairs,
and permit periodic inspections. Thirty-nine cities are participating in the program. Properties are valued at $13.9 million; HUD has committed $16.1 million in rehabilitation loans.

**HUD SECTION 235** provides mortgage interest subsidies to low and moderate income families to purchase new or substantially rehabilitated single family homes or condominiums. The Housing Authorization Act of 1976 revised this program so that benefits could be provided to a wider range of lower-income families. The eligible income ceiling was raised from 89 percent of median family income in an area to 95 percent of the median income, with adjustments for smaller and larger families determined by HUD. The Housing and Community Development Act of 1977, now pending in Congress, raises the mortgage limits to $31,000 ($36,000 in high cost areas) and $36,000 for a family of 5 or more ($42,000 in high cost areas).

**COLLEGE HOUSING PROGRAM.** HUD is reactivating a program that provides direct, 3% interest loans to public or nonprofit educational institutions to assist in providing housing and related dining facilities for students and faculty members. Funds may be used for purchase, rehabilitation and reuse of facilities. Maximum term is 40 years. New regulations for the fiscal year 1978 program have not been made available. Approximately $109 million is expected to be available for loans in fiscal year 1978. HUD's area offices are keeping a list of people interested in receiving information on this program when it becomes available.

**INDUCEMENTS FOR PRESERVATION**

**TAX REFORM ACT OF 1976.** Section 2124 of the act, "Tax Incentives to Encourage the Preservation of Historic Structures," provides several new incentives for historic preservation. This section allows for the amortization of rehabilitation expenditures over a 5 year period for income producing properties listed in the National Register, included in a National Register historic district that is certified by the Secretary of the Interior as being significant to the district, or located in historic districts designated under a statute
of the appropriate state or local government, if such statute is certified by the Secretary of the Interior as containing criteria which will substantially achieve the purpose of preserving and rehabilitating buildings of historic significance to the district. The law also disallows deductions for demolition of certified historic structures and accelerated depreciation for properties erected on a site previously occupied by a historic structure on or after June 30, 1976. Finally, the act provides that a deduction is allowed for the contribution to a charitable organization or a governmental entity exclusively for conservation purposes of (1) a lease on, option purchase, or easement with respect to real property, in perpetuity; or (2) a remainder interest in real property. Conservation purposes include the preservation of historically important land areas or structures.

**FEDERAL PERSONAL PROPERTY DISPOSAL.** As of October 17, 1977, nonprofit, tax exempt public or private educational organizations, museums, libraries and public agencies established for a public purpose such as conservation, economic development, or parks and recreation, will be eligible to obtain federal surplus personal property through the General Services Administration. A wide assortment of property, from pots and pans to office equipment, that is no longer required by federal agencies in the discharge of their responsibilities, is available. This property may be useful in administering a preservation office. Distribution will be handled by the individual state agency for surplus property (or Office of Federal Property Assistance). Eligible organizations can write the state agency directly, inspect warehouses and lists of available personal property in their area, or make other specific requests with which the agency will attempt to comply. Methods of establishing charges for services performed by state agencies are currently being reviewed; they are expected to fall within a range of 1-10% of original acquisition costs to cover care and handling. A listing of the proper state agency to write can be obtained by requesting a "Surplus Property Donation Brochure" from the Office of Personal Property Disposal, GSA-FSS-FWUD, Washington, D.C. 20406.

**PUBLIC BUILDINGS COOPERATIVE USE ACT OF 1976** directs the Administrator of the General Services Administration (GSA) to acquire space for federal offices in buildings of historic, architectural, or cultural significance, unless the use of such space would not prove feasible and prudent compared with available alternatives. The legislation also encourages GSA to make space in federal buildings available to
persons or firms through leasing of commercial space or provision of services or facilities for recreational or cultural purposes. The act directs the Administrator, prior to undertaking a planning survey, to determine the public building needs of the federal government within a geographical area, to request the Chairman of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to identify existing buildings in the community that are of architectural, cultural, or historic interest and that are suitable for purchase to convert into federal office space. The act states that buildings of "historic, architectural, or cultural significance" including, but are not limited to, "buildings listed or eligible to be listed on the National Register . . . “

PRESERVATION TOOLS

TAX INCREMENT FINANCING. Through this technique, property taxes collected above a designated amount in a particular district are set aside for use only within the designated area. Money can immediately pay for any special needs of the area or can be invested for future use.

REVOLVING FUNDS can be used to multiply funds. They can be established with block grants, NPS grants, National Trust funds, Urban Reinvestment Task Force funds, or other sources. Some systems acquire, preserve, and sell historic properties; other systems are for preservation loans to owners. Proceeds return to the fund for other projects so that funds have a continued impact. Private organizations as well as local and state governments can utilize this technique.
FINDINGS

1. The preservation of historical buildings, sites and objects can provide urban area residents and visitors with a valuable and enjoyable connection to the past and provide a sense of place, permanence, continuity and perspective.

2. The Roseburg urban area has an important heritage of historic sites, structures and objects worthy of preservation; however, there has been no comprehensive inventory and analysis of these resources. Both state and federal agencies exist for the purpose of assisting local government and private individuals in the identification, classification and preservation of significant historical resources.

4. The development of a "Historic Preservation Ordinance" would provide a mechanism for identifying, preserving and protecting significant historic resources found in the Roseburg urban area.

5. A joint City-County Historic Resource Review Committee created for the purpose of identifying significant historical sites and structures for inclusion in a local register would avoid unnecessary duplication of effort and would facilitate coordination and uniformity between the two units of government.

6. The limited amount of archeological research conducted in the Roseburg urban area has revealed the potential of significant sites associated with the South Umpqua River. Laws requiring analysis and possible protection of significant archaeological sites apply only to projects involving public funds or public lands which may impact such sites.
GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICY STATEMENTS

Goal

To identify, preserve and protect historic and cultural resources of the Roseburg urban area.

Objectives

1. Develop and expand public awareness of the Roseburg urban area's origin, development and history.

2. Encourage preservation and restoration of sites, structures, objects and areas of cultural, historic or archaeological significance for the enjoyment and knowledge of present and future generations.

3. Establish a local register of significant historical resources.

4. Document the social, economic, cultural, educational and other public benefits to be derived from local historical preservation efforts.

5. Consider the various impacts of land use decisions on identified historical resources during the planning process.

6. Strive for continued and improved cooperation and coordination between units of government as well as other public and private organizations concerned with the identification and preservation of historical resources.

Policies

1. The City of Roseburg will formulate, adopt and implement a Historic Preservation Ordinance which as a minimum will:
a. establish a Historic Resources Review Committee for matters concerning historic resources within the Roseburg city limits;
b. establish a local register of significant historical, cultural and archaeological resources;
c. set standards for use, alteration or demolition of registered historical resources;
d. set standards for the excavation of identified archaeological sites.

2. The City shall explore and consider the use of various incentives to encourage individuals to identify, restore, maintain, and utilize historic resources.

3. The City will encourage and cooperate with individuals and organizations seeking to obtain grants or loans for the purpose of restoring or preserving historic resources.

4. The City will evaluate all city-owned property for potential cultural or historic significance and shall establish policy regarding the use, alteration, removal, demolition or other action which may impact city-owned historical and cultural resources.

5. All city-funded projects shall be evaluated for potential adverse impact on sites, structures or objects of known or unknown cultural, historical or archaeological value.

6. For the protection and preservation of historic resources, the City should consider the application of performance standards, regarding the use, alteration, removal, demolition or other action which may impact city-owned historical and cultural resources.

5. All city-funded projects shall be evaluated for potential adverse impact on sites, structures or objects of known or unknown cultural, historical or archaeological value.
6. For the protection and preservation of historic resources, the City should consider the application of performance standards, density bonus and density transfer techniques, as well as site plan reviews, to minimize the adverse impacts of proposed development on identified cultural and historic resources.

7. The City shall encourage the relocation of significant historical and cultural resources as an alternative to demolition.