

United States Department of the Interior National Park Service

For NPS use only

National Register of Historic Places Inventory—Nomination Form

received APR 3 1989 date entered

See instructions in How to Complete National Register Forms Type all entries—complete applicable sections

1. Name

historic New Mexico Campus Buildings built 1906-1938

and or common

2. Location

street & number Various not for publication

city, town vicinity of

state code county code

3. Classification

Table with 5 columns: Category, Ownership, Status, Present Use, and other. Includes checkboxes for public/private ownership, occupied/unoccupied status, and various present uses like educational, museum, etc.

4. Owner of Property

name State of New Mexico

street & number

city, town Santa Fe state New Mexico

5. Location of Legal Description

courthouse, registry of deeds, etc. Various

street & number

city, town state

6. Representation in Existing Surveys

The nomination is based on several separate surveys; title has this property been determined eligible? yes no

date see continuation sheet federal state county local

depository for survey records

city, town state

7. Description

Condition		Check one	Check one
<input type="checkbox"/> excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> deteriorated	<input type="checkbox"/> unaltered	<input type="checkbox"/> original site
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	<input type="checkbox"/> ruins	<input type="checkbox"/> altered	<input type="checkbox"/> moved date _____
<input type="checkbox"/> fair	<input type="checkbox"/> unexposed		

Describe the present and original (if known) physical appearance

Summary

The thematic nomination covers the campuses of eight state-supported institutions of learning which are distributed throughout New Mexico. A total of 28 buildings, built between the years 1906 and 1938, in nine architectural styles, have been individually nominated.

Description

The nomination covers the campuses of state-supported institutions in New Mexico dedicated primarily to learning, and includes all of the buildings on these campuses which were documented to be of qualifying age, integrity, and significance at the time that the nomination was prepared. The eight institutions are: the University of New Mexico (UNM, Albuquerque); New Mexico State University (NMSU, Las Cruces); New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology (NMIMT, Socorro); Western New Mexico University (WNMU, Silver City); New Mexico Highlands University (NMHU, Las Vegas); Eastern New Mexico University (ENMU, Portales); New Mexico School for the Deaf (NMSD, Santa Fe); and New Mexico School for the Visually Handicapped (NMSVH, Alamogordo).

These institutions include the main campuses of all the state-supported universities in New Mexico. The New Mexico Military Institute (NMMI, Roswell), which covers the first two years of college in addition to four years of high school, is already listed on the National Register as part of the nomination of Historic Resources of Roswell, New Mexico and is therefore not included as part of this nomination. In addition, the nomination includes two state-supported schools, which cover kindergarten through the twelfth grade, the New Mexico School for the Visually Handicapped and the New Mexico School for the Deaf. Both are boarding schools with fully developed campuses of the required age and integrity. The nomination did not consider state-supported schools which are primarily correctional in purpose.

A total of 28 significant buildings built between the years 1906 and 1938 on the eight campuses are being individually nominated. Nine architectural styles are represented: California Mission Revival, Spanish Pueblo Revival, Mediterranean, Spanish Colonial Baroque, Decorative Brick, Mayan Revival, Renaissance Revival, Collegiate Gothic Revival, and the Prairie style. Architectural styles were determined using the New Mexico Historic Building Inventory Manual, Marcus Whiffen's American Architecture Since 1780: A Guide to the Styles, Paul Venable Turner's Campus: An American Planning Tradition, and other sources on vernacular styles as listed in the bibliography.

The majority of the nominated buildings were designed in Revival styles derived from the Spanish Colonial experience: nine are in the California Mission Revival style, nine in the Spanish Pueblo Revival style, two in the Spanish Colonial Baroque, one each in the Mediterranean, and Mayan Revival

(See Continuation Sheets)

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 6 Page 1

The nomination is based on several separate surveys:

Van H. Gilbert Architect, 1983

- Eastern New Mexico University
- New Mexico School for the Deaf
- New Mexico School for the Visually Handicapped
- New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology
- New Mexico State University
- Western New Mexico University

Albuquerque Landmarks Survey, 1982

- University of New Mexico

Chris Wilson, 1982

- New Mexico Highlands University

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetSection number 7 Page 1

styles. In addition, the Decorative Brick style is represented by three buildings; the Renaissance Revival, Collegiate Gothic Revival, and the Prairie style by one building each.

All of the campuses are actively in use, as are the majority of the structures nominated. These institutions are architecturally diverse and each has followed its own pattern of development. All are related by a conscious goal to create a distinctive place for furthering their educational purposes.

The main campus of the University of New Mexico is built on 110 acres close to the geographic center of Albuquerque's greater metropolitan area which has a population of 500,000. The present campus is laid out following the grid of Albuquerque's street system. In recent years many of the through streets have been closed off on campus in an attempt to create a more pedestrian oriented layout. The six buildings nominated at UNM are located at the western end of the main campus. They are mixed in with a variety of newer buildings with which they are connected by concrete walks and by landscaping that on this end of the campus is predominantly grass with some shrubbery and tall pine trees. The nominated structures include classroom buildings, an administration building, a gymnasium, and a residence. Five of the nominated buildings are Spanish Pueblo Revival in style and one is Mayan Revival/Pueblo Revival mixed style. Many of the surrounding campus buildings are either in the Spanish Pueblo Revival style or a contemporary adaptation of that style. Altogether, the University of New Mexico has a unified appearance.

New Mexico State University was originally built around a classic horseshoe and then expanded into the city of Las Cruces' grid street system. The campus consists of 230 acres located at the southern end of Las Cruces, the third largest city in New Mexico with a population of 50,000. Four buildings on the NMSU campus are included in this nomination, of which three stand around the Horseshoe surrounding the campus green, and the fourth is north of the Horseshoe along the main University Avenue. These structures include classroom buildings, a residence, and an unoccupied building. Two are built in the California Mission Revival Style, one in the Spanish Colonial Baroque style, and one in the Prairie Style. The associated buildings around the Horseshoe are built in predominantly in Revival styles of Spanish origin. Many of the buildings are connected by sidewalks with landscaping which is predominantly grass with many broad leaf deciduous trees and some shrubbery.

The New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology is a smaller campus built on 45 acres in Socorro, New Mexico which has a population of 8,000. The campus is laid out in a square with streets along four sides but none running through the campus. The majority of buildings are in the California Mission Revival

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetSection number 7 Page 2

style, including the two nominated, a dormitory and an administration building. There are several walkways that crisscross the grounds connecting the buildings. The campus is landscaped with grass, shrubs, and large groves of evergreen and deciduous trees.

Western New Mexico University is located in the foothills looking east over Silver City, New Mexico, a town of 9,000 people. The six buildings included in this nomination are located on 35 of the more than 80 acres that make up the campus. The apparently arbitrary layout does not follow a grid or any deliberate pattern. Five of the six nominated buildings are built in the California Mission Revival style or a period adaptation of thereof, the other designed in the Renaissance Revival Style. These buildings represent classrooms, a museum, a gymnasium, and a heating plant. Many of the streets that originally ran through the campus have been closed to create a pedestrian orientation. Most of the landscaping is natural and consists of short to mid-length grasses, with evergreen and deciduous trees scattered about.

The main campus of Eastern New Mexico University is laid out in an orderly fashion on about 60 acres in Portales, New Mexico, a town of 10,000 people located on the eastern side of the state. The buildings are consistently designed in the Collegiate Gothic Revival Style and are placed in a rectangle around a large open area in the center of the main campus. One building (administration) has been included in the nomination. The landscaping consists of grass, shrubbery, and hundreds of chinese elm trees planted in the thirties.

New Mexico Highlands University is located in Las Vegas a northern New Mexico city of 15,000 people. The campus is laid out on the city's grid street system and does not appear to follow any other pattern. The buildings do not follow any one architectural style. The one building (administration) included in this nomination is designed in a modified Spanish Colonial style. Landscaping consists of grass, trees and shrubs. Some areas of the campus have manicured lawns and shrubbery with evergreen and deciduous trees, while other areas have a more natural landscaping of short to mid-length grasses that grow in clumps under and between stands of evergreen and deciduous trees.

The New Mexico School for the Deaf is located in Santa Fe, New Mexico, the state capital which has a population of 60,000. The School for the Deaf is laid out in an orderly rectangular grid pattern. The four buildings on this campus that are included in this nomination represent classrooms, administration, a hospital, a dormitory, and a residence, and are all in the Spanish Pueblo Revival style. The landscaping is predominantly grass with many randomly located large deciduous and evergreen trees.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 7 Page 3

The New Mexico School for the Visually Handicapped is located in Alamogordo, a city in south central New Mexico with population of 30,000. The campus is laid out in a rectangular grid that is on a north/south axis. The four buildings included in this nomination are an administration building, an auditorium and recreation building, an infirmary, and a warehouse. All are red brick, and three are Decorative Brick and one Mediterranean in style. Other buildings on this campus are designed in compatible red-brick styles giving the campus a cohesive look. Concrete walkways connect the buildings and the landscaping is grass with many large and mid-size trees about the grounds, and some shrubbery around the buildings.

8. Significance

APR 3 1989

Period	Areas of Significance—Check and justify below					
<input type="checkbox"/> prehistoric	<input type="checkbox"/> archeology-prehistoric	<input type="checkbox"/> community planning	<input type="checkbox"/> landscape architecture	<input type="checkbox"/> religion		
<input type="checkbox"/> 1400-1499	<input type="checkbox"/> archeology-historic	<input type="checkbox"/> conservation	<input type="checkbox"/> law	<input type="checkbox"/> science		
<input type="checkbox"/> 1500-1599	<input type="checkbox"/> agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/> economics	<input type="checkbox"/> literature	<input type="checkbox"/> sculpture		
<input type="checkbox"/> 1600-1699	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> architecture	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> education	<input type="checkbox"/> military	<input type="checkbox"/> social/ humanitarian		
<input type="checkbox"/> 1700-1799	<input type="checkbox"/> art	<input type="checkbox"/> engineering	<input type="checkbox"/> music	<input type="checkbox"/> theater		
<input type="checkbox"/> 1800-1899	<input type="checkbox"/> commerce	<input type="checkbox"/> exploration/settlement	<input type="checkbox"/> philosophy	<input type="checkbox"/> transportation		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1900-	<input type="checkbox"/> communications	<input type="checkbox"/> industry	<input type="checkbox"/> politics/government	<input type="checkbox"/> other (specify)		
		<input type="checkbox"/> invention				

Specific dates 1906-1938 Builder/Architect various

Statement of Significance (in one paragraph)

Criteria A & C

Summary

The eight institutions included in this nomination represent the campuses of New Mexico's six state universities and two special schools. Each has played a significant role in the history of education in New Mexico, and of the various cities and towns in which they are located. Although these institutions are united by their educational function and by state support, each is distinguished by its own individual historical and architectural development. Twenty-eight buildings from these campuses have been individually nominated, all for architectural significance and one for historical significance as well. The nominated buildings have undergone little change and well represent the architectural and historical development of their campuses. In addition, some have played a major role in the development of regional architectural styles. The small number of buildings found to meet the criteria of integrity and significance in comparison with the number built or even the number still standing reflects the paucity of buildings which have not been lost or significantly altered, and renders those that remain all the more valuable to the historic record.

Period of Significance: 1906-1938

Because each of these schools has its own individual history, it was not possible to select one beginning date for the period of significance which would be equally relevant to all. Therefore, the beginning of the period of significance was arbitrarily set at the date of the earliest building found to be eligible for nomination. An earlier date could have encompassed more of the buildings which are no longer extant or are ineligible due to alterations, such as the date of the earliest campus building at any of these schools or the date that the first institution came under state control. However, this would be equally arbitrary for the other institutions since each must be considered within the range of dates relevant to its own development. The termination date was set at the end of the fifty-year limit when the nomination was prepared, with the intention that buildings built after this date could be considered for nomination as they become eligible.

(See Continuation Sheets)

APR 3 1989

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number 8 Page 1

History of State-Supported Education In New Mexico

All of the state-supported institutions were established, or came under state control, within a short time of one another between 1887 to 1893, with the exception of NMSVH and ENMU which were established in 1903 and 1927 respectively. With the creation, or assumption of control of these colleges and schools, the Territorial legislature affirmed its commitment to supporting higher and special education in New Mexico, years before statehood was achieved in 1912.

Formal higher education in New Mexico began in 1889, when the Territorial Legislature passed an act to create the University of New Mexico to be located in Albuquerque, The Agricultural Experiment Station (now NMSU) in Las Cruces, and the New Mexico School of Mines (now NMIMT) in Socorro. In the same year, the Legislature passed the Territory's first certification statute for teachers. Hereafter, all teachers would be required to read or write sufficiently to keep their own record in either the English or the Spanish language. In 1893, two normal schools were created in Silver City and Las Vegas, with the purpose of furnishing the state with competent teachers. Also in this session, New Mexico assumed control of the existing Goss Military Institute in Roswell which was renamed the New Mexico Military Institute. When the State Constitution was adopted in 1912, the six institutions previously established were designated as state institutions. In an effort to gain support for the Constitution in the eastern part of the Territory, a seventh institution was authorized, a normal school to be located in one of the counties of Union, Quay, Curry, Roosevelt, Chaves, or Eddy. This facility was left undesignated until 1927, when Portales was chosen as the location for Eastern New Mexico Normal School (ENMU).

The two special schools were created or came under state control in the Territorial period. In 1887, the Territorial Legislature assumed control of New Mexico School for the Deaf in Santa Fe, an institution established two years earlier. In 1903, the New Mexico Institute for the Blind (now the New Mexico School for the Visually Handicapped) was created in Alamogordo.

All the school campuses began modestly, financed initially by an assessment on all territorial property and appropriation by the Legislature. The framers of the education act of 1889 were eyeing eventual statehood in the establishment of the first three state-supported institutions of higher learning. They created the Agricultural and Mechanics College with the intent of becoming eligible for benefits under the federal Morrill Act of 1862. This land grant act created an endowment financed by the sale of 30,000 acres of federal land for the support of "one college where the leading object shall be . . .

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 2

branches of learning relating to agricultural and mechanic arts . . . " In 1898, Congress granted the Territory the 16th and 32nd sections in each congressional township and 500,000 acres for its public institutions. In 1910, under enabling legislation for the purpose of framing a constitution for statehood, New Mexico was granted sections 2, 16, 32, and 36 in each congressional township as a permanent endowment for its common schools. Under the Enabling Act of 1912, the New Mexico School for the Deaf and the School for the Blind were given land in fee and held jointly for buildings and/or operations. The major source of funds for campus improvements came from a permanent fund made up of the income from these lands and appropriated from the Territorial and/or State Legislature. This money was occasionally supplemented by bonds.

Although appropriations were made by the Legislature, the specific development of the institutions was guided by the Board of Regents of each school who were responsible for decisions as to what to build and how it would be designed. Each school sought to create its own unique expression and individualistic style based on its location and educational purpose. Generally, physical improvements proceeded slowly, given the modest fiscal resources of the sparsely-populated territory and state. Improvements that were made were guided by the visions of a few key administrators or board members. By the 1920s, most of the campuses had defined the styles and geographic boundaries recognizable today. In the 1930s, there was a spurt of physical growth as most of the campuses took advantage of the public works programs started by the federal government to aid the unemployed.

Historical Significance

The buildings considered in this nomination are on the campuses of the major universities in New Mexico, and of two unique special schools. These institutions are themselves significant within the history of education in New Mexico and in the history of the development of their communities. The buildings which form these campuses were judged to be historically significant within the context of the history of their institutions and of education, if they represent either a milestone in the history of a particular school, or were the site of a significant accomplishment in the history of knowledge or of learning. Although few buildings were nominated for historical significance, it is anticipated that as others become eligible by age, they may meet this criterion.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 3

Architectural Significance

All of the buildings included in this nomination were nominated for architectural significance. These campuses represented a major opportunity, in a sparsely-populated and relatively poor state such as New Mexico, for architectural expression providing designers with a nearly unique occasion to plan multiple buildings over a large area using state funds and, in the 1930s, those of the federal government. Although appropriations were made by the Legislature and grants came from the federal government, the decisions concerning the function, placement, and design of buildings resided with the Board of Regents of each institution. Since the Regents are most often local residents, the architecture reflects the concerns and attitudes of particular locations and specific educational needs.

Most of the campuses adopted a consistent style, and majority of these represent two regional revival styles derived from the Spanish colonial experience - the California Mission Revival (NMSU, WNMU and NMIMT) and the Spanish Pueblo Revival (UNM and NMSD). The Mission Revival style was brought from California by the railroad for its design of stations and hotels. It represents the importation of a Spanish style into New Mexico in a generalized attempt to use a style relevant to the Spanish history of the area. The Spanish Pueblo Revival having its roots in the Pueblo Indian and Spanish colonial traditions of northern New Mexico represents the development of a revival style more specifically appropriate to the history of this region. On the other hand, NMSVH has consistently followed the closely related expressions of the Mediterranean and Decorative Brick styles, and the older buildings at ENMU are built in the Gothic Revival style, which was rarely used in New Mexico but popular for Collegiate buildings in other parts of the country. Only NMHU has no consistent style.

All of the schools made use of professional architectural and planning assistance, employing in many instances the leading architects of the region, many of whom later received local and regional recognition for work done on these campuses. John Gaw Meem (1894-1983) was the campus architect for UNM, and also designed buildings for WNMU and NMHU. His work epitomized the Pueblo Revival style of architecture. In addition to his work on the campuses, Meem designed many important buildings in New Mexico and was largely responsible for the definition, development, and propagation of the Pueblo Revival style. Henry C. Trost, AIA (1863-1933) of El Paso, Texas, established the campus plan and designed a number of buildings at NMSU and NMSVH, and designed buildings for WNMU and UNM. George H. Williamson, FAIA (1872-1936) designed buildings at UNM, NMSU, WNMU, and NMIMT in the California Mission Revival and Spanish Colonial Baroque styles, and for NMSVH in the Decorative Brick style. Charles

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 4

F. Whittlesey (1867-1941) was the chief architect of the Santa Fe Railroad in charge of designing hotels and stations on the line. He designed the first building at WNMU with a regional character, which established the California Mission Revival style on the campus.

A number of the oldest buildings on these campuses were lost to fire. Others were torn down and replaced by larger, more modern buildings which could better serve the needs of the growing and changing institutions. Many of those left standing were remodeled and enlarged beyond recognition in relatively recent times. These changes reflect the fact that these are dynamic, living institutions which must respond to changing educational and social patterns in a growing state, and which use public funds to supply the current needs of the state's population. This response has often been at the expense of architectural integrity.

These buildings are architecturally significant in representing the early development of these campuses. In some cases they have additional significance as the work of important regional architects and for their place in the development and use of regional styles.

The PWA and WPA

Two federal programs are relevant: the Public Works Administration (PWA) and the Works Progress Administration (WPA):

The PWA was the major "bricks and mortar" vehicle, set up to provide jobs, to stimulate business, to increase the national purchasing power and to help fulfill the needs of the people for permanent and useful public services.

For six years, with funds appropriated by Congress, the PWA carried on a nationwide program of construction in cooperation with various departments of the federal government and thousands of state, county, city, and other local governments. The federal government made grants to states and municipalities (or other public bodies) not in excess of 30% of cost of labor and materials. New Mexico passed special legislation to allow it to take advantage of PWA funds. Although the PWA had a list of criteria it applied to projects (e.g., social desirability, economic desirability, technical soundness, financial ability of the applicant, collectibility of securities), it did not interfere with the selection of architects/engineers. Designs were left in the hands of the local communities.

APR 3 1989

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetSection number 8 Page 5

The WPA was created in the depths of the depression to test whether public works carried out through the normal channels of private enterprise could be made effective as a medium of reemployment and economic recovery. It resulted from the 1932 Emergency Relief and Construction Act. The WPA was established in 1935. It administered a nation-wide program of "small useful projects" designed to provide employment for needy employable workers, and to coordinate the activities of the "works program". It was primarily involved with employing out-of-work Americans in a variety of public works projects, and was a cooperative federal-state-local program. WPA did not use grants. All WPA workers were federal employees. Formal requests for WPA funding had to come from a public agency with authority to sponsor programs. WPA provided no funds for land. Sponsors had to complete the project and then it belonged to the sponsor. To secure approval, the proposed project had to provide employment for needy unemployed persons available in the local community. The majority of these workers were unskilled. Sponsors in many cases had to use their own money to hire skilled workers. This was especially true in the construction of school buildings. The largest proportion of WPA employment (75%) was provided through construction projects. Planning of the projects was the sponsors' responsibility, but WPA suggested eligible projects. By 1939 WPA had been absorbed into other federal programs, and by 1942 had ceased to exist.

From 1933 to 1939, PWA aided in the construction of about 70% of all educational buildings built in the country (about 24,000 projects). These included 622 college projects. Nationwide, 1171 schools and 53 libraries were erected based upon local requests and aided by local funds. Furthermore, 19,449 schools were renovated. Of the 108 college buildings in New Mexico still standing, at least 30 were built using these programs.

Only five buildings built with Federal grants on four campuses were found to meet the criteria of age, integrity, and significance required for inclusion in this nomination. Three architects were involved in the design of these projects: John Gaw Meem, Orville R. Walker, and Gordon F. Street. John Gaw Meem designed Scholes Hall at UNM and Rogers Administration Building at NMHU, both completed in 1936. Orville R. Walker designed Administration Building at ENMU was completed in 1936. Gordon F. Street designed the School Building Number 2 and the Hospital at NMSD which were completed in 1936 and 1937 respectively.

Many buildings built with Federal assistance were found to have been drastically altered after the period of significance, and others had not yet become fifty years old at the time the nomination was completed.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 23

New Mexico State University

The origins of New Mexico State University are to be found in the passage of the Morrill Act (Land Grant Act) in 1862, which allocated to the states 30,000 acres of land for each member of Congress. Investment of the proceeds were to be used for support of at least one college relating to "agricultural and mechanic arts . . ." Under the provisions of this act colleges were to offer both liberal and practical education for the benefit of the industrial classes. In 1887, the Hatch Act provided for the creation of an "agricultural experiment station" in every college established under the Morrill Act. In 1889, Hiram Hadley established Las Cruces College in anticipation of an agricultural station being developed in Las Cruces. In the same year bills were introduced in the Territorial legislature which established the Agricultural College and Experiment Station to be in or near Las Cruces. This same bill established the University of New Mexico in Albuquerque, the School of Mines in Socorro and the Insane Asylum in Las Vegas.

In April of 1889, 120 acres of land were acquired for the land grant college in Las Cruces. Regents were appointed in September of that year and in November, Hadley was appointed as President of the Faculty. It was decided to rent the buildings used at that time by Las Cruces College. The new school became known as the New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts. The school retained this name until 1960, when it became New Mexico State University.

In 1890, the first building was planned for the campus and in 1891 McFie Hall was completed. This was the first building completed on any campus of higher education in New Mexico (McFie Hall was destroyed by fire in 1910). The next two buildings, Science Hall and a girls' dormitory, were completed in 1895. By 1901, there were six buildings on campus.

The Adams Act, passed in 1906, provided for a more complete endowment and maintenance of the Agricultural Experiment Station. At this time, the Regents decided that "Spanish Renaissance" rather than Mission Style architecture would be followed in a building program that would transform the campus into the most beautiful in the Southwest. In 1907 Henry Trost of Trost and Trost, Architects, received the commission to devise a comprehensive plan for the campus and design some of the new buildings. Existing buildings were to be torn down as replacements were completed. The exception was the Science Building which was to be retained and remodeled to harmonize with the new buildings, (Engelbrecht, p.93).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 24

The Trost plan, as described in a newspaper article of the time and quoted by Engelbrecht, called for "six buildings at each side in the form of a horseshoe and the administration building in the center", and for "all of the buildings (to be) of yellow pressed brick and terra cotta clay tile roofs". The buildings were designed with low-pitched, tiled, hip roofs, towers with domed tops, and many semicircular arches, and were also to have been connected with round-arched arcades derived from the mission complexes in California. The arcades were never built but several Trost-designed buildings were. Although no strict plan was followed, the Trost buildings as well as those of other architects who followed were designed in compatible, Spanish-derived styles, (Engelbrecht, p. 94-5).

In 1907, the YMCA commissioned Professor Sage to draw up plans for a campus project. He was instructed to provide for an adobe mission style structure that included meeting rooms, a gymnasium and perhaps bowling alleys. The YMCA building was started in 1907 and completed in 1908. It served as a Student Union and later housed the Music Department and finally the Air Science Department. In the late 1960's, the University purchased the building from the YMCA. It has been nominated as the Air Science Building.

Most of the buildings which represented the original and subsequent expressions of the Trost plan have been destroyed or significantly altered. The centerpiece of the plan was the administration building, Hadley Hall, completed in 1908 following Trost's plans and demolished in 1958. The 1909 Wilson Hall was destroyed by fire in 1937. The nominated 1907-8 Air Science building (formerly YMCA), though built mostly with non-Territorial funds, was also included in the plan. Although its original brick exterior has been plastered over, the elements which continued to influence campus architecture can be seen in other major design elements such as the tiled, hipped roof with projecting eaves and exposed rafters, and the arched windows and entry. This building, on the north side of the horseshoe, remains the least altered and thus the best representative of the buildings from the Trost era. In contrast, the Trost-designed gymnasium (Military Science building), next to the Air Science building, has been altered to the extent that it is no longer eligible for nomination, as has the 1927 Trost-designed, Young Hall, also on the horseshoe. The nominated Goddard Hall (1913), on the south side of the horseshoe represents a building designed by another architect, O.H. Thorman, which continues the stylistic precedent of the Trost plan in its tiled, hip roof with wide overhang and exposed rafters, arched windows, and central bell tower over the entrance.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 24A

Although neither narrowly conceived nor strictly adhered to, the Trost plan continued to influence the location and the design of campus buildings in subsequent years. Although the school eventually grew beyond it, most of the building in subsequent decades continued around the Trost's semicircle which came to be known as the "Horseshoe", and remained the focal area of the school and still forms an entrance to the campus. Despite the early preference of the trustees for Spanish Renaissance architecture, the elements of the Trost plan which continued to influence the design of campus buildings were those associated with the California Mission Revival style: low-pitch, tiled, hip roofs; projecting eaves with exposed rafters; semicircular arches, and the occasional use of Spanish Colonial Baroque detailing. Although Trost used yellow brick, later buildings were stuccoed. The 1907 Air Science building (original YWCA) was eventually stuccoed presumably to bring it into conformity with the later evolution of the style.

The nominated Foster Hall, designed by the firm of Braunton and McGhee in 1930 on the south side of the horseshoe, represents this continuing influence of the Trost plan. It has been classified in a style closely related to the California Mission Revival, the Spanish Colonial Baroque, because of the ornate relief decoration around the arched entry and over the first floor windows on the main facade. Kent Hall, designed about 1930 by Braunton and McGhee a block off of the horseshoe, and Dove Hall, designed in 1936 by Percy McGhee, continued the use of the California Mission Revival style and illustrate the influence of the Trost plan, although both have been judged ineligible for nomination due to alterations. Other buildings built after 1937 on and beyond the Horseshoe, demonstrate the continuing stylistic influence of the work of Trost and can be evaluated for nomination as they come within the fifty-year limit.

The fourth of the nominated buildings, the University President's house, was built in the Prairie style in 1918. Located on University Avenue, a block away from the Horseshoe, this design represents a break from the domination of the Trost-derived California Mission Revival style and represents an infrequent use of this nationally popular style on a New Mexico campus. Another building, Young Hall, built in 1928, shows the influence of the Prairie style but is ineligible for nomination due to alterations.

This campus has experienced much growth and change since 1938. The four nominated buildings are those built within the period of significance, which have not been significantly altered, and which represent the architectural development of the campus.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 24B

9. Major Bibliographical References:

Gunn, Virgil. A History of Higher Education in New Mexico. Unpublished Master's Thesis. University of Chicago, 1927.

Engelbrecht, Lloyd C. and Engelbrecht, June Marie. Henry C. Trost: Architect of the Southwest. El Paso: El Paso Public Library Association, 1981.

Kropp, Simon F. That All May Learn: New Mexico State University 1888-1964. Las Cruces: New Mexico State University, 1972.

Telephone conversation with Dwayne Dorsey. NMSU Architect's Office, April 26, 1985.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetSection number 8 Page 33**New Mexico Institute of Mining & Technology**

The New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology was created in 1889, by the General Education Act of the Territorial Legislature which initiated higher education in New Mexico. Founded as the New Mexico School of Mines, the school was located in Socorro, a center of importance for mining and smelting operations. The purpose of the School of Mines was stated thus:

the furnishing of facilities for the education of those who wished to receive instruction in chemistry, metallurgy, mineralogy, geology, mining, milling, engineering, mathematics and drawing. . . also instruction in the fundamental laws of the U.S.; in rights and duties of citizenship and other courses of study (not including agriculture) as might be prescribed by the Board of Trustees.

An early catalog stated that the intention of the school was to promote the mineral development of the Southwest. It was also recognized that the cultural phases of education should not be neglected.

Initial income for the School came from a 1/5 mil. assessment of territorial property. In 1890, the first building at the School, "Old Main", was started. Completed in 1893 at a cost of \$43,940, it was built of gray trachyte from Blue Canyon in the Socorro Mountains and trimmed with Arizona sandstone. It housed a Quantitative and Qualitative Laboratory. Although seven students were in attendance in 1893, lack of necessary equipment and funds delayed development of a full curriculum until 1895.

Between 1895-1913, the Territorial Legislature required that all college institutions offer preparatory departments. In this period, the school served as a high school for Socorro, in addition to its other functions. The school grew to 127 students in 1905, but declined to a low of 19 students in 1918 during World War I. After the War, enrollment rose again and the school maintained between 70 and 95 students in the 1920s. There were few changes in the original plan until after World War I, when several new additions were made to the campus. In 1919, a new steam plant was constructed, and in 1921 tennis courts and a swimming pool were built. The next year the campus was extended to the west by ten acres. A new gymnasium was completed in 1924.

In 1927, the creation of the New Mexico State Bureau of Mines and Mineral Resources (Bureau of Mines) as a department of the school gave NMIMT increased importance. In 1928 Science Hall (Cramer Hall) was constructed. Old Main burned down the same year and in 1929 a new administrative and classroom building was built in its place and named Brown Hall after early regent C.T.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetSection number 8 Page 34

Brown. Cramer and Brown Halls established a precedent of building in the California Mission Revival style with occasional use of the Spanish Colonial Baroque, which was continued on this campus through the next decade. Of these two buildings Brown Hall remains without significant alteration and has been included in this nomination.

The school grew during the 1930s, with enrollment reaching 176 in 1937, and several new buildings were added to the campus, taking advantage of depression-era the federal assistance programs, PWA and WPA. Constructed during this time were President's Hall, Fitch Hall, a major addition to Driscoll Hall, Wells Hall, Weir Hall, a new gymnasium (replacing the existing gymnasium), and the Assay Laboratory. These buildings continued to use the style established in the late 1920's. Fitch Hall (1937) remains without significant alteration and is included in this nomination. Four of these buildings were constructed in 1939 and therefore did not fall within the period of significance.

All of the buildings from the late 1920s through the 1930s share a common architectural heritage. Brown and Cramer Halls were designed by George Williamson. The remaining buildings of this group were designed by the firm of Brittelle and Ginner. Before the work of George Williamson, there had been no consistent architectural style at the campus. Williamson was successful in instituting a California Mission Style with occasional use of Spanish Colonial Baroque decoration with Cramer and Brown Halls in the late 1920s. Brittelle and Ginner, both of whom had worked for Williamson, were faithful to this style throughout the 1930s. Whether the style was Williamson's innovation or a client preference is not known. It is probably not coincidence that Edgar H. Wells was President of NMIMT (1921-1939) during this entire period. One might also speculate that the similar California Mission Revival style adopted at New Mexico State University and Western New Mexico University had some influence. The regents at NMIMT never formally adopted this style, and went in other directions in later buildings.

During World War II, enrollment declined drastically and dormitories were converted to barracks. However, by 1947, enrollment was at an all-time high of 213, as veterans took advantage of post-war educational opportunities.

In 1951, the school changed its name from the New Mexico School of Mines to New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology. This name change was formalized in 1960.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 34A

Of the nominated buildings, Brown Hall is significant as representative of the first conscious effort to establish a consistent architectural style on the campus, and Fitch Hall is significant as an example of how this style was carried into the 1930s.

9. Major Bibliographical References:

Christiansen, Paige W. Of Earth and Sky: A History of New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology 1889-1964. Socorro: New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, 1964.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 69

New Mexico School for the Visually Handicapped

In 1903 the New Mexico Institute for the Blind was founded by an act of the Territorial legislature and located in Alamogordo, New Mexico. Several thousand acres of land were set aside to generate money for the operating budget of the school. The Institute opened in 1906 with one three-story, brick building, a superintendent who also taught, two teachers, and twenty-one students. The original building, which was torn down in the 1940's, contained classrooms, music rooms, work rooms, dormitories, a bathroom each for boys and girls, and a gymnasium with exercise equipment. The school grew rapidly and soon had to put students on a waiting list. Dr. Pratt, the Institute's second Superintendent, reported in that year:

. . .one hundred and five trees have been planted around the building and the drives leading in from the main entrance. . .the fence in the front of the school has been re-set with new posts. . . We have grown one of the prettiest lawns in the Southwest.

The original three-story building was outgrown and by 1914 a new brick girls' dormitory designed by Henry Trost had been built southeast of the main building. By this time also a brick heating plant and laundry was in place directly east of the main building, also designed by Trost. In 1916 the school secured an appropriation for a Teachers' Cottage and Hospital (later converted to the Administration Building) which was begun in 1918 and completed in 1920. In 1919-20 the boiler house and laundry were enlarged, and a boys' dormitory was built northeast of the main building, balancing the girls' dorm, and similar to it in appearance. All of these buildings were designed by Henry Trost, and were built of red brick with tile roofs.

All of these buildings were designed by Henry Trost, in a style consistent with that of the original main building. Common features of these early structures, in addition to red brick, were hipped, tile roofs with overhangs decorated with dentils and one-story, flat-roofed centrally placed front entrance porches with arched openings. Trost's buildings are also characterized by concrete continuous sills which form a continuous band around the buildings, and in the case of the Administration Building concrete lintels forming a similar continuous band. In 1927 a kindergarten building was added to the campus, the name of which had been changed in 1925 to the New Mexico School of the Blind. Of these buildings only the Teachers' Cottage and Hospital still stands. It was converted to the present-day Administration building in the 1960s and has been nominated as such.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 69A

Although only one of the Trost-designed buildings remains, the influence of the red-brick style that he established on the campus persists. Three major buildings were added to the campus in the 1930's: the Auditorium and Recreation building (1930), designed by the firm of George Williamson, Inc. Architects; the Infirmary (1936), designed by Brittelle & Ginner; and the Swimming Pool (1938), also designed by Brittelle-Ginner Associates and now Central Receiving. William Miles Brittelle, AIA had worked for George Williamson and had been associated with Trost and Trost in 1932-1934. John J. Ginner also had worked for Williamson. All of these buildings are still standing and all have been nominated. They are designed in a style closely related to that of the early Trost buildings and have in common with them, the use of red brick, hipped tile roofs with overhangs, and entrance porches with at least one arched opening.

In the early 1940's the original main building was torn down and replaced by the Education Building, a two-story, red-brick building with a hipped, tile roof. In 1953 the name of the school was changed to New Mexico School for the Visually Handicapped. In the 1960's and 1970's others of the original buildings were torn down and new dormitories built. The old swimming pool building was converted into Central Receiving. In 1978 the Bert Reeves Learning Center was constructed on the site of the original girls' dormitory. The entire campus underwent renovation in 1980, but the exterior appearance of the buildings remains intact. The influence of the red brick style is seen even in the newer buildings giving the campus a greater coherence of style than most of the institutions in this nomination.

9. Major Bibliographical References:

Clark, Larry. "History of the New Mexico School for the Visually Handicapped". Unpublished manuscript.

Minutes of the Board of Trustees. July 9, 1912; December 20, 1912; July 29, 1918; May 22, 1919; November 4, 1919.

New Mexico Institute for the Blind. Annual Reports. 1906; 1909; 1910; 1912; 1914; 1916; 1918; 1914-1922.

"NMSVH - Glimpse at the Past". BEAR PAWSes. Volume IX, No. 4, Summer 1983.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 80

APPENDIX B

ARCHITECTURAL STYLES

The stylistic terminology is generally that which has been standardized in the New Mexico Historic Building Inventory Manual (rev. 1980), with the exception of the Mayan Revival and Renaissance Revival which were not frequently used in New Mexico. The dates following the name of a style are the years of its greatest popularity in New Mexico. On some campuses a style once established continued to be used for many years after its general popularity had waned.

California Mission Revival (1900-1930)

Number of buildings: 9

Dates: 1906; 1907; 1909; 1913; 1917; 1928; 1929; 1936; 1937.

Also known as the California Mission style and the Mission Revival style. Originated in California in the 1890's and brought to New Mexico by the railroad as a generalized evocation of the area's Spanish heritage. Used as style of the campus at NMSU and NMIMT. Characterized by semi-circular arches, curvilinear gables and parapets; light-colored stucco walls, usually free of ornament; low-pitched, tile roofs; projecting eaves with exposed rafters. Balconies, towers, or turrets. Lacks the sculptural ornamentation which distinguishes the Spanish Colonial Baroque.

Spanish Pueblo Revival (1905 - present)

Number of buildings: 9

Dates: 1906; 1908; 1926; 1927; 1928; 1930; 1934; 1936; 1937.

Based on Indian and Spanish prototypes in Northern New Mexico and Arizona. Known in the early years as the Santa Fe style, for the city where it was enthusiastically promoted as a traditional style based on regional prototypes. First use in New Mexico was at the University of New Mexico in 1906 under the leadership of President William George Tight. Characterized by massive appearance of walls; lack of symmetry; lack of arches; flat roofs surrounded by parapets; multi-level roofs; set-back upper stories; doors and windows inset with exposed wooden lintels; projecting vigas (round roof beams) and canales (wooden drain spouts); and portales (long porches) supported by round posts and topped by corbels. Whether constructed of adobe or, more commonly other forms of masonry or wood frame, walls are always plastered in earth tones, and are often shaped to resemble the irregular contours of adobe with rounded corners and parapets, battered walls, and corner or wall buttresses.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 81

Mediterranean (1910-1950)

Number of buildings: 1
Date: 1918-20.

As the name would suggest, a style more generally derived from Spanish traditions. Has in common with the California Mission Revival and Spanish Colonial Baroque styles, the use of arches, red tile, and light-colored stuccoed walls. However, these features are in more dilute form. Roofs are often flat with red tile restricted to porches or parapets. Arches often restricted to one opening or group of windows. Wood or wrought iron balcony railings and window grills often used. May have ornamental decorations of cast stone such as twisted columns.

Spanish Colonial Baroque (1930-1950)

Number of buildings: 2
Dates: 1930; 1933.

Also known as the Spanish Colonial Revival style. Shares several features with the California Mission Revival and the Mediterranean styles, such as low-pitched tile roofs, light colored stucco walls, and the use of arches. However, this style was generally used for large scale public, religious, or commercial buildings and is distinguished from other Spanish styles by the use of often elaborate cast or carved shallow relief decoration, generally around doors and windows, and on parapet walls.

Decorative Brick (1920-1940)

Number of buildings: 3
Dates: 1930; 1935-6; 1938.

Red-brick, typically commercial or institutional buildings, of one or two-stories, and generally flat-roofed. Lack the elements which would identify them with a particular Revival style. Facades usually symmetrical with modest concrete ornamentation which is often geometric.

Mayan Revival

Number of buildings: 1
Date: 1920.

Heavy massing, small openings, walls of concrete or scored stucco to resemble large chunks of stone, geometric friezes.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 82

Prairie Style 1920-1940

Number of buildings: 1
Date: 1918.

Typically a residential style, derived from turn of the century work by Frank Lloyd Wright in the Middle West. Infrequently used in New Mexico and examples there lack Wright's complex massing. Characterized by low hipped roofs with very wide overhangs and windows grouped into horizontal banks with continuous sills and lintels.

Collegiate Gothic Revival (1905-1940)

Number of buildings: 1
Date: 1930

A late form of the Gothic Revival used for ecclesiastic, educational, and commercial structures which was introduced at Bryn Mawr College in the early 1890's and thereafter brought to other schools such as Princeton, Yale, and Duke, (Whiffen, p. 174-4). In New Mexico these buildings possessed the typical Gothic elements of pointed arches, pitched roofs, and buttresses; and were often red brick with stone or concrete trim, especially around entrances. Windows were flat topped and placed in horizontal groups separated by large stone muntins.

Renaissance Revival

Number of Buildings: 1
Date: 1928

Influence of the Renaissance tradition in balanced symmetrical facades topped by elaborate cornices, plain wall surfaces with emphasis on windows in horizontal rows, often close together and linked by stringcourses. Classical decorative detail over windows such as pediment, entablature, or keystone arch. Strong emphasis on front entrance with elaborate classical detailing such as side pilasters supporting an entablature or pediment.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 83

APPENDIX C

ARCHITECTS and ARCHITECTURAL FIRMS

WILLIAM MILES BRITTELLE, SR., AIA. Born 1894. Worked for George Williamson as chief draftsman, for Trost and Trost as architect-designer. In partnership with Trost and Trost from 1932-34. From 1934-55 associated with John J. Ginner in the firm Brittelle-Ginner Associates, which became Brittelle-Ginner and Dekker in 1955 on. Office in Albuquerque. Designed 1930 President's House at UNM. Brittelle-Ginner Associates designed structures at NMIMT and NMSVH.

FRANCES BARRY BYRNE. Worked in Frank Lloyd Wright's office from 1902-1909. Joined another apprentice of Wright, Andrew Willatzen, in Seattle. Took over the office of Walter Burley Griffin, who worked for Wright from 1902 and 1913, when Griffin left for Australia to plan Canberra. Later returned to Chicago and designed the Clarke House in Fairfield, Iowa (1915). Described by Whiffen as representing "Neo-expressionism". Designed building No. 12, the Crafts Annex at UNM.

EDWARD BUXTON CRISTY. Albuquerque's first architect. Assisted George Tight, UNM's third President, by preparing working drawings for his pueblo-type buildings and thus was instrumental in defining this style in New Mexico.

GAASTRA, GLADDING AND JOHNSON. Designed four buildings at UMN dedicated in 1928, Parsons Hall, Science Lecture Hall, Carlisle Gym, and Yatoka Dormitory, after the 1927 decision of the Board of Regents establishing the Pueblo Revival as the official architectural style for the campus.

JOHN J. GINNER. Draftsman for George Williamson, Inc. Later a partner of Miles Brittelle in Brittelle-Ginner Associates of Albuquerque. (See entries for Brittelle and Williamson). Brittelle-Ginner Associates designed structures at NMIMT and NMSVH.

PERCY MCGHEE, AIA. Born 1889. Educated at Texas A & M. Associated with the firm of Braunton & McGhee in El Paso, Texas. Designed at least five structures at NMSU.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 84

JOHN GAW MEEM. Born 1894 of American parents in Brazil. Died 1983 in Santa Fe, New Mexico. Bachelor of Science degree in Civil Engineering from the Virginia Military Institute 1914. Came to New Mexico to regain his health at the Sunmount Sanitarium of Santa Fe in 1920 where developed an interest in the regional architecture of New Mexico and turned to an architectural career. In 1922 joined the firm of Fisher and Fisher in Denver; evenings attended the Atelier Denver, a school affiliated with the Beaux-Arts Institute of Design based in New York City. Returned to New Mexico in 1924 for health reasons and formed an architectural firm. In partnership with Cassius McCormick, 1924-1928. Hugo Zehner joined firm in 1930 and served as a partner from 1940 to 1956. Edward O. Holien joined the firm as a partner in 1944. In 1956 William Buckley became the third partner in the firm when Hugo Zehner retired. Recipient of numerous commissions and honors. The catalog for a 1953 retrospective of Meem's work, held at the Museum of New Mexico, said of Meem: "In Fine Arts circles in the Southwest, the names Meem and New Mexico, as far as architectural design is concerned, are almost synonymous. To John Gaw Meem, more than any other individual, is contemporary art indebted for the conservation, development and propagation of the southwestern regional architectural style, which finds its greatest expression in the Rio Grande Valley of New Mexico." Appointed University Architect at the University of New Mexico 1935. Designed structures at NMHU, WNMU, and more than thirty major buildings at WNMU.

GORDON STREET. Joined the Meem firm as a draftsman in 1927. Established his own firm after winning the commission to design the New Mexico Supreme Court Building in 1937. Designed structures at NMSD.

OTTO HENRY THORMAN, AIA. Born 1887. Educated at the night architectural school at the University of St. Louis. Established the practice of Roberts and Thorman in Albuquerque in 1909-10. Firm later Thorman and Frazer and O.H. Thorman in El Paso. Designed two structures at NMSU.

HENRY C. TROST, AIA. Born 1863. Died 1933 in El Paso, Texas. Originally from Toledo, Ohio, began architectural work in Tucson, Arizona. Designed the Carnegie Library in Tucson and other buildings in Phoenix and Douglas, Arizona. Moved to El Paso, Texas in 1903. Established firm of Trost and Trost in partnership with his brother, Gustavus. Devoted a major part of his career to buildings in New Mexico. Established campus plan and designed buildings at NMSU and NMSVH. Designed buildings at UNM and WNMU.

ORVILLE R. WALKER, AIA. Architect from Lubbock, Texas. Designed structures at ENMU.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 85

CHARLES F. WHITTLESEY. Born 1867 in Alton, Illinois. Died 1941 in Los Angeles, California. Trained in architecture in the Chicago office of Louis Sullivan, and shortly after started work in that city. In 1900 appointed Chief Architect of the Santa Fe Railroad Company, in charge of designing hotels and stations on the line. Notable examples of these were the Alvarado Hotel, the station at Albuquerque and the El Tovar Hotel at the Grand Canyon in Arizona. A few years later, moved to Los Angeles and established a practice. One of the first architects to use reinforced concrete for construction purposes, covering exposed surfaces with ornamentation cast in place. Following the 1906 earthquake and fire in San Francisco, joined other architects in reconstruction work, and rebuilt several structures including the Pacific Building. Designed buildings at WNMU and seems to have been the first architect to try to establish an overall campus style at the school.

GEORGE H. WILLIAMSON, FAIA. Born 1872 in Brighton, Colorado. Died in 1936 in Denver, Colorado. Trained in architecture under Frederick Sterner, and in 1910 joined him in partnership. Together they designed several well-known structures in Denver (Daniels Office Building, Fisher Tower, Athletic Club). Later, in independent practice, he specialized in school work (East Denver High, Smiley Junior High and Teller School). Established the campus style at NMIMT, and designed structures at UNM, NMSD, and NMSVH.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 9 Page 78

APPENDIX A

BIBLIOGRAPHIC RESOURCES

Bunting, Bainbridge. **Early Architecture in New Mexico**. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1976.

Bunting, Bainbridge. **John Gaw Meem**. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1983 [draft copy]

Christiansen, Paige W.. **Of Earth and Sky: A History of New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology 1889-1964**. Socorro: New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, 1964.

Dillon, Thomas J. "History of the New Mexico School for the Deaf." 1983.

Gunn, Virgil. **A History of Higher Education in New Mexico**. Unpublished Master's Thesis. University of Chicago, 1927.

Engelbrecht, Lloyd C. and Engelbrecht, June Marie. **Henry C. Trost: Architect of the Southwest**. El Paso: El Paso Public Library Association, 1981.

Hughes, Dorothy. **Pueblo on the Mesa**. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1939.

Kelley, J.R.. **A History of New Mexico Military Institute: 1891-1941**. 1941.

Koyl, George S. Ed. **American Architects Directory**. New York: R.R. Bowker Company, 1955.

Kropp, Simon F. **That All May Learn: New Mexico State University 1888- 1964**. Las Cruces: New Mexico State University, 1972.

Mann, Aubrey Eugene. **The History and Development of Eastern New Mexico University**. Unpublished Ed.D. Thesis. Colorado State College, 1959.

Mass, Albuquerque: University of New Mexico School of Architecture and Planning, Spring 1983. (Issue devoted to John Gaw Meem)

Moyers, Robert Arthur. **A History of Education in New Mexico**, University of Missouri, Thesis. 1941.

Nason, Thelma and Simons, Katherine. "Report on Scholes Hall and Zimmerman Library." A report for the The Historic Landmarks Survey of Albuquerque, June 6, 1975.

.PA
New Mexico Military Institute. "New Mexico Military Institute Building Survey". A report submitted to the State Board of Educational Finance, June 16, 1981.

New Mexico, State of, Board of Educational Finance. "BEF Space File". 1983.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

AUG 8 1988

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 9 Page 79

"NMSVH: A Glimpse at the Past." **BEAR PAWSes**. Volume IX No. 4, Summer 1983.

Overturf, Donald Sheldon. **The History of New Mexico Western College**. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Nebraska, 1961.

Short, C.W., and Brown, R. Stanley. **Public Buildings: A Survey of Architecture Projects by Federal and Other Governmental Bodies Between the Years 1933-1939 with the Assistance of the Public Works Administration**. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1939.

Simmons, Marc. **Albuquerque**. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1982.

Turner, Paul Venable. **Campus: An American Planning Tradition**. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1984.

University of New Mexico, Office of the University Architect. **Hodgin Hall: Historic Structure Report**. University of New Mexico, 1979.

Whiffen, Marcus. **American Architecture Since 1780: A Guide to the Styles**. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 1969.

Wilson, Chris. **Architecture and Preservation in Las Vegas II**. Prepared for the Citizens' Committee for Historic Preservation, 1982.

Withey, Henry F. and Withey, Elsie R. **Biographical Dictionary of American Architects (Deceased)**. Los Angeles: New Age Publishing Co., 1956.

Works Progress Administration. **Inventory: An Appraisal of the Results of the Works Progress Administration**. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1938.

United States Government. **Final Report on the WPA Program 1936-43**. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1946.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number _____ Page 1

NEW MEXICO CAMPUS BUILDINGS, BUILT 1906-1938

Answers to questions raised by the reviewer on the return sheet dated 8/8/88.

The reviewer has raised a number of questions in connection with the Thematic Nomination and with three of the specific campus nominations, New Mexico State University, New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, and New Mexico School for the Visually Handicapped.

I. QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE THEMATIC NOMINATION.

The reviewer's questions concerning the Thematic Nomination fall into two categories: those dealing with the methodology used to identify, evaluate, and document for registration the buildings included in the nomination, and those concerning details of content. Questions relating methodology predominate and are concerned with (A) the history of the production of the nomination and its general methodology, and (B) the specific criteria for the selection of (1) nominated campuses, (2) nominated buildings within those campuses, and (3) the period of significance of the nomination as a whole. The reviewer's questions are printed in bold.

METHODOLOGY

A. History of the production of the nomination and its general methodology:

What were the purpose and products of previous surveys? How was that material used to produce this nomination? Was additional archival research or field survey needed to supplement earlier surveys?

This nomination is based on surveys and historical research which were performed over a period of years. Since this was done in the dynamic, ever-changing atmosphere of state-supported campuses, it was particularly meaningful to reevaluate the previous work at each successive stage.

In 1983 Van H. Gilbert, in conjunction with Architectural Research Consultants, was contracted to undertake an architectural/historical survey and inventory of historic buildings on state-supported New Mexico campuses, including the University of New Mexico, New Mexico State University, New Mexico Highlands University, Eastern New Mexico University, Western New Mexico

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number _____ Page 2

University, the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, the New Mexico Military Institute, the New Mexico School for the Visually Handicapped, and the New Mexico School for the Deaf.

Five of these campuses had already been surveyed: Western New Mexico University in 1979-80; Eastern New Mexico University in 1980; the New Mexico Military Institute as part of the survey of Historic Resources of Roswell, New Mexico performed by Texas Tech University in 1979-80; the University of New Mexico as part of the Albuquerque Landmarks Survey performed in 1982; New Mexico Highlands University as part of the survey of Las Vegas, New Mexico performed by Chris Wilson in 1982. The contractor reviewed these existing surveys, to verify and update their contents by means of on-site inspections of the campuses, and an examination of historic materials relating to the founding and architectural development of each campus. In the case of ENMU and WNMU, new survey sheets were completed.

The four institutions which had not been previously surveyed - New Mexico State University, the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, the New Mexico School for the Deaf, and the New Mexico School for the Visually Handicapped, were freshly surveyed by the contractor.

The surveys of all nine institutions were completed on the New Mexico Historic Building Inventory forms which require that the present appearance of each building be described and photographed; that the dates of original construction and additions or alterations be documented; and that the building's architectural integrity and its contribution to a potential district be evaluated. In most cases both field inspections and historic research were necessary to make these determinations.

The stated purpose of these surveys was to identify each pre-1945 building on the campuses and to evaluate each for integrity and significance. Further research was performed to determine the place of the buildings in the historical development of their respective campuses, and their architectural and/or historical significance. The inventory and research data were then used as the basis for a draft of a thematic nomination of New Mexico Campus Buildings, which included all nine campuses.

In 1987 Tim Price of Architectural Research Consultants redrafted the nomination into its present form, updating it and bringing it into conformance with current NR standards. He reviewed all of the surveys and performed on-site inspections with some rephotographing at the University of New Mexico, New Mexico State University, and the New Mexico School for the Visually Handicapped. Historic data were reviewed to clarify the architectural and

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number _____ Page 3

historical significance of individual buildings. In the course of reevaluating buildings, it was found in several cases that alterations had compromised architectural integrity to the extent that a building was no longer eligible for nomination. In other instances, buildings previously judged contributing were found to have been subsequently demolished. At this time the New Mexico Military Institute was dropped from consideration because it had been included in the Multiple Resource nomination for Roswell, New Mexico.

In response to the reviewer's questions which are being answered herein, Corinne Sze has researched the history of the preparation of this nomination, and has performed additional research into the history of campus development at NMSU, NMIMT, and NMSVH, in order to detail the architectural context of the nominated buildings at these schools.

B. Criteria Considerations

Why were the nominated buildings selected as significant out of all of those constructed during historic periods?

1. Criteria for the Selection of Campuses

Are the nine (sic) State institutions mentioned in the context the only State schools of higher education in New Mexico? If not why were these schools selected and others ignored?

The nomination as written is unclear concerning the educational level of the schools covered. It was intended to cover the campuses of state-supported institutions, dedicated primarily to learning, which are of sufficient age and architectural interest to qualify for consideration, and to include all of the buildings on these campuses which are of qualifying age, integrity, and significance. The eight nominated institutions include all of the main campuses of state-supported institutions of higher education, with the exception of the New Mexico Military Institute, which covers four years of high school and the first two of college, but was dropped from this nomination after it became part of the nomination of Historic Resources of Roswell, New Mexico. In addition, two state-supported schools which are not institutions of higher education are included, the New Mexico School for the Visually Handicapped and the New Mexico School for the Deaf. Both cover kindergarten through the twelfth grade, and are state-supported boarding schools with fully developed campuses of the required age and integrity. The nomination did not consider state-supported schools which are primarily correctional in purpose.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number _____ Page 4

2. Criteria for the selection of buildings

How were these buildings selected for nomination from the universe of buildings related to the defined themes?

Buildings in the designated universe, in this case those that make up campuses of state-supported educational institutions, were studied through on-site inspection and research to determine their age and degree of architectural integrity. Those which were of sufficient age and integrity were further evaluated to determine whether they would qualify for nomination on the grounds of architectural or historic significance. The criteria of integrity and significance which were applied are defined in more detail below.

Are the nominated buildings the only extant buildings constructed between 1906 and 1937? If not, how were decisions on which buildings to nominate made? What is the acceptable threshold of integrity for these buildings?

Do the necessary characteristics for integrity for these buildings differ depending on whether they are significant for architectural design or historic associations? If so, how?

The nominated buildings are not the only extant buildings from the period of significance, but are all the extant buildings which were found to meet the criteria of integrity and significance. The small number of buildings nominated in comparison with the number built or even the number still standing reflects the paucity of buildings which have not been lost or significantly altered, and renders those that remain all the more valuable to the historic record.

A number of the oldest buildings on these campuses were lost to fire. Others were torn down and replaced by larger, more modern buildings which could better serve the needs of the growing and changing institutions. Many of those left standing were remodeled and enlarged beyond recognition in relatively recent times. These changes reflect the fact that these are dynamic, living institutions which must respond to changing educational and social patterns in a growing state, and which use public funds to supply the current needs of the state's population. This response has often been at the unfortunate expense of architectural integrity.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number _____ Page 5

Under the criteria for architectural integrity applied in this nomination, existing buildings constructed during the period of significance were eliminated from consideration if they had been altered in such a way that they no longer possess the essential features which gave them their original identity. This might mean radical changes such as rearrangement and/or restyling of fenestration, or the obliteration of other distinguishing architectural details. In some instances a building had a large recent addition appended to it. A general criterion used in this case was the visible presence of three elevations, including the main facade, which had not been significantly altered.

Once the question of integrity was established, buildings were evaluated for significance. Several criteria were used for determining architectural significance, such as whether the building represents the work of an architect who played a crucial role in the development of the campus, or represents a style significant to that development, or illustrates the use of a nationally popular style on a New Mexico campus. Historical significance was evaluated according to the criteria described below.

No distinction was made in judging the integrity of buildings between those which could be nominated for the significance of their architecture and those which were historically significant.

Section 8, p.8, states that there are 30 extant PWA/WPA college buildings on the New Mexico campuses. Five are nominated. How were these five selected among the 30 extant buildings with similar historic associations?

The five nominated buildings are those which qualified on the basis of the criteria of age, integrity, and significance as outlined above. Some of those which were of sufficient age had been significantly altered. Others were not yet fifty years old at the time the nomination was completed.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number _____ Page 6

How can it be determined which buildings are significant under criterion A. The statement here is too broad. What functions, associations, or other characteristics would be needed to qualify these buildings for individual listing on the basis of having made a significant contribution to the development of their institutions?

Currently it is left for each nomination form to make a separate case for each building. So far only one nomination claims criterion A. It is acceptable on the basis of having been used as the first library on campus.

Although these buildings are united by a common educational function, and this theme is appropriately developed in the significance statement, most have been nominated for their architectural significance. In a sparsely populated and relatively poor state, these campuses represented a major opportunity for architectural expression throughout the period of significance, providing designers a nearly unique occasion to plan multiple buildings over a relatively large space using state funds and, in the 1930's, those of the federal government. In the context of this nomination, historic significance would adhere to a building which represents either a milestone in the history of a particular school, or was the site of a significant accomplishment in the history of knowledge or of learning. Although only one building has been so judged in the nomination as submitted, it is anticipated that in future years as buildings become eligible by virtue of age, others may also meet one of these criteria for historic significance.

This nomination covers a number of separate and very different institutions, united by their educational function and state support, but each distinguished by its own history. Since the historical significance of individual buildings on each campus is to be found in the majority of instances in the history of a particular institution, it is appropriate that the historical significance of buildings as they become eligible for nomination be evaluated on a case by case basis within the unique context of each institution.

Are there other known buildings that fit into the context discussed, which are eligible or possibly eligible, and which may be nominated later?

The nomination did not intentionally omit buildings constructed within the period of significance which met the other criteria for eligibility, although it is theoretically possible that further research could bring to light something which was overlooked. There are also a number of buildings which were constructed after the end of the period of significance at the

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number _____ Page 7

fifty-year limit at the time when the nomination was prepared. These can be reevaluated when they became eligible by age and nominated if they meet the other criteria at that time.

3. The criteria for the selection of the period of significance for the nomination as a whole.

How was 1906 chosen? The historical background for each institution mentions numerous buildings constructed before and after 1906. Some of these have been destroyed but in many cases there is no mention of either destruction or loss of integrity.

How was the period of significance selected? This period should encompass the entire context within which the nominated buildings have been evaluated, not just the period represented by extant buildings.

The dates of the period of significance are arbitrary. The beginning date is that of the earliest building found to be eligible for nomination. It would be possible to use an earlier date which would encompass more of the buildings which are no longer extant or are ineligible due to alterations, such as the date of the earliest campus building at any of these schools. However, this date would be equally arbitrary for the other institutions since each was properly considered within the range of dates relevant to its own development. Thus it is impossible to establish a single date which marks the beginning of the period of significance in which each of the schools was considered.

The termination date was set at the end of the fifty-year limit at the time when the nomination was prepared, with the intention that buildings constructed after this date could be considered for nomination as they become eligible. The termination date of the nomination has now been changed to 1938 because additional research has established that one of the buildings previously nominated was built in that year.

DETAILS OF CONTENT OF THE THEMATIC NOMINATION

Appendix B should include information on all the styles represented by the nominated buildings. "Decorative Brick" and "Prairie Style" have been omitted.

Appendix B has been rewritten to include all of the styles applied to nominated buildings and to eliminate duplications. See section 8, Page 80.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number _____ Page 8

What is "the Act" referred to in the second line of the last paragraph of section 8, p. 5. When was it passed?

The act passed by the New Mexico Territorial Legislature in February 1889 creating the University of New Mexico, the New Mexico School of Mines (NMIMT), and the Agricultural Experiment Station (NMSU). The portions of Section 8 of the Thematic nomination dealing with the general history of campus development has been revised in the interest of clarity.

Is the "Agricultural and Mechanics College" referenced in the last paragraph of Section 8, p. 5 the New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts discussed in section 8, p. 23?

Yes.

II. QUESTIONS CONCERNING INDIVIDUAL NOMINATIONS

General Questions

Several nominations talk about buildings constructed during "this period". What is the period referenced: 1906-1937? A particular period of development for the campus on which the buildings are located? The period given in Appendix B for a particular stylistic influence?

Presumably the period under immediate consideration. If none is apparent, then the period of the nomination, 1906-1938. Ambiguous references to dates have been clarified on the returned nominations for individual buildings.

The buildings being returned likely are all eligible under criterion C, but it is necessary to answer certain questions or reconcile discrepancies between information in the context statement and the individual nominations before they can be evaluated adequately.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number _____ Page 9

A. NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY:

There is no context provided for the University after 1908, but three of the four buildings nominated were built after 1908, in 1913, 1918 and 1930 respectively.

Information on the University states that the Trost and Trost plan adopted in 1906 "governed the appearance and placement of buildings" for two decades, only one of the four nominated buildings (1930) is identified as fitting into "a Spanish style similar to that adopted by the regents in 1906". Clarify how these buildings represent an important aspect of the architectural development for the campus.

Clarification of the Trost and Trost Plan and the Architectural Context of the University (1907-1930):

In 1907 the University commissioned the Trost and Trost architectural firm of El Paso, Texas to design a comprehensive plan for the development of the campus, (Engelbrecht, p. 93). The aspects of the plan which influenced subsequent campus development, as expressed in buildings designed in the following decades by the Trost firm and others, were the placement of buildings in a semi-circle which came to be known as "The Horseshoe", and the use of a broadly defined Mission Revival style of architecture and other compatible styles of Spanish Colonial origin.

Although the school eventually grew beyond the horseshoe, most building in subsequent decades continued the pattern around this configuration, which remained the focal area of the school and still forms an entrance to the campus. Although the trustees are quoted as deciding at about the time Trost and Trost were hired to follow a "Spanish Renaissance" rather than a "mission-style" architecture (Kropp, p. 103), the Trost plan called for buildings in styles which although eclectic in their use of elements from Southwestern traditional architecture, today would be classified as dominated by elements derived from Spanish styles originating in California, (Engelbrecht, p. 94), including the California Mission style.

The Trost plan, as described in a newspaper article of the time and quoted by Engelbrecht, called for "six buildings at each side in the form of a horseshoe and the administration building in the center", and for "all of the buildings (to be) of yellow pressed brick and terra cotta clay tile roofs". The buildings were designed with low-pitched, hip roofs; towers with domed tops; and many semicircular arches. They were also to have been connected with round-arched arcades after the mission complexes in California. The

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number _____ Page 10

arcades were never built but several Trost-designed buildings were. These as well as other buildings by other architects continued to be in Spanish-derived styles compatible with the original plan, (Engelbrecht, p. 94-5).

Most of the buildings which represented the original and subsequent expressions of the Trost plan have been destroyed or significantly altered. The centerpiece of the plan was the administration building, Hadley Hall, completed in 1908 following Trost's plans and demolished in 1958. The 1909 Wilson Hall was destroyed by fire in 1937. Also completed in 1908 was the nominated Air Science building. Although its original brick exterior has been plastered over, the predominant style of the Trost plan can be seen in other major design elements such as the tiled, hipped roof with projecting eaves and exposed rafters, and the arched windows and entry. This building, on the north side of the horseshoe, remains the least altered and thus the best representative of the early Trost-designed buildings on campus. In contrast, the Trost-designed gymnasium (Military Science building), next to the Air Science building, has been altered to the extent that it is no longer eligible for nomination, as has the 1927 Trost-designed, Young Hall, also on the horseshoe. The nominated Goddard Hall (1913), on the south side of the horseshoe represents a building designed by another architect, O.H. Thorman, which continues the stylistic precedent of the Trost plan in its tiled, hip roof with wide overhang and exposed rafters, its arched windows, and its central bell tower over the entrance.

The nominated Foster Hall, designed by the firm of Braunton and McGhee in 1930 on the south side of the horseshoe, represents the continuing influence of the Trost plan. It has been classified in a style closely related to the California Mission, the Spanish Colonial Baroque, because of the ornate relief decoration around the arched entry and over the first floor windows on the main facade. The building remains eligible for nomination because three of its facades, including the main have not been significantly altered, and a large addition extends only from a portion of the south (rear) facade. Kent Hall, designed about 1930 by Braunton and McGhee a block off of the horseshoe, and Dove Hall, designed in 1936 by Percy McGhee, are both in a California Mission style and demonstrate the influence of the Trost plan, although both have been judged ineligible for nomination due to alterations. Other buildings built after 1937 on and beyond the horseshoe, illustrate the continuing influence of the style established by Trost and can be evaluated for nomination as they come within the fifty-year limit.

The fourth of the nominated buildings, the University President's house, was built in the Prairie style in 1918. Located on University Avenue, a block away from the horseshoe, this design represents a break from the domination of

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number _____ Page 11

the Trost plan and illustrates an infrequent use of this nationally popular style on a New Mexico campus. Another building, Young Hall, built in 1928, shows the influence of the Prairie style but is ineligible for nomination due to alterations.

The four nominated buildings on the campus of New Mexico State University are those built within the period of significance (as defined by the nomination), which have not been significantly altered, and which represent the architectural development of the campus.

1. AIR SCIENCE BUILDING - NMSU

The context describes the appearance by which campus design was to be governed after 1906 as a change from California Mission to Spanish Renaissance, and a look characterized by yellow pressed brick and terra cotta with clay tile roofs. This building does not appear to represent the 1906 plan because it was designed in an earlier style; also the brick surface has been plastered over. Is it an important transition building? Does it cement stylistic consistency between earlier California Mission Style buildings (do any of these survive?) and the later Spanish Renaissance ones? Is it significant as an important example of T. and T.'s work regardless of it's ability to represent a period of campus design.

The Air Science building is significant as an example of the style that the Trost plan established for the campus which influenced campus architecture through the 1930's.

See previous answer for a clarification of the Trost and Trost plan and the architectural context of the university.

When was it plastered over, and how has this affected integrity?

It has not been established at this time when the building was plastered over. However, this was probably done to make it consistent with later California Mission Revival buildings which were stuccoed, such as the nominated Goddard and Foster Halls. This plastering has only affected the wall surface, covering the original brick. Other significant elements representing the style of the building have not been obscured.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number _____ Page 12

2. UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT'S HOUSE - NMSU

This building does not relate to any of the information provided in the context discussed in the cover form. Why is a modest example of the Prairie Style on a university campus significant?

It is significant architecturally as a rare example of the Prairie style on a New Mexico campus. As such it is an expression of influence of a nationally popular style on a campus otherwise dominated by regionally derived styles.

3. FOSTER HALL - NMSU

The nomination states that this is the only Spanish Colonial Baroque building at NMSU to be nominated. Are there others that are not being nominated? If so, how was this one determined to have significance superior to the others?

There are other buildings in this style, but they were not eligible for nomination either by virtue of alteration or lack of sufficient age. The latter can be evaluated when they come within the fifty-year limit.

Also this is one of only a few buildings along the horseshoe to be designed in a style similar to the one adopted for the 1906 plan. Is that because few were constructed, and, if that is true, how significant is this plan if it was not followed? Or, is this one of the few surviving buildings of many designed in a Spanish style. The nomination states that the plan was influential for two decades - was this the last or one of the last Spanish-style buildings constructed? When did the preferred style for campus buildings change to something else?

See above: Clarification of the Trost and Trost plan and the Architectural Context of the University (1907-1930).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number _____ Page 13

B. NEW MEXICO INSTITUTE OF MINING AND TECHNOLOGY

1. BROWN HALL

The nomination states that this is one of "a few" relatively unaltered historic buildings - are there more than two? If so, how were the two nominated determined to be the most significant? How do the alterations to this building compare with those of similar buildings on campus?

The two nominated buildings, Brown Hall (1929) and Fitch Hall (1937), are the only buildings constructed before termination of the period of significance, which were judged to be sufficiently unaltered to qualify for nomination.

Other buildings have either been so altered that their historic appearance has been totally lost, or have been overwhelmed by large additions. Where additions were a factor, a building was considered to have retained its architectural integrity if three original sides are visible and not significantly altered. Brown Hall has a small addition on the rear facade. The original symmetry has been lost, but three sides of the building have kept their historic appearance. Fitch Hall has had no additions.

On the other hand, Cramer Hall (1928) which was originally similar to Brown Hall, has a very large addition obliterating the west (rear) and the west portion of the south facade. The Gymnasium (1936) also has additions larger than the original building which have destroyed the north and west facades. Eaton Hall (1936) has additions which have completely obscured three sides including the original main facade.

There are four buildings constructed in 1939 which appear eligible for nomination according to the inventory performed in 1983. At that time, Presidents Hall had no additions and had undergone only minor remodeling; Wells Hall had only a library vestibule added to a secondary entry on a back corner of the building; Weir Hall and the Assay Laboratory had rear additions connecting the two buildings.

Is this building considered a good example of its style.

Yes, in that it exemplifies the characteristics of the California Mission Revival style as it is expressed on this campus with such common elements as smooth-plastered walls; low-pitched, tile roofs with bracketed overhangs; curvilinear gables which rise over the roofline at the sides of buildings and

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number _____ Page 14

over front entry sections at the center of the main facades, each gable having a small, centrally-placed, usually round window; and some semicircular arched window and door openings usually in close association with the gables. This building also has Spanish Colonial Baroque decoration over the main entrance, a style of detailing which is not common to most other campus buildings, but was used again in the 1939 Wells Hall.

2. FITCH HALL

The nomination states that this building was designed in the California Mission Revival Style, "which was a popular style...during this period." To what period does this refer?

The period of significance (1906-1938).

Appendix B indicates that the California Mission Style dates from 1900 to 1930, but this building was constructed in 1937. Explain this discrepancy.

The dates provided are an approximate range of a style's greatest popularity in New Mexico, as specified by the New Mexico Historic Building Inventory Manual. As these buildings attest, this doesn't preclude later use of the style, particularly where a precedent has been established. In this case, the use of the California Mission Revival style represents the continuation of a style which had been used on the campus since the first conscious effort to establish a consistent architectural style at the school was made in the 1920's. The firm of Brittelle and Ginner followed that precedent through the 1930's.

Is this building considered a good example of this style?

This building is an excellent example to the style as expressed on this campus with such consistent elements as smooth-plastered walls; low-pitched, tile roofs with bracketed overhangs; curvilinear gables which rise over the roofline at the sides of buildings and over the front entry sections at the center of the main facades, each gable having a small, centrally-placed, usually round window; some semicircular arched openings.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number _____ Page 15

The nomination states that there are seven other buildings on this campus from the same period built in this style, and implies that this building is nominated because it's integrity is better than the five others? What was the threshold of integrity used to determine how many were eligible for listing? How has this building been altered, and how do those alterations compare with those of the buildings that were not nominated?

This building has had no additions and no significant alterations.

Of the other buildings which have not been nominated, Cramer Hall (1928) has a very large addition which obliterates the west (rear) facade and the west portion of the south facade; Eaton Hall (1936) has been almost completely obscured by additions on three sides, including the main facade; the Gymnasium (1936) has additions larger than the original building which have destroyed the north and west facades. Four others, built in 1939, and were not within the period of significance when the nomination was prepared.

See above under Brown Hall for complete details.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number _____ Page 16

C. NEW MEXICO SCHOOL FOR THE VISUALLY HANDICAPPED

**Administration building
Central Receiving Building
Auditorium and Recreation Building
Infirmary**

The context essentially omits any discussion of campus development after 1920. In addition, the context statement for the campus discusses neither the stylistic development of the campus (except to suggest that most of the buildings on campus, from whatever period, were designed in the Decorative Brick or Mediterranean styles of the nominated buildings, since "all campus buildings has a cohesive look"), nor the influence of Trost and Trost...Please provide the necessary information on important architectural influences, designers, plan, and development of NMSVH campus to enable an adequate evaluation of the nominated buildings.

Please make information in the context statement and in the individual nomination consistent.

Additional research has clarified the history of campus development, and determined the architects and dates of the nominated buildings. This information has been added to the context statement, Section 8, p.69, and to the individual nominations.

The school quickly outgrew its original three-story building and by 1914 a new brick girls' dormitory designed by Henry Trost had been built southeast of the main building. By this time a Trost-designed brick heating plant and laundry was in place directly east of the main building. In 1916 the school secured an appropriation for a Teachers' Cottage and Hospital (later converted to the Administration Building) which was begun in 1918 and finished in 1920. In 1919-20 the boiler house and laundry were enlarged, and a boys' dormitory was built northeast of the main building, balancing the girls' dorm, and similar to it in appearance.

All of these buildings were designed by Henry Trost, and were consistent with the style of the original main building. Common features of these early buildings, in addition to red brick, were hipped tile roofs with overhangs decorated with dentils and one-story, flat-roofed centrally placed front entrance porches with arched openings. Trost's buildings are also characterized by concrete continuous sills which form a continuous band around the buildings, and in the case of the Administration Building a similar

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number _____ Page 17

concrete lintel. In 1927 a kindergarten building was added to the campus. Of these buildings only the Teachers' Cottage and Hospital (Administration Building) still stands and has been nominated.

Three major buildings were added to the campus in the 1930's: the Auditorium and Recreation building (1930), designed by the firm of George Williamson, Inc. Architects; the Infirmary (1936), designed by Brittelle & Ginner; and the Swimming Pool (1938), now Central Receiving, also designed by Brittelle and Ginner. All of these buildings are still standing and all have been nominated. They are designed in a style closely related to that of the early Trost buildings and have in common with them, the use of red brick, hipped tile roofs with overhangs, and entrance porches with at least one arched opening.

In the early 1940's the original main building was torn down and replaced by the Education Building, a two-story, red-brick building with a hipped tile roof. In the 1960's and 1970's others of the original buildings were torn down and new dormitories built. In 1978 the Bert Reeves Learning Center was constructed on the site of the original girls' dormitory. The influence of the red brick style is seen in the newer buildings giving the campus a greater coherence of style than most of the institutions in this nomination.

Revised dates and architects of the four nominated buildings.

<u>Building</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Architect</u>
Administration	1918-20	Trost and Trost
Auditorium	1930	G. Williamson, Inc. Architects
Infirmary	1935-36	Brittelle and Ginner
Central Receiving	1938	Brittelle and Ginner

The nomination for the administration building states that four buildings were constructed on the campus between 1918 and 1935. According to the three other nominations, there are five buildings from this period still standing, and at least two others have been razed.

The buildings known to have been constructed between 1918 and 1935 are (1) the Teachers' Cottage and Hospital (1918-1920); (2) the Boy's Dormitory (1919-20); (3) the Kindergarten Building (1927); (4) the Auditorium and Recreation Building (1930); and (5) the Infirmary (1935-6). Of these the three nominated buildings are the only ones still standing.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number _____ Page 18

The context statement cites two buildings constructed between 1918 and 1920; and the only information provided for the period between 1920 and 1953 is that the school undertook "various agricultural endeavors" (including the initiation of a dairy farm), changed its name, and continued to increase in enrollment as well as physical facilities. Please clarify how many buildings were constructed during the period of significance, how many survive from this period, and the relative significance and integrity of the surviving buildings: how was it determined which of these building were eligible for the National Register?

As detailed above, eight buildings have been documented as constructed between the period 1906 to 1937. Of these three are still standing and they, with the Central Receiving building, which has now been documented as having been constructed in 1938, are the four nominated buildings. They were judged eligible for the National Register because they have not been significantly altered and represent the work of Henry Trost and his continuing influence on the development of the school. The 1918-20 Administration building (Teachers' Cottage and Hospital) is the only remaining of the Trost-designed buildings; the three later buildings are designs from the 1930's by other architects in a style similar to that established by Trost whose influence is seen even in buildings constructed after the period of significance.

The information in the overall context statement on the influence of Trost and Trost on New Mexico campuses does not mention NMSVH.

This omission has been corrected on p. 7 of section 8.

Also, the contributions of Trost and other architects to this school have been added to their biographies, Section 8, pp. 83-85.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number _____ Methodology _____ Page 1

METHODS OF IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF SIGNIFICANT PROPERTY

I. Previous Surveys

This nomination made use of a number of previous surveys. In 1983 Van H. Gilbert, in conjunction with Architectural Research Consultants, was contracted to undertake an architectural/historical survey and inventory of historic buildings on state-supported New Mexico campuses, including the University of New Mexico, New Mexico State University, New Mexico Highlands University, Eastern New Mexico University, Western New Mexico University, the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, the New Mexico Military Institute, the New Mexico School for the Visually Handicapped, and the New Mexico School for the Deaf.

Five of these campuses had already been surveyed: Western New Mexico University in 1979-80; Eastern New Mexico University in 1980; the New Mexico Military Institute as part of the survey of Historic Resources of Roswell, New Mexico performed by Texas Tech University in 1979-80; the University of New Mexico as part of the Albuquerque Landmarks Survey performed in 1982; New Mexico Highlands University as part of the survey of Las Vegas, New Mexico performed by Chris Wilson in 1982.

The contractor reviewed these existing surveys, to verify and update their contents by means of on-site inspections of the campuses, and an examination of historic materials relating to the founding and architectural development of each campus. In the case of ENMU and WNMU, new survey sheets were completed.

The four institutions which had not been previously surveyed - New Mexico State University, the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, the New Mexico School for the Deaf, and the New Mexico School for the Visually Handicapped, were freshly surveyed by the contractor.

II. Methodology

The surveys of all nine institutions were completed on the New Mexico Historic Building Inventory forms which require that the present appearance of each building be described and photographed; that the dates of original construction and additions or alterations be documented; and that the building's architectural integrity and its contribution to a potential district be evaluated. In most cases both field inspections and historic research were necessary to make these determinations.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number _____ Methodology _____ Page 2

After the surveys were completed, further research was performed to determine the place of the buildings in the architectural and historical development of their respective campuses, and their degree architectural and/or historical significance. The inventory and research data were then used as the basis for a draft of a thematic nomination of New Mexico Campus Buildings which included all nine campuses.

In 1987 Tim Price of Architectural Research Consultants redrafted the nomination, updating it and bringing it into conformance with current NR standards. He reviewed all of the surveys and performed on-site inspections with some rephotographing at the University of New Mexico, New Mexico State University, and the New Mexico School for the Visually Handicapped. Historic data were reviewed to clarify the architectural and historical significance of individual buildings. In the course of reevaluating buildings, it was found in several cases that alterations had compromised architectural integrity to the extent that a building was no longer eligible for nomination. In other instances, buildings previously judged contributing were found to have been subsequently demolished. At this time the New Mexico Military Institute was dropped from consideration because it had been included in the Multiple Resource nomination for Roswell, New Mexico.

The dates 1906 to 1937 were chosen for the period of significance. The latter was arbitrarily set at the 50-year limit. The former was established, also arbitrarily, at the date of the earliest building found to be eligible for nomination. Although an earlier date could have been used, such as the date of the establishment of the first state school, this date would be equally arbitrary for the other institutions, since each is properly considered within the range of dates relevant to its own development.

In response to the reviewer's questions concerning the nomination as submitted in August 1988, Corinne Sze researched the history of the preparation of the nomination primarily through interviews with participants, and performed additional documentary research into the history of campus development at NMSU, NMIMT, and NMSVH, in order to detail the architectural context of the nominated buildings at these schools. The termination date for the nomination was changed to 1938, because one of the nominated buildings was found to have been built in that year, which is now within the 50-year limit. Section 7 and portions of Section 8 of the thematic nomination have been rewritten as necessary to include new information, as have the significance sections of the relevant nominated buildings.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number _____ Methodology _____ Page 3 _____

There are a number of buildings which were constructed after the ending of the period of significance at the fifty-year limit. These can be reevaluated when they became eligible by age and nominated if they meet the other criteria.

Since this nomination was based on surveys and historical research which were performed over a period of years, in the dynamic, ever-changing context of school campuses, it was particularly meaningful to reevaluate the previous work at each successive stage.

III. Criteria for Selection of Nominated Campuses and Buildings

The nomination covers all of the campuses of state-supported institutions, dedicated primarily to learning, which are of sufficient age and architectural interest to qualify for consideration. The eight nominated institutions include the main campuses of all the state-supported universities in New Mexico. The New Mexico Military Institute, which covers the first two of college in addition to four years of high school was not included in this nomination after it became part of the nomination of Historic Resources of Roswell, New Mexico. In addition, the nomination includes two schools which though not institutions of higher education, are state-supported boarding schools with fully developed campuses of the required age and integrity - the New Mexico School for the Visually Handicapped and the New Mexico School for the Deaf. Both cover kindergarten through the twelfth grade. The nomination did not consider state-supported schools which are primarily correctional in purpose.

The original surveys undertook to identify, document, and evaluate for integrity and significance every building built on a state-supported campus before 1945. When the nomination was written in 1987, these findings were reevaluated. The termination date for the period of significance was established at the 50-year limit of 1937, and all extant buildings constructed before that date were reevaluated for architectural integrity.

Buildings built within the period of significance were deemed to have lost the integrity of their architecture and thereby to be ineligible for nomination if they had been altered in such a way that they no longer possess the essential features which gave them their original identity. This might mean radical changes such as rearrangement and/or restyling of fenestration, or the obliteration of other distinguishing architectural details; or it might mean that a building had been overwhelmed by a large, recent addition. A general criterion used was the visible presence of three elevations, including

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 3 1989

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number _____ Methodology _____ Page 4 _____

the main facade, which had not been significantly altered. No distinction was made in judging the integrity of buildings between those which could be nominated for the significance of their architecture and those which were historically significant.

Those buildings which were found to meet the criteria for architectural integrity were then evaluated for significance, either architectural or historic. Several criteria were used for determining architectural significance. Within the context of the development of the university, a significant building could represent a style significant to that development, or the work of an architect who played a crucial role in that development. In a broader context a building could illustrate the use of a nationally popular, though not locally typical, style on a New Mexico campus or could represent an aspect of the work of a significant architect.

Buildings were also evaluated for historical significance within the context of their universities and within the larger context of the history of education. Historical significance would adhere to a building which represents either a milestone in the history of a particular school, or was the site of a significant accomplishment in the history of knowledge or of learning. Although only one building was judged historically significant in the nomination as submitted, it is anticipated that in future years as buildings become eligible by virtue of age, others may meet one of these criteria.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

g. [unclear]

Section number _____ Page _____

Multiple Resource Area
Thematic Group

Name New Mexico Campus Buildings Built 1906-1937 TR
State Bernalillo County and others, NM

Nomination/Type of Review	Date/Signature
Cover Substantive Review	Keeper <u>Beth Boland 5/16/89</u> Attest _____
1. Administration Building (Otero County) Substantive Review	Keeper <u>Beth Boland 5/16/89</u> Attest _____
2. Administration Building (Roosevelt County) Substantive Review	Keeper <u>Beth Boland 9/22/88</u> Attest _____
3. Air Science Substantive Review	Keeper <u>Beth Boland 5/16/89</u> Attest _____
4. Art Annex Substantive Review	Keeper <u>Beth Boland 9/22/88</u> Attest _____
5. Auditorium & Recreation Building Substantive Review	Keeper <u>Beth Boland 5/16/89</u> Attest _____
6. Bowden Hall Substantive Review	Keeper <u>Beth Boland 9/22/88</u> Attest _____
7. Brown Hall Substantive Review	Keeper <u>Beth Boland 5/16/89</u> Attest _____
8. Carlisle Gymnasium Substantive Review	Keeper <u>Beth Boland 9/22/88</u> Attest _____
9. Central Receiving Building Substantive Review	Keeper <u>Beth Boland 5/16/89</u> Attest _____
10. Connor Hall Substantive Review	Keeper <u>Beth Boland 9/22/88</u> Attest _____

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number _____ Page _____

Multiple Resource Area
Thematic Group

Name New Mexico Campus Buildings Built 1906-1937 TR
State Bernalillo County and others, NM

Nomination/Type of Review

Date/Signature

11. Estufa	Substantive Review	Keeper	<u>Beth Boland</u>	<u>9/22/88</u>
		Attest	_____	_____
12. Fitch Hall	Substantive Review	Keeper	<u>Beth Boland</u>	<u>5/16/89</u>
		Attest	_____	_____
13. Fleming Hall	Substantive Review	Keeper	<u>Beth Boland</u>	<u>9/22/88</u>
		Attest	_____	_____
14. Foster Hall	Substantive Review	Keeper	<u>Beth Boland</u>	<u>5/16/89</u>
		Attest	_____	_____
15. Goddard Hall	Substantive Review	Keeper	<u>Beth Boland</u>	<u>9/22/88</u>
		Attest	_____	_____
16. Graham Gymnasium	Substantive Review	Keeper	<u>Beth Boland</u>	<u>9/22/88</u>
		Attest	_____	_____
17. Heating Plant	Substantive Review	Keeper	<u>Beth Boland</u>	<u>9/22/88</u>
		Attest	_____	_____
18. Hospital	Substantive Review	Keeper	<u>Beth Boland</u>	<u>9/22/88</u>
		Attest	_____	_____
19. Infirmary Building	Substantive Review	Keeper	<u>Beth Boland</u>	<u>5/16/89</u>
		Attest	_____	_____
20. Light Hall	Substantive Review	Keeper	<u>Beth Boland</u>	<u>9/22/88</u>
		Attest	_____	_____

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number _____ Page _____

Multiple Resource Area
Thematic Group

Name New Mexico Campus Buildings Built 1906-1937 TR
State Bernalillo County and others, NM

Nomination/Type of Review

Date/Signature

21. President's House

Substantive Review

Keeper

Beth Boland 9/22/88

Attest _____

22. Reynolds, Sara, Hall

Substantive Review

Keeper

Beth Boland 9/22/88

Attest _____

23. Ritch Hall

Substantive Review

Keeper

Beth Boland 9/22/88

Attest _____

24. Rogers Administration Building

Substantive Review

Keeper

Beth Boland 9/22/88

Attest _____

25. Scholes Hall

Substantive Review

Keeper

Beth Boland 9/22/88

Attest _____

26. School Building Number 2

Substantive Review

Keeper

Beth Boland 9/22/88

Attest _____

27. Superintendent's Residence

Substantive Review

Keeper

Beth Boland 9/22/88

Attest _____

28. University President's House

Keeper

Beth Boland 5/16/89

Attest _____

29.

Keeper _____

Attest _____

30.

Keeper _____

Attest _____