MESSAGE FROM THE CO-CHAIRMEN

$25,000 WARHOL FOUNDATION AWARD TO NAOP FOR THE "OLMSTED WORKBOOK"

A year ago the NAOP board initiated "THE OLmSTED WORKBOOK" project and began efforts to raise funds to set it in motion.

Our goal is to gather information on a wide range of topics, particularly technical aspects of restoring historic parks, and to publish the results on a regular basis as a series of papers available to our members.

We were delighted that the Warhol Foundation awarded NAOP a $25,000 grant for the initial effort. Darlene McCloud has been retained to direct the project, develop criteria for the Workbook's format and production, draw up an initial list of topics, identify their potential authors, and to carry out the research and editing of the first volumes.

Darlene McCloud, after receiving a Master's degree from Columbia's Department of Historic Preservation, was Director of Planning Issues at the Municipal Art Society and later worked at the NYC Department of City Planning on the City Waterfront Project. She has been actively engaged on the NAOP Workbook since January, working with Marion Pressley and the Special Projects Committee.

We have also been fortunate to have one of our board members, Sandy Sparks, a talented graphic designer, take on the job of designing the format and production of the Workbook.

Our first volume is a monograph on Charles Eliot, which we plan to have ready for the May conference in Boston. This will, we hope, establish the Workbook as a regular part of NAOP's activities.

The grant has also assisted us with the important "Urban Forest" conference to be held this fall in Philadelphia (described elsewhere in this Newsletter). The conference will bring together a wide group of foresters, landscape architects, and park managers to share the results of their research and restoration efforts. We plan to make this a subject of next year's Workbook volume.

Other topics under consideration for future publication are: "How to Start a 'Friends of the Park Group'"; "How to Research an Historic Park"; "Funding in Difficult Economic Times"; as well as specific technical and design issues such as "Signage," "Lighting," and "Park Furnishings."

If you have a subject which might lend itself to adaptation for the Workbook, or if you have ideas for topics which need investigation, please call Darlene McCloud at 914/373-9886.

THE PLANNED COMMUNITY

This NAOP Newsletter concentrates on the planning of new communities, subdivisions, community parks, and towns undertaken by Frederick L. Olmsted, his sons, and the Olmsted firm. This planning work is often overshadowed—publicized—parks and park systems that have provided critical relief for millions of city dwellers for generations. But, it is in the planning projects that the broad range of environmental, design, and social concerns of the Olmstedes were able to achieve full blossom.
An introduction to the Olmsted planning work is provided by Susan L. Klaus, an historian in Washington, DC, and a scholar on F.L. Olmsted, Jr. Then, Olmsted planning in a new community, a resort island, and an industrial town will be discussed.

In Dayton, Ohio, we see how the local industrial mogul, John Patterson of National Cash Register Company, involved Olmsted and the firm in a myriad of planning projects which helped to shape the city and influence the lives of those working for NCR, as well as the entire city. The Dayton work is discussed by Noel Vernon, ASLA, a landscape architect teaching at Ball State University in Muncie, Indiana, who has been working on the landscape heritage of Dayton and Ohio--since the mid-1980s.

The Olmsted project on Cushing's Island, Maine, a resort island, is described by Betsy Igleheart, who has been leading the work on historic landscapes in Maine's State Historic Preservation Office.

A trustee of Riverside, long-time activist, and Olmsted supporter, Edward Straka, outlines the Olmsted heritage and the challenges today in sustaining the integrity of the Olmsted-planned community of Riverside, Illinois.

The planning theme continues with Emory professor and former-NAOP board member Dana White’s book review essay, and then, a discussion of landscape architect and recent-NAOP administrator Piera Weiss’ article on Rock Creek Park in Washington.

**THE OLMSTED COMMITMENT TO PLANNING**

In 1944, anticipating his Fiftieth Harvard Reunion, Frederick Law Olmsted, Junior, wrote:

> From the start I had many opportunities—in the office conducted by my father and elder brother and Charles Elliot—to practice landscape architecture in the broad sense in which Charles Eliot used the term, as "the art of arranging land and the objects upon it for use and the accompanying landscape for enjoyment. . . ." Beauty in those environments seems no less important to human happiness than I used to think it. Only I am far more concerned than I once was with the importance to society of differences in the kinds of use, and abuse, to which land is put.

This issue of the NAOP Newsletter, which focuses on some of the larger issues of land use and landscape design with which all three Olmsteds were involved, once again reminds us of the breadth and complexity of the Olmsted legacy.

For one hundred years there was an Olmsted actively engaged in shaping the American landscape. Frederick Law Olmsted (FLO), Senior (1822–1903), created parks in major cities which continue to provide *rus in urbe* for urban dwellers, laid out suburban communities whose romantic spirit influenced future generations of developers, and awakened Americans to issues of conservation, wilderness preservation, and environmental quality long before the words themselves entered the common parlance. His sons and professional heirs, John Charles Olmsted (1852–1920) and Frederick Law Olmsted, Junior (1870–1957), carried FLO’s discourse and concerns into the twentieth century. Whether dealing with urban, suburban, or rural landscapes, the Olmsteds refused to be limited by a narrow, technical definition of the profession which FLO helped create. They took exception to the "not uncommon impression . . . that landscape architecture . . . is mainly decorating the surroundings of buildings after they are erected, and embellishing of other special kinds of ornamental grounds . . . by means of . . . gardening techniques." Olmsted, junior, noted that in "this almost all-inclusive field of "land planning," a landscape architect might need to draw on
the skills of the architect, the civil engineer, the artist, the horticulturist, the geologist, the ecologist, and the geographer. And to an astonishing degree, the Olmsteds embodied this range of skills.

They applied this extraordinary range of talent and their artistic sensibility to projects remarkable in their variety but, more importantly, in the degree to which they addressed important social issues of their day. The Olmsteds' work looked to the future of this country—the rising importance of the suburban satellite community, the importance of regional planning, the need to preserve wilderness landscapes, the significance of national and state parks, the necessity of revitalizing central cities, and the recognition of the growing importance of the Southwest and western areas of the United States. Would a listing of today's environmental concerns read any differently?

Clearly, it is the Olmsteds' prescient reading, in their time, of the course of the United States' development that makes their work so relevant to our day. Their concern for enhancing urban and suburban living through community design, for planning the physical environment to meet the demands of modern living while protecting and preserving open spaces and wilderness areas, are once again at the forefront of both professions: landscape architecture and city planning which the Olmsteds helped guide and nourish. The Olmsted legacy is marked not by one immediately identifiable style, but rather by a clear expression of a well-considered objective or point-of-view which leaves us in no doubt, as ELO's first biographer noted nearly a century ago, as to "the broad ideal which guided the artist." It is this synthesis of artistry and practicality, this harmonizing of use and beauty in city and suburb, in park and wilderness preserve across the broad American landscape which continues to offer inspiration and practical examples for planners, landscape architects, and environmentalists today.

—Susan L. Klaus


2 Ibid., p. 409.

3 Ibid.


CUSHING'S ISLAND, MAINE

In 1882 Olmsted was asked by Francis Cushing for advice on planning a 250-acre island for summer homes. At that time the island, only twenty minutes from Portland by steamer, had a hotel, the Ottawa House, and a farm house. In 1883 Olmsted prepared a report and a preliminary study for laying out the island, a unique design project for Olmsted as the island was planned as a summer colony for visitors escaping from urban conditions. Yet to succeed, it needed to provide vacationers with sufficient amusements and recreation.

Olmsted's recommendations sought to enhance the natural beauty of the island. To distinguish Cushing's Island from a thousand other places along the coast, he suggested that nearly 50 percent of the island remain as common property. The plan proposed the entire circumference of the island be held as common property, including cliffs and beaches and adjoining land for a footpath. At more interesting points the width was increased. Large public areas around the Ottawa House and Whitehead were connected by wide parkway-like carriage paths. The road from the Portland Ferry Dock was to be seventy feet wide and planted with trees; all other roads were to be forty feet wide. Olmsted viewed the roads, which were along the highest ridges, as "... common land from which to view the expansive vista in all directions."
Cushing's Island Company incorporated this suggestion into its Articles of Incorporation. The stockholders received title to their lots and the right to use the land held in common by the company. A portion of the island including the drives, walks, unnumbered plots, bathing beaches, boat harbors, hotel, and its outbuildings were to remain the common property of the company unless "... otherwise determined by two-thirds vote of the stockholders."

Although much of the Olmsted layout for Cushing's Island was never realized, many of his suggestions were followed. The concept of privately supported public grounds was adopted with covenant and easement provisions incorporated into the deeds. Deeds also stipulated that "... the grounds in front of said lot bordering on said bay are to be forever kept open and unobstructed." The design guidelines proposed by Olmsted were carefully observed by John Calvin Stevens, the architect of all but two of the surviving summer cottages designed and built between 1883 and 1910. The cottages were set back the recommended distance from the road; the height was limited to two stories. Stevens specified the use of simple materials: unpainted shingles and field stone, consistent with Olmsted's desire that all artificial structures be secondary to the natural landscape. Although Stevens, a junior partner in the Fassett firm, did not meet with the Olmsted party during the Cushing's Island tour in May 1883, the two designers were philosophically "of like mind"; the works of each complemented the other.

Correspondence between Francis Cushing and the Olmsted firm suggests that the island was plagued by financial difficulties from the start and prevented Olmsted's usual construction supervision and later periodic supervisory visits. The Olmsted plan, although never executed in full, has guided the island's development for the last 100 years. The quantity and quality of the cottage designs by John Calvin Stevens are also significant as they represent important regional examples of single shingle style architecture. Thus, Cushing Island's development was benefitted by the work of two important American designers.

(Dayton, Ohio)

Dayton, Ohio, is a remarkable example of the breadth of the Olmsted firm's planning and design work. It also serves as a case study on how the combined forces of a local leader, John H. Patterson (1844-1922), imaginative and progressive founder and president of National Cash Register Company, and an outstanding design firm were able to shape the life and appearance of a city.

John Patterson brought the Olmsted firm to Dayton in 1894, and during the course of its work until 1922 when Patterson died, the Olmsted Brothers had 188 job listings. Sixty landscape plans and fifty completed projects were produced. These included plans for the grounds of National Cash Register, homes of upper echelon employees and friends, employe and city recreational facilities (several of which remain), a plan for the city's park system (still similar to recommendations), airfields, and Wright Brothers' memorials. Dayton was also home to the Wright brothers. These diverse projects were designed to improve not only the appearance and functioning of Dayton, but also to ameliorate the health and welfare of Dayton's residents, particularly NCR employees.

In Dayton the Olmsted firm found a true believer in Patterson. An early leader in industrial management, Patterson introduced profit sharing, healthy working conditions, and recreational programs. Included in Patterson's progressive programs was landscape gardening. NCR had a landscape gardening department and under Patterson's leadership, NCR published several pamphlets on the role of landscape in industrial welfare. Landscape gardening, for Patterson, was a way of enriching the lives of NCR employees. For workers who purchased houses, often with NCR help, there were lantern slide shows on ways of beautifying their homes through landscaping. One show was presented by John C. Olmsted.

Patterson's sense of corporate duty and progressive management, motivated partially to ward off the threat of unionization, was carried on after Patterson's death by his friend and coworker, Colonel Edward S. Deeds, automotive and airflight pioneer and fellow civic benefactor. Deeds was active for over forty years in stimulating an impressive range of landscape projects with the Olmsted firm—from the Miami Conservancy Commission (one of the country's early
park/conservation greenways), a variety of airfield projects and parks, including Wright Memorial Hill, a park overlooking Wright-Patterson Air Force base, and several projects in Moraine including two land development plans, Moraine Park (1915) and Moraine Industrial Community (1917-19). Moraine Park was intended to be an upper-class "romantic" subdivision, but it was never built. Moraine Industrial Community was planned as a complete industrial town with factory sites, residential areas with neighborhood schools, a shopping district, a civic center, and a park system, but it, too, did not materialize, possibly due to World War I. In 1953 Deeds was still corresponding with the Olmsted firm from his NCR office.

Aside from the Olmsted work for the Patterson-Deeds connections, Dayton also had several estates, including Governor James Cox's, designed by the Olmsted firm in conjunction with three local landscape firms that gained popularity in the 1920s: George Siebenthaler, Samuel Zehrung, and Malcolm Dill, who planned one Dayton subdivision.

Surveying and documenting this massive landscape heritage in Dayton has been tackled by Noel Dorsey Vernon, ASLA, of Ball State University. With support from two Dayton garden clubs, the Garden Club of Dayton and Four Seasons Garden Club, and the Dayton Foundation, and in cooperation with the State's Historic Preservation Officer, W. Ray Luce, and ASLA, Vernon has been uncovering exhaustive materials in Dayton, Brookline, and at the Library of Congress. This Dayton job was designed in 1986 as a preliminary study to develop an appropriate method for conducting the Olmsted-related portion of the Ohio Historic Landscapes Survey. The survey, spurred by the Olmsted Heritage Landscapes Act, was planned so the state could learn more about and, thus, be better prepared to protect its historic landscapes and educate both the public and preservationists relative to Ohio's landscape heritage. Vernon and the SPHO staff have done a remarkable job in educating the public about Ohio's landscape heritage through mailings and a slide/tape show chronicling the careers of five Ohio landscape architects, now available in five major libraries in the state. As reported in the last NAOP Newsletter, the City of Dayton has contracted with Noel Vernon to undertake an historic landscape plan for the Hill and Dales—so the historic landscape work in this important city continues.

Discussion is underway for NAOP to sponsor a workshop in Dayton in the future.

(This article was based on a paper, "Landscape Architecture and Public Service: The Olmsted Firm in Dayton Ohio 1894-1930" by Noel Dorsey Vernon, ASLA, Landscape Architecture Department, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana, for the CELA Proceedings, Providence RI, RISD, 1987.)
RIVERSIDE
THE OLMSLED FIRM'S SUBDIVISION & COMMUNITY DESIGNS

The Olmsted subdivisions and community designs are residential developments where planning and landscaping provide a continuous relationship with nature. As parks are intertwined in these communities, there is not the need to "escape" to parks as in most congested hard-edged cities.

The earliest and most extensive of the residential community designs is Riverside, Illinois (1868). Buffalo's Parkside (1872), is a residential complex adjacent to Buffalo's Delaware Park and relies, more than most of the subdivision designs, for its expansive relief upon its close relationship to the large urban park. The Berkeley neighborhood design concept was planned to be adjacent to the University of California, Berkeley campus.

Sudbrook, Maryland (1876), a small suburban subdivision outside Baltimore, and Atlanta's Druid Hills (1892), were originally remote and separate from the city even though now surrounded by urban sprawl.

The total community design of Riverside, a suburb of Chicago, is the most comprehensive of the Olmsted community designs. It is a self-sufficient suburb with a completely unified curvilinear road system. The road's parkways are landscaped consistent with the planted area of its public lands. The village center contains a business district, town hall, library, and a railroad station linking Riverside by rail to the center of Chicago. The community has extensive landscaped public lands interspersed throughout the village and along the adjacent Des Plaines River. The river meanders through the community. The landscape scene is pastoral. Self-contained utility systems were integrated into the original plan. All features and details of the design were governed by a Master Plan.

Today, Riverside's population of nearly 9,000 is enriched by its large expanse of landscaped roadways and public lands. The mastery of the Olmsted, Vaux and Company's plan has retained its rural, sylvan environment—even though it has been surrounded by typical urban rectilinear street-lined suburbs. The dominance of the Plan has provided and instilled the strength to sustain its beauty.

The subdivisions and communities have been susceptible to the same threats of misuse and intrusions as the park designs. Adding insensitive structures in public lands and splitting communities with new roads, as proposed in Druid Hills, are examples of current misuse.

Living in an Olmsted residential community is enriched by one's constant awareness of the landscape. Such designs, as Riverside, remain some of the finest examples of urban and community design today.

--Ed Straka

BEYOND AESTHETICS: New Scholarly Directions
by Dana F. White

As the "Olmsted Movement" enters its third decade, we can look back upon noteworthy accomplishments and forward to formidable challenges.

The seventies established the scholarly base. The celebration in 1972 of the 150th anniversary of Frederick Law Olmsted's birth, brought the movement national recognition. Soon to follow were the ambitious biographies by Laura Wood Roper and Elizabeth Stevenson, an interpretation of the man and his works by the late Albert Fein, and the initial funding and subsequent publication of the early volumes of the Papers of Frederick Law Olmsted. The Papers Project quickly evolved into a multifaceted resource base by serving as an information center for scholars, attracting attention to the Olmsted materials in Washington, and demonstrating to the Library of Congress' administration through user interest and demand how vital the Olmsted holdings are nationwide. (Thus, in 1977, there appeared a revised edition of the 1963 Frederick Law Olmsted: A Register of His Papers in the Library of Congress.) Finally, when the "other papers"—the maps, plans, drawings, photographs, etc., housed at the Olmsted offices in Brookline, were acquired by the National Park Service in 1979, a beginning was made toward restoring and making available to scholars both the written and visual Olmsted legacy.

If the seventies were a decade of scholarly consciousness—raising about matters Olmstedian then the eighties were a time for consolidation. The Papers are approaching their mid-point, with the fifth volume, The California Frontier, 1853-1865, published in 1990, coinciding with Yosemite's Centennial. The Master List of Design Projects of the Olmsted Firm (compiled by Charles E. Beveridge, Carolyn F. Hoffman et al.; distributed by NAOP, in conjunction with the Mass. Assoc. for Olmsted Parks), published in 1987, catalogs about 3,500 plans, organized in eight information columns and arranged in fourteen categories. In its thoroughness, it stands as the authoritative guide to the Olmsted firm's holdings at Brookline. Finally, at NAOP's tenth annual conference in May 1990, the Buffalo Friends of Olmsted Parks provided The Olmsted Parks Preservation Directory, edited by Susan J. West, with one-to-two page introductions to thirty national, regional, and local landscape preservation groups. With such valuable inventories at hand, the stock-taking for the movement's first two decades seems to be in good order.

Landscape preservation scholarship also advanced markedly, especially during the eighties, but primarily as a "laboratory science." Historic preservation plans for Central Park in New York, Prospect Park in Brooklyn, and a dozen parks in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts demanded scholarly expertise, imagination, and innovation. The import of these research ventures into "applied history" should be examined up close—preferably by an historian who has been involved in such projects.
Olmsted scholarship during the past two decades has focused, understandably enough, largely upon matters of content—that is, design. With only a few exceptions—most notably a major monograph by Cynthia Zaitzevsky—has it grappled with process—policy and finances. In "The Design Process," Part Three of her Frederick Law Olmsted and the Boston Public Park System (Harvard, 1982), Zaitzevsky devoted five chapters to an analysis of the organizational structure of the Olmsted firm, how it secured park commissions, its role in engineering and construction, its provisions for park structures, and specifics about plant materials and their placement in Boston's open spaces. Sensitive always to design matters, Zaitzevsky nonetheless ventured beyond aesthetics into the field of public policy as it influenced park-making in Olmsted's Boston.

What Zaitzevsky managed for a single city, William H. Wilson attempted for five cities. In The City Beautiful Movement (Hopkins, 1990), awarded the 1989 Lewis Mumford Prize for best American planning history book by the Soc. for Am. City and Regional Planning History, he, too, has advanced well beyond aesthetics. "In the broadest sense," Wilson contends, "the City Beautiful was a political movement, for it demanded a reorientation of public thought and action toward urban beauty." Because it was "cultural, aesthetic, political, and environmental," it transcended narrowly defined "municipal politics." "In fact," Wilson argues, "City Beautiful activity, though complementing other reforms, possessed an ideology, purpose, and mode of operation."

"Frederick Law Olmsted and the City Beautiful Movement" is the first of four chapters in Part I: "Origins and Ideology." Based mainly upon secondary works familiar to many Newsletter readers, Wilson's is an able synthesis of FLO's "three fundamental contributions to the City Beautiful movement": his "planning of comprehensive, multiple-purpose park and boulevard systems"; his ideological formulations on the influence of nature upon man antedated, even anticipated "the organicism and environmentalism of the City Beautiful era"; and "the flourishing consulting practice he developed and bequeathed to his son and stepson" (10). Three additional chapters offer challenges to claims for the centrality of the 1893 Chicago Fair to the larger movement, examples of connections between many municipal improvement efforts and the City Beautiful movement, and a demonstration of how politics was employed "to achieve a congeries of socioeconomic reforms related to urban design" (75).

Parts II and III, on the "Early" and "Late" stages of the movement, are concerned with politics, policy, and finance, and are illustrated by three case studies: Kansas City, Seattle, and Denver.

Kansas City created a magnificent park system at the turn of the century, but only after its civic-commercial leadership established "the legal substructure so essential to the success of city planning" (112). It did so by orchestrating a drive in 1895 to amend the city charter to its own ends, by isolating its opposition as "knockers" and "mossbacks," and by keeping in place an "effective coalition of determined men" (204). When that coalition disintegrated after a quarter-century's effectiveness, so too did the local City Beautiful movement.

Seattle got out the vote for its park-boulevard system. How its park commissioners did so and what that vote meant ward-by-ward provides one of the most intriguing narratives in this volume (156-60). John C. Olmsted's role in this "alien climate and boom-town culture" is another story of note (151-56 & 160-67), both for Olmsted trackers and students of artist-client relationships. As in Kansas City, "the politics and economics of planning" determined the end point for City Beautiful effectiveness in Seattle—the point at which planners failed at political persuasion.
Denver demonstrated "the critical importance of administrative and electoral politics to City Beautiful success" (171). And it did so largely through the agency of one individual, Mayor Robert Speer (173-89). This "boss-broker" oversaw or encouraged almost every City Beautiful improvement from before his election as mayor in 1904 to his death in 1918. "Mayor Bob," as Lincoln Steffens dubbed him, was "the centralist who gathered the power of city government in his hands, through formal or informal means of control" to achieve, in this instance, municipal beautification (169). The City Beautiful in Denver survived his passing, but just barely.

City-by-city then, Wilson guides us through the politics of planning. In the process, he opens up for us directions that would have pleased Olmsted himself. When he published The Spoils of the Park in 1882, FLO subtitled his essay: With a Few Leaves from the Deep-laden Note-books of a Wholly Un-practical Man." That he regarded and had proved himself the opposite is emphasized by the job titles following his signature: one of the designers of the park; several years its superintendent; and sometime president and treasurer of the department. It seems time for the rest of us to get past that first semicolon.

ROCK CREEK PARK
THE EMERALD OF THE CAPITAL CITY.

Piera Weiss, landscape architect, former administrator of NAOP, and now planner at the Maryland Park and Planning Commission, has written with William Bushong the lead article on Rock Creek Park in the Fall/Winter 1990 issue of Washington History, the magazine of the Historical Society of Washington, DC.

In the article, "Rock Creek Park, Emerald of the Capital City," Weiss and Bushong present a fascinating and comprehensive history of the park, including the role of F. L. Olmsted, Jr. As a member of the McMillan Commission, FLO, Jr., was critical to the planning of Washington's park system which has become one of the distinguishing features of the Washington metropolitan area.

Olmsted urged the planning and development of neighborhood parks and a system of parks to connect the Civil War forts and a parkway, the now well-known Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway, to connect the Mall with the Zoo and Rock Creek Park. Concerned about the blasting for sections of the upper parkway in the park, Olmsted suggested that future roads be built on heights rather than in the creek valley. This conflict between preservation and public use led Olmsted to observe: "The value of the park scenery depends absolutely upon making it accessible to the people, but nothing can be gained if the means of access destroys the scenery."

In 1918 the Olmsted Brothers prepared a master plan for the Park, which has provided "the philosophy and practical framework for the future development of the Park," according to Weiss and Bushong. The article then traces the many challenges and changing conditions such as pollution, new administrative bodies and policies, heavy use, and automobile traffic. Yet, as the authors state, Rock Creek Park, observing its centennial year, remains a remarkable natural resource.

NEWS

OLMSTED THEATER FOR CHILDREN

New York's Theater in Motion has produced an "historical, multicultural, musical fantasy" presentation about Frederick Law Olmsted and the creation of Central Park, entitled "The great Democratic Experiment, Oasis for Everyone." This participatory production, appropriate for children 6-14 years old, points out how contemporary many of Olmsted's concerns for the environment and civil rights were by bringing Olmsted back to be with the audience in 1991. Reports are that the production was a big hit with Camp Central Park last summer. If your school or organization is interested in booking the production—or learning more about it, please write: Leslie Faneili, Theater in Motion, 121-25 6th Ave, Queens, NY 11356, or call 718-624-7329.

OLMSTED ISLAND INACCESSIBLE

James Olmsted of Rockville, Maryland, has brought to our attention the sad fact that the bridge to Olmsted Island in the Potomac River at Great Falls, Maryland, has never been rebuilt. Located just upstream from Washington, it was washed out in a flood twenty years ago.
This footbridge enabled people not just to step onto the Olmsted Island, but to have one of the best views possible of the dramatic Great Falls. Evidently the federal, state, and county governments have raised $400,000 for the construction of the footbridge, but $20,000 in private funds was needed by the end of March, if the job were to be undertaken.

HELP WANTED

Gail Elnicky is working on a project for Seattle's Historic Preservation Office to prepare a list of privately owned, significant, historic, or cultural estates and gardens and the methods used to protect them. She would like information from our readers on both the processes they used to identify and designate significant features of private gardens and estates, as well as the legal tools used to protect them. She has a special interest in those done under NPS Bulletin #18's guidelines and, also, those where the approach considered elements as part of larger spatial and visual concepts. Both good and bad examples are welcome! Her address is: 4315 Bagley Ave North, Seattle, WA 98103-7626, or call 206-633-4783.

CALENDAR

Upcoming Conferences

\textbf{JUNE 10-20}
American Horticultural Society, Gardens of the Southwest, Colorado Rockies, and Canyons, Colorado, Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico. For information, write: AHS, Box 0105, Mount Vernon, VA 22121.

\textbf{SEPTEMBER}
National Park Service, course, Preservation of Outdoor Monuments. For information, call 202-343-8153.

\textbf{OCTOBER 4-5}
NAOP URBAN FOREST CONFERENCE in Philadelphia on managing forests in historic parks that have suffered ecologically and aesthetically from neglect and abuse. Featured speakers will be the English forest planner, Ralph Cobham, who has worked at Blenheim and Biltmore and landscape architect, Leslie Sauer of Philadelphia whose projects include Prospect Park.

\textbf{OCTOBER 16-20}
National Trust for Historic Preservation, Annual Conference, San Francisco, CA.

\textbf{OCTOBER 18-22}
National Recreation & Parks Association's Annual Conference focusing this year on Urban Gateways & Greenways, Baltimore, MD.

\textbf{OCTOBER 19-22}
American Society of Landscape Architects, Annual Conference, Kansas City, MO.

\textbf{NOVEMBER 7-10}
Planning History Conference, Richmond, VA. For further information: The Society for American City & Regional History, 3655 Darbyshire Dr., Hilliard, OH 43026.

\textbf{NOVEMBER 13-17}
American Forestry Association, Alliances for Community Trees.

\textbf{Calendar Continued...}