



United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve
P.O. Box 140
Gustavus, Alaska 99826-0140

Tel: 907-697-2230 · Fax: 907-697-2654



RECEIVED

SEP 07 2012

OHA

IN REPLY REFER TO:
H2621

AUG 31 2012

Ms. Judith Bittner
State Historic Preservation Officer
Department of Natural Resources
Office of History and Archaeology
550 W. 7th Suite 1310
Anchorage, AK 99501-3561

Dear Ms. Bittner:

In compliance with Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, (16 U.S.C. Sec. 470h-2, as amended, 90 Stat. 1320), we have prepared the enclosed Determination of Eligibility for the Mission 66 Development within the Bartlett Cove Residential District, located in Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve near Gustavus, AK. We have determined that the district is ineligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, set forth in 36 CFR 60.4.

GBQ-3 Residence, GBQ-5 Residence and GBA-10 Recreation Center and Storage are located on the south shore of Bartlett Cove, west of the headquarters compound and east of the Glacier Bay Lodge. The area was originally developed as part of the Mission 66 program in the late 1950s as a residential compound for National Park Service permanent employees working at Glacier Bay. GBQ-5 was the first building to be completed in 1957, with GBQ-3 and GBA-10 being completed in 1958. Two more single family houses were planned for that would have completed the community, but were never built.

All three buildings have undergone some alterations over time, although they retain their original location and overall design. However, they have since lost significant integrity of materials, workmanship, setting, feeling and association, primarily due to alterations to the Mission 66 landscape plan caused by subsequent park development. These buildings no longer convey the planning efforts of Mission 66 at Glacier Bay, and while their physical integrity is moderate, they no longer possess enough overall integrity to be eligible for the National Register. The combination of the alteration and demolition of other Mission 66 buildings throughout Bartlett Cove and subsequent residential development in the immediate area have orphaned all three buildings out of their historic context.



The Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve Headquarters Compound (AHRS JUN-00997) was also developed as part of the Mission 66 planning efforts. This Mission 66 complex has similarly lost integrity and in 2006, it was determined ineligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

As per the implementing 36 Code of Federal Regulations 63.2, we would appreciate your 45-day review and concurrence with the ineligibility of this district. If you have any questions about this Determination of Eligibility, please call Heather Miller, Architectural Historian, Alaska Regional Office at 644-3473.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,



Susan Boudreau, Superintendent
Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve

Enclosure

cc: (w/enclosure)
Cultural Resource Specialist, GLBA
Architectural Historian, ARKO

2-10 WSM
Anch 99501



THE STATE
of **ALASKA**
GOVERNOR SEAN PARNELL

Department of Natural Resources

DIVISION OF PARKS AND OUTDOOR RECREATION
Office of History and Archaeology

550 West 7th Avenue, Suite 1310
Anchorage, Alaska 99501-3565
Web: <http://dnr.alaska.gov/parks/oha>
Phone: 907.269.8721
Fax: 907.269.8908

September 21, 2012

Re: 3330-6N Mission 66 Development within the Bartlett Cove Residential District

Susan Boudreau, Superintendent
Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve
P.O. Box 140
Gustavus, Alaska 99826-0140

Dear Ms. Boudreau:

The Office of History and Archaeology review committee discussed the *Mission 66 Development within the Bartlett Cove Residential District, Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve*. documentation received at our office September 7, 2012. You asked us to concur with your determination three buildings (GBQ-3, GBQ-5, GBQ-10) are not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The reviewers concluded, and I concur, the buildings individually and as a district are **not eligible** for listing in the National Register under any of the criteria, principally because of alterations over time to the buildings and changes to the residential area, including demolition of other Mission 66 buildings.

Thank you for including completed Alaska Heritage Resources Survey (AHRS) forms for the three buildings with the determination of eligibility report, photographs and maps. If you have questions about this determination please contact Joan (Jo) Antonson, State Historian, at 907.269.8714 or jo.antonson@alaska.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Joan M. Antonson".

Judith E. Bittner
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

cc: Heather Miller, Alaska Regional Office, NPS, 240 West 5th Ave., Anchorage, AK 99501



Eligible _____ Not Eligible X

1. **Name of Property** Mission 66 Development within the Bartlett Cove Residential District: GBQ-3 Residence, GBQ-5 Residence and GBA-10 Recreation Center and Storage

Historic name: GB-3 Residence, GB-5 Residence, GB-10 Power House

Other name: Supervisory Park Ranger Residence (GB-5); Maintenance Man Residence (GB-3); Storage Building (GB-10)

AHRS number:

Field number: N/A

IDLCS number: N/A

2. **Location**

Map sheet: Juneau B-6

Aliquot: N ½, Section 32, Township 39S, Range 58E, Copper River Meridian

UTM: UNK

Latitude: 58° 27' 18.79" N **Longitude:** 135° 52' 37.17" W

Acreage: <1 acre

Street and number: N/A

City or town: Gustavus, AK

Land Status: Federal

Verbal Boundary Description: The Bartlett Cove Residential District is bounded to the north and east by the old alignment of the Gustavus-Bartlett Cove Road, now maintained as a graded shoreline footpath. It is bounded to the south by the current alignment of the same road. It is bounded to the west by the turn-off road that is now the only motor vehicle access to the Mission 66 residences.

Boundary Justification: The boundaries of the district were chosen because they completely encompass both the remaining Mission 66 not yet considered for nomination and contemporary NPS residential housing at Bartlett Cove.

3. **Description**

Ownership of property: National Park Service

Category of property: District

Property's function:

Historic: DOMESTIC: Single Dwelling; **INDUSTRY:** Energy Facility

Current: DOMESTIC: Single Dwelling; **SOCIAL:** Clubhouse;

INDUSTRY: Industrial storage

Architectural classification: MODERN MOVEMENT: Ranch-style

Materials:


Foundation: Concrete
Framing: Wood, Steel
Walls: Wood, Plywood
Windows: Vinyl, Aluminum, Wood
Roof: Metal
Other:

Integrity: Poor. All three buildings have undergone multiple physical alterations over time, but still retain their integrity of location from when they were first constructed in the late 1950s. They also retain their design, as the general floor plans and window fenestration patterns of each building remains the same. While there have been some significant additions to all three buildings, there are not completely detrimental changes to the physical appearance of the buildings, as they have been sympathetically constructed in relation to the overall layout of each. This makes the buildings appear very similar to the way they looked historically. However, the buildings have lost their integrity of setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. The setting has been compromised by more recent NPS employee residential development in the same area that has overtaken the Mission 66 construction, obscuring the original site plan by altering circulations patterns and thinning the original sheltering trees and shrubs. Some original materials remain, but have either been incompatibly replaced or refinished, and original craftsmanship details such as trim and cabinetry have been changed over time. Most importantly, the feeling and association of the buildings with Mission 66 development at Glacier Bay has been lost. A separate Determination on Eligibility has already been written for the Mission 66 development in the park headquarters compound in Bartlett Cove, concluding their ineligibility. The combination of the alteration and demolition of other Mission 66 buildings throughout Bartlett Cove and subsequent residential development in the immediate area have orphaned all three buildings out of their historic context.


Narrative Description:

GBQ-3 Residence, GBQ-5 Residence and GBA-10 Recreation Center and Storage are located on the south shore of Bartlett Cove, west of the headquarters compound and east of the Glacier Bay Lodge within Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve, near Gustavus, AK (Map 1 and 2). The area was originally developed as part of the Mission 66 program in the late 1950s as a residential compound for National Park Service permanent employees working at Glacier Bay. GBQ-5 was the first building to be completed in 1957, with GBQ-3 and GBA-10 being completed in 1958. Two more single family houses were planned for, which would have completed the community, but were never built. In 1993 nine more seasonal residences were built in the same area just south and west of the original development.

GBQ-3 Residence




Drawing 3: GBQ-3, Current Floor Plan. Based on Drawing No. NM-GB-3012A and field observations.




Drawing 4: GBQ-3 Residence, Original Floor Plan. Based on Drawing No. NM-GB-3012A.

GBA-10 Power House/Recreation Center and Storage



Drawing 5: GBA-10 Recreation Center and Storage, Current Plan. Based on Drawing No. NM-GB-3009A and field observations.



Drawing 6: GBA-10 Power House, Original Plan. Based of Drawing No. NM-GB-3009A.

All three buildings have undergone some alterations over time, but retain their location and overall design from when they were first constructed. However, they have since lost their integrity of materials, workmanship, setting, feeling and association, primarily due to alterations to the Mission 66 landscape plan caused by subsequent park development. Alone without their historic context, these buildings no longer convey the story of Mission 66 at Glacier Bay, and while their physical integrity is moderate, they no longer possess enough overall integrity to be eligible for the National Register.

Setting

The Gustavus-Bartlett Cove Road lies to the south of the development. Traveling west on this road, the vehicle entrance to the Mission 66 residential area where GBQ-3 and GBQ-5 are located is the third turn on the right, past the two turn-offs to the headquarters compound and 1990s employee housing area. The spur road is rough graded with gravel, descending down the slope to the houses. The new housing area sits on the rise above the Mission 66 houses, partially screened from view by a thin line of Western Hemlock and Sitka Spruce trees and thick shrubs. GBA-10 is located near the entrance of this new development off the right side of the road. There is no direct motor vehicle route between the two residential areas, only a single foot trail that descends the hill from the above road and ends just east of GBQ-3. To the north of the buildings lies Bartlett Cove, clearly visible from both residential buildings but obscured by foliage from GBA-10.

GB-5 Residence

GBQ-5 was the first residential building to be constructed as part of Glacier Bay's Mission 66 Master Plan for permanent employee housing at Bartlett Cove. It was completed in September 1957 as a two bedroom, one bathroom single family house (Photo 1). It is a one story side gable house with a rectangular ranch-style floor plan and a large gable roofed addition on the rear (north) elevation (Photo 2). The foundation of the building consists of a board formed concrete stem wall with additional wood posts on concrete blocks supporting the floor within the perimeter wall. The structure is wood frame construction, clad in vertical board and batten siding made of cedar wood and painted a muted clay red. The wood trim around the windows, door, and roofline is painted a contrasting off-white color. The low pitched gable roof is covered with metal sheet roofing with enclosed eaves. The addition's roof is clad in the same material, its gable roof intersecting at a right angle with the roof of the main body of the house. Louvered vents are located at the apex of each gable. The roof also has two metal chimneys, one for a wood burning

stove and the other for the boiler.

The main entrance on the front (south) elevation is offset to the right (east) end of the building, while the garage is at the left (west) end (Photo 2). A single step leads up from the concrete sidewalk to the stoop in front of the entryway. The front door itself is metal with a single fixed upper window, opening into a mudroom. It is flanked to the right by a 1/1 single hung vinyl window. A gable-like pediment protrudes from the roofline, covering the porch and directing water away from the entrance. The window, door, and gable pediment are new, added when the original recessed front porch was enclosed to create the mudroom; the original breadth of the porch is indicated by the width of the exterior concrete stoop. The window fenestration pattern across the façade is original, though all the original 2/2 double hung wood windows (with matching storm windows) have been replaced with 1/1 single hung vinyl windows. The window order is as follows, from left to right: a short 1/1 window, two identical 1/1 windows grouped together in a single frame, two longer 1/1 windows, the front door, the new 1/1 window (not original), and another long 1/1 window. All the windows on the front elevation, as well as every other elevation, are either brand new or replacement vinyl windows. The wood trim around the windows and doors is possibly original, but this could not be conclusively determined. The garage door is also a replacement.

The left (west) elevation is relatively simple, with two 1/1 single hung vinyl replacement windows in the center of the façade, capped with the roof gable (Photo 3). The roof projects slightly out from the body of the house, creating a shallow jetty. The wall underneath the gable is clad in wood beveled horizontal lap siding. This end of the house has no projecting eaves, but is instead flush with the façade. The house's external utilities all enter on this side of the building, both electrical and phone. There is also an antenna strapped to the upper portion of the roof jetty. A large wood pile partially obscures the lower portion of the elevation.

The rear (north) elevation has a stepped profile, which is shallowest at the west end where the deck (a recent addition) meets the façade. It steps out slightly where the living room picture window is located, and steps out even farther for the master suite addition (Photo 4). The rear door that leads from the deck to the utility room is the same as the front door, but with a matching screen door included. A 1/1 single hung vinyl window is located on the small partial wall created by the step in the façade. The Chicago-style picture window has a central fixed pane flanked by two narrow 1/1 single hung vinyl windows. The west wall of the addition has one small 1/1 window and a set of two 1/1 windows in a single frame, mimicking the fenestration pattern on the front elevation. The north wall of the addition has two sets of two 1/1 windows in a single frame, trimmed with extra decorative moldings. The north side of the addition

imitates the gable ends of the main body of the house. However, it lacks the protruding jetty, has a slightly overhanging eave, and has 'wingtip' trim at the ends of the gables, imitating the gable end treatment on house GBQ-3 (compare Photos 5 and 9). The shed side eaves also have long, narrow vents screened with fine mesh, unlike the unvented eaves on the rest of the house.

The right (northeast) elevation was originally the same to the opposite end, but has been elongated by the master suite addition (Photo 6). This side of the addition is plain board and batten siding, while the end of the main house has three 1/1 single hung vinyl windows. The right (north) window has been added since the original construction, providing extra light into the interior bedrooms.

The interior of the house has a three bedroom, two bath plan (Drawing 1). Entering from the front door, to the left is the living room, dining area, galley kitchen, utility room and garage. To the right one enters a hallway to the private side of the house, leading to two bedrooms, a hallway bathroom, an original built-in linen closet, and ending at the new master suite, which has a private bath. The kitchen, bathrooms, and utility area have vinyl flooring, while the rest of the floors are carpeted. The walls have a pebbled plaster finish, as do the ceilings. White beveled baseboard and window trim is consistent throughout the house, save for in the master suite, where the window trim is a simpler design stained a natural wood color. The house is heated by a baseboard heating system.

Alterations Overall GBQ-5 has fair to moderate physical integrity. While the exterior of the house appears very similar between historic and recent photographs, several notable changes have been made (Drawings 1 and 2). As previously noted, the front porch has been enclosed into a mudroom, with a gabled pediment over the front door. The large rear master suite and deck have also been constructed. The siding, which used to be stained so as to show off the cedar siding, has been painted, as has the concrete foundation. All the original 2/2 double hung sash wood windows (with matching awning storm windows) have been replaced with 1/1 vinyl windows, and new windows have been added, altering the fenestration of all but the southwest façade. On the roof, the original wood enclosed metal flue chimney, which supported an interior fireplace in the living room, has been completely removed and replaced with two separate metal pipe chimneys. The roof also used to be clad in cedar shingles, which were replaced with metal roofing in 1982¹. A deck was also added in 2008 and is accessed through a new door outside from the utility room.²

¹ GLBA Maintenance Files, Building File GB-5.

² Facilities Management Software System (FMSS). Work Order Information by Location Hierarchy. Work order #1528531. Accessed July 2011.

The interior floor plan of the house has also been altered since the time of construction. The front porch was enclosed to create a mud room. The hallway was widened by removing the closet from Bedroom #2 to add the master suite (which postdates 1985³), bringing the total number of bedrooms to three and bathrooms to two. All the interior finishes, however, have been completely changed. The floors throughout the house used to be painted concrete, first replaced with vinyl and carpet in 1983⁴. The walls used to be painted, with no textured finish. All the interior trim is also likely a replacement, as it is consistent between both original and new parts of the house. The kitchen has also been completely remodeled, with new cabinets and appliances. The living room has also changed, with the fireplace being removed and replaced with a corner oriented wood burning stove.

Landscape There is no formal landscaping plan for the house. The site has a forested character, tucked back into the tree line along the shore of Bartlett Cove. The front yard of the house has a few taller shrubs growing up against the sides, fronted by an unmanicured grass lawn. The driveway is original, though it is now paved concrete instead of rough graded with gravel. The back and side yards have been allowed to revert to a more natural state and are dominated by a mix of grasses and ferns. According the current resident, a worn game trail passing behind the building parallel to the shoreline is often used by bears traversing the area.

GBQ-3 Residence

Construction on GBQ-3 began just as GBQ-5 was finished in September 1957. This three bedroom, two bathroom residence was completed in April 1958 (Photo 7). Similar to GBQ-5, this residence has a ranch-style plan, but was not constructed based on the same plans, or by the same contractor. GBQ-3 is a one story side gable house with a rectangular plan (Photo 8). It has three additions; two lean-to shelters on the front (northwest) and rear (southeast) elevations, and an enclosed bathroom addition on the left (northeast) side. The foundation of the building consists of a board formed concrete stem wall with additional wood posts on concrete blocks supporting the floor within the perimeter wall. The bathroom addition had a raised foundation concealed by wood boards. The structure is wood frame construction, clad in cedar vertical board and batten siding and painted a muted taupe. The wood trim around the windows, door, and roofline is painted a contrasting off-white color. The low pitched gable roof is covered with metal sheet roofing with enclosed eaves, containing narrow eave vents. As an added decorative element, the eave ends

³ GLBA Maintenance Files, Building Index.

⁴ GLBA Maintenance Files, Building File GB-5.

on the gable sides of the roof have a wooden 'wingtip' detail that slightly overlaps the siding of the house. The bathroom addition is covered in the same roofing, though its pitch is higher than the main building and has circular holes as eave vents. Louvered vents are located at the apex of each gable. The roof also has two metal chimneys, one for a wood burning stove and the other for the boiler.

The front (northwest) elevation has two louvered foundation vents just above the concrete stem wall. The main entrance is roughly in the center of the building. A flagstone flight of stairs leads up from the edge of the road to the concrete stoop in front of the recessed porch. The front door itself is metal with a single fixed upper window with a matching screen door. The window fenestration pattern across the façade is original, though all the original 2/2 double hung wood windows (with matching storm windows) throughout the house have been replaced with 1/1 single hung vinyl windows. The order of windows is as follows, from left (north) to right (west): one large window (bedroom), two small windows (hallway bathroom), one Chicago-style picture window (living room), and another small window, slightly wider than the two for the bathroom (utility room). The wood trim around the windows and doors is possibly original, but this could not be conclusively determined. On the right side of the elevation there is a lean-to shelter supported by wood posts. This construction covers a large diesel fuel tank, which provides the house with its heat.

The right (southwest) elevation has an incised corner porch at the south corner (Photo 9). Two doors are located here, one metal door, matching the front door but painted teal, that leads into the utility room of the house, and the other is a wooden hollow core door that leads to an enclosed storage room with shelving. The board and batten siding runs all the way up the façade, from ground level and underneath the roof gable, a detail also mimicked on the opposite end of the house. However, the lower portion of the siding does not align with that of the gable; this is because this wall is a newer addition, first enclosed circa 1976.⁵ The storage room was an exposed wood shed in the original construction.⁶ The roofline has also been extended toward the rear of the building because of a lean-to addition made to that side of the house.

The rear (southeast) elevation is similar to the front, with two louvered foundation vents, but with a different fenestration pattern (Photo 10). The order of windows is as follows, from left (south) to right (east): one small 1/1 window, two small 1/1 windows in one frame, two longer 1/1 windows in a single frame, again two longer 1/1 windows in a single frame, then a final longer

⁵ GLBA Photo Files, GLBA-00491, Box 6, Folder 15.

⁶ GLBA Maintenance Files, Building File GB-3, Historic Photo; Drawing No. NM-GB-3012A.

1/1 window. The major architectural feature on this side of the house is the lean-to shelter addition, used as a covered wood shed. The structure is of wood frame construction, the supporting posts sunk into the ground, protected by metal sleeves. The lean-to is open along the façade of the building, covering a stepped deck made of wood boards and plywood. The outer wall of the shelter is covered in plywood. The roof of the shelter is covered in the same metal sheeting as the main house, forming a seamless continuation of the original roof pitch. The east corner of the façade has been extended by the addition of a bathroom off the northeast side of the house.

The left (northeast) side of the building originally had two 1/1 windows centered on the façade, but the window near the east corner has been removed and a bathroom addition added (Photo 11). The addition is clad in board and batten siding to mimic the original building, though the roof and eave details are quite different. Rather than being eave-less on the gable end as the main building, the bathroom addition has a projecting eave with a simple modillion detail. It also had a square gable vent instead of a triangular type featured on the original building. On the shed side, the eave vents also do not match with the house, consisting of round holes instead of a narrow mesh vent. The addition has a single 1/1 vinyl window. Along with the addition, a foundation crawl space access has been added at the connection between the building and the addition. It is covered with a removable plywood lid for easy access.

The interior of the house has a three bedroom, two bath plan (Drawing 3). Entering from the front door, to the right is the living room, dining area, galley kitchen and utility room. To the left one enters a hallway to the private side of the house, leading to a hallway bath, two closets, a built-in linen closet, the three original bedrooms, and the new bathroom addition, located en suite in the east corner bedroom. The walls have a pebbled plaster finish, as do the ceilings, all painted white. Wood trim stained a natural color is found throughout the house around the baseboards and the windows. The kitchen, bathrooms, and utility area have vinyl flooring, while the rest of the floors are carpeted. The house is heated by a forced air furnace, a system original to the house.

Alterations Overall GB-3 has moderate physical integrity. While the exterior of the house appears very similar between historic and recent photographs, several notable changes have been made (Drawings 3 and 4). As previously noted, three additions have been made to the outside of the house, and the original outdoor wood shed has been enclosed to create extra storage. The siding, which was originally stained so as to show off the cedar siding, has been painted, as has the concrete foundation. All the original 2/2 single hung wood windows (with matching awning storm windows) have been replaced with 1/1 vinyl windows. On the roof, the original wood enclosed metal flue chimney,

which supported an interior fireplace in the living room, has been completely removed and replaced with two separate metal pipe chimneys. The roof was originally clad in cedar shingles, but it was replaced with metal roofing in 1978.⁷

The interior floor plan has been moderately altered since the time of construction. The house was constructed with a three bedroom, two bath plan; the hallway bathroom, which is one large bathroom today, used to be divided into two smaller bathrooms, with entrance doors right next to each other in the hallway. The living room has also changed, with the fireplace being removed and replaced with a corner oriented wood burning stove. All of the interior finishes and fixtures, save for the hallway linen closet, have been replaced. Originally, the floors throughout the house were covered in asphalt (asbestos) tiles, but are now carpet and linoleum.⁸ The kitchen has also been completely remodeled, with new cabinets and appliances. The overall layout of rooms, however, remains the same.

Landscape

As with GBQ-5, GBQ-3 has no formal landscaping plan, though it is more carefully manicured than the former. Shrubs flank either side of the front porch, and narrow planter beds appear to line the front façade, though they are currently empty. Wildflowers have overgrown the flagstone path. This path is not original to the landscape plan; a sidewalk originally ran from the driveway to the front door, not directly to the street, as seen in a historic photograph from 1968⁹. However, no evidence could be uncovered to prove or disprove this theory. The lawn/clearing around the house appears to have been recently mowed, and the trees have been kept back a fair distance from the house. The original graded driveway, which approaches the house from the southwest side, has been retained.

GBA-10 Recreation Center and Storage

Out of the three buildings in the district, GB-10 retains the most physical integrity. Originally built in 1958 as a power house, it was equipped with two diesel-fueled electrical generators to provide power for the whole NPS Bartlett Cove complex that was proposed during Mission 66 (Photo 12).

This one story, side gable utility building is rectangular in plan with one lean-to rear (northwest) addition and an adjacent storage shed to the left (northeast) (Photo 13). The original part of the structure has a board formed concrete slab foundation, with two additional 12" thick rectangular concrete slabs

⁷ GLBA Maintenance Files, Building File GB-3.

⁸ GLBA Maintenance Files, Building File GB-3.

⁹ GLBA-00491, GLBA Photo Files, Box 6, Folder 20 (Bartlett Cove Development).

positioned symmetrically within the interior of the building where the power generators were mounted. The rear lean-to addition is raised up on wooden piers set atop small square concrete blocks. The walls are wood frame construction, clad in cedar vertical board and batten siding, painted a muted taupe. The addition is clad in plywood and painted the same color. The low-pitched gable roof is covered with 3V metal sheeting with open eaves. The addition's roof is clad in the same material, forming a seamless continuation of the rear roof slope. Two louvered vents are located at the apex of each side of the gable. The roof also has a single metal chimney on the rear northeast shed side that descends into the addition.

The front (southwest) elevation has a centrally located steel double door with a concrete slab at the exterior entrance. The door is flanked by two windows. The windows have fixed four-pane steel sashes above, and plywood panels covering louvered vents in the lower sash. An aluminum gutter hangs off the edge of the eave, directing rain to either side of the entry. The right (southeast) side of the main building has one centrally located window with four fixed panes identical to the upper sash on the front windows; the addition has a simple plywood door with two concrete steps placed in front of it (Photo 14). The rear (northeast) façade is plain plywood (Photo 15). The left (northwest) side of the building is a mirror of the right, while the addition has a single 1/1 aluminum sash window and a rectangular metal louvered vent (Photo 15). There is a plywood storage shed sitting at the north corner of the building. It is not attached bodily to the main construction, but a conduit pipe does connect the two structures.

While GBA-10 was originally erected as a power house, it is currently being used as a mixture of employee recreation space¹⁰ (dubbed "The Erratic" by park employees) in the main building and equipment storage in the rear addition (Drawing 5). The interior of the main space has painted concrete floors, with gaming tables perched on the raised slabs where the generators were seated (Photo 16). The walls are clad in plywood paneling which is painted an off-white color, framed with cream trim. The ceiling is also off-white, and braced with two red steel beams that are further supported by two 3 1/2" diameter steel pipes that bridge the gap between the beams and the concrete slab.

Alterations Overall the building retains a high degree of physical integrity with moderate additions that do not obscure the original form of the building (Drawings 5 and 6). However, it is no longer part of the utility infrastructure of the park, and now stands isolated amongst the newer seasonal employee

¹⁰ The recreation use was proposed as early as 1984, as part of the park's development concept for Bartlett Cove. United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service. *Bartlett Cove Development Concept, Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve*. Document No. 132-20023B, January 1984.

housing. Alterations to the exterior of GBA-10 Recreation Center and Storage include: painting of the exterior siding, which used to be stained to show off the cedar wood; replacement of the original cedar shingle roof with metal sheeting; construction of the rear lean-to addition; replacement of the original double front doors; placement of plywood over louvered vents in the lower sash of southeast elevation windows.

Alterations of the interior of GBA-10 Recreation Center and Storage include: removal of power generators and repurposing as recreation center; addition of a flat ceiling inside the structure, which originally had open rafters; enclosing of one rear façade window and opening of one window for interior entrance for lean-to addition. The plywood paneling and trim appear consistent as compared to the finishes called for in the original working drawings for the structure". However, what is there currently is likely a newer addition, added after the rear wall was altered to accommodate the lean-to.

Condition

Building GBQ-3 is in good to excellent condition, having just been completely remodeled on the inside. The exterior also shows no obvious signs of damage, appears recently painted, and the roof is sound. The eaves of the new bathroom addition should be finished as soon as possible, before any animals have a chance to enter into the roof and nest. The buckling battens on the southwest façade should also be repaired. Building GBQ-5 is in good condition, appearing to be sound both inside and out. There were signs of water damage and minor rot in the hallway bathroom, which should be addressed as soon as possible to prevent any serious deterioration of the building. The master suite addition also has issues with excess humidity, which should be addressed. Building GBA-10 is also in good condition. Because of its more wooded setting and lack of a lawn, care should be taken to keep vegetation away from the foundations so that it is not compromised.

4. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria

Criterion A: No

Criterion B: No

Criterion C: No

Criterion D: No

Areas of significance: Architecture, Community Planning and Development

Significant date(s): 1957 (GBQ-5 completed), 1958 (GBQ-3 and GBA-10 completed)

Period of significance: 1945 -1972 (Mission 66)

¹¹ Drawing No. NM-GB-3009A, Sheet 1 of 3

Level of significance: State

Significant person(s): N/A

Cultural affiliation: N/A

Architect/Engineer: National Park Service (NPS), Western Office of Design and Construction (WODC)

Builders: Stutte and Gloege Construction Co. (GBQ-5), Cole and Paddock Construction Co. (GBQ-3 and GBA-10)

Historical information:

Mission 66 for the National Parks

The years leading up to Mission 66 were lean ones for the National Park Service (NPS). During World War II federal funding for many agencies had been cut in order to channel more dollars to the war effort, and the National Park Service was no exception. The war brought the end of the CCC and other New Deal programs that had benefited the parks as legislators in Washington, D.C. streamlined the budget by paring down or completely cutting off major public works programs. When the war ended in 1945, the annual NPS budget was only \$4,740,000, down over 70% from the annual budget of \$21,098,000 in 1940.¹² As a result of this protracted period of underfunding many park units could barely keep up with maintenance as old facilities aged, and staff was stretched so thin that many parks were without adequate protection. Problems were further compounded by exponentially increasing visitor numbers; the American public, flourishing in the post-War economy, had begun to vacation again. The national parks quickly became a popular travel destination as many of them were accessible by car, offering escape from the cities and suburbs across the country. However, the parks were ill-equipped to deal with record visitation, and soon the National Park Service was drawing criticism from the public because of overcrowded campgrounds, deteriorating trails and trampled vistas.¹³

When Conrad Wirth, formerly a National Park Service recreational planner, first gained the directorship in 1951, the parks were still attempting to deal with repairs on a park by park basis, making individual requests for funds as had been done in the past. The subsequent failure of that system to keep up with demands led to a new style of administrative planning which involved seeking funding on a larger scale. To that end, the NPS was able to secure federal aid highway money specifically for park roads as part of the Federal Highway Act (FHA) of 1954.¹⁴ Inspired by the success of such multi-year funding proposals in Congress, the very next year Wirth convened a committee of architects, historians, foresters, naturalists, and economists to put together a 10-year funding plan to revive the

¹² Conrad Wirth. *Parks, Politics, and the People*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980, p. 261. Figures in period dollar amounts, not adjusted for inflation.

¹³ Ethan Carr. *Mission 66: Modernism and the National Park Dilemma*, p. 55.

¹⁴ Carr, *Mission 66: Modernism and the National Park Dilemma*, p. 88.

national parks. Named "MISSION 66" by Wirth, the goal of the program would be "To Provide Adequate Protection and Development of the National Park System for Human Use."¹⁵ Wirth presented the Mission 66 proposal during President Eisenhower's cabinet meeting in January 1956, with the president's personal endorsement.¹⁶ That same spring Congress approved the proposal with its initial expected budget of over \$700 million. In order to be considered for part of the Mission 66 funding, each park unit was required to submit a prospectus, outlining a basic idea of what facilities they would need to construct over the next ten years and estimates for expenses.

Beyond the task of restoring the National Park System, Mission 66 was a development program. It was not enough to repair extant buildings (most built during the CCC era of park construction.) New visitor and administration facilities were also required to accommodate future growth, especially in the newer and more remote park units that had never experienced extensive use before, or had no infrastructure to speak of at all. According to Ethan Carr, by 1966 the National Park Service would spend over \$1 billion on land acquisition, new staff and training, general operations, and all types of construction activity.¹⁷ However, the philosophy of NPS planners was to keep the impact of new development as minimal as possible, either by building in already developed areas or by keeping new construction to the periphery of the park away from sensitive natural and cultural resources. Visitor centers were also developed to more efficiently provide the public with information, and sidewalks, trails and viewpoints were built to more effectively control visitor impact on the landscape.¹⁸ Separate park headquarters compounds were built elsewhere, separating administrative and visitor functions so as to facilitate smooth operations within the parks. Not only were the planning principles modern, but so was the style of the buildings, which had strong modernist lines. Some of the more important building complexes were even designed by top flight contemporary architects such as Richard Neutra and Eero Saarinen. All of this was done not only to create a mental break with past Rustic style architecture and planning, but so that NPS could take advantage of the latest labor-saving technologies and materials to keep costs down.

While Mission 66 began with enthusiastic public support, by the 1960s growing concern over environmental issues began to make people question whether the program was not overdeveloping the parks. Controversies over such projects as the reconstruction of the Tioga Road in Yosemite stirred debate over whether

¹⁵ United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service. *Mission 66 for the National Park System*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1956. Title page.

¹⁶ Ethan Carr, Elaine Jackson-Retondo, and Len Warner. National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form, "The Mission 66 Era of National Park Development, 1945-1972". Draft, January 2006. Section E, Page 4.

¹⁷ Carr et al., Section E, Page 4

¹⁸ Sarah Allaback. *Mission 66 Visitor Centers: The History of a Building Type*. Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 2000, p. 17

portions of the national parklands should be set aside as wilderness and the definition of wilderness.¹⁹ Tensions within the Department of the Interior also put pressure on the program, as the new Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall was appointed in 1961. Udall was himself sympathetic to the environmental cause, and had conflicting ideas with Wirth as to how the national parks fit into the new wilderness legislation passing through Congress.²⁰ Wirth ended up stepping down as director of the National Park Service at the end of 1963, to be replaced by George B. Hartzog, Jr.²¹ Hartzog saw the Mission 66 program through to the grand completion celebrations in 1966, and tried to use the funding momentum created by Mission 66 to launch his own initiative entitled "PARKSCAPE, U.S.A." to be completed by the Yellowstone Centennial in 1972.²² The Parkscape program continued many aspects of the Mission 66 program that came before, but did not represent the same scale or level of the original planning for Mission 66.²³

The legacy of Mission 66 is one of long term planning and development that not only shaped the way the parks look today, but how the National Park Service manages them and how the public interacts with them.

Glacier Bay National Monument

Glacier Bay National Monument was created by executive order in 1925, under the authority of the Antiquities Act of 1906. The establishment of the monument was the dream of Dr. William S. Cooper, assistant professor of botany at the University of Minnesota.²⁴ Cooper wanted Glacier Bay preserved because it is a superlative example of the processes of glaciation and reforestation in the aftermath of glacial retreat. At the time the monument was declared, the area received very few visitors, a mix between miners, homesteaders, and tourists coming to see the epic landscape that John Muir has described decades earlier. For the first twelve years Glacier Bay had no local administration, but was managed from afar by the NPS director and visited occasionally by Mount McKinley's superintendents.²⁵ Between 1937 and 1953 management of the monument was transferred to the regional office in San Francisco. The first permanent position, chief ranger, was not created for the monument until 1951. At that time Glacier Bay and Sitka National Monuments were being co-managed by a single superintendent, Benjamin Miller, based out of Sitka. At the time, the only permanent NPS structure within the monument was in Bartlett Cove; a small cabin that had been dragged to Lagoon island by a seasonal ranger the same

¹⁹ Carr et al., Section E, Page 69.

²⁰ The Wilderness Act became law in 1964.

²¹ Carr et al., Section E, Page 99

²² Carr et al., Section E, page 106

²³ Carr et al., Section E, page 107

²⁴ Catton, Theodore. *Land Reborn: A History of Administration and Visitor Use in Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve*. Seattle: Government Printing Office, 1995, p.49

²⁵ Catton, p. 134.

year.²⁶ In addition to no administrative facilities, there were no visitor facilities, either, making visitation to Glacier Bay difficult and hard to manage.

Glacier Bay National Monument²⁷, as well as Sitka National Monument, Mount McKinley National Park (now Denali National Park and Preserve), and Katmai National Park and Preserve received a substantial amount of Mission 66 funding.²⁸ The Master Plan developed by Superintendent Miller in 1952 became the basis for the Mission 66 prospectus for Sitka and Glacier Bay National Monuments.²⁹ The prospectus requested \$1,823,000 for development of administrative and visitor facilities in Bartlett Cove, South Sandy Cove, and other outlying areas within Glacier Bay.³⁰ As the area would essentially be built from scratch, a power plant, administration building, residences, lodge, pier and boat dock were proposed, among other items. However, it should be noted that limiting the impact of the development on the monument was an important consideration, especially since the monument was created specifically to preserve its natural, scenic, and scientific wonders. While a substantial amount of infrastructure was going to be required to prepare the monument for increased visitation³¹, it was planned to be only a few acres in size, leaving the remaining millions of acres of the monument untouched.³²

Mission 66 Residential Development at Bartlett Cove: GBQ-3, GBQ-5 and GBA-10

An important aspect of the Mission 66 plan for Glacier Bay was developing a permanent headquarters and housing area for park employees to operate within the national monument. Adequate housing was to be provided to all park seasonal and permanent staff, as there was nowhere else nearby where accommodations were available. As early as the 1940s Bartlett Cove had been chosen as the likely location for facilities development within the park, not only for its access to the waters of the bay, but because of its close proximity to the Gustavus Airport and the military development happening within the monument during World War II.³³ The 1947 Master Plan for Glacier Bay called for the placement of employee residences on south side of Lagoon Island, with a pile causeway connecting the development to the shore (Map 3).³⁴ However, by the time the 1952 Master Plan (the basis for the monument's Mission 66 Prospectus)

²⁶ Cotton, p. 136.

²⁷ It would not become a National Park and Preserve until 1980 with the passing of ANILCA.

²⁸ G. Frank Williss, "A New Beginning: The NPS in Alaska, 1950-1960" in *Do Things Right the First Time: Administrative History: The National Park Service and the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980*, 1985.

²⁹ Catton, p. 138

³⁰ United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service. "Mission 66 for Sitka and Glacier Bay National Monuments." 1957, revised 1960 and 1964, p. 9

³¹ Estimated to jump from 3,000 a year in 1956 to upwards of 15,000 in 1966. *Prospectus*, p.7.

³² *Prospectus*, p. 8.

³³ Catton, p. 91-92

³⁴ Drawing No. NM-GB-2005A. Dated February 1947.

was issued, the residential area had been moved across the water to the south shore of Bartlett Cove. The proposed community called for four single family residences, GBQ-2 through 5, to be built along a loop road addition to the Gustavus-Bartlett Cove Road (Maps 4 and 5).³⁵ Survey of the designated sites in Bartlett Cove began as early as September 1955, when a team from the Western Office of Design and Construction (WODC) arrived to complete topographic mapping of the area.³⁶ Construction began soon after.

The Bartlett Cove residential area building projects were as follows:

- Project No. R-1-1 Residential Road broke ground in 1956 and was completed by the middle of 1957.³⁷ It was left with an unpaved gravel grade.
- GBQ-5 was designed by Architect Milton Swatek of WODC and built by the Stutte and Gloege Construction Co., Juneau, AK. It was reported completed in September 1957³⁸ at a total cost of \$40,828.33.³⁹
- GBQ-3 was designed by Architect Goshin of WODC and built by the Cole and Paddock Construction Co. It was reported completed in April 1958⁴⁰ at a total cost of \$43,894.44.⁴¹
- GBA-10 Power House was designed by Architect Riddell of WODC and also built by Cole and Paddock Construction Co. It was reported completed in 1958 for a total cost of \$16,499.32.⁴²

As evidenced above, all three buildings were designed by WODC architects in consultation with Glacier Bay administration. WODC was the western branch of the NPS's design arm, its eastern counterpart being the Eastern Office of Design and Construction (EODC). These offices included all of the architects, landscape architects, engineers, and other design professionals who worked within the park units. It was the policy of the National Park Service during Mission 66 to do as much design and planning in house as possible, to keep costs down and the ensure that development was compatible with the management goals of each park service unit. Cost was a key factor, as the Department of the Interior Bureau of Budget had set strict guidelines as the size and cost of residential

³⁵ Drawing No. NM-GB-2005B. Dated January 1955.

³⁶ Superintendent's Monthly Report, October 1955.

³⁷ Superintendent's Monthly Report, May 1957 (Project No. R-1-1)

³⁸ Superintendent's Monthly Report, September 1957. Project No. B-21-1.

³⁹ GLBA Maintenance Files. Building Files, Folder Qtrs #5, Individual Building Report.

⁴⁰ Superintendent's Monthly Report, April 1958 (Project No. B-21-1/B-1911).

⁴¹ GLBA Maintenance Files. Building Files, Folder Qtrs #3, Individual Building Report.

⁴² GLBA Maintenance Files. Building Files, Folder Storage Building – Bldg #10, Individual Building Report. (Project No. B-25)

construction.⁴³ To this end, the first edition of “Standard Plan for Employee Housing” was issued by NPS in 1957. It included standardized plans for single as well as multiple family housing units that had to be strictly adhered to by the parks, and could only be changed through special request. However, construction details, such as materials and external appearance, were left up to the discretion of WODC and the parks. They were encouraged to use construction methods and styles compatible with local environmental and economic factors; in other words, they were to build as cost-effectively as possible, while still providing fully modern living facilities for park employees. As a result, WODC architects generally chose to stick to mainstream trends and techniques that local contractors would be familiar with, which meant modern styles like the Ranch house and labor-saving technologies like pre-fabricated and concrete construction. This was a sharp contrast to the Rustic style of architecture from the decades before, but was squarely within the mainstream of contemporary design in the 1950s and 1960s.⁴⁴ The modernist style design used by NPS during Mission 66, in conjunction with standardized planning (especially for residential development) has been dubbed Park Service Modern by Mission 66 researchers such as Ethan Carr and Sarah Allaback.⁴⁵

While the WODC adhered to many of these principles when designing the residences and structures for Glacier Bay National Monument, both houses were drafted before the first addition of “Standard Plans” was distributed. Hence, they are not representative examples of standardized Mission 66 housing. No evidence was uncovered during research to suggest that the Power House structure was based on any kind of WODC standardized plans, either. The architectural style of the buildings is also modest, derived more from the ubiquitous Ranch-style popular during the mid-century period. Again, because the buildings were designed before standardized planning was in place at WODC, they do not fulfill all of the criteria to be called Park Service Modern, despite their less-than-rustic exterior aesthetics.

The NPS housing plan for Bartlett Cove was never fully realized. While the Superintendent continued to request funding to complete the residential complex at Bartlett Cove, development in other areas he jointly administered, namely the administration complex at Indian Point and the new museum at Sitka National Monument were also taking up significant portions of the Mission 66 budget. In a memorandum to the Regional Director in 1959, the Acting Regional Chief of Operations for NPS relayed his discussion on the topic with then Superintendent Mitchell, stating that construction funds could not, and should

⁴³ United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service. “Standard Plan for Employee Housing.” Unpublished report. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1957.

⁴⁴ Carr, *Mission 66: Modernism*, p. 137.

⁴⁵ Allaback, p. 22-24.

not, be shared between these joint management areas.⁴⁶ Thus, proposed buildings GBQ-2 and GBQ-4 were never constructed, leaving the development unfinished.

Later Development

Extensive infill development has occurred within the Bartlett Cove Residential Area since the first buildings were constructed during Mission 66 (Map 6). Two additional residences were built along the loop road parallel to GBQ-3- GBQ-9 Duplex Residence (1976) and GBQ-4 Residence (1985) (Map 2). Both of these houses are outside the period of significance for the district, and do not conform the original Mission 66 Master Plan for the site. The most dramatic changes to the area occurred in the 1990s, when seven new employee residences were constructed. The first three, GBQ-75 through 77, are two-story seasonal employee apartments, built in 1994. The second set of four consists of three one-story seasonal duplexes, GBQ-81 through 83, and a three bedroom single family residence, GBQ-80. These buildings were completed in 1998.

Construction of these new residences not only required clearing of the site's vegetation, altering the viewshed, but also a substantial realignment of the historic residence road. The first adjustment occurred in 1994, when the original spur road that lead to GBA-10 was lengthened and improved to create an access road to GBQ-75 through 77. The second adjustment occurred in 1998, further lengthening the road to accommodate GBQ-80 through 83. The most recent, and extensive, modifications began in 2000, when the main road alignment was redirected south, and the original road along the shoreline between headquarters and the Glacier Bay Lodge was converted into a foot trail. Construction was completed by 2003, and as a result, the Mission 66 houses are no longer along the main road corridor, but can only be accessed by a spur road, completely altering the historic circulations patterns within the district.

Relationship to Park Headquarters Compound

The only other permanent employee residential building constructed during Mission 66 was GBQ-12 General Storage and Apartments. It was constructed in 1958 in the park headquarters compound of Bartlett Cove. It was a two story building, with storage and offices on the first floor and two seasonal housing units above. However, the Mission 66 development within the Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve Headquarters Compound (AHRS JUN-00997) has already been determined ineligible for the National Register of Historic Places because of the of lack of integrity of the remaining buildings, GBA-6 and GBA-12 (formerly GBQ-12.)⁴⁷ The loss of integrity in the headquarters area also has a

⁴⁶ Visitor Information Station Collection. Box 2, Folder 30. Dated December 29, 1959.

⁴⁷ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service. Determination of Eligibility, Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve, Headquarters Compound. July 25, 2006, p.7.

direct effect on the integrity of the Mission 66 development in the housing area because the entire NPS administrative complex was designed as a cohesive unit; administration and residential were planned together. While this is true in most national parks, it was especially true for Glacier Bay, which was very isolated, with only the small town of Gustavus nearby.⁴⁸ Inclusive master planning was a hallmark of the Mission 66 program, and the lack of a relationship between the two Mission 66 areas in the park, on top of the loss of integrity within the residential district itself, only serves to harm the integrity of the district even further.

Related Multiple-Property Listing: N/A

Statement of significance:

The Mission 66 Development within the Bartlett Cove Residential District contains three resources built between 1957 and 1958, historically known as GBQ-3 Residence, GBQ-5 Residence and GBA-10 Power House. Located on the south shore of Bartlett Cove, the two residential buildings and one utility structure are currently in good to excellent condition, and alterations to all three buildings over the past 50 years have only had a moderate impact on the physical integrity of the group. The road system for the district, which includes the original alignment of the Gustavus-Bartlett Cove Road and the residential spur road, is in fair condition but has poor historical integrity since both roads have been significantly altered in form and function. The period of significance for the district is 1945-1972, encompassing the pre-planning, execution, and successive results of Mission 66 at Glacier Bay National Monument (now Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve.) The district was considered for nomination under Criterion A, as an example of residential and infrastructural development in the national parks under the Mission 66 Program.

However, the Mission 66 portion of the Bartlett Cove Residential District appears to be ineligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places as a historic district. Despite the physical integrity of the group, it has lost its historic context in relation to Mission 66 developmental planning at Glacier Bay.

Architecture

While all three buildings have an architectural style that is arguably appropriate to their environmental and historical contexts, none of them have any special stylistic or structural features that make them exceptional. During Mission 66 the Western Office of Design and Construction (WODC) issued several unpublished

⁴⁸ Moreover, at the time the National Park Service had a very tense relationship with the people of Gustavus, having been involved in many heated debates over the boundaries and management of the national monument for several years.

editions of standardized plans for employee residential housing, as it was one of the most pressing issues the park service was facing in the 1950s and 1960s. Deviation from the plans provided was only allowed with special permission from NPS administration. The resulting architecture, with standardized layouts and sometimes standardized facades, has come to be known stylistically as Park Service Modern. However, GBQ-3 and GBQ-5 pre-date the first edition of the plan booklet, which was issued in 1957. As a result, both buildings were designed with generic ranch-style floor plans by WODC based on the needs expressed by the superintendent at Glacier Bay and Sitka National Monuments, the requirements of the site, and on current popular tastes at the time. GBA-10 also appears to be a basic structure minimally designed by WODC, but the finishing left to the contractor on site. Thus, none of the buildings have any particular architectural connection to Mission 66.

Community Planning and Development

Developmental planning was one of the most important aspects of the Mission 66 program. Adequate facilities for both visitors and staff were needed in order to accommodate increased visitation and use of the parks, all while minimizing the impact on cultural and natural resources. For better or worse, the employee residential plan for Bartlett Cove was never completed, with only two of the four ranch houses proposed being built. This makes the district an incomplete example of Mission 66 planning at the residential scale. More broadly, much of the broader Mission 66 development at Bartlett Cove, including the road system, has either been demolished or altered over time, destroying the unity of planning and design the NPS administrative area of the park was meant to have. As a result, structures like GBA-10, as well as the residential buildings, have become orphaned in the landscape, no longer able to convey the story of Mission 66 planning at Glacier Bay. Without their associative context, the historic significance of these buildings is greatly diminished, such as even moderate physical integrity cannot make up for its loss.

5. Major Bibliographic References

Allabeck, Sarah. *Mission 66 Visitor Centers: The History of a Building Type*. Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 2000.

Carr, Ethan. *Mission 66: Modernism and the National Park Dilemma*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2007.

Carr, Ethan, Elaine Jackson-Retondo, and Len Warner. National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form, "The Mission 66 Era of National Park Development, 1945-1972". Draft, January 2006.

Catton, Theodore. *Land Reborn: A History of Administration and Visitor Use in Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve*. Seattle: Government Printing Office, 1995.

Facilities Management Software System (FMSS). Accessed July 2011.

Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve, Maintenance Files. Accessed June 2011.

Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve, Superintendent Monthly Reports. GLBA-00530, GLBA 6823. Accessed June 2011.

Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve, Visitor Information Station Collection. GLBA-00551, GLBA-6284. Accessed June 2011.

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service. *Bartlett Cove Development Concept, Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve*. Document No. 132-20023B, January 1984.

U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service. Determination of Eligibility, Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve, Headquarters Compound. July 25, 2006.

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service. *Mission 66 for the National Park System*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1956.

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service. "Mission 66 for Sitka and Glacier Bay National Monuments." 1957, revised 1960 and 1964.

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service. "Standard Plan for Employee Housing." Unpublished report. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1957.

Williss, G. Frank, "A New Beginning: The NPS in Alaska, 1950-1960" in *Do Things Right the First Time: Administrative History: The National Park Service and the Alaska*

National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980, 1985,
http://www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/williss/adhird.htm

6. **Form Prepared By:** Kelly M. Christensen, Historian, National Park Service Alaska Regional Support Office

7. **Additional Material**

Maps:

- Map 1. Topographic Map, Juneau B-6; N ½, Section 32, Township 39S, Range 58E, Copper River Meridian.
Map 2. Bartlett Cove Vicinity. (shows district boundaries and labels buildings)
Map 3. Bartlett Cove Site Plan showing original road alignment and proposed NPS housing. 1947. Drawing No. NM-GB-2005A. Sheet 1.
Map 4. Bartlett Cove Site Plan, 1955. Drawing No. NM-GB-2005B. Sheet 1 of 2.
Map 5. Bartlett Cove Site Plan, 1955. Excerpt, close up on proposed residential area. Drawing No. NM-GB-2005B. Sheet 2 of 2.
Map 6. Current Site Plan; new road alignment is shown in light brown. GLBA Maintenance Collection.

Photographs:

- Photo 1: Historic Photograph, GBQ-5 Residence. Taken August 1961. GLBA Maintenance Building Files.
Photo 2: GBQ-5 Residence, Southwest Elevation facing north.
Photo 3: GBQ-5 Residence, West Elevation facing northeast.
Photo 4: GBQ-5 Residence, Northeast Elevation facing southwest.
Photo 5: GBQ-5 Residence, Northwest elevation Master Suite Addition.
Photo 6: GBQ-5 Residence, Northeast Elevation facing southwest.
Photo 7: Historic Photograph, GBQ-3 Residence, Left Front. Taken June, 1961. GLBA Maintenance Building Files.
Photo 8: GBQ-3 Residence, Northwest Elevation facing southeast.
Photo 9: Building GBQ-3 Residence, Southwest Elevation facing northeast.
Photo 10: Building GBQ-3 Residence, South Elevation facing northeast.
Photo 11: Building GBQ-3 Residence, Northeast elevation facing southwest.
Photo 12: Historic Photograph, GBA-10 Power House. Taken June 1961. GLBA Maintenance Building Files.
Photo 13: GBA-10 Recreation Center and Storage. Northeast and Northwest Elevations, facing east.
Photo 14: GBA-10 Recreation Center and Storage, Southwest and Southeast Elevations, facing west.
Photo 15: GBA-10 Recreation Center and Storage, Northeast and Southeast Elevations, facing south.

Photo 16: GBA-10 Recreation Center and Storage, Interior looking south from north corner.

Drawings:

Drawing 1. GBQ-5 Residence, Current Floor plan. Based on Drawing No. NM-GB-3007A and field observations.

Drawing 2. GBQ-5 Residence, Original Floor plan. Based on Drawing No. NM-GB-3007A.

Drawing 3. GBQ-3 Residence, Current Floor Plan. Based on Drawing No. NM-GB-3012A and field observations.

Drawing 4. GBQ-3 Residence, Original Floor Plan, based on Drawing No. NM-GB-3012A.


Drawing 5. GBA-10 Recreation Center and Storage. Current plan. Based on Drawing No. NM-GB-3009A and field observations.

Drawing 6. GBA-10 Power House, Original plan. Based on Drawing No. NM-GB-3009A.



7. Additional Material


Maps:




Map 1: Topographic Map, Juneau B-6; N ½, Section 32, Township 39S, Range 58E, Copper River Meridian.




Map 2: Bartlett Cove Vicinity. Prepared by Kelly M. Christensen, National Park Service, Alaska Regional Support Office.



Map 3: Bartlett Cove Site Plan showing original road alignment and proposed NPS housing. 1947. Drawing No. NM-GB-2005A. Sheet 1.



Map 5: Map 5. Bartlett Cove Site Plan, 1955. Excerpt; close up on proposed residential area. Drawing No. NM-GB-2005B. Sheet 2 of 2.



Map 6. Current Site Plan; new road alignment is shown in light brown. GLBA Maintenance Collection.

Photographs:



Photo 1: Historic Photograph, GBQ-5 Residence. Taken August 1961. GLBA Maintenance Building Files.



Photo 2: GBQ-5 Residence, Southwest Elevations facing north.



Photo 3: GBQ-5 Residence, West Elevation facing northeast.




Photo 4: GBQ-5 Residence, Northeast Elevation facing southwest.



Photo 5: GBQ-5 Residence, Northwest elevation Master Suite Addition.



Photo 6: GBQ-5 Residence, Northeast Elevation facing southwest.



Photo 7: Historic Photograph, GBQ-3 Residence, Left Front. Taken June, 1961. GLBA Maintenance Building Files.



Photo 8: GBQ-3 Residence, Northwest Elevation facing southeast.




Photo 9: Building GBQ-3 Residence, Southwest Elevation facing northeast.




Photo 10: Building GBQ-3 Residence, South Elevation facing northeast.




Photo 11: Building GBQ-3 Residence, Northeast elevation facing southwest.



Photo 12: Historic Photograph, GBA-10 Power House. Taken June 1961. GLBA Maintenance Building Files.



Photo 13: GBA-10 Recreation Center and Storage. Northeast and Northwest Elevations, facing south.




Photo 14: GBA-10 Recreation Center and Storage, Southwest and Southeast Elevations, facing north.




Photo 15: GBA-10 Recreation Center and Storage, Northeast and Southeast Elevations, facing west.






Photo 16: GBA-10 Recreation Center and Storage, Interior looking south from north corner.

Drawings

GBQ-5 Residence



Drawing 1: GBQ-5 Residence, Current Floor Plan. Based on Drawing No. NM-GB-3007A and field observations.



Drawing 2: GBQ-5 Residence, Original Floor Plan. Based on Drawing No. NM-GB-3007A.