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The City of Olympia Mid-Century Residential Survey is a focused study of residential neighborhoods primarily developed between 1945 and 1965, including some properties in the City of Tumwater (see Introduction for discussion).

The Olympia Heritage Commission periodically initiates professional surveys of Olympia’s properties that are 50 years old or older to gather information on the community’s historic places. Over 2,500 buildings have turned 50 since the last survey was completed in the 1990s. This survey is limited to single-family houses built between 1945 and 1965 and will identify buildings and areas of historical significance to the community.

The survey focused on four clusters of homes developed during the specific date range. These four neighborhood areas all were found to have some potential as Historic Districts, though additional research would need to occur.

The results of the survey also identified at least two properties within each of the four surveyed clusters of homes that appear to be individually eligible for listing on the National Register or on the Olympia Heritage Register.

It is important to recognize that this survey and the conclusions reached are preliminary in nature. As more Mid-Century research is added to the body of historic data in Olympia, the results in this survey may be reviewed and updated.
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SURVEY INFORMATION
Information for each property is accessible on the DAHP “WISAARD” database, available online at https://fortress.wa.gov/dahp/wisaard/ The survey report is available for viewing (along with all online information in the database printed out and compiled) at the City of Olympia: 601 4th Avenue East, Olympia WA 98507. Michelle Sadlier may be reached at (360) 753-8031.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Project Background

The four residential neighborhoods surveyed are geographically situated in different areas of Olympia. All of the areas are a short distance outward from the downtown core, so they are relatively close-in neighborhoods. The oldest areas of the City are generally in the central and downtown core, with successive rings of newer development occurring over time from downtown. Development taking place in the survey period of 1945 to 1965 took place within a generally similar distance from downtown Olympia.

Areas surveyed included approximately 40 acres in survey area in South Westside survey area (SWSA); 30 acres in Forest Hills survey area (FHSA); 23.5 acres in the Upper Eastside and Bigelow Highlands survey area (UEBHSA); and 13.5 acres in Carlyon/North survey area (CNSA). More detailed maps on pages 26-29 show the four surveyed areas colored in, using different colors for each 5-year span of development. The total surveyed area is approximately 107 acres.

The Carlyon/ North neighborhood is partly within the City of Tumwater, but the boundary between the two jurisdictions jumps property-to-property rather than keeping to a single street or other visible boundary. Because the neighborhood and its development pattern is cohesive regardless of City lines, the decision was made to include Tumwater properties where appropriate. Further, the boundary line has shifted over time, so it is not a historic delineation.

The City of Olympia worked with the consultant team to identify concentrations of resources that had been constructed in the years 1945-1965, and chose four different neighborhood clusters. The selection of the South Westside, Carlyon/North, Upper Eastside and Bigelow Highlands, and Forest Hills provides some geographic diversity within...
the City and enables contrasts and comparisons by development area. The Reconnais-
sance-level survey included 393 properties. They are all located in the same public land
survey Township and Range; T18 North and R2 West.

The consultant retained by the City of Olympia to perform the survey work was Peter
Meijer Architect, PC (PMA). The survey personnel included Kristen Minor, Preservation
Planner, Ernestina Fuenmayor, Preservation consultant, and Hali Knight, Project Support
with additional review and oversight by Peter Meijer, Principal. In-field survey work and
photography was primarily done by Ernestina Fuenmayor and Hali Knight, with assis-
tance by Kristen Minor. Data entry was performed by Ernestina and Hali, with review by
Kristen and Peter. Evaluations and assessment of properties were performed by Kristen,
Ernestina, and Hali. Kristen wrote the survey report and provided public presentations.
All of the persons performing work on the project meet the Secretary of the Interior’s
professional qualifications standards.

Objectives

The Olympia Mid-Century Residential Survey was initiated to compile information about
historic residential buildings and development within the City of Olympia. The survey
adds information particularly within the more recent end of the historic period, which
has been less studied or formally documented. The resources surveyed were constructed
during the period 1945 to 1965. The survey information adds to the Department of
Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP)’s Statewide Historic Property Inventory
Database also known as “WISAARD”, a valuable scholarly research tool for students,
professionals, residents, historians, associations, and other groups. Locally, the informa-
tion will help Heritage Commissioners and the City of Olympia’s Historic Preservation
Officer work with members of the public who live in these properties and want to add
their homes to the Heritage Register or form a historic district. The information will also
be used to consider heritage tourism opportunities, whether or not an area is formally
listed or designated as historic; and to raise interest and appreciation of the resources in
the survey areas.

This historic survey report provides an organizational framework for understanding, in-
terpreting, and evaluating the significance of potential historic resources. In combination
with “Mid-Twentieth Century Olympia: A Context Statement on Local History and Mod-
ern Architecture, 1945-1975,” produced by the Olympia Heritage Commission in 2008,
the survey report provides a foundation for review and continuing study of the commu-
nity’s historic resources, as well as the people and forces that enabled the development
of the City and the region.

The City of Olympia and its Heritage Commission consulted with PMA to decide on the
survey areas. The City’s first decision was to limit the era of construction to a 2-decade
period from 1945 to 1965. With the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944—commonly
known as the G.I. Bill—providing home loan guarantees for veterans, the post-World War
II housing construction boom was initiated. The survey start date (and the 2008 context
statement start date) was set at 1945, when the effects of the G.I. Bill began to be evident.
Though the context statement extends to 1975, the last and most recent decade of this
period is not yet fifty years old. The National Register generally defines the period of
historic significance to end at a date fifty years in the past, which would (as of the current
date of 2015) extend only to 1965.
Secondly, the City directed the survey to include single-family residential concentrations only, rather than to focus on larger swaths of Olympia. While this necessarily removed some of the interesting Mid-century resources from the survey that were constructed as “outliers” or in established older neighborhoods, it did allow for an examination of the overall development of these clustered neighborhood areas, providing opportunities to compare and contrast the infrastructure, street patterns, and other larger development decisions as well as the individual properties. It is expected that future surveys can cover properties built outside of these chosen areas as well as covering dates of construction after 1965.

Using the City map illustrating the dates of construction, the project team looked for clusters of properties all developed within 1945-1965, and found a handful of identifiable clusters. The final decision made by the City included the Carlyon/ North survey area; the South Westside survey area; the Forest Hills survey area; and the Upper Eastside Bigelow Highlands survey area. The number of individual properties surveyed was 393.

There are a number of established boundaries delineating existing neighborhoods. One example is the boundary between the City of Tumwater and the City of Olympia, which creates a patchwork of property affiliations in the Carlyon/North neighborhood. Current neighborhood association boundaries, school district boundaries, zip code boundaries, and other governmental or geographic areas also have their own boundaries, none of which necessarily align. The areas surveyed are named according to their predominant neighborhood association, but it is important to recognize that the surveyed areas may include areas outside of each neighborhood association’s recognized boundaries, and do not include other areas of the recognized neighborhood.

Survey Methodology

RESEARCH
The survey was completed within the existing research and overview of the document “Mid-Twentieth Century Olympia: A Context Statement on Local History and Modern Architecture, 1945-1975.” This document is referred to as “the context statement.” However, limited research was done to gain a better understanding of the specific development history of the neighborhood areas surveyed. Archival sources included original plats for the areas surveyed, available online through the Washington State Archives; some historic Thurston County Board of Commissioner meeting minutes; and historic newspaper searches. A supplemental bibliography is included at the end of this report. Further, a more specific residential context statement for the City of Olympia is soon to be written by PMA, and will use these added biographical sources, many of the sources cited in the existing context statement, and will likely uncover other sources of information for further study of residential resources in Olympia.

FIELDWORK
The consultant team created survey forms using the list of addresses provided by the City of Olympia, and separating them by area. The forms had spaces to be filled out in the field, capturing the information needed for the DAHP’s WISAARD database, including the roof shape and material, style and massing of the house, cladding, visual assessment of past alterations, prominent landscape features, and details such as chimneys, planters, and other notable features. Several digital photographs were taken of each building from the right-of-way, including outbuildings where visible. The in-field survey...
forms are included in the Appendix.

The City of Olympia’s resource maps for the four clustered areas were used, along with printed Google Maps street maps of the same areas, providing a place to note addresses, features of the neighborhoods, or other notations as needed.

**DATABASE WORK, ANALYSIS, AND OUTREACH**

After the in-field information had been collected for each resource, the consultant team entered the information directly into the DAHP WISAARD database. In most cases, the team did not have to create a new entry for each resource, as the Thurston County Tax Assessor information had already been entered into the system, providing information about each property’s date of construction and location in Olympia (or Tumwater). Digital photos taken in the field were also attached to each online entry. Additional historic photos taken by the Thurston County Tax assessor department were provided to the consultant team by the Washington State Archives, though the photos were only grouped by Plat name and not by address or street locations. In most cases, the consultant team was able to match a historic tax assessor photo with the current building and add a historic photo also to the database.

An architectural description and statement of significance were written for each property surveyed, based on an evaluation of the resource and its integrity. Historic tax assessor photos were an excellent source of determining when and what alterations might have occurred over time. An assessment of alterations were described as part of the written evaluation of each property. Occasionally, Google Maps or Google Earth aerial views were consulted to verify the size and shape of a building’s footprint; though these were not used to assess any possible alterations to the back side of a building or property (not visible from the right-of-way).

Inventory sheets from the WISAARD database for each surveyed resource were printed out and compiled to include with the survey report (included in the Appendix).

The project included a public “kickoff” meeting, held on October 9, 2014 at the Lee Creighton Justice Center in Olympia. Most of the Heritage Commissioners were in attendance, as well as City of Olympia staff and a number of residents of the four neighborhood clusters identified for the survey. Survey work had begun, starting in the SWSA, and surveyors also carried flyers about the survey and the meeting to distribute to anyone interested. The City of Olympia sent email notices about the meeting to the surveyed neighborhood associations.

In a few instances, residents of the surveyed areas, or interested members of the public, contacted the City of Olympia with historic information, photos, and other data that was, wherever possible, included in the DAHP WISAARD database. While not all supplied information could be verified, the information is included in the report text and/or the database with its source noted.

**HISTORIC SURVEY REPORT**

The final step in the survey project was writing the survey report, including graphics representing the findings and analysis of the survey, and recommendations from the consultant team.
Expectations

An Historic Context Statement is a narrative document that identifies the broad patterns of history that have influenced a community’s social and physical development. The context statement is typically researched and written prior to fieldwork, as it provides an organizational framework for evaluating the significance of potential historic resources and is a foundation for review and continuing survey of the community’s historic resources. The Olympia Mid-Century Modern Residential survey was able to draw upon “Mid-Twentieth Century Olympia: A Context Statement on Local History and Modern Architecture, 1945-1975” to define and date the housing types and styles within the study boundaries. Another context statement will be written in the near future by Peter Meijer Architect PC; this one a more targeted residential context statement for the City of Olympia.

Because the survey’s time period is from 1945 to 1965, the first expectation was that most of the architectural styles in the survey area would be earlier styles discussed in the context report, such as Minimal Traditional, Ranch Style, and Split-level Ranch. Also, it was expected that the buildings studied would show many basic similarities. These might include a use of similar materials, which would have been regionally available and prevalent; a strong focus on the automobile as a part of the house and the entry sequence; and a high possibility of being constructed by a developer rather than by an architect. The four post-WWII neighborhood areas studied would also be expected to share some similarities, such as the prevalence of grassy, open front yards, and generous streets with sidewalks along them.
In the context statement the regional housing types and styles of a three-decade time period are illustrated and discussed starting on page 66, with a list of those styles primarily used in residential development starting on page 79. A broader discussion of Olympia's residential neighborhood development during this same time period is on pages 10-12 of the context statement.

Neighborhood Background and Development

SWSA
The South Westside neighborhood was one of the first areas to be developed with a concentration of residential homes in Modern architectural styles within the City of Olympia. Developed primarily between 1945 and 1955, the SWSA saw its major peak of construction in 1947, with 38 homes completed that year. A smaller secondary peak of development occurred in 1960, with 12 houses added to the SWSA. The date of construction map for the SWSA shows this later 1960 peak taking place mostly on the east side of Cushing Street south of 6th Avenue. (See page 29 for detailed map). The streetscape in the neighborhood is characterized by detached one to one-and-a-half story houses with large setbacks and mature trees, especially towards the western end of the surveyed area. Lots are relatively large, with wide streets and back alleys. The east edge of the neighborhood, up to the midpoint between Decatur and Thomas streets, is part of an older plat: Percival’s 2nd Addition. Norton’s Addition, abutting Percival’s 2nd Addition, was platted in 1945. Continuing west, Scully’s 1st Addition also dates from 1945, extending past N. Cushing Street to N. Division. These two 1945 plats form the middle and western side of the SWSA. A small northern area between 4th and 5th Avenues, Arnold Addition, was platted in 1954.

At least one house on 6th Avenue was prefabricated in panels made by West Coast Mills out of Chehalis, Washington. West Coast Mills was one of the leading manufacturers of wood-framed residential house units in the Pacific Northwest. Several homes towards the south end of the surveyed area were developed by Chester J. Ziegler. Other developers mentioned by residents of the area include E.K. Armstrong of Olympia, and Anderson Homes from Tacoma. Anderson appears to be the same firm owned by the Schmidt family of Tumwater, Washington, who began producing and building pre-cut home kits during the 1920s, but it is not clear if any of the homes constructed in this neighborhood after WWII were also “ready-cut.” There are certainly a handful of residential designs that were repeated in more than one location in the SWSA. Even if these homes were not constructed using some prefabricated components, they were likely designed by a development company and constructed with or without input from a buyer, altering a few finish details for various iterations of the design.


Most of the neighborhood streets have rear alleys. This pattern is also evident in the older platted areas of the west side, closer to downtown Olympia. The SWSA may be eligible as a Historic District (local or National) under National Register criterion A in the area of Community Planning and Development as one of the earliest groupings of Modern residential development during the mid-twentieth century in Olympia, and under Criterion C for its collection of architectural styles.

CNSA
The Carlyon/North neighborhood was developed primarily between 1947 and 1950, with 1948 its busiest construction year at 11 new homes completed. The neighborhood is characterized by transitional Modern architectural styles and early Ranch houses. There are no alleys, and sidewalks are narrow, though the streets are generously sized. The old Thurston County Fairgrounds were located in the general area around the intersection of Carlyon Avenue and Capitol Way. The Fairgrounds became the site of a velodrome for bicycle racing which operated from 1890 to 1900, as well as a baseball park. Fred Carlyon then operated a trotting track for a time at the velodrome site before he divided the property for single-family residential use in 1940 (Carlyon’s Sunset Addition No. 6).³

The Carlyon Sunset Addition No. 6 plat did presumably include some older homes. Additional names on Fred Carlyon’s plat included Fleming, Chamberlin, Kopf, and Williams, which were not tied to specific addresses but are easily found in the 1940 census of Tumwater Precinct 2, all with addresses on Bates Road. It is possible these are still located on Maringo Road, which was originally Bates Road.⁴

The area was cut off from the South Capitol neighborhood in the 1950s when the interstate freeway was constructed under Capitol Way. Prior to this time, the Tumwater City limits extended north to Carlyon Avenue, excepting a handful of properties on the south side of Carlyon. This boundary appears to have shifted over time and may prove to be an interesting topic of further research.

The CNSA may be eligible as a Historic District (local or National) under National Register criterion A in the area of Community Planning and Development as an example of urban development during the mid-twentieth century in Olympia, and under criterion C for its collection of architectural styles.

UBHSA
The Upper Eastside Bigelow Highlands survey area was developed primarily between 1946 and 1952, with a pronounced building spike in the years 1949 and 1950, each of which saw 24 new homes constructed in the UEBHSA. Bigelow Highlands/Upper Eastside exhibits a wide range of styles within the modern era, and the development pattern is characterized by narrow lots and wide streets. Some areas of the neighborhood have relatively good integrity and at least a portion of this neighborhood may therefore be eligible under National Register criterion A in the area of Community Planning and Development as an example of urban development during the mid-twentieth century in Olympia, and/or under criterion C for its collection of architectural styles.

⁴ Ibid (SE Neighborhood brochure)
The neighborhood features predominantly one to one-and-a-half story detached houses. There are a number of very large trees in the neighborhood, especially mid-block between Fir Street and Turner Street NE. These trees provide a park-like feeling to much of the neighborhood. At the south border of the surveyed area, on Olympia Avenue, commercial uses were very much in evidence.

The surveyed area is made up of portions of several distinct plats. Garrard’s Addition, which extends from Fir Street on the west to mid-block between Turner St. and Wilson St., was platted in 1954 and developed by the Garrard Brothers. According to a resident of the neighborhood, there were some older houses in the neighborhood that were torn down to make way for the modern houses constructed by the Garrard Brothers. Much of the area was undeveloped, however, and may have been part of an orchard that supplied the Olympia Canning Company in the 1920s. A small, 7-lot plat was formed in 1953; the Banner Addition, by the various owners of the separate tracts. Banner Addition extends between Bigelow and Glass Avenues in a mid-block location. Another platted area within this neighborhood is Emerald Park, platted in 1948, which abuts Garrards to the east and extends to N. Frederick Street. Emerald Park was platted by Hubert and Lilliebell Secrist, who were also likely the developers of at least some of the Mid-Century residences in the platted area. The overall surveyed Bigelow Highlands/ Upper Eastside area also includes a part of several older plats, Turner’s Addition and McSorley’s Addition.

FHSA
The Forest Hills neighborhood was developed starting in 1955 by Virgil Adams with the Forest Hill Addition, extending from Eskridge Boulevard on the south to lots facing Forest Hill Drive on the north. North of the Forest Hills plat area was the Eastland Addition of 1957, which was developed by the Dawley Brothers. The northernmost plat area in Forest Hills was the Siegler Addition of 1956. The peak of construction within the surveyed area and time period was 1956 and 1958, both of which years had 13 new dwellings completed. By 1961, construction had slowed its pace (however, homes constructed after 1965 were not included in the survey; another later peak of construction might be in evidence in a future survey). The Dawley Brothers developed many commercial buildings in Olympia and a number of residential structures. Other builders in the overall Forest Hills neighborhood included the Berschauer Construction Company, and a few houses were designed by individual architects such as Robert Wohleb.

The Forest Hill and Eastland subdivisions were laid out with distinctive curving streets and cul-de-sacs and relatively large lots. Sidewalks are not constructed at all on many streets, especially the cul-de-sacs. The lots along these curvilinear streets not only had varying directional frontages, but the houses that were developed on the lots were far less rectilinear in their relationship to the street than were earlier developments. Many of them have open “V” shape plans or angled wings which are not perpendicular to the lot fronts. Access to rear yard spaces is often provided via a “pass-through” between the garage wing and the house, indicating that these back yard spaces were becoming more important to the residents. Landscaping at the front of the house was also important, with flowering beds and shrubs near the house and generally open lawn along the street.

The curvilinear subdivision layout had become mainstream across the United States by the late 1940s. The curving streets and generous setbacks provided a flowing, pastoral

---

5 1941 Polk’s Olympia City directory lists “Secrist Hubert J (Lilliebell)” as a building contractor, with address of 1821 West Bay.
quality that immediately differentiated the area from the surrounding City grid. Forest Hills was one of these post-World War II suburban landscapes which provided garden-like settings to showcase new, attractive residences. Forest Hills also may have some properties with the local glacial formations known as kettles or moraine holes, some of which hold water.\(^7\) The FHSA retains a high degree of integrity, and is one of the most recent mid-century modern residential neighborhoods in Olympia (1955-1970). The area may be eligible under National Register criterion A in the area of Community Planning and Development as an example of urban development during the mid-twentieth century in Olympia, and under criterion C for its collection of architectural styles.

### PREVIOUSLY SURVEYED AREAS AND RESOURCE IDENTIFICATION

There are a few houses listed on the Olympia Heritage Register that were constructed in 1945 or later. One of these is the Donald and Irene Elliott House (1948) at 1603 W. 4th Avenue, included in the surveyed area. The Wisniewski House on Boundary Street SE (also 1948) was not within the surveyed area. There are no houses constructed post-WWII on the State or National Register in Olympia, though as of this writing there are two commercial buildings in the International Style on the National Register dating from the 1950s. These are the General Administration building of 1956 and the Georgia Pacific building of 1952.

There are several existing historic districts within central Olympia, but only one is a residential neighborhood Historic District: the South Capitol Neighborhood Historic District, listed on the National Register in 1991. The period of significance for this district extends to 1941.

### Survey Results

#### PRELIMINARY ELIGIBILITY

A minimum of two properties in each of the four neighborhood clusters were found to be potentially individually eligible for listing on the National Register or the local register under National Register criterion C, for their architectural design. This is the only criterion that could be evaluated under the survey without research on past ownership, construction, and other historical information. Additional research may bolster or may diminish the preliminary evaluation of eligibility. These resources are listed below:

- **SWSA**
  - 1511 6\(^{th}\) Avenue SW
  - 1509 6\(^{th}\) Avenue SW
  - 1510 8\(^{th}\) Avenue SW
  - 2337 Fir Street SE
  - 2338 Fir Street SE
  - 2606 Fir Street SE
- **UEBHSA**
  - 1719 Glass Avenue NE
  - 1853 Bigelow Avenue NE
  - 1915 Parkwood Drive SE
  - 1908 Eastwood Drive SE
- **CNSA**
  - 3197 Fairfield Road SE
  - 3231 Maringo Road SE
  - 1909 Eastwood Drive SE
  - 1918 Eastwood Drive SE
- **FHSA**
  - 1919 Forest Hill Drive SE
  - 1929 Forest Hill Drive SE
  - 1930 Eastwood Drive SE
  - 1805 Eastwood Place SE

\(^7\) Bigelow, Mary Ann, *Where the Potholes Are*, (Thurston Regional Planning Council for the Olympia Heritage Commission, 1990), 40-41
These properties were chosen not because they are the most beautiful or even the best-preserved (though all have good integrity), but because they are excellent examples of their style and type. However, evaluations in a reconnaissance-level survey are limited to those features that are visible from the right-of-way, so this list is preliminary only and expected to change with further research.

At least some portion of each surveyed residential cluster is also potentially eligible as a district. Potential districts are mapped and discussed under Recommendations.

**RESOURCE TYPES**
The survey was limited to only single-family residences, however, there were auxiliary buildings associated with the residences such as freestanding garages and storage sheds.

**CONSTRUCTION DATES**
The date span from 1945 to 1965 was used to determine which properties to survey. The four neighborhood areas surveyed show different peak dates of construction, as discussed above in Neighborhood Background and Development. Overall, the “peak” of construction within this limited time period and of the properties surveyed was 1947, with lesser peaks in 1949 and 1950. These results cannot be considered conclusive, though, since the data is limited to area and date. With more areas of the City surveyed, findings may point to alignments with known economic and other contextual trends.

![Figure 2: Date Distribution by Areas Surveyed](image-url)
Examples of Styles Surveyed

**Modern Stripped Classical:** (<1%)
Still somewhat vertical in form
Symmetrical, often with entry at center
Traditional “punched” window openings
Trim at openings is greatly simplified and reduced

**Minimal Traditional:** (37%)
Small and one-story; double-hung windows
Typically, medium-pitch gable roof with minimal overhang

**World War II-Era Cottage:** (4%)
Small and one-story
Typically square in plan with hipped roof
Sometimes an octagonal window
Porches are minimal

**Early Ranch:** (11%)
Transitional ranch style with low-pitched roof
Front picture window
Smaller size than later ranches (on an older lot)

**Ranch:** (31%)
Broad and low, one-story without dormers.
Attached garage, typically facing the street
Front picture window

**Split-Level or Split-Entry Ranch:** (4%)
Garage is a lower level under part of the house
Entry occurs at the mid-level

**Storybook Ranch:** (<1%)
Gable roof dormer(s) or cross-gable
“Gingerbread” fascia board details.
Typically has diamond-pane windows.

**Early American or Colonial Ranch:** (3%)
Some columnar elements across the front, often with curved beams suggesting arches.
Typically has “shutters” & divided-light windows

**Contemporary Ranch:** (9%)
Gabled roof treated as thin “folded plane”
Widely overhanging eaves
Typically has windows in gable end and roof beams exposed
STYLES

Modern Architecture has quite a number of recognized sub-styles. The discussion of styles and building forms in the context report starts on page 66, and the discussion of sub-styles primarily found in residential architecture begins on page 79. The Modern architectural styles identified in the report are divided into three categories, “Modern,” “Neo-Eclectic,” and “Contemporary Folk.” Because the second two categories were popularized starting from about 1965, the expectation was that there would likely be very few representatives from those style groups, and indeed there were no “Neo-Eclectic” or “Contemporary Folk” styles identified in the survey, since the survey was limited to resources constructed from 1945 to 1965.

The category of “Modern” architecture as applied to single-family residences includes such sub-styles as Minimal Traditional, World War II-Era Cottage, Ranch, Split-Level or Split-Entry Ranch, Contemporary, and Shed. For the purposes of the survey, the category of “Ranch” is used both as a single category, with other recognized variations on Ranch including the Split-Level or Split-Entry Ranch, Contemporary Ranch, Storybook Ranch, Early American (or Colonial) Ranch, and Early Ranch counted separately. Examples of each of these styles and a few features that distinguish them are found on page 11 of this report.

If a property had been altered but could be recognized by its original style, it was identified as such. The only exception to this was when a resource had been altered later with added stylistic features from a different style, or where the original style was unrecognizable, the style was identified as “Various.”
The Modern Minimal Traditional style is characterized by small, symmetrical houses with medium-pitched gabled roofs with little to no overhang. Cladding is generally wood clapboards or shingles, and windows are typically wood double-hung, sometimes with multi-pane divisions on the front. Garages are sometimes detached and set back, or in many cases attached but completely set back from the front plane of the house.

World War II-Era Cottages are primarily identified by their one-story compact size, with low-pitched hipped roof. Cladding is limited to one or two materials, often wood clapboard or combed shingles, and brick veneer. A short projecting wing is common at the front, with the entrance on the side or next to it, within a recessed porch. Windows are typically wood multi-pane fixed and double-hung, often with corner windows. Garages were mostly detached and fully set back from the house, however in some cases they were attached, but without internal connection. A secondary door is typical, facing the driveway, sheltered by an enclosed porch or a small projecting porch with a stoop.

Early Ranch style houses are characterized by one-story, horizontal volumes with low-pitched roofs (either hipped or gabled). Garages are always attached to the house, sometimes recessed with a lower roof. Because this is a transitional style to the later Ranch style, some more traditional details are often found, as in the Minimal Traditional and World War II-Era Cottage styles. Building footprints can vary, and include rectangular, L-shaped, and U-Shaped. Entrances are recessed and sheltered by the main roof, and two entrances are common (one next to the garage and a centered main entrance).

Ranch style houses are generally one story, with a low-pitched roof (either hipped or gable) with overhanging eaves. Garages are always attached and face the street. Later ranch houses gave even more prominence to the garage, sometimes including more than one garage bay and with its own connected wing of the house. Entrances feature a large multi-pane fixed (originally wood) window close to the main entrance. Cladding is an important characteristic and was used to highlight areas, many houses include up to four different types of cladding that varies from wood clapboards, vertical boards, vertically grooved plywood, and brick and stone veneer that usually extends to chimneys and integrated planters.

Split-Level or Split Entry Ranch styles are more accurately described as variations in form rather than style. The house is two levels on one side, with the lowest level occupied by the garage or garages. On the other side of the house, there is only one level, which often occurs at a mid-level between the other two floor levels. The roof may be stepped or on one level, and is typically side or cross-gabled, or hipped or cross-hipped, with broad eaves. The entrance is located in the center, and is typically recessed. Windows may be wood and/or metal.

“Styled” Ranch includes both Early American (or Colonial) Ranch, and Storybook Ranch. There are other variations on this style, but none that were identified in the survey. The style uses various decorative elements and details from other architectural styles on a low, horizontal Ranch style house.

Contemporary Ranch style houses are characterized by roof forms that are extended from the house in thin planes. The structural supports for the roof are exposed or stylized, sometimes with the ridge extending further out creating a “prow” shape to the gable end. Other stylized roof shapes of this style include “gull wing” forms with two sides sloping inwards towards the center or multiple parallel gables. Garages are mostly attached, however in many cases the garage is separated from the house and attached by a breezeway with a pergola that sheltered the main entrance, or the garage becomes an attached
carport. Floor-to-ceiling windows are common.

The survey found the largest single style category to be modern Minimal Traditional, with 146 examples. Ranch as a stand-alone style closely followed with one hundred and twenty-three (123) examples. There were forty-two (42) examples of Early Ranch and thirteen (13) “styled” ranch styles (Early American Ranch and Storybook Ranch, with eleven (11) and two (2) examples respectively). Thirty-seven (37) examples are Contemporary Ranch, fifteen (15) are Split-Level/ Split-Entry, and thirteen (13) are WWII-Era Cottage. There was one (1) modern Stripped Classical and three (3) “Various.” The chart on page 12 shows the distribution in percentages of the total number of resources surveyed.

Further, the typical date ranges for these styles begins to be illustrated by an examination of which styles are more commonly found in each of the four surveyed areas. For instance, while each of the four residential clusters had a relatively large proportion of ranch style residences, the later FHSA has very few Modern Minimal Traditional or World War II Cottage styles.

Figure 4: Style Distribution by Area Surveyed

**EVALUATION**

Resources that have reached the age of 50 years are typically considered eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places if they meet one or more of the four criteria of significance defined by the National Parks Service, and if they sufficiently retain historic integrity. However, resources under 50 years of age can be determined eligible if it can be demonstrated that they are of “exceptional importance,” or if they are contributors to a potential historic district. The National Register of Historic Places criteria are defined in depth in National Register Bulletin Number 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. The criteria are:
• Criterion A, Properties associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;

• Criterion B, Properties associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;

• Criterion C, Properties that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or that represent the work of a master (architect or craftsman), or

• Criterion D, Properties that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Because the City of Olympia Mid-Century Residential Survey was limited to visual information only, no property-specific evaluations were possible within Criteria A, B, or D. With further research, any of the individual properties surveyed, or groups of properties (districts) may be found to be eligible for listing on the National Register under any of these four criteria, as long as they retain sufficient integrity.

Properties were found to be either individually eligible for the National Register or Local Register, contributing to a potential Historic District, or none of the above. Properties that were found to be individually eligible were also found to be contributing to a potential District.

INTEGRITY
The National Register of Historic Places defines integrity as the authenticity of a property’s historic identity, evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property’s historic or prehistoric period. There are seven recognized aspects to integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. In general, a property must retain sufficient original character-defining features and materials in order to be considered eligible for listing, whether individually or as a contributing resource in a district. In a practical sense, the survey team evaluated the scope of changes sustained to each specific property. If the overall roofline or height of a structure had changed, that was considered a major loss of integrity. For the most part, the conversion of a street-facing garage to living space, or the alteration of original window openings were also considered a major loss of integrity. The condition of a property should not be confused with its integrity. Condition is generally defined as “state of repair.” A building can be in poor condition, but still retain a high degree of historic integrity.

It is possible for the integrity of a structure to shift over time. A structure would lose integrity with a severe alteration or large addition, but it may also gain back integrity if incompatible alterations were restored with elements more appropriate to the original design and materials.

ARCHITECTS, DEVELOPERS, AND BUILDERS
The Olympia Mid-Century Residential survey was a reconnaissance-level survey, so very little research was conducted on the builders or architects who were responsible for the surveyed properties. However, the context statement identifies a handful of specific architects, developers, and builders who were active in the surveyed areas. The limited research done with the survey project as well as information provided to the survey team identified a few more of these design and construction entities, and these names were added to the database.
MATERIALS

Properties constructed in the 1945-1965 era were likely to have two or even three different exterior materials. Modern architecture, in all of its styles, had a strong propensity for horizontality. Architects reacted against the cramped verticality of older styles to create the new aesthetic, which was broad, low, and unadorned. In residential architecture, especially on Ranch styles, it was very popular to use a brick or stone veneer at the base of the front façade, typically stopping at the sill of a picture window. Changing materials not only created more horizontal lines, but also allowed for an inexpensive way to create visual interest and break up large expanses of a façade.

The chart below illustrates the types of materials found on the surveyed properties and the percentages of use of each material.

Of the three hundred and ninety-three (393) residences surveyed, almost half (190) incorporated horizontal wood or painted cementitious siding (a composite product incorporating some wood) on at least part of the house. One hundred and thirty (130) used wood panel or plywood panel areas, one hundred and four (104) used shingles on at least part of the exterior, and sixty (60) used board-and-batten or a vertically grooved manufactured wood panel (commonly referred to as “T-1-11.”)*

---

* T-1-11” was introduced in the mid-1950s. A 1957 brochure by the Douglas Fir Plywood Association included “Answers to Typical Plywood Questions,” including “What is this new “grooved” plywood?” The answer was “Texture One-Eleven,” noted as being popular, good looking, and economica Douglas Fir Plywood Association, “Fir Plywood Facts,” Tacoma: Douglas Fir Plywood Association, 1957, 5, 30.
Brick or stone veneer was used on one hundred and twenty-five (125) residences. Brick or stone cladding was often used in long, low planters along the front of the house or extending out from the house, as well as on chimneys. Plain concrete or concrete block (thirty-one instances), or dimensional brick or stone (eleven instances), were also used, with a few instances of stucco. Vinyl siding, which became popular during the 1970s and is a later alteration, was found on thirty-six (36) of the surveyed resources.
Preservation Planning Recommendations

The City of Olympia’s map of single-family residential properties by construction date on page 25 illustrates the large number of properties that are or will shortly be potentially eligible for historic status as these resources turn 50 years old. The current survey was not able to cover all of these resources across the City. Recommendations start with ways to add to the survey data across Olympia.

Individually eligible resources were noted in each of the four surveyed areas. Because there are a number of benefits for owners of historically-designated properties (whether contributing to a Historic District or individually designated), owners may appreciate having the initial evaluation information. The City of Olympia offers a “special valuation” property tax exemption for historic properties undergoing renovation. Researching and writing a nomination in support of a property’s (or a district’s) listing takes time and effort, but will make a meaningful contribution to the body of knowledge about Mid-century development in Olympia or Tumwater. Recommendations regarding these resources are included below.

- Initiate further survey work to cover more of the single-family potential resources of the Post-War era in Olympia.
- Develop information to be shared through individual neighborhood associations to educate owners of Mid-Century houses, who may not realize that their house and/or neighborhood is eligible for historic status. Provide ways homeowners can help to add to the body of knowledge about their neighborhood or home.
- Add to the online information at the City of Olympia website for homeowners to consult in order to counter the information they receive from certain commercial manufacturers. Homeowners also need to know that their home may re-gain integrity and historic character by reversing certain alterations; for instance, by removing vinyl siding.
- Identify possible resources homeowners can use for advice on how to conduct further research on a historic property or neighborhood. Such resources might include a student-run workshop in Olympia provided by a college or university with a Historic Preservation program, such as the University of Oregon. Such a workshop might be offered for free or for a very minimal stipend.
- Include links to Preservation organizations that specifically value mid-century resources in updated websites. Such organizations include the Recent Past Preservation Network and Docomomo WEWA.
- Consider heritage tourism opportunities such as a home tour, a mid-century themed Christmas lights display, or a landscaping or garden tour. These would be organized and run by neighborhoods, but the City could provide support, historic information, publicity, and resources for those interested in learning more.
Neighborhood Area Recommendations

The Olympia Mid-Century Residential Survey provides a first look at historic single-family residential resources of the 1945-1965 period, but it was also designed to compare and contrast four different residential neighborhoods. The first set of recommendations provides a framework for potential future listing of one or more Historic Districts, whether on the National Register or Olympia Heritage Register.

Boundaries for a potential district are shown on the maps of each neighborhood, keeping in mind National Register guidelines for establishing historic district boundaries. In general, a district should have visual continuity. The edges of a district might be a larger street, topography change, development pattern shift, or historic boundary. Boundaries shown for each of the four surveyed areas are an early recommendation based only on existing information. The City of Olympia, the community, and the Olympia Heritage Commission may consider altered boundaries for any of the surveyed areas.

CNSA:
- Consider surveying and compiling information about some of the slightly older houses in the area. The period of significance for a Carlyon/North historic district might include properties constructed in the early 1940s starting with the plat. Examples are 3227 Ogden Road (1941) and 3229 Maringo Road (1940), neither of which were surveyed due to their construction dates.
- Research the name and any interesting historic facts about Angle Park, delineated on the 1940 Carlyon plat as simply “Park.”
- The south boundary of a potential district might extend to Blass Avenue, where the lot sizes and development patterns change. The boundary would include the properties on the west side of Fairfield Road (including 302 Blass Ave. and several “out of period” 1920s residences such as the Partlow House).

Figure 6: CNSA Eligibility and Potential District
FHSA:

- Expand the date range for the surveyed area in order to capture the eligible resources constructed after 1965. It is evident that there were residences constructed in the area up to about 1975, so these resources should be surveyed.

- Consider a collaborative effort between neighborhood residents and the City to complete DAHP Intensive Level Survey (ILS) forms for selected properties in the neighborhood, especially those identified as being potentially individually eligible, but possibly including all of the properties within the potential boundaries.

- Because there are a significant number of potentially individually-eligible properties in this neighborhood, the neighborhood association (possibly with assistance from the City and/or other preservation groups) may consider holding a celebratory event to show off these resources and raise interest and awareness of mid-century residential architecture.

Figure 7: FHSA Eligibility and Potential District
UEBHSA:

- Because loss of integrity was a larger factor in this neighborhood as compared to the other three areas surveyed, boundaries were difficult to recommend. The eastern edge as drawn in the map follows the historic plat boundary between Emerald Park and Garrard’s Addition for most of the potential boundary, while the western edge may extend to Fir Street and then extend westward to include an individually-eligible property. Further study for the boundaries of a potential historic district may be warranted.

- Research the history of the large, existing trees in the area, and their age. Were they planted or were they pre-existing to the residential development?

- Strengthen the southern edge of the residential area, protecting it from encroaching commercial and industrial uses or impacts. This may be achieved simply through working with existing commercial uses on Olympia to suggest plantings or other visual screening, or other “good neighbor agreement” solutions.
SWSA:

- There were a number of houses that appeared to be built from the same design, indicating that they may have been “pattern book” or “ready-cut” homes in this neighborhood. More research into the builders of these houses may provide design information and help to preserve examples of these types of resources.

- The alleys are highly valued by residents of the neighborhood, and although a number of newer garage structures have been constructed on alleys, the layout and character of the neighborhood was formed by the inclusion of these semi-public zones. Any potential district should recognize the importance of the alleys, and their different nature from the public, front side of a property.

Figure 9: SWSA Eligibility and Potential District
Conclusion

The City of Olympia’s standing as the Capitol of Washington and the resulting governmental job base has provided it with a bit of an economic cushion against some of the highs and lows of other industries, such as the timber industry. Still, Olympia, Tumwater, and the surrounding communities were affected by the loss of the large mills and other timber related operations in the 1950s and 1960s. The late 1950s and early 1960s also marked many large-scale physical changes within the area, such as the construction of I-5, the damming of the Deschutes River to form Capitol Lake, and the construction of a large addition to the State Capitol complex on the east.

STATE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION IN THE LOCAL COMMUNITY

With these economic and physical changes occurring in Olympia, there were localized efforts to save certain properties or neighborhoods, but there was no official preservation program in Olympia until 1983. Part of the reason for the slow development of historic preservation activism in the community may be the perception that most of Olympia’s built environment was not “old enough” or not “impressive enough.” Today, there are a number of regional groups, individuals, government entities, and neighborhoods working together to preserve important resources and gather information. While these groups have universally worked to preserve buildings constructed prior to World War II, there are sparse local research opportunities for Mid-Century buildings. The DAHP has been actively promoting a statewide campaign launched in 2003 to recognize post-WWII resources, and the number of buildings from this era to achieve historic status has been creeping upwards.

Olympia’s built environment includes excellent examples and concentrations of resources that provide a window into middle class life in the region during the 20th Century. These are perhaps more deserving of study than those buildings created for people at the top end of the economic spectrum, because most people did not live at the top of the economic pyramid. These types of resources are certainly more vulnerable to neglect, unsympathetic alterations, or demolition.

The results of this survey may begin to spark more local interest in historic preservation among homeowners who might not have thought about their home in historic terms before. Further, it may provide a sense of pride and strong sense of community among concentrated mid-century neighborhoods.
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C. List of Properties Surveyed

The following list was prepared by the City of Olympia. Addresses were altered in some cases to use directional notations at the end of the street name for consistency in the DAHP database.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1853 BIGELOW AVE NE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>3228 OGDEN RD SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929 THURSTON AVE NE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>3305 MARINGO RD SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923 THURSTON AVE NE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>3231 MARINGO RD SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310 WILSON ST NE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>3225 MARINGO RD SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308 WILSON ST NE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>569 BURNABY AVE SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719 4TH AVE W</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>561 BURNABY AVE SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405 MILROY ST SW</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>555 BURNABY AVE SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415 MILROY ST SW</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>521 BURNABY AVE SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421 MILROY ST SW</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>434 SE VISTA ST</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1718 5TH AVE SW</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>500 SE VISTA ST</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1708 5TH AVE SW</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>510 VISTA AVE SE</td>
<td>TUMWATER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704 GLASS AVE NE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>3135 MARINGO RD SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716 GLASS AVE NE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>530 VISTA AVE SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1515 SW 8TH AVE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>3117 MARINGO RD SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>815 CATON WAY SW</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>538 BURNABY AVE SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>821 CATON WAY SW</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>430 BURNABY AVE SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830 CATON WAY SW</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>3118 SE SUNSET WAY</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1510 SW 9TH AV</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>1926 NE OLYMPIA AVE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>827 SW THOMAS ST</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>2405 FIR ST SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>821 SW THOMAS ST</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>2413 FIR ST SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3105 MARINGO RD SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>2503 FIR ST SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425 CARLYON AVE SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>2513 FIR ST SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3204 MARINGO RD SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>2525 FIR ST SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3216 MARINGO RD SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>2535 FIR ST SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3230 MARINGO RD SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>2601 FIR ST SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3232 MARINGO RD SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>1832 EASTWOOD PL SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3242 MARINGO RD SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>1828 EASTWOOD PL SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3310 MARINGO RD SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>1822 EASTWOOD PL SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3314 MARINGO RD SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>1812 EASTWOOD PL SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3197 FAIRFIELD RD SE</td>
<td>TUMWATER</td>
<td>2528 FIR ST SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3201 FAIRFIELD RD SE</td>
<td>TUMWATER</td>
<td>2516 FIR ST SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3211 FAIRFIELD RD SE</td>
<td>TUMWATER</td>
<td>1815 EASTWOOD DR SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3219 FAIRFIELD RD SE</td>
<td>TUMWATER</td>
<td>1831 EASTWOOD DR SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433 VISTA AVE SE</td>
<td>TUMWATER</td>
<td>1901 EASTWOOD DR SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425 SE VISTA ST</td>
<td>TUMWATER</td>
<td>1909 EASTWOOD DR SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3216 FAIRFIELD RD SE</td>
<td>TUMWATER</td>
<td>1917 EASTWOOD DR SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3224 FAIRFIELD RD SE</td>
<td>TUMWATER</td>
<td>2617 CAIN RD SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3226 FAIRFIELD RD SE</td>
<td>TUMWATER</td>
<td>2705 CAIN RD SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3233 SE OGDEN RD</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>1831 EASTWOOD PL SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3219 SE OGDEN RD</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>1823 EASTWOOD PL SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515 VISTA AVE SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>1815 EASTWOOD PL SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3211 MARINGO RD SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>1805 EASTWOOD PL SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505 SE VISTA AVE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>2606 FIR ST SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3218 OGDEN RD SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>2406 FIR ST SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3222 SE OGDEN RD</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>1814 EASTWOOD DR SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3226 SE OGDEN RD</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
<td>1822 EASTWOOD DR SE</td>
<td>OLYMPIA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Inventory Forms

Historic Property Inventory forms are printed out from the WISAARD database and included.

E. Field Forms

(original field forms and notes are included)