2.0 RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROJECT METHODS

To develop a thorough understanding of Ohio's recent past, Gray & Pape conducted archival research and limited field investigations. The research design takes into account that the built environment yields immediate evidence of the character of the historical architectural properties within a given area, as well as their relative integrity and ubiquity. A visual record of previous activities and periods of growth or change, therefore, may be discerned through study of architectural resources in a locale. However, historically significant patterns, trends, events, and associations with significant persons are not always immediately apparent through a visual survey. Historical research, including review of maps, local histories, atlases and other primary and secondary sources, is necessary to develop a full understanding of the influences that shaped development and change over time, both within a general area and at a specific property.

2.1 Research Design

To facilitate identification of regional patterns within the state, Gray & Pape delineated six regions in Ohio, as follows: Appalachian-Southeastern Ohio; Cincinnati-Southwestern Ohio; Cleveland-Akron-Youngstown-Northeastern Ohio; Columbus-Central Ohio; Dayton-Western Ohio; Toledo-Lima-Northwestern Ohio (Figure A1). The regional boundaries are based in part on the regional chapters of the American Institute of Architects Ohio (AIA Ohio), as well as on delineations based on various federal and state government agencies' work, including the U.S. Office of Management and Budget's metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs) and the federal-state partnership of the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC). This geographic framework was used to inform archival research and preparation of the historic context for Ohio's recent past; information presented in Appendices C, D, and E also is organized by region.

Along with delineating a regional approach to Ohio, Gray & Pape developed a preliminary list of research questions that shaped initial investigations. These questions were developed based on the firm's previous experience with similar resource types and scopes of work. To maintain project coherence and cohesion, therefore, the primary focus of the investigations was to determine how Ohio's architectural legacy from 1940 to 1970 reflects historic events and patterns of development, and how NRHP eligibility criteria may be applied thereto. Gray & Pape's research questions ranged from the changes in construction methods and techniques from the 1940s to the early 1970s; to the identities of major architects and designers working in Ohio during this period; to the effects of the G.I. Bill and other government initiatives on transforming the built environment; to the emergence of social justice and civil rights movements and their influences on land use, planning, and open space preservation.

2.1.1 Research Themes

Gray & Pape identified a series of themes to provide a framework for the statewide historic context. In keeping with the overall purpose of the context, each of these themes was examined primarily with reference to Ohio's architectural legacy from the recent past.
   (1) Industrialization/Deindustrialization

(2) Changing Demographics
(3) Social History
(4) Land Use Planning
(5) Conservation/Environmental Regulation
(6) Technological Innovations
(7) City vs. Suburb
(8) Transportation (Focusing on resultant land use issues and changing development patterns)
(9) Design Trends
(10) Major Architects, Builders, and Planners

Each of these themes is discussed in greater detail in the historic context in Section 3.0. The historic context is organized both chronologically and thematically. Beginning with a brief overview of conditions in Ohio during the 1940s, the historic context uses a thematic approach to describe historical trends and patterns of development that occurred during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. Overarching themes that shaped Ohio's built environment from the 1950s to the early 1970s are discussed in Section 4.0, as well as a description of design trends in Ohio during the recent past.

2.2 Archival Research Methods

Gray & Pape conducted research on development in Ohio from 1940 to 1970. Our project team member, Youngstown State University, led by Donna M. DeBlasio, conducted oral history interviews with a selection of community leaders, designers, and builders associated with construction and housing developments from the recent past. Gray & Pape's research included gathering information pertinent to the building materials and construction methods associated with resources of this era. In addition, Gray & Pape consulted with local historians, historical societies, and other professional organizations or experts on the recent past time period to help provide historic background and research sources.

Gray & Pape undertook limited primary and extensive secondary source research on post-World War II/recent past themes and property types. Among the repositories consulted were the OHS; OHPO; historical societies and libraries in major metropolitan regions such as Cleveland, Columbus, Dayton, and Cincinnati; and historic preservation organizations and municipal agencies in major metropolitan areas, including Akron, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, Dayton, Toledo, and Youngstown, as well as smaller cities, such as Gallipolis, Oxford, Portsmouth, and Steubenville. Staff and collections at professional organizations, such as the AIA Ohio and the Ohio Planning Conference, were consulted as well. Gray & Pape reached out to architecture, historic preservation, and urban planning faculty at Bowling Green State University, Kent State University, Miami University, Ohio State University, and University of Cincinnati for their insight into historic and design trends of Ohio's modern period. A complete listing of Ohio's repositories and organizations that were invited to participate in the project is included in Appendix I. Online sources, including the Library of Congress, also were referenced. Those that are cited in this report are included in Section 7.0, References Cited. The bibliography in Section 8.0 presents a wide-ranging list of secondary and online sources that focus on numerous aspects of the recent past (1940-1970) and modern-period architecture.

Gray & Pape identified a representative selection of primary source materials, such as historic state, city, and county maps; plat maps on file at county courthouses and/or city-county planning offices; historic photographs; historic and current aerial photographs; and both outstanding and typical examples of recent past buildings and landscapes that can be used to facilitate future research efforts. Secondary source materials identified by Gray & Pape consist of period general interest magazines, such as *Better Homes and Gardens*; period professional interest magazines, such as *House and Home* and *Architectural Record*; period house plan catalogs; period builders' catalogs and magazines; newspapers; the *Avery Index to Architectural Periodicals*; studies such as Condit's *American Building Art (20th Century);* and local guides for all major metropolitan areas, such as the *Bicentennial Guide to Greater Cincinnati*. Biographical information about major architects, builders, and developers who lived and worked in Ohio from 1940 to 1970 has been sought as well. Findings of the archival research are presented in the bibliography in Section 8.0 of this report.

A plethora of lay and professional historians, mid-century modern enthusiasts, and other interested individuals have devoted countless hours to researching, photographing, and writing about Ohio's recent past (1940-1970). The fruits of their labor often are posted on Internet websites. Gray & Pape consulted a number of these websites during the course of our research. We endeavored to identify and credit all referenced material. Internet sources cited throughout this report are included in the References Cited in Section 7.0. Additional examples of websites that were not cited directly are included in the Bibliography in Section 8.0.

2.2.2 Online Survey

Gray & Pape selected www.SurveyMonkey.com to host the online survey component of this project. The survey's title was Ohio Modern: Preserving the Recent Past. In March 2010, Gray & Pape created an account and built the survey using the website's tools. The survey remained online and accessible to the public through June 30, 2010. A complete listing of the survey questions is included in Appendix H of this report, along with a summary of the survey responses. A total of 21 responses to the online survey were recorded.

Organizations contacted to request their staff and/or members' participation in the survey are listed in Appendix I. All contacts by Gray & Pape were made via either telephone or email. Some organizations, such as The Cultural Landscape Foundation, included a link to the online survey in communications to their members (i.e., in electronic newsletters or on the organization website's home page).

2.2.3 Oral History Interviews

Oral history interviews were another component of the Ohio Modern project. The interviewer, Dr. Donna M. DeBlasio, Professor of History and Applied History at Youngstown State University, developed a set of interview questions in cooperation with the OHPO and Gray and Pape. They also developed a list of possible interviewees, working from lists of Ohio architects who were members of the American Institute of Architects by the 1960s. The legal documents or interview agreement forms were adapted from those used by the Youngstown State University Oral History Program. The agreement turns over the rights

5

and ownership of the interview (which is standard practice in oral history programs) to the Ohio Historical Society. It also informs the interviewees as to how the interviews will be deposited and made available to the general public.

A summary of each interviewee is included in Appendix J. Being submitted under separate cover, the digital audio interviews and the accompanying transcripts will be housed in the OHS Archives. Additionally, copies of both versions will be placed in Youngstown State University's Maag Library as a part of its Digital Oral History Collection at www.maag.ysu. edu/oralhistory/oral_hist.html.

2.2.4 GIS Datasets

Gray & Pape incorporated GIS applications during our research to create graphic illustrations for the historic context report. The OHPO provided a list of previously inventoried architectural resources dating from 1940 to 1970 and of 1940 to 1970 resources already listed in the NRHP. A map showing the geographic distribution of these resources is presented in Appendix A of this report (Figure A1). Gray & Pape also used U.S. census data to create maps illustrating various demographic trends across Ohio between 1940 and 1970. All of these maps are in Appendix A (Figures A2–A6).

Gray & Pape originally planned to geo-reference a representative selection of aerial photographs with overlays from maps of historic and existing conditions, and use these to track change over time to the rural landscapes. In consulting with staff at OHS and ODOT, we discovered that the available aerial photography was recorded at a small scale that is incompatible with the planned use. Due to the small scale, dozens of aerial photos are required to show the extent of the boundaries of a city such as Toledo or Akron. The level of detail available on the aerial photos, however, will make them an excellent tool for any future city-level studies that may be undertaken. The aerial photo collections at OHS that Gray & Pape consulted are listed in the bibliography in Section 8.0.

Gray & Pape also considered tracking change to urban landscapes over time by geo-referencing changes in corporate boundaries on either topographic maps or street maps. This approach yielded mixed results. Some of Ohio's major urban centers have seen few boundary changes since before World War II. Cleveland, for example, has not annexed any adjacent lands since 1929. Other cities, including Columbus and Toledo, undertook aggressive growth campaigns during the recent past (1940-1970). Graphic representations of this expansive period, however, proved difficult to identify. Several of Ohio's major cities, such as Cincinnati and Cleveland, have developed extensive GIS databases that include a wide variety of topics, ranging from locations of public infrastructure, to demographic characteristics of neighborhood populations, to distributions of natural resources. Because municipal governments began using GIS applications comparatively recently (within the past fifteen to twenty years), very little historical data is included in the municipal databases. Gray & Pape did not identify any extant electronic datasets that could aid in tracking change over time between 1940 and 1970. As a result, we determined that a GIS-based approach to this avenue of inquiry would provide little useful information regarding Ohio's urban development patterns between 1940 and 1970. Records of annexation patterns, such as meeting minutes, plat and subdivision maps, and metropolitan land use plans, are still

available at municipal planning offices. These are likely to provide pertinent information for future regional, municipal, and neighborhood-based studies of recent past trends and patterns of historical development.

Finally, ODOT maintains an online collection of historic highway maps dating from 1912 to 2003 at www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/TransSysDev/Innovation/Prod_Services/TransMap/Pages/default.aspx. As a representative example of using such maps to track change over time in a metropolitan area, Gray & Pape selected the 1945, 1955, 1965, and 1975 maps and focused on the Cleveland-Akron-Youngstown Northeastern Ohio region. These figures are presented in Appendix A of this report (Figures A7–A8).