

Thank-you Dana. It truly is an honor to be recognized with the Dana Crawford Award, and it is overwhelming to be placed in the same company as some of the country's greatest preservationists.

First, I want to thank my husband Keith who has never wavered in his support and encouragement as I spent thousands of hours on preservation, at CPI and wandering the state to help our rural communities. He also cheerfully let me turn our home into Hotel Goodwin, also known as CPI South. I would also like to introduce some of my family who is here tonight; one of my sisters – Carolyn Smith, my bother Joe Edgar, my nephew Cody Ridenoure, my great niece Kelsey and her husband Jess Price.

Most of you know me, so you know that I don't have a problem with talking. But, I do get nervous so please forgive me for using my notes. There are things I do not want to forget.

My professional background is not in historic preservation and I had spent many years away from SE Colorado working in the field of material culture in Boston and the Pacific Northwest. From my time in other regions of the country, I knew that while people might not understand the impact of agriculture to our economy, or what the potential loss of 6 million acres would mean – people did care about history and the heritage of the west. But, none of us can do preservation by ourselves. When I came back to Colorado and we were facing a monumental fight, I knew we needed help. I had the great gift of being mentored by many remarkable people; who I am not going to try and name because I know I would forget someone. These people are associated with organizations who are leaders in Colorado and the country, the State Historical Fund and the Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and the University of Colorado-Center for Preservation Research. And, the most remarkable statewide preservation non-profit in the country, Colorado Preservation, Inc. Without CPI and all the wonderful staff and board members, both past and present, who I learned so much from and who passionately supported our efforts in opposition to the expansion of the PCMS, SE Colorado and our remarkable heritage and cultural resources would have been lost without you.

In 2007 Colorado Preservation Inc. placed the Santa Fe Trail and Purgatoire River Region on their most Endangered Places list. A staff member at the time prepared a nomination to the National Trust's 10 Most Endangered Places List. At the time, we were working on getting a funding ban in place which have prevented the Army from spending any money on anything associated with expansion of the PCMS. It did not look like the ban with pass. By chance, the. T day the vote was to be taken on the funding ban it was announced that SE Colorado was placed on the Trust's 10 Most

Endangered Places List. Those in Washington working on the effort gave every member of the House a copy of the press release announcing the listing, and the funding ban passed.

Thank you to these organizations and those who mentored me! It is my commitment to pass it forward.

When we began the Pinon Canyon fight, my great niece and nephew Kelsey and Colby were teenagers and both expressed interest in continuing the legacy of our family ranch. They would be the sixth generation on the ranch, and I promised them I would do everything I could to give them the opportunity to do so. They were just two of the young people in SE Colorado who's futures were threatened. After generations on a farm or ranch, you can't just pick up and go somewhere else.

With us tonight is a group of very special young people from the Future Farmers of America chapter at Hoehne high school. I encourage everyone to visit with these young people. While these FFA members were not in high school at the time, they have siblings and friends who were, and who were instrumental in our efforts. They wrote and spoke to legislators, helped with fundraisers, and testified in support of legislation were working on and got passed at the state capitol. These young people are the future of our working landscapes and rural communities - and are the reason why we all must commit to doing everything we can to help our rural areas preserve their heritage, cultural resources and communities. These are also the future owners of Colorado's Centennial Farms and Ranches. I want to thank Dan Love and Cameron Wolfe for making it possible for them to be here tonight.

I would also like to recognize a few members of the Pinon Canyon Expansion Opposition Coalition who are here tonight: Steve Wooten and Tony and Connie Hass. Our success in SE Colorado was because of a large grassroots effort and an amazing group of Coalition board members and advisors who ate, breathed and lived Pinon Canyon for over eight years.

Although everyone involved was regularly told that we did not have a chance, we knew one thing – at least we would know we had tried. Doing nothing was a choice, but it was not our choice. Preservation is also a choice, and it is a choice we make for the present and the future.

Preservation matters, and as a friend and former CPI board member always says, it's about the people. But, so often it is about someone or an event long past. Our working landscapes are different. By definition, working landscapes are always evolving and are significant because the people, their use of the place, the natural environment, the built environment, cultural resources and the ongoing heritage the place represents are intertwined. As preservationists, historians and those

interested in heritage we must think of working landscapes differently than most other cultural resources.

Preservation generally looks at a defined period of significance, but with working landscapes their ability to evolve while also maintaining their significant characteristics, is what allows them to survive. Barns, houses or corrals may have to be adapted somewhat over time to make continued use possible, but the patterns of use, natural environment and heritage remain. Technology, knowledge of land and environment, economics and markets for products, even the agriculture product itself may change – but that is what keeps working landscapes viable. These changes do not alter the reasons historic working landscapes are still significant. I cannot tell you how many times I called one of the ranchers or PCEOC board members, only to have them answer their cell phone while on horseback moving cattle. Think about it. New technology, but the cultural resource is still the same.

While our working landscapes and rural communities usually are not threatened by actions that will change entire regions of our state, they are facing tremendous pressures. Since 1982 our country has lost 24 million acres of agricultural land - 40 plus acres of agricultural land is lost to development and sprawl every hour. Between 2007 and 2012 Colorado lost 281,000 acres of agricultural land (46,833 acres, or roughly 73 square miles per year). While a great deal of our agricultural land, and multi-generational working landscapes, is changed forever by development – we also continue to lose working landscapes to public policy decisions that do not value or adequately consider the impact to unique eco-systems, cultural resources, community economics and dynamics, heritage, and most importantly the multi-generational families who fostered, protected and continue to evolve these working landscapes.

When we lose agricultural land, we also lose our rural communities and the main streets preservationists work to preserve and revitalize. In our rural areas, the working landscapes and the economy and vitality of the town are forever linked. When we lose working landscapes, and the ability for rural families to continue their family heritage, we gradually reach a tipping point which results in the loss of businesses in town - which in turn means empty or deteriorating buildings on main street, diminishing school populations which result in empty school buildings – (which are often historic buildings) and diminishing tax base and revenue which results in the inability for local governments to maintain the needed services, much less historic city halls, courthouses, jails, and other buildings.

When it comes to preservation, we are incredibly fortunate in Colorado. We have the State Historical Fund, which often is the critical funding needed for preservation/documentation projects

related to non-profits or government entities. Our state historic preservation tax credit, which we just got re-authorized through the state legislature, can provide the needed puzzle piece for rehabilitation projects on commercial buildings. We have a great technical support system through the Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation and the State Historical Fund. We have a strong Certified Local Government program, which was built through the efforts of Dan Corson and his successors. The National Trust for Historic Preservation has been a strong supporter of projects and issues around the state, including our rural areas. And, we have Colorado Preservation Inc. – a small but mighty preservation non-profit that has worked with over 100 Endangered Historic Places around Colorado – including the Santa Fe Trail/Purgatoire River Region and the WPA Adobe Stables in Rocky Ford; and supports preservation projects spread from Cortez to Phillips County, and Baca County to Grand Junction.

But, there still is great need in our rural communities. So, as preservationists and those who love our history and heritage, what can we do to support our rural communities and working landscapes?

First, we must always listen to the community. Rural communities and the working landscapes that support them (whether they are farms, ranches, orchards, etc.) may not always agree on all their needs and goals. But, we must listen to both “parts” of the community and find ways to support their efforts while embracing what they find significant. If we encourage a town to adopt a preservation or revitalization approach that alienates or dismisses those who have supported the town and the tax base through generations, we fail. The reason SE Colorado was successful in our efforts was because it was a true grassroots effort that includes ranchers, farmers, residents of the towns, business people, students, environmentalists, artists, archaeologists, architectural historians, biologists, Republicans, Democrats You get the point.

It is not enough to understand a community’s current situation and their needs. We must also take the time to listen and understand how they believe they got there, their specific concerns and goals; and the dynamics of the people within the community.

Second, we must understand that each rural “community” has different historic and preservation stories, resources and priorities – which means that each community may have different needs when they are defining how they will embrace and undertake preservation. We must also understand how timing may impact priorities. Because of the Pinon Canyon issue, private landowners in southern Otero, eastern Las Animas and an area of Huerfano Counties were open to the idea of undertaking a cultural resource survey to document the remarkable number of resources on

approximately 60 ranches. Abbey Christman and her team also did a historic context; and we simultaneously did a biological survey on area ranches. Steve Wooten and I spent a year meeting with landowners, explaining the process, answering questions, and finding answers for other questions. Every landowner in the identified survey areas had the choice of participating or not. At the time, many landowners saw the external threat as significant and the surveys a way to demonstrate how unique and important the resources and region were. In contrast, currently in northern Otero County we are proceeding with context studies and focused surveys documenting specific ethnic groups and their role in our history. This is comfortable for the community right now, but the community is not ready for a broad survey of the entire north half of the county.

The concept of an historic apple orchard as a cultural resource that is significant and should be a priority of saving can be a stretch for some. Yet, when I visited Montezuma County multiple people, whose ancestors had been among the earliest settlers and homesteaders, explained to me that those orchards were a significant part of their history. The first thing the settlers did was plant their orchards, then they built a barn, and then when they had the time and money they built a house. Those orchards were the basis for the working landscape that built areas of Montezuma County. How can we say that the historic houses and buildings in town are significant and represent the history of the area if we don't recognize what helped build the buildings and towns?

Third, we need to expand our preservation training in our rural communities. As we all know there is a great deal of mis-information about historic preservation and too many "scare tactic" stories. Preservations organizations in Colorado do a great job with training, but we need to provide more training within the context of the concerns of the specific community, which means we must understand why they are concerned. Section 106 was an incredible tool in fighting the expansion, because it put significant responsibilities and restrictions on the government agency; but those same restrictions did not apply to the private landowners. Over the past ten years our county commissioners have seen the importance of participation in Section 106 – I always tell county commissioners it is a way to be pro-active instead of reactive and it is a way for the county to have control over their own destiny. Every land use/planning request Otero County gets first comes to the preservation board for review. Earlier this year Otero County worked with History Colorado to provide a Section 106 training in February for CLGs. We need to find ways to do more of this, in the communities, and in a way that incorporates their specific situations into the discussion.

Fourth, it is imperative to understand that there are intelligent, knowledgeable people in our rural communities and that they live in the rural communities not because they have to but because

they choose to. After the Coalition began talking about cultural landscapes and what would be the catastrophic impact from expansion of the Maneuver Site, I spoke at EIS scoping meeting. Afterward, a cultural resource officer from the Army came up to me and said, and I quote “We didn’t think you people were smart enough to use the cultural landscape approach, that is the one thing we cannot mitigate.” While they may not have known the correct terminology or the defined preservation approach, the ranchers knew every cultural resource on their property, usually knew the history of the site, and multiple generations had done everything they knew of to protect the site – which often necessitated not talking about its existence. In the Coalition there is a rancher with a PhD from Stanford, but if you did not know him and just looked at his cowboy hat and old jeans, you would probably think he had never left the country. Yet, invariably when he spoke opponents would be stunned by his knowledge and would ask “who the heck is that guy?”.

Fifth, as you all know our rural communities have a capacity issue. For most of these communities raising the cash match for a grant or funding a project so tax credits can be utilized is a major challenge. People capacity is the other challenge. We have great preservation boards and CLGs in towns and counties throughout this state, yet the capacity to take on projects still is difficult. Many rural preservation boards have no paid staff, minimal or no budget, and no prospect of any of that changing. I don’t know what the answer is, but these are issues we must continue to consider.

For ten years a handful of us tried to save a historic building in La Junta. We managed to do a Historic Structure Assessment, and a feasibility study but we are just now ready to begin the first phase of rehabilitation. It took a brave non-profit, the assistance of the La Junta Urban Renewal Authority and the potential of the tax credits to get to this point. We are incredibly fortunate to have a great team of architects, a preservation specialist, and a preservation construction firm. But, often it is difficult to find those resources who are willing to take on the additional travel and time of projects in our remote areas. Thanks to all of you who are willing to take on those extra challenges, please keep it up.

Finally, we need to support the non-profit organization who adds capacity in preservation through advocacy, technical expertise and passion. Not only does CPI advocate for endangered sites throughout the state and for public policy such as reauthorization of the tax credit (which included hiring lobbyists), they provide capacity when the community cannot. With the invaluable support of the State Historical Fund, once a year CPI provides all of us with access to the best networking and preservation education in the country. I would ask each person who is or has been involved with an endangered site to not just say thank you when your site has been saved; please, commit to

Dana Crawford Award – May 9, 2018
Rebecca Goodwin acceptance comments

continued support for the EPP program and to making yourself available to share your lessons learned with others who are facing preservation challenges. For everyone who has ever attended a conference, received technical expertise and guidance, or been recognized for your preservation efforts – please pass that forward through your financial support for CPI. They need our support which in turn will allow them to continue to travel to every remote corner of the state to help with the next preservation challenge.

Thank you to everyone in this room for your support of preservation in all areas of Colorado. There is much left to do.