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“There are houses which have soul and spirit, inclined to joy or sorrow; there are places of dignity and grandeur. There are facades of brick and stone that hold images; there are little silent places where, in half-forgotten whispers in dusty corners, the stories of ages find voice.”

— Margaret Meade-Fetherstonhaugh
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THE VISION

Zimmerman Heritage Farm is our cultural heritage, a lasting vestige of East Multnomah County’s agricultural roots. It offers the experience of “life as it really was” in the decades at the turn of the 20th century, reflecting the past through a mirror unique to the Zimmerman family’s farming and domestic life.

Zimmerman Heritage Farm benefits and serves the community through cultural history educational programs and partnerships, park and recreation programs, recreational activities, and community events.
December 1999

Dear Interested Citizens:

As Mayor of the City of Gresham, I have come to recognize the importance of preserving the treasured elements of Gresham that have helped to form our community. One of those treasures is the historic Zimmerman Heritage Farm. This remnant of a bygone era stands today for our citizens, young and old, as a sentinel to the agricultural foundation on which our economy was built.

We are indebted to Isobel Zimmerman for seeing our future before we saw it ourselves. She assured that her family's collective history and that of the region during the mid-1800s would be preserved for future generations by donation of her house and belongings. For this we owe her dearly, as we now complete this Master Plan to pay tribute, as well as establish our common goals, to honor her generous contributions through preservation, interpretation, and education.

Let us work together to implement the community’s vision embodied in this plan, not only for today, but for those who will benefit in future generations.

Honorable Mayor Charles J. Becker
City of Gresham
December 1999

The image of the Zimmerman Heritage Farm is an impression of a young girl in her summer white dress stepping from the gingerbread adorned Victorian home on the Columbia Slough. The day is warm. The fragrance of sweet peas and roses hangs in the air. The gardens, so lovingly tended by her mother and three sisters, extend to the old Sandy Road where a watering trough quenches the thirst of passing horses and adventuring dogs.

Dairy cows can be heard in the distance. A carriage passes in front of the house on the road that was once an old Indian trail, later an immigrant trail. The girl was Isobel Zimmerman. The house and three generations of family belongings would be her gift to us, a legacy.

In an age when much of our heritage is being lost, this historic site has become a doorway into a time capsule that reveals the life and times of those who arrived at the end of the Oregon Trail. In the spirit of Isobel Zimmerman’s desire to share her family’s story and its importance to the development of this region, we have undertaken the task of preserving and presenting all of its tales and treasures for generations to come.

We look forward to sharing this heritage through educational activities that are reminiscent of pastimes enjoyed when the Zimmerman girls and their friends played in the house, under the arbor, around the yard and gardens — adventures that will thrill school children coming to experience a life that is scarcely recognizable today. Visitors will reflect on genteel Victorian life, as well as agricultural and dairy influences of local families. Special heritage events will round out the spectrum of activities available to visitors at “the farm”.

This Master Plan lifts up the potentials and opportunities for telling a special story and continuing a wonderful legacy. This legacy can be part of your legacy as well. On warm summer evenings, a casual picnic at “the farm” could be a welcomed respite from the rigors of the day. Family and friends can gather, as they have done for over a century, to enjoy warm fellowship, chat on the front porch, linger in the gardens or repose with a good book in the shade of the oak tree that has sheltered many who have come before. We welcome you as a vital ingredient toward developing this wonderful image and legacy.

Jeanette McDermid, President
Fairview-Rockwood-Wilkes Historical Society

Theodore J. Welty, Executive Director
Zimmerman Heritage Farm
Zimmerman Heritage Farm is a unique cultural education and recreational resource that is being created for the benefit of the public on a 5.98-acre historic site in Gresham, Oregon. The focal point is the historic Zimmerman House, a Victorian era farmhouse, which was built in 1874 and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

The Master Plan for Zimmerman Heritage Farm outlines a comprehensive vision and a long-range, phased implementation plan for cultural heritage education and complementary recreation facilities, programs, and special events and activities.

The goal of this master plan is to provide a vision and a “road map” for creating a cultural heritage museum and community park that will become an enduring benefit to the community.

The educational and interpretive focus of this historic house museum is the heritage of the Zimmerman family and dairy farming in East Multnomah County. When fully operational, Zimmerman Heritage Farm is expected to attract over 20,000 visitors a year.

BACKGROUND

The Zimmerman farmhouse is located in Gresham on NE Sandy Boulevard. The existing property is a remnant parcel of the original dairy farmstead that at one time encompassed approximately 600 acres of reclaimed bottomland along the lower Columbia River. The Zimmerman family had continuously lived on the dairy farm from 1870 until 1992, more than 120 years.

Isobel Zimmerman, the last descendant to live in the house, wishing that the house, contents, and grounds be developed as a public museum for the public, willed the land to the City of Gresham. In 1993, the Fairview-Rockwood-Wilkes Historical Society (FRW) was willed the home and subsequently estab-
lished a standing committee, the Friends of the Zimmerman House (FOHZ). The goal was to preserve the house, its rare and extensive artifact collection, its picturesque gardens and grounds, and to work with the City of Gresham to establish an historical community park. The historic house along with its grounds is managed through a partnership arrangement between the City of Gresham and the FRW, whereby the City owns the property and the FRW owns the house and its contents.

MASTER PLAN VISION

The comprehensive design concept for Zimmerman Heritage Farm is restoration of the historic landscape scene of the farm. This will be accomplished through restoration and reconstruction of historic buildings and structures, as well as the gardens and orchards associated with the home.

The historic site showcases the restored historic farmhouse along with restoration of the buttery building, arbor, fences, gardens, and grounds. The long-range plan envisions reconstruction of a number of farm outbuildings that will support the site’s operational needs.

Site facilities for recreational and community purposes will be designed to recall images of traditional farm structures of the region at the turn of the century, thereby contributing to the overall image of the restored farmscape. New facilities will include picnic shelters, foot paths, open meadow, and a visitor center to be used in conjunction with the house museum and as a community meeting space.

The primary interpretive focus of the farm will be the years between 1899 and 1915. These years appear to be the fullest and happiest for the Zimmerman family. The last child, Isobel,
had been born, extensive Queen Anne style additions to the house had been completed, and the dairy farm was operating over a large area in East Multnomah County.

Within the museum area of Zimmerman Heritage Farm, interpretative and heritage education programs will be created to draw upon the richness of the Zimmerman collection. Potential exhibits and programs will encompass permanent indoor exhibits, living history presentations, self-guided tours, changing exhibits, and special events.

PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

Zimmerman Heritage Farm is intended to benefit and serve the community through complementary uses, such as educational partnerships, park and recreation programs, recreational activities, and community events. Some activities will directly serve the educational mission. Other complementary uses will be accommodated that can help sustain the site economically.

Education programming for schools will include grade school programs (on- and off-site) and guided tours. School programs will be tied to the State of Oregon’s education benchmarks.

A range of community education programs will be offered through the Gresham Parks and Recreation Division for all ages such as heirloom gardening, genealogy, restoration techniques, old-fashioned craft skills, and watercolor painting.

Special heritage events will be developed around seasonal themes and will be established to create awareness, support, and revenue. Other related special events sponsored on the grounds by the City or FOZH might include evening concerts and art exhibits in the park. In addition, the historic grounds will have the facilities and appeal to attract small weddings, family reunions, and other

Methinks long years have flown
And, sitting in her old arm chair
Jessie has older grown.
With silver sprinkled in her hair.
Her album thus she holds,
And turns its many pages o’er
And wonders if it still contains
The memories of yore.
As o’er these pages thus she runs
With many a sigh and kiss
Then suddenly she stops and says
"Who could have written this?"

- S. M. A., Sept 1883
One of multiple entries in
Jessie McCall’s album
groups to the site.

Activities for the general public in park site of the project include reserved-use of grounds and group-shelters for private gatherings, picnics, receptions, and occasional small weddings. The site is also designed for low-key activities such as strolling, jogging, and picnicking.

Agriculture museums are becoming highly popular in urban areas around the country because of their ability to foster connections with our disappearing agrarian past. Building upon this potential, visitor attendance and an array of community uses of Zimmerman Heritage Farm are projected to increase over time as the facility and programs develop and improve.

IMPLEMENTATION

Three phases are identified in the implementation plan that give direction for facility development, operations and management, and program development. During the first five years (Phase 1) annual attendance is anticipated to be fairly limited due to the necessary repair and restoration work on the historic house as well as the need to manage the on-site collections.

As Zimmerman Heritage Farm engages the activities associated with Phase 2 (years 6-10), annual attendance is projected to increase to approximately 14,000 visitors. As Zimmerman Heritage Farm enters Phase 3, full development of the master plan, annual attendance should increase to over 21,000 visitors. The increase represents continued development of interpretive exhibits, established education programs and activities, as well as enhanced special events. In addition, the historic grounds will have the facilities and appeal to attract small weddings, family reunions, and other groups to the site.

Estimates of shared project costs for construction, operation, and revenue are summarized in the table below.

### Shared Project Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Facility Costs</th>
<th>Annual Operating Costs</th>
<th>Annual Revenue Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>$188,200.</td>
<td>$31,830.</td>
<td>$32,362.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>$472,600.</td>
<td>$91,652.</td>
<td>$92,126.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>$1,039,300.</td>
<td>$138,849.</td>
<td>$138,981.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
All construction costs are in 1999 dollars.
INTRODUCTION
he historic Zimmerman House is a delightful, turn-of-the-century farm house situated in a rapidly urbanizing area of Northwest Gresham in East Multnomah County. The farmhouse is located at 17111 NE Sandy Boulevard on 5.98 acres, a remnant parcel of the original dairy farmstead that at one time extended over 600 acres of reclaimed bottomland along the Columbia River. The historic Zimmerman house and 1.58 acres of historical property was listed on National Register of Historic Places on 5 June 1986.

OVERVIEW

From the time Jacob and Lena Zimmerman purchased the property, the Zimmerman family had continuously lived on the farm until the death of their youngest granddaughter, Isobel Faith Zimmerman in 1992. Jacob and Lena had arrived in the area as immigrants in October 1851, coming west over the Oregon Trail. They settled in the Portland vicinity and eventually purchased the Robert P. Wilmot Donation Land Claim as their farm in December 1869, and moved onto the farm in 1870.

It was Isobel Zimmerman’s desire that the house, contents, and remaining 2.38 acres of farmland be developed as a historic house museum for the public.

In 1987, local citizens created the Fairview-Rockwood-Wilkes Historical Society (FRW) for the purpose of preserving and interpreting the cultural history of the Fairview, Rockwood, and Wilkes communities. Isobel Zimmerman was a charter member of the historical society.

Subsequently, the historical society established a standing committee, Friends of the Zimmerman House (FOZH), for the purpose of preserving the house, its comprehensive collection of artifacts, its gardens and grounds, and to work with the City of Gresham to establish a historical community park.

In 1993, the Zimmerman house was bequeathed to FRW and in 1994 the land on which the house sits was donated to the City of Gresham. In 1995, the City of Gresham formally accepted the 2.38 acres of land for the purpose of creating a community park.

In 1996, the City purchased an additional 1.5 acres directly west of the Zimmerman House parcel. In 1997 Kenneth Hoffman, Isobel’s nephew, donated an additional 2.1 acres to the City bringing the overall park site to a total area of 5.98 acres. The balance of the original dairy farm that surrounded the project site was sold over time to private parties for light industrial purposes.

A restoration-rehabilitation and accessibility plan for the house was completed by FOZH in 1997 and is being implemented in phases. In 1998, a temporary caretaker’s house was located near the east property line.

The historic house and the grounds are
managed through a partnership arrangement between the City of Gresham and FRW, whereby the City owns the property and FRW owns the house and its contents, with FOZH as an oversight committee.

**Gresham Parks and Recreation Division Mission**

The Mission of the Gresham Parks and Recreation Division is to offer facilities and programs that invite the public's use. Its efforts shall enhance Gresham's quality of life through the significant benefits provided through recreation. The Division takes an active role in delivering park and recreation services in a cost-effective manner. They strive to offer fully accessible services in partnership with others, encouraging volunteer involvement.

**Fairview-Rockwood-Wilkes Historical Society Mission**

The mission of the Fairview-Rockwood-Wilkes Historical Society is to stimulate an interest in and preserve the history of the Fairview, Rockwood and Wilkes areas of East Multnomah County, Oregon. It's stated goal is to ensure that the future of their three areas does not loose touch with the past.

**MASTER PLAN DIRECTIVE**

The leadership of the City of Gresham and the FOZH required planning services for the development of a master plan for the historic Zimmerman House site and associated park grounds. The objective was to create a master plan for a cultural heritage museum and community park that would become an enduring benefit to the community.

The interpretive focus was the history of the Zimmerman family along with supporting themes of Native American habitation, early settlement and agriculture. The City and FOZH established general project objectives to complete the master plan as a first phase of a long-range vision:

- Involve the Gresham community.
- Establish project vision and goals.
- Research of the site's archaeology and history.
- Analyze comparable facilities and forecasting demand.
- Analyze activity and event programming scenarios.
- Analyze historic landscape restoration potential.
- Analyze appropriate recreational usage.
- Develop project components, size, scope, costs.
- Analyze financial aspects of public demand and support.
- Examine of management and operations scenarios.
- Establish project priorities and phasing.
MASTER PLAN PROCESS

In response to the Master Plan Directive, the interdisciplinary master plan consultant team developed a multi-task planning process for a 10-month planning period. Working in collaboration with the Gresham Parks and Recreation Division and FOZH, the planning consultants examined a range of historic, education, recreation, and economic research and planning considerations.

A blue-ribbon Technical Advisory Committee of cultural heritage professionals was created to review and comment on planning work at strategic intervals. Throughout the process, presentations were made to the City of Gresham's Parks and Recreation Citizen Advisory Committee and Historic Resources Advisory Committee.

A focus group meeting was conducted with local business community stakeholders that included the Chamber of Commerce and Gresham Area Visitor Association. In addition, two community open-house events were conducted to provide the public an opportunity to review and comment on facility design and program concepts for the heritage farm and park.

The following planning tasks formed the basis of the master plan process:

**Task 1 - Project Initialization**

Consultants compiled and reviewed all relevant materials regarding the site and the Zimmerman family’s history. A Concept Development Workshop was conducted to explore an overall vision, general scope and content, and preliminary programs for the project. The Workshop included representatives of the Gresham Parks & Recreation Division, FOZH, FRW, Gresham Parks & Recreation Citizen Advisory Committee, Gresham Historic Resources Advisory Committee, cultural heritage museum profession, and master plan consultants.

**Task 2 - Research and Analysis**

An archaeological surface survey of the historic site was completed to determine the existence of any evidence of past material culture. Research of the history of the Zimmerman Family, relevant Native American history, emigrant settlement era, and the development of agriculture in East Multnomah County was completed as a basis for historic landscape restoration of the site and to assess preliminary interpretive opportunities for the historic house museum.

Market research of comparable facilities was completed to gather information on demand, operating costs and sources of revenue, partnering examples, long range facility plans, volunteer activities, programming, and staffing for use in developing attendance projections and a financial pro forma for operation and management of the park and museum.

A museum research field trip to Philip Foster Farm at Eagle Creek, Oregon and
Stevens-Crawford House Museum in Oregon City, Oregon was completed. The research trip allowed the client and consultants to gather pertinent information on comparable historic sites and to also develop an increased awareness of operation and development issues that are relevant to the master plan of the Zimmerman Heritage Farm.

Inventory and analysis of project site conditions was completed to examine project opportunities and constraints as a basis for subsequent site design work of the historic landscape. Relevant planning, building code, and accessibility were assessed for compliance requirements.

**Task 3 - Facility Program Development**

Based upon the foregoing research activities, a range of appropriate facility programs and special events for the Zimmerman Heritage Farm were examined to determine their consistency with desired public benefits and impact on development of the project site. A preliminary museum vision and interpretive theme structure for the museum was developed that addressed both indoor and outdoor interpretation and education programming.

**Task 4 - Alternative Site Master Plan Designs**

Based upon the findings of the foregoing Facility Program Development task, alternative site designs of proposed facilities were prepared illustrating site concepts, facility program components. The alternative site designs were presented for evaluation and synthesis of a Preferred Master Plan Design Concept.

**Task 5 - Final Master Plan Concept and Implementation Plan**

Based upon evaluation of site plan design alternatives, a Preferred Design Concept of the site was developed for incorporation in the Master Plan. The Preferred Concept also illustrated the range of potential interpretive-educational program and facility components and utility infrastructure.

An implementation and operation plan was prepared to establish respective responsibilities between the City of Gresham and the Friends of Zimmerman House. The implementation plan also provides recommendations for site facility programs, collections management, staffing, governance, construction costs, annual maintenance and operations costs, revenue projections, and prioritized phasing of facility components.
The Zimmerman Heritage Farm site is located in the northern limits of the City of Gresham in East Multnomah County. Gresham, with a population of over 83,000 in 1999, is Oregon’s fourth largest city.

REGIONAL SETTING

Situated east of Portland, Oregon’s largest city, Gresham is rapidly urbanizing, transforming itself from an agriculture-based area of berry and dairy farming to a service-based, residential community. The communities of Fairview, Wood Village, and Troutdale are directly east of the farm and adjacent to the north Gresham area.

Zimmerman Heritage Farm is located directly north of I-84, Oregon’s only east-west interstate freeway. A majority of visitors reach the site via Exit #13 on I-84 approximately 1/2 mile east of the farm site. Local access is from NE Sandy Boulevard, an historic east-west travel route to and from Portland.

Zimmerman Heritage Farm is accessible from Portland International Airport via I-205 and I-84. The farm museum site is in proximity to the gateway to the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic area with its array of cultural and natural history resources and attractions.

PARK PLANNING CONTEXT

In the “City of Gresham Parks, Recreation, & Open Space Master Plan” completed in 1995, the Zimmerman site is designated as a unique community park in a portion of the City of Gresham that is considered under-served with regard to city park and recreation services. A community park as defined in the master plan is intended to serve all residents of the City and to provide a variety of active and passive recreation opportunities. The master plan further states that “the historic Zimmerman House could provide a community park that emphasizes Gresham’s history and the history of agriculture in the area.”
ARCHAEOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

A foot survey of the Zimmerman property was complete on 28 December 1998. Fifteen meter transects were walked in a continuous west to east, east to west direction across the property, when ever possible. Generally, the site's surface was covered with a thick cover of grasses. In most areas, the surface was not visible due to a heavy cover of vegetation, primarily blackberry brambles.

West of the existing Pound Pear orchard the original surface was not visible due to approximately 2-3 feet of soil overlying the site. This soil overlay was located on the property once leased by a tree nursery. The overburden covers over half of the property west of the orchard. There were still a few nursery trees planted in this area, but most of it is unvegetated.

As a result of preliminary archaeological field work, no cultural material was encountered during the foot survey of the property. While no cultural material was encountered on the surface, this does not eliminate the possibility of subsurface features being present.

There are several structures, such as the privy, that are no longer present and that have not been accounted for on the project property. Historic features, as well as prehistoric, could possibly be encountered during any future ground-disturbing activities.

A library search was conducted in order to find any previous archaeological work conducted in the project area. One previous archaeological survey of project area was located. During 1978-1979, a cultural resources survey was undertaken in the Greater Portland area. This project was funded by the City of Portland, under CETA, Title VI and sponsored by the Department of Anthropology at Portland State University.

The Blue Lake area was one of three specific areas investigated. The Blue Lake Survey Region (BLSR) was roughly defined as a two mile by one and one-half mile area between Blue Lake Park and NE 158 Avenue, and between the south bank of the Columbia river and the Banfield Highway/Union Pacific Railway tracks.

This area was selected because of the known presence in Blue Lake Park of a late prehistoric/historic Chinook Indian village and because of the potential threat to archaeological sites within that area urbanization. The goal was to locate archaeological sites and to mobilize efforts on behalf of their preservation once they were located. The Zimmerman House is located within the BLSR project area.

The BLSR research team conducted a surface land survey of all accessible land having some visibility. Ninety percent of the flood plain/river-front property was surveyed and approximately sixty percent of the first and second terraces (land areas of different heights).

That project found that the flood plain was still largely agricultural with some small sections still wooded and other sections devoted to industrial use. Land was not surveyed if it had thick grass or weed cover, if it was wooded, if no access was permitted by
the landowner, and if it was inaccessible due to commercial/industrial development. All land within the vicinity of Zimmerman Heritage Farm was privately owned.

As part of the BLSR study private artifact collections were also examined and photographed. A total of 10 presumably prehistoric artifacts from the Zimmerman collection were examined and some analysis was completed. The study identified nineteen archaeological sites and one historic site of special note. These sites were within a highly disturbed area delineated for urban development. An historic site of interest for the Zimmerman Heritage Farm project, which was identified but not physically located during the BLSR project, was one of the home sites of Indian John, a friend of the Zimmerman family.

In 1979, a archaeological study of the area was completed by Lambi Kongas. Within that study, Kongas recorded the location of the home of Indian John, a Native American friend of the Zimmerman family. His home was located almost directly south of the Zimmerman house on a portion of a plant nursery that was situated half-way between NE Sandy Boulevard and the Banfield Highway/Union Pacific Railway tracks, approximately 800 meters west of the junction of NE Sandy Boulevard and NE 181st Avenue. Apparently, until 1893, Indian John lived in a cabin that had been built earlier by pioneers. At the time of his occupancy of the cabin, this location was a wooded area.

In summary, the BLSR project did not locate or record any historic or prehistoric sites on the Zimmerman Heritage Farm Master Plan project property.

HISTORICAL RESEARCH

Physical Setting

The Zimmerman Heritage Farm is located in a cross-section of the sandy and silty Columbia River flood plain on a low terrace consisting of unconsolidated sand and silt. The broad flood plain of the Columbia River has elevations of 10 feet to 30 feet and the soil is silty alluvium.

The Columbia River and its flood plain have continued to change appearances innumerable times with shifts in the riverbed, in the erosion of banks, and in the composition of the sloughs surrounding the river.

The farm’s location and the surrounding area which now makes up the Gresham, Fairview, and Troutdale communities border the Columbia River with several large islands nearby. South of the river to Sandy Boulevard is low-lying, rich bottomlands forested with ash, willow and dogwood. Wappato, an Indian food staple, originally grew in the ponds, such as nearby Blue Lake.

The uplands at the south edge of Gresham were forested with cedar and fir. East and south of Gresham, foothills lead into Mt. Hood from which flow the Sandy River and the lower Sandy River. The flat gravel terraces continue west to Portland.

The climate of the project area is pleasant
with moderate, warm dry summers and mild wet winters. The annual precipitation is 40" to 60" with air temperatures averaging from 52 to 54 degrees F annually, and an average of 165-212 frost-free days a year.

Zimmerman Heritage Farm is situated at the west-end of the Columbia River Gorge, the major passageway through the Cascade Mountain Range. The Gorge creates dramatic east winter winds and ice storms in the project area.

Little of the original fauna and flora remain in the project area. Historically, the flood plain was mostly used for agricultural purposes while the terraces are being utilized for commercial, residential and increasingly for industrial purposes.

Native Culture

In its riverine orientation, the Zimmerman Heritage Farm project area echoes an ancient subsistence theme, suggested by the regional archaeological record. Evidence of habitation dates from approximately 10,000 years before present times.

Sites of early human occupation may reflect seasonal-round activities, i.e. the movement during periods of the year to take advantage of seasonal plants and wildlife. During this time, the population would move from more permanent winter villages to smaller secondary sites. Gathering, fishing and hunting were the main components of the subsistence cycle.

Ethnographic accounts of the Lower Columbia River Chinook culture are numerous although not focused upon the Zimmerman project area. It is generally accepted that the Chinook people lived in autonomous villages that were under the leadership of a wealthy and/or influential person. Travel for trade, as well as for seasonal exploitation of resources, was common; rivers served as the main avenues of travel. It is also generally accepted that Chinook society was a class society with distinctions made between nobles, common people and slaves.

The abundance and fertility of the physical environment permitted a complex Chinookan social fabric, which were basically fishing, hunting, gathering and trading economy.
Exploration Period

Euro-American contact with the Native Peoples of the Lower Columbia began in the 16th century with the maritime explorations of the Spanish and English. Contacts resumed by the English and Spanish in the 18th century with additional interest from the Americans and Russians. Exploration soon turned to fur-trade which would give way to overland expeditions, the establishment of pioneer trails, and the eventual settlement and possession of the region by Euro-Americans.

The Lewis and Clark Expedition at the start of the 19th century provides the first published detailed information concerning the physical and cultural environment of the country west of the Rocky Mountains in general and the Zimmerman Heritage Farm project area.

The area now known as the Portland Basin was a fertile, lush region with mild-climate producing an abundance of fauna and flora. The Columbia River in this area was noted to contain several islands. The islands had interior ponds ranging from sparse to thickly timbered, some heavily populated by fowl during fall migration.

Lewis and Clark focused exploration primarily on the Columbia River; smaller trips were made up tributaries, such as the Sandy River and their men hunted on the islands and in the uplands. From the descriptions Lewis and Clark provided, the Zimmerman project area and its surrounding vicinity appear as a dynamic region with a heavy concentration of micro-environments: bottom lands, dry prairies, island, uplands, marshes, rivers, lakes and woods all within a short distance of each other.

Approaching the Sandy River, on their journey to the coast, and three miles to the east of that river, Clark complains that

"the undergrowth rushes, vines, etc. in the bottoms (are) too thick to pass through."

At the Sandy River, he remarks that

"the country has a handsome appearance in advance. No mountains. Extensive bottoms. The water shallow for a great distance from shore."
He calls the Sandy River the Quicksand River and describes it as shallow and sandy, draining the western slope of Mt. Hood with the two mouths of the river discharging into the Columbia River.

Clark names Lady Island the Island of Fowles (sic) and describes it as three and one-half miles by one and one-half miles with a rocky northern side having pines and cottonwood and immense quantities of geese, brants, ducks, sea otter, swan, sandal crane, loons and white gulls. He writes, "a thousand fowl passed overhead."

Rich bottomland was noted with scattered riverfront trees consisting of cottonwood, large-leafed maple, ash, willow, and dogwood with the bottoms having small ponds where wappato grew. A few lowland prairie areas, some with ponds and lush spring growth of numerous plants and other bottomlands thickly covered in the fall with heavy brush were also observed.

Uplands of dense stands of white cedar and fir at elevations of 200 feet having very rich soil, with a gradual approach to the uplands and woods of white oak, pin and undergrowth. Mountains as foothills heading into the Mt. Hood Corridor, were noted as having rich soil and plentiful spring hunting of elk, bear and deer.

Lewis and Clark estimated that 8,000 people lived between the site of present-day Portland and the Cowlitz River to the west. The Expedition notes the presence of two villages, one on either side of the project area. Ne-cha-co-kee to the east, in Blue Lake Park area; and Neer-che-ki-o to the west of this area in the region of the present-day Portland International Airport.

During the early decades of the 19th Century, British and American fur companies were positioning themselves in the Pacific Northwest for control of the fur trade. By 1821, the North West Company was absorbed by the...
powerful, Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC).

In 1825, operations were moved from Fort George on the coast to the north shore of the Columbia River, seven miles upstream from the Willamette and would be called Fort Vancouver.

Disease had steadily been taking its toll on the Native population from the time of first contact, raging up and down the Columbia River. Disease was the worst around Fort Vancouver and Sauvie Island. HBC Chief Factor Dr. John McLoughlin estimated death rates from 50 to 90 percent of the native people during this early period of Euro-American contact.

**Settlement Era**

Fort Vancouver continued to be the major British settlement in the Portland area humming with activity that deeply impressed occasional visitors. Fort William, a rival trading post built on Sauvie Island by the independent American fur trader Nathaniel Wyeth, lasted only two years from 1835 to 1837, before the HBC took over the abandoned site as a dairy farm.

The first large European settlements were located along the Willamette River. Retired employees of HBC, mostly French Canadians, had begun to settle and cultivate the “French Prairie” in 1829.

A second settlement formed at the base of Willamette Falls on the Willamette River where John McLoughlin and Methodist missionaries contended for control of what seemed to be the natural location for a major town.

By the winter of 1842–43, the new community of Oregon City had made a significant impression on the wilderness, with more than thirty buildings, a gristmill, and a growing competition for building lots. It was the first destination for most of the participants in the swelling American migrations that had brought over 800 new settlers to Oregon in 1843 and about 1,200 more in 1844.

By the time the Zimmerman family arrived in Oregon in 8 October 1851, the Portland area and its surrounding settlements were emerging as real towns. In 1850, three quarters of the 805 residents recorded were male; nine-tenths of all Portlanders in their twenties were men, attracted by jobs in road and building construction. Portland served as depot and general store for the growing Oregon population.

By the end of the 1850’s, when the town was poised for a new surge of growth, Portlanders had organized a typically American community of churches and schools, government, politics, and fraternal organizations. In 1872 it was reputed to be one of the richest towns of its size in the United States. Wealth came from transportation, banking, merchandising, and real estate. An iron furnace, and several casting plants, comprised Portland’s heavy industry. Shipbuilding activities were modest. There were about the same number of ship carpenters, riggers, and caulkers employed in Oregon and Washington.
Gresham Area

The earliest settlers to the Gresham area arrived in the 1840’s. Peyton and Anna Wilkes settled in the Sandy River area in 1845. Newspaper accounts report that Wilkes settled in Washington County where he opened a tannery in 1847, not remaining in the Gresham area.

Perhaps the first road into the north Gresham area was Sandy Road, known first as Columbia Slough Road. Snyder states that Sandy Road can be dated back at least to 1881. The Columbia Gorge leg of the Oregon Trail followed this road. Later it became the route of the old Columbia River Highway from Portland to Troutdale.

Powell Valley Road, which went from the Willamette River in Southeast Portland to the Sandy River, was the first road into the central Gresham area. Land claims along this road date from 1852.

Other early roads include Base Line Road, which later became Stark Street. It was laid out on the Base Line of the first territorial land survey in the 1850’s. Division Street was laid out in the 1870’s as Section Line Road. It was a line between surveyed sections. The name was changed to Division in 1882.

Several nearby communities were organized about the same time as Gresham. The earliest of these was Fairview, located west of Troutdale. Pioneer immigrants Jacob and Lena Zimmerman were one of five families that founded and settled the community of Fairview.

Fairview adopted its name in 1855 and was also the name of a Methodist church, organized two years earlier. The Oregon Railroad and Navigation Company line was built in 1882, and the station was named Fairview. As there was a Fairview in Coos County in Southern Oregon, confusion resulted.

Fairview was also known as Cleone for a short time. Milton Hosford suggested Cleone as a name for the post office established on March 29, 1883. Eventually, the Fairview in Coos County was abandoned, and the name Fairview was again adopted.

Regional Agriculture - Late 19th Century

By the late 1800s, Willamette Valley farmers had easily fallen into patterns of farming and husbandry that were neither profitable nor enterprising. They were reluctant to change their ways from methods they had learned elsewhere to suit the conditions of the new land. Private citizens instituted a State Agricultural Society in 1860 and agriculture publications helped to bring new ideas to the region. Fruit farming began to take hold in the Valley by 1870, but the farmers’ staples were wheat and cattle.

Agriculture was generally in the doldrums in the 1870’s and no less so in Oregon and Washington. In 1871, Portland was experiencing a real estate boom that sent prices up 20-25% in older parts of town and 50-100% in new additions, improved farmlands in the Valley on the route of the west-side railroad.
were offered, with few takers, at 10 dollars to 20 dollars an acre.

Dairy farming prospered most in the valley lands of Western Washington and Oregon, especially where transportation and location were fairly accessible to the urban markets. The chief dairy counties in Oregon were those in the Willamette Valley: Lane, Linn, Washington, Clackamas, and Multnomah.

Bulletins published by agricultural agencies emphasized the opportunities awaiting those that would claim the logged-over timberlands, and described in some detail the manner in which it must be done.

One emigrant from the Middle West, who settled 40 acres of logged off land, put dairy cows on it, and in a short time built it up from a 1,000-dollar investment to $10,000, stated "I make more here in the summer in one month out of cream than I did all year in Kansas."

**Dairy Farms**

The Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC) brought a small cattle herd to Fort Vancouver, sometime in 1835. These animals probably came from the Sandwich Islands. HBC retained exclusive ownership of every animal, including the offspring of the cows while leased to American and other settlers. Because of this monopoly, no progress was made in stock raising, until 1837, when the first Spanish cattle were brought overland from California by American settlers in the Willamette Valley. Oregon Trail immigrants traveled the 2,000 mile route with a milking cow as part of their livestock inventory. By 1850, the number of cattle in the valley was so great that this region supplied the northern mines and the miners of Southern Oregon.

In pioneer homes, butter and cheese making usually supplied home need, but processes for such were simple and often crude. Settlers in the valley counties could see that conditions for dairying were excellent, even unsurpassed, due to the almost perpetually green grass, the pure water and the abundant shelter. In 1885, it was noted that the ample opportunities for the dairy industry were not being taken advantage of.

The failure of urban markets to influence the location of butter and cheese production may be explained at least partially by the exceptionally rapid growth of major towns. Portland was only four years old in 1850, and most of its population had arrived since 1849.

Given the economic and physical limitations of frontier life, farmers simply could not convert to dairying rapidly enough to meet new demands—especially during a gold rush that found many farmers away from their homes for at least part of each year.

A better breed of cow was needed for dairying, and by the end of the 19th century, not one of the original traits of the Mexican imported pioneer cattle existed in Oregon. Instead, the fine points of Jersey, Alderney, Ayrshire, Shorthorn, and other imported breeds could be found in almost every Willamette Valley herd.

The first effort of any importance to

---

“I make more here in the summer in one month out of cream than I did all year in Kansas.”

— Immigrant dairy farmer

“The dairy interests, like fruit-growing, are capable of indefinite extension; and the supply of butter and cheese might be made equal to any demand. Cows can be kept alive all the winter, sustained solely on the natural grasses, and a slight addition to their food will keep them in excellent condition. In no case is it necessary to resort to the expensive stall-feeding, practiced with dairy cows in the East, for, with far less care and attention, the Oregon cow equals the Eastern animal in quality and flow of milks. Hence, the dairyman, as regards the expense of keeping cows, stands at an advantage in Oregon.”

— Unknown writer, (Lang 1885)
improve the breeds of cattle in Oregon was made by S.G. Reed, in 1872. In that year, Reed purchased a tract of land at Reedville in Washington County, and another larger tract at Boardmeads in Yamhill County. He stocked both places with the best beef and dairy cattle he could find in the eastern states or Scotland.

Shorthorns, Ayreshires, and Jerseys were purchased without regard to price. Reed transported his cattle by rail and brought skilled labor with them. The new cattle made a great sensation at all the agricultural fairs and stock shows creating much excitement, interest and rivalry.

The distinctive Holstein-Friesian breed was highly regarded by dairymen for its high milk production capability. Dairy farms developed large herds of Holsteins with annual milk production often averaging 16,000 pounds of milk per cow. Holstein-Friesians were originally developed in provinces of North Holland and West Friesian, Holland. The breed was brought to the U.S. by the Dutch who settled New Amsterdam (now New York) around 1630.

During the 1800’s, dairying was being established in the region, often on a large scale. The Ankey farm on the Santiam River, kept some two hundred cows and butter and cheese manufactured with patent appliances and equipment of the most approved style of the day.

A group of progressive farmers in Washington County organized a creamery association in order to make butter for the whole neighborhood at one place and by experienced butter makers. A year’s trial proved that there was more money in making butter and cheese than in raising wheat. So the scene was set for George Zimmerman, Jacob’s son, when he took over the farm in 1881.

“You can whip our cream, but you can’t beat our milk” was a whimsical advertisement used by Fairview Farms Dairy in the Wood Village area to promote their dairy products from the 1940’s to the 1960’s.

Houses and Styles of the Period

The Zimmerman farmhouse is typical of farmhouses that were built between 1875 and 1900 and have been collectively called “Western Farmhouses”. Similar structures appeared across the rural American West about the same time. Whatever style they adopted, these houses were roughly alike in volumetric organization, plan layout and disposition of ornament.

Positioning bedrooms and woodsheds across the south and west of the plan was typical. Secondary spaces buffeted living spaces from the extremities of climate.

Along with functional advantage, organi-
zation in separate wings provided a distinctive pictorial quality. Ceilings were high; windows, relatively tall and narrow. Bay windows, tall chimneys and a profusion of porches enhanced their appearance. Even when the overall house was plain, with eaves and window frames of simple construction, the porches have ornamental posts, brackets and railings.

New houses ranged from a utilitarian farmhouse type, generally plain except for porch detail, to expressions of a succession of national styles, including the Italian Villa, the Second Empire and later, some evidence of High Gothic and Queen Anne.

Within the precepts of any later 19th century style, there were myriad possible interpretations giving houses individuality. The Zimmerman house most closely reflects the Queen Anne style.

The utilitarian house may have developed in direct relationship to rural conditions. The house was built in a current style with urban and suburban origins.

Selection of such a house for an isolated rural site in the Willamette Valley suggests the prosperity, sophistication and/or aspirations of
the farmer in the later part of the 19th century.

The Nicolai Brothers company (a sash, door and blind company) in Portland provided architectural elements for these new farmhouses built between 1875 and 1895 and particularly the decade from 1880 to 1890.

Details were suited to houses in a variety of styles; both the Italian Villa and the Second Empire house could be easily accommodated. Selection and organization of materials and forms and massing of the new building established a particular style.

Imagery and coordination was the work of the designer or architect and the factory supplied many of the ingredients. Any of which could be custom made to suit special requirement or whim, resulting in an endless variation.

Mechanical improvements appearing in the 1880’s were by 1920 incorporated in most new buildings and remodeling. Improvements include running water in the kitchen, a full bathroom, a hot-air furnace or radiators throughout. Most houses had electric wiring and a telephone by the 20th century.

Household and Farm Chores

It was not unusual for women (wives, daughters and sisters) to undertake the work of what would later be delegated to “hired hands” in the early days of a homestead. This was especially true and critical during the early years of any farm or homestead. Until a farm could be established and children (hopefully sons) and cash money for wages could be counted upon, mothers and daughters would take up the slack in addition to doing the usual household chores of cooking, cleaning, and child rearing.

Milking cows had to be done twice a day—morning and night, year in and year out, unless a cow had a “sucking calf”. Cows were brought in from the pasture—usually the cows knew the time and started back to the barn—caught, and put into stantions. Each cow’s udder was washed before milking.

Quantity and quality of milk and cream depended on the time of year, feed and type of cow. Good milk cows, such as Holsteins, were kept in production and their calves weaned early.

Each cow and her personality were known. Some might be gentle to milk and others worked to make this chore difficult—kicking, swishing tails or kicking over buckets. Milk was then cooled and the cream separated. By the late 19th century cream separation was done by a machine, first hand-operated and then electric.

One person could accomplish production of milk, butter, cream and cheese for home use and have a surplus for sale. It was not unusual for a home herd to be about 12-18 head of cattle.

Children of all ages were expected to help—bringing in cows, feeding, herding, milking, and making butter. For larger operations, it was necessary to have hired help, dependable and speedy transportation to market, and adherence to industry standards.
Indian John

At the end of the 19th century, a noted Native American figure of the Portland/Fairview area was known only as “Indian John”. Some estimated the time period of his life to have spanned the period of Lewis and Clark’s visit to the Blue Lake Park area as well as the settlement and the development of agriculture in the area.

Oral history records claim Indian John to be descendant from the Chief of the Multnomah who was credited with having maintained long-term peace in this area. Apparently he held confederacy meetings on Sauvie Island. He also participated in Indian gatherings at Blue Lake.

Indian John said he remembered Lewis and Clark on their visit to the Blue Lake area. He was a small boy and may have received an iron skillet as a gift. Indian John traveled overland to The Dalles area in Eastern Oregon. He was friendly toward the pioneers, and they were grateful to him for the warnings he issued of possible Indian uprising east of the Cascades, e.g. the 1847 Cayuse war and the 1855 war.

In 1863, the Patrick Hogan farm was leased to Indian John. The Patrick Hogan farm was originally the Jessie Flemming Donation Land Claim that George Zimmerman later purchased in 1869 and became the western half of George’s 600+ acres of dairy farm. Indian John lived on the Hogan farm with his sixth wife and daughter. His wife, however, died shortly thereafter. Indian John wrapped her in a blanket and placed her in a raised platform in a traditional Indian burial. His daughter also died during this time and he cared for her in a similar manner. The platform was placed in a wooded area called Memaloos Woods and his daughter’s body was placed on Memaloos Island in the Columbia River down-river of The Dalles, Oregon.

Toward the end of his life, Indian John earned his living in a variety of ways; tanning hides, hoeing potatoes, hunting and selling fish. During his last years, Indian John lived on George Zimmerman’s property. Mr. Zimmerman feared the old man might die alone in his cabin in the woods, so he arranged to have him placed in the county poor farm. He died shortly after being confined there. He was said to be over 100 years old at the time of his death in 1893.

Zimmerman Family – A Short History

Jacob Zimmerman (1816–1899) was born in Baden, Germany, in Hofenheim. As a young man, he learned the machinist trade in his native land. In 1843, Jacob Zimmerman sailed to America and settled in Philadelphia, PA. Jacob immediately applied for U.S. citizenship.
while still in Philadelphia. In 1845, Jacob married Lebolina (Lena) Schoepfel (1827-1887) who was also a Baden native. By 1849 Jacob’s citizenship was granted and he and Lena were living in Cincinnati Ohio.

In 1851 Jacob and Lena and two children, William J. and Frances S., joined a wagon train of immigrants bound for the Oregon Territory. The family arrived in the Willamette Valley on 10 October 1851. Late in the same year the Zimmerman family settled on Hayden Island in the Columbia River below Portland. Jacob was disappointed when, in the spring/summer of 1852, the Columbia River flooded his early farming attempts.

He relocated about 10 miles east of Portland on a 320-acre Donation Land Claim, located between what is now 201st Avenue on the west, Fairview Lake on the North, 210th Avenue to the east, with the southern border approximately 1 block north of NE Halsey Street. The tract contained some timber and bottomland along the Columbia River. Jacob and Lena’s son, George Henry Zimmerman (1852-1915), was born on this land.

Sometime during the period between 1857 and 1869, Jacob traded this farm for a larger farm nearby, and continued farming until 1868, at which time he moved to Portland and worked at the Oregon Iron Works Company.

In December 1869, Jacob purchased the Robert P. Wilmot Donation Land Claim and moved onto the farm site in 1870 where his family would spend the rest of their years.
During this first year, the family would be housed in a log cabin. Soon after the cabin was completed, pear trees were planted and other improvements made on the land. The original farmhouse was built by James S. Love in 1874. By that time, Jacob had established a thriving business of selling produce from the farm. Jacob continued to farm until renting the farm to his son, George, in 1881.

As a young man, George Zimmerman received a common school education and supplemented it by attending Portland Academy. In 1880, he managed Mrs. Hannah Smith’s farm and experimented with dairy farming. The next year George leased his father’s farm.

George married Jessie M. McCall (1862-1943) in 1883. Jessie had been born in Kilmarnock, Ayshire, Scotland. She immigrated with her family to Canada in 1868 and later to the United States in 1871. By 1875, they had found their way to Willamina, Oregon.

In the years of 1881/82, the McCall’s moved to the Rockwood area. George and Jessie would have four daughters, Jessie May (1884-1968), Olive Hope (1889-1980), Mabel June (1891-1914), and Isobel Faith (1899-1992).

George Zimmerman enlarged the farm to 660 acres and carried on a profitable dairy business. Butter and cheese were manufactured on the farm and delivered to the Portland area. Significant improvements would be made to the farm during the middle part of the 1880’s. A horse barn was added in 1885, a cow/dairy barn was added in 1889, and the

George and Jessie Zimmerman, 1883 wedding portrait.
brick “dairy building” was constructed, where cheese and butter would be made and sold. After completing these enhancements, the house underwent a major remodel in 1899. Remodeling of the farmhouse by Jack Brown included enlarging 4 of the 5 bedrooms on the west side of the house, adding a new kitchen on the east side of the house, and completing a facelift to the porches and exterior of the home. It is during this remodeling that most of the “gingerbread” and other architectural details are added.

In 1903, George was described as a Republican who “has been active in supporting the best interests of his party, and has himself served as a school director and clerk. He is a member of the Methodist Church, and is one of the staunch supporters of that denomination in
The early 20th century brought many changes, adventures and tragedies to the Zimmerman family. In 1906, the eldest daughter, Jessie May was wed to Thomas Millar during a ceremony held under the grape arbor in the farmhouse yard. George, Jessie, and the three unmarried daughters took an extensive overland trip during August 1909 through August 1910. They traveled across the Canadian Rockies, through the northeastern and southern United States, and back through the southwestern portion of the county and returning home from San Francisco by ship.

One of the first stops on this trip was to the Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition in Seattle, Washington.

In 1911, George, Jessie and the youngest
daughter, Isobel, cruised from San Francisco to Hawaii aboard the S.S. Sierra. Tragically, in 1914, Mabel June Zimmerman, the third daughter, would die at the young age of 23. George passed away in 1915 at the age of 63. It would not be until 1943 that Jessie McCall Zimmerman would follow her husband in death at the age of 81.

Older daughter Jessie May and her husband Tom Millar moved back home to operate the dairy. Sometime in the early 1920’s George’s widow, Jessie, decided to lease the farm land and dairy buildings. Several different Swiss dairymen operated their businesses at the Zimmerman farm.

Isobel graduated from the University of Oregon with a degree in teaching and science in 1921. She followed her sisters Olive and Mabel who both graduated from the University of Oregon in 1913. Isobel taught science at Franklin High School in Portland from 1930-1960. Never marrying, Isobel continued to live in the family house until her death in 1992 at the age of 93.

From initial research of the family history it is assumed that, given the economic and social position of the family, Jessie and her daughters did not routinely participate in farm chores as might occur on other farm households of the era.

Material Culture of the Zimmerman Family

It is through the rich material culture of the Zimmerman Family that we are able to
glimpse some of the everyday life on the farm. Thomas Schlereth defines material culture “as the entire natural and man-made environment with which researchers can interpret the past.” This catch-all phrase includes structures, artifacts, art, beliefs, and even habits.

The house is essentially the way it was when the youngest daughter Isobel was growing up. Very few changes were made during her adult life, certainly no major structural changes to the house. The family left behind a very complete material record of their life. The collection of family artifacts includes furniture, photos, documents, clothing, books, advertising memorabilia, diaries, albums, and letters, to mention a few.

There is also the full range of common household items and the special keepsakes that made up one family’s existence. By “reading” the artifacts, which were left behind, some assumptions can begin to be made about the life and the family.

One of the most valuable documents, which provide a look into the early years of the Zimmerman family, is an account ledger. In this, the business accounts for the farm were kept. The first entry we are able to see is January 1869 where butter was sold at 40 cents per pound. Over the years, entries were faithfully kept—recording the produce sold and equally faithfully recording the items purchased. Through the years what the farm produced and sold is recorded: cherries, eggs, butter, potatoes, cabbage (in cooler months sauerkraut), apples, turnips, beef, chickens, turkeys, wheat, carrots, beans, blackberries,

Dear Jessie,

“May thy path be strew’d with flowers and no thorns in thy way
May health and happiness (sic) be yours is my prayer from day to day.”

Francis Tegart,
Rockwood Sep 16, 1883

— Excerpt from Jessie McCall Zimmerman’s album
"January 9, 1880 "Great wind storm commenced at 12 O’clock and lasted until 4 O’clock demolishing fences and timber by the thousands. Being the greatest ever known in the state”.

— Entry in Zimmerman ledger.
and peaches. In 1873 the first notation of cheese being sold is found.

From this ledger we learn the house was built in 1874, not 1878 as claimed by Isobel and incorrectly noted in the National Register Nomination. A list of materials and costs are recorded.

The expenses in the 1870’s were modest, running just over $325.00 in 1871 and a low of $217.80 in 1879. Calico, linen, muslin, suit cloth, tin repairs, bellows, salt peter, candles, and two chairs were a few of the items purchased in 1871.

There is no indication of where these things were acquired or who might be making these entries. In the fall of 1872, a trunk and a satchel were added to the family inventory.

Small pleasures such as candy and “wiskey” (sic) are seldom found. But, we do know that a canary lived at the house in 1875 by the purchase of birdseed in April. In January 1876 the Zimmerman wealth was increased with the purchase of:

“1 set of furniture $160.00, 1 organ $71.00, 1 spring wagon $180.00 and 1 sewing machine $65.00”.

Also recorded is income from rental property:

“Mr. Smith moved in our house Sept. 13 1869 received one month rent $8.50”

Notations of when hired help came to work were made:

“Jim Chinaman commenced Dec. 15 1883 at # O’clock wages $15 dollars a month.”

The daughters of George Zimmerman were well educated in both academics and the social arts. They kept busy with music, painting, poetry, and writing, needle arts and
Zimmerman family and friends gathered on the ornately crafted front porch, c. 1910.
Front l. to r.: Clyde Stone, Isobel Zimmerman, Jessie May Zimmerman, Mary Burns, Mabel Zimmerman, Cedric Stone, Olive Zimmerman. Back l. to r.: George Zimmerman, John Burns, Jessie McCall Zimmerman, Eliza Stone.

Grape arbor was a popular setting for family activities.

Jessie May posing on the front porch steps.
handicrafts. There are examples of their work throughout the house. Paintings, poems, essays, hooked rugs and music all attest to their talent.

As children, the girls had an abundance of toys and games with which to amuse themselves. Holidays such as Valentine’s Day, Thanksgiving and Christmas were acknowledged with cards.

Outside activities included gardening—flower and vegetable, pets, picnics and family gatherings during the summer on the front lawn. Family photos show the girls at the river in swimming suits by a rowboat, oars in hand, or on other occasions posing with tennis rackets and croquet mallets. The presence of a sidesaddle indicates that either the girls or their mother rode horses.

The family owned a beach house at Long Beach, Washington that George built in the 1890’s. Isobel maintained ownership of the beach house until 1990.

It appears that most, if not all, of the Zimmerman family were prolific letter writers, which is no surprise for the times. Communications were sent back to Jessie May and Tom during the extended family trips while they tended the farm and to the girls while they attended college. News about the cows and other everyday activities are found in the treasured letters.

Most of the family members kept journals and dairies, especially of the special trips. Even in their adult years, both Jessie May and Isobel kept dairies noting weather, work around the house and special events. At the end of a journal of the 1909-10 trip a list of items purchased was dutifully recorded:

"Indian Basket .75; Spoon AYC 1.00; Wedgwood China 1.75; Spoon Vancouver 1.50; Chicago 1.00; Niagara 1.00; Boston 1.00, NY 1.00; Washington Pennant 1.50; Poster Yale .25."

Family outing on the Columbia Slough, north of the house. Isobel is the young girl, 3rd from left.
SITE ANALYSIS

The principal objective of site analysis is to inventory and document the nature, character and condition of site features in the project site. Within the 5.98-acre site, approximately 1.5 acres has been designated as a National Historic Landmark. The landmark property includes the house, buttery, garage, and gardens around the house.

The Zimmerman Heritage Farm site is 5.98 acres. Of this project area, the museum site makes up 2.38 acres on the eastern portion and the park site makes up 3.6 acres on the western portion of the site. Within the museum site, is the National Register Property that represents 1.5 acres.

Historical Landscape Features

The relationship of the house to its surrounding grounds is extensively documented in photographs from the time the family was in residence. A number of mature trees, still standing today, date from before or near the time when the farm was developed. The area north and east of the house was predominantly an orchard of apples, prunes, plums, nuts, and cherries. Only six of these trees remain and are in very poor condition.

The immediate garden grounds around the house exist on a raised grass terrace providing a prominent setting in the countryside above the flood plain. The terraced area, as well as the whole front area between the house and road, was developed as a garden to a level above the average farmstead of the areas and the time.

An inventory of the horticultural shrubs, flowers, fruit trees and vines has been prepared for this area is included in the Appendix.

Remnants of a number of historic landscape features that were part of daily life are still present in the museum site. These historic features include the buttery, wood shed, bunk house/garage, the grass terrace in front of the residence along with the steps and sidewalk through the front garden to NE Sandy Boulevard, the front fence and gate along NE Sandy Boulevard, the driveway and the garden fence between the lawn terrace and the buttery. (Please refer to the Historic Landscape Features drawing on page 39).

Historically, the property extended north into the Columbia River flood plain. There is oral history about Native American villages and encampments as well as the first primitive cabins and shelters of pioneer immigrants on this site. These lands were isolated from the original homestead with the advent of the fill for the Union Pacific Railroad railbed along the north boundary of the project site.

The fields (park site) west of the residence appear to be at or near the historic grade and contour. This is the site of the heritage pear trees described in the National Register of Historic Places nomination in 1986. At the time there were 24 pear trees existing. Of those identified in 1980 seven *Pyrus* spp. Pound Pear trees remain in the center of the field. This row of trees parallels the front facades of the house and adjacent outbuildings. There is a vague
oral history reference to a lane extended through the meadow, possibly along this row of trees, from the house to a water well on the west side of the original donation land claim.

Two large *Juglans regia* Persian Walnut trees on the fence line between the house and west field appear to be seedlings on the own rootstock. One of these trees is in fair condition. The other has considerable structural damage from storms and weather.

Near the front porch an historic wisteria vine and grape vine still exist. Other than the vegetation and trees identified, the site is covered with wild meadow or pasture grasses, weeds, and wild flowers.

**Zoning**

The site is in an industrial/commercial zone. The restoration of the Zimmerman house museum and garden and the development of the adjacent west parcel as a park shall comply with “Gresham Development Code, Section 3.1140 – Site Design Criteria and Standards for Community Service Developments.”

**Archeological Implications**

The site lies within the Gresham City limits and north of I-84. This area is designated as a Historic and Cultural Landmarks special purpose district; restoration or development of this site must meet the requirements of “Gresham Development Code, Section 2.0537 – Discovery of Archaeological Objects and Sites North of Interstate 84.”

**Vehicular Access**

The existing road right-of-way (ROW) is 50 feet on NE Sandy Boulevard. Proposed improvements to NE Sandy scheduled for the year 2000, include widening the road ROW to 90 feet (refer to page 41). The proposed widening will move the ROW nominally 25 feet inside the site’s south boundary, which will remove or move the existing farm lane along the south edge of the museum site next to the house.
HISTORIC LANDSCAPE FEATURES
ZIMMERMAN HERITAGE FARM

LEGEND
1. Zimmerman House
2. Buttery
3. Bunk House
4. Horse Barn
5. Grape Arbor
6. Gardens
7. Picket Fence
8. Wood Shed
9. Pear Orchard
10. Original Cabin
11. Dairy Barn
12. Milking Parlor
13. Outbuildings
14. Farm Fields
15. Railroad

Site Note: Drawing illustrates approximate farm development period from c. 1874-1940's.
to NE Sandy Blvd. Currently, access is from NE Sandy to the house and farm from two driveways; one to the residence garage and the other approximately 160 feet east, that formerly accessed the dairy barn and milk house. If one of these driveways is closed, combined, or relocated, a new site access for the park area will be required.

**Pedestrian Access**

Pedestrian access to the site is presently limited. However, improvements to NE Sandy will provide a bike lane and sidewalk on both sides. The future Gresham/Fairview Trail will provide more opportunities for pedestrian access. It will provide a north/south connection between Springwater Trail in south Gresham and the 40-Mile Loop Trail along NW Marine Drive in the north portion of the city. These trails will connect Zimmerman Heritage Farm to Blue Lake Park and the Columbia Slough trails. The Gresham/Fairview Trail will cross NE Sandy 0.4 miles east of the site.

**Site Acoustics**

Acoustic conditions have changed from the rural and pastoral idyll. Railroad traffic runs on the elevated railbed 100 feet north of the house. NE Sandy is presently a heavily traveled two-lane highway carrying auto and truck traffic. Road improvements will increase traffic to five vehicle lanes, a bike lane, and sidewalk on each side. In addition to rail and road noise, the site is in the glide path for aircraft approaching both Portland International Airport and Troutdale Airport. Vegetation buffers on the east, west, and north property boundaries will provide visual screening and minimal noise buffer, but existing noise will always be a reality.

**Soils**

Soils at the site are alluvial sediments several feet deep. These soils are excellent for farming and gardening. Future construction work at the site will require local geo-tech investigation to determine underlayment and soil bearing for footings and foundations of any future structures.

**Drainage**

The site is well-drained by surface drainage moving from the southwest corner to the northeast corner of the site. This means that all the surface water runoff flows around the south and north sides of the raised terrace for the house. At the time of this assessment, no permanent wet areas were in evidence, although considerable surface water run-off passes through the front garden area south of the house. It has been reported by FOHZ members that the north and south sides of the house can become extremely wet and makes vehicular access difficult. Over the last few months, mud has been seeping into the basement on the south side. This is creating mold on surfaces. Prior to this the basement has been dry.
EXISTING CONDITIONS
ZIMMERMAN HERITAGE FARM

LEGEND
1. Zimmerman House
2. Buttery
3. Garage
4. Caretaker’s Temp. Quarters
5. Field
6. Heritage Pear Trees
7. Pear Trees
8. Western Red Cedars
9. Walnut Trees
10. Fruit Trees
11. Oak Tree
12. Cherry Tree
13. Holly Tree
14. Pear Tree
15. Lawn Terrace
16. Septic Field
17. Well Casing
18. Railroad
West side of house showing “star” motif at roof eaves.

House with family in front yard terrace. Grape arbor on left and buttery to the right.

Winter view from Sandy Boulevard, c. 1970. Butterly and garage are to the right of the house.
BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES ASSESSMENT

The historic architectural elements of the Zimmerman farm represent a range of domestic and farm facilities as denoted on the Historic Landscape Features drawing that is located in the Site Analysis section of this master plan. The architectural history of the Zimmerman farm site begins in 1870 with construction of a log cabin as the first residence. Subsequently, in 1874 the original 1800 sq. ft. farmhouse was built. The farm development represents several decades of periodic construction that includes the renovation and expansion of the house along with construction of a number of outbuildings.

On 5 June 1986, the historic Zimmerman House with its two remaining outbuildings within 1.5 acres of its 2.38 acre site was listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The historic register property structures today consist of the farmhouse, a brick-veneered dairy building (“buttery”), and a wood-framed garage.

A number of off-site historic farm structures such as the cow barn no longer exist, and therefore could not be assessed. These structures are illustrated on the Historic Landscape Features drawing, page 39. A remnant of the original cow barn that burned in 1976 is the clay tile milking parlor. This building currently exists east of the project site, but is not part of the project.

The buildings below represent those historic structures analyzed within the Museum Site of the project and the temporary residence of the caretaker that was located at the Museum Site in 1998. Non-existing farm buildings that were historically located within the Museum Site include the privy, wood shed, bunk house, and horse barn.

Existing Historic Buildings:
- Zimmerman House
- Butterly Building
- Garage

Existing Non-Historic Building:
- Temporary Caretaker’s House

Non-Existing Historic Buildings:
- Privy
- Wood Shed
- Bunk House
- Horse Barn

Existing Historic Buildings

Zimmerman House (2,525 sq. ft.)

The architectural style of the 1874 Zimmerman farmhouse is classified generally as Victorian era. However, the original house is more representative of the “Western Farmhouse” style that was built between 1875 and 1900 across the American West. According to architectural historian Philip Dole in Space, Style, and Structure: Building in Northwest America, these new Western farmhouses as a group were roughly similar in their volumetric
organization regardless of the style adopted. These rural homes were characterized further by their simple, utilitarian appearance. Local adaptations were typically made to accommodate local or regional influences and materials. Dole further notes that

"... the term "Western farmhouse designates that extensive group of rather plain rural homes built throughout the 1870 – 1900 period in the Willamette Valley which do not comfortably fit within any national stylistic architectural vogue. In some respects they are a derivation of the Rural Gothic Cottage Style of the 1860s."

With the renovation and expansion of the farmhouse in 1899, the structure was embellished with Queen Anne Style detailing that exists on the house today. One of the most distinctive features added to the house was the curved, wrap-around front porch with its elaborate, ornamental woodwork. Additional detailing can be seen in the treatment of the south and west gables and trim with dramatic shadow effects from five-point star, half-moon, and spindle motifs. From its early years, the farmhouse was distinguished in the area by its distinctive flower and kitchen gardens in the front yard and grape arbor in the west side yard.

The original 1874 structure enclosed approximately 1,800 square feet on two floors. The 1899 expansion on both floors brought the total floor
area to 2,525 square feet. Today, the interior spaces include a parlor, dining room, sitting room, bathroom, kitchen, bedroom and office sewing room on the ground floor and bedrooms on the second floor. In 1997, a restoration-rehabilitation and accessibility master plan for the house was completed and is currently being implemented in phases.

_Buttery Building (350 sq. ft.)_

The buttery was built circa 1890’s west of the farmhouse for storage of milk and processing milk to make cheese and butter on the family’s farm. Oral history suggests that the structure was also a sales room for Zimmerman dairy products.

The structure was built with wood-framed floor, walls, and pitched roof covered with wood-shingles. The buttery was constructed on a sloping site with two rooms on the main level and a small crawl-space below that was reached through a small opening on the downhill, north side. A brick veneer was added to the walls for insulation value to preserve dairy products until removal from the building.

Prior to refrigeration, butteries such as the Zimmerman’s, were cooled with large amounts
of block ice, typically in a lower floor or crawl-space. This technique provided adequate cooling for temporary storage of milk and other perishable products. The structure is in a seriously deteriorating condition throughout.

Garage (500 sq. ft.)

A small wood framed, wood sided garage with a dirt floor exists east of the buttery building. The automobile garage is c. 1920’s vintage and is in a deteriorating state. The garage occupies the site of the former bunk house that can be seen in historic photographs.

Existing Non-Historic Building (Temporary Location)

Caretaker’s House (1,500 sq. ft.)

In 1998, a temporary caretaker’s house was located at the eastern property line as an interim security measure. The house is a single story, manufactured home with a low-pitched roof. The house compromises the integrity of the historic site and is not appropriate for long-term presence.

Non-Existing Historic Buildings

Privy (20 sq. ft.)

Prior to indoor toilets, the traditional family outhouse was located within convenient walking distance of the main house and away from the water well. The location of the Zimmerman’s privy is not known at this time, but with careful archaeological investigation could be located at some future date. Oral history places it on the backside of the house, probably in the northeast section of the yard.

Wood Shed (750 sq. ft.)

The wood shed appears to have been constructed as an addition on the north side of the farmhouse in the 1890’s. The wood shed was a two level, pitched roof structure, wood-framed with wood drop siding and double-hung windows as shown in historic photos. Oral history suggests that the top level provided quarters for hired hands at one point in its use. The bottom level with large doors was used for storage. The original wood shed collapsed in the late 1990’s due to its deteriorated condition.

Bunk House (1,500 sq. ft.)

The original bunk house was built circa 1890’s east of the buttery building. Photographic documentation indicates that the structure was a two-story building of wood-framing, wood drop-siding, double-hung windows, and a pitched roof. Oral history suggests that the structure was used as housing for hired-hands.
Horse Barn (3,000 sq. ft. ±)

Family photographs indicate a horse barn south of the bunk house that was probably built around the turn-of-the-century. The original horse barn appears to be a large structure with wood siding and a pitched roof. At this time, little information exists on the interior layout, but presumably the building contained a large interior stable area, tack room, storage areas, and perhaps a loft. Additional research is required of family records and period horse barns to determine the characteristics and spaces of the structure and its construction.

Horse barn in foreground with cow barn behind. The wooden fence separated the front yard and gardens from the barnyard. Two horses can be detected in front of the woman picking cherries.
CURRENT MANAGEMENT ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Outlined below is a summary of existing project accomplishments and detail on the responsibilities of the City of Gresham and Friends of Zimmerman House.

Grounds Maintenance

City: Responsible for acreage west of historic property, east of driveway and behind house. Maintenance has included mowing, spraying, and providing materials and assistance to historic garden efforts as requested.

FRW/FOZH: Responsible for garden in the historic site, immediately around and in front of house. Work is coordinated by FOZH Garden Curator and done with volunteers.

House Maintenance & Restoration

City: Provided limited funding for house restoration plan.

FRW/FOZH: Pay and maintain utilities. Coordinate and oversee volunteer services to repair and maintain home. Obtain funding and administer contracts to make improvements to home.

Collections Curation

City: None.

FRW/FOZH: Protection, sorting, filing, and storage of collection.

Volunteer Activities

City: Volunteer Coordinator helps recruit and direct volunteers to Zimmerman Heritage Farm to help with grounds improvement projects. City Operations provides some materials, tools, and portable restroom to assist volunteer projects.

FRW/FOZH: Volunteer recruitment and coordination. Coordination with City. Supervision of grounds improvement projects. Volunteer acknowledgments.

Site Security

City: None.

FRW/FOZH: Alarm system in historic house. Caretaker living on-site.

Site Development

City: Provided planning assistance and funding assistance for site preparation for caretaker’s residence. Installed gravel drive way. Funded and managed master planning process.

FRW/FOZH: Purchased and installed Caretaker’s temporary residence; administered contracts and building permits. Completed house foundation wall repairs.
Public Relations

City: Periodic, as tied to specific activities.

FRW/FOZH: Ongoing, carried out by FOHZ members.

Fundraising

City: None.

FRW/FOZH: Ongoing, through donations, memberships, and grants.

The Partnership

City: Agreement with FRW needs to be updated.

FRW/FOZH: FRW has agreements with City and with FOZH that need to be updated.

Mother Jessie at Union Station in Portland.
CULTURAL HERITAGE MARKET ANALYSIS

Comparable Facilities and Demand Trends

This section of the master plan reviews data collected from selected historic homes. The descriptive section contains information such as attendance, featured programs and attractions, staff size, and primary sources of revenue.

Comparable analysis is a particularly useful and efficient approach for assessing proposed interpretive developments, and can help demonstrate the attendance potential for a similar program or facility. A number of facilities were reviewed in order to determine the level of comparability, and six were selected for the purpose of investigation. The examples were selected with the following criteria in mind:

- Historic home with grounds, interpretive programs, and/or special event facilities.
- Located in the Northwest Region (Oregon or Washington).
- Located in an urban area or a rural area that functions as a visitor destination.
- Relatively small size (less than 15,000 visitors per year).

The following historic homes were selected:

- Bybee House and Howell Territorial Park
- Frazier Farmstead Museum
- Historic Deepwood Estate
- Jenkins Estate
- Philip Foster Farm
- Pomeroy Living History Farm

Each of these particular examples provides very useful insights with regard to the interpretive programs and operations of historic houses as well as an indication of the potential demand. Selected characteristics for each comparable facility are summarized in Tables 1 and 2.

The primary findings from this portion of the study include:

- Annual visitation including school groups and special events is generally between 5,000-10,000 visitors a year.
- Admission fees account for a small portion annual revenue (typically less than 10%).
- When admission fees are charged they are in the range of $2.00 - $4.00 per person.
- Education programs and special events serve as the primary attraction for historic house visitors.
- Historic houses that operate with public partners tend to have higher operating budgets and more paid staff.
- Historic houses without public partners tend to depend almost exclusively on volunteer staff.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Facility</th>
<th>Size (acres)</th>
<th>Primary Elements</th>
<th>Activities/Programs</th>
<th>Annual Visitation (includes school groups &amp; special events)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bybee House and Howell Territorial Park</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Historic farm, restored house and grounds</td>
<td>Tours, educational programs, picnics, special events</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sauvie Island, OR</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frazier Farmstead Museum</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Historic farm, restored house, flower, herb, and</td>
<td>Group tours, special events, weddings, and meetings</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Milton-Freewater, OR</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>vegetable gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Deepwood Estate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Queen Anne style house and gardens</td>
<td>Tours, special events, meetings</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Salem, OR</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins Estate</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Log cabin house, two-story stable building, garden and</td>
<td>Weddings, business meetings; events that use the garden</td>
<td>37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aloha, OR</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>tea house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Foster Farm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Historic Farm and grounds</td>
<td>Educational programs for children, hands-on activity, special events</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Eagle Creek, OR</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomeroy Living History Farm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Historic log home, barn, and grounds</td>
<td>Educational programs for school groups, self-guided tours, and special events</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Yacolt, WA</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1**

Comparable Historic Facilities Description and Size
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Facility</th>
<th>Facility Management</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Annual Operating Budget 1997-98 ($)</th>
<th>Admission Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bybee House and Howell Territorial Park</td>
<td>Metro Regional Parks and Oregon Historical Society</td>
<td>1 curator 2 part-time interns for summer</td>
<td>87,834</td>
<td>No Admission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sauvie Island, OR</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frazier Farmstead Museum</td>
<td>Milton- Freewater Area Historical Society</td>
<td>1 full-time director 16 Brd of Directors 30 volunteers</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>No Admission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Milton- Freewater, OR</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Deepwood Estate</td>
<td>City of Salem and Friends of Deepwood</td>
<td>1 full-time director 2 volunteers 5 wrk-study students</td>
<td>60,593</td>
<td>Adults: $4 Students: $3 Children: $2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Salem, OR</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins Estate</td>
<td>Tualatin Hills Parks &amp; Recreation District</td>
<td>1 full-time director 4 full-time positions 15 part-time (weekends)</td>
<td>242,450</td>
<td>No Admission¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aloha, OR</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Foster Farm</td>
<td>Jackknife-Zion-Horseheaven Historical Society</td>
<td>1 full-time director 8 Brd of Directors 20 volunteers</td>
<td>28,205</td>
<td>Adults: no charge Students: $3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Eagle Creek, OR</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomeroy Living History Farm</td>
<td>Friends of Pomeroy Living History Farm</td>
<td>3 part-time 5-6 volunteers</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>Adults: $3.50 Children 3-11: $2 Under 2 free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Yacolt, WA</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Jenkins Estate grounds are open to the public. The Main House, Stable, and Gatehouse are seen by appointment only.
Source: Dean Runyan Associates
Bybee House and Howell Territorial Park
Sauvie Island, OR

The James F. Bybee House, located in Howell Territorial Park on Sauvie Island, serves as a museum of Sauvie Island life among European-American settlers between 1858 and 1885. The historic home, built in 1856, was acquired by Multnomah County in 1962. Restoration of the home was completed in 1969. The furnishings in the home were provided by the Oregon Historical Society and are intended to reflect how a family would have lived in Oregon during the 1858-1885 period.

In 1969, a barn was built for storage purposes and an agricultural museum was added in 1980. Approximately one-quarter of the barn has been leased to the Birds of Prey Rescue Northwest, Inc., a program that rehabilitates injured raptors for release back into the wild. The agricultural museum portion of the barn, created for youngsters, focuses on the farm life and displays farm implements typical of those used throughout Oregon from 1890 to 1920. It also features horse-drawn and dairy equipment along with living history workshops in harness, wood, leather, and metal work.

In 1994, management of Howell Territorial Park including the Bybee House was transferred from Multnomah County to the Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department. Currently, Metro owns and maintains the land, buildings, and related improvements at the Park. Occasionally, Metro does conduct natural history education programs for the public.

To provide historical interpretation and visitor services, Metro administers a $20,600 contract with the Oregon Historical Society (OHS). Metro contributes $10,300 of the contract, which is matched by Multnomah County. The contract agreement does not allow OHS to charge admission to the Bybee House or for special events; however, Metro is in the process of reviewing a new master plan and will consider charging a parking fee. Currently, the contract stipulates that OHS shall provide the following activities:

- Provide research and interpretation for the Bybee House.
- Hire, train, and supervise interpretive staff to lead tours, conduct living history programs, and provide public safety.
- Provide interior housekeeping and security during open hours for the structures and furnishing.
- Book reservations for weddings and picnics and supervise functions.
- Host special events.

Bybee House is open for viewing from noon to 5 p.m. Saturdays and Sundays, June through Labor Day. During this time, OHS interpreters lead half-hour guided tours through the home. On the last weekend in September, OHS holds an annual event called “Wintering-In” which includes educational activities for children, food, music, crafts demonstrations, and cider pressing along with
tours of Bybee House. The event has attracted between 3,500-5,000 visitors over the single weekend.

Bybee House receives approximately 10,000 visitors per year, which includes the attendance from “Wintering In”. OHS collects about $1,000 in donations per year from Bybee House visitors. On-site parking is available for a maximum of 500 vehicles.

Frazier Farmstead Museum
Milton-Freewater, OR

The Frazier Estate was willed to the Milton-Freewater Area Foundation. In 1984, the estate was opened to the public as the Frazier Farmstead Museum by the Milton-Freewater Area Historical Society. During the first ten years as a museum, the home, built in 1892, was restored with the addition of period wallpapers, floor and window coverings. Most of the furnishings and household goods have been in the home since the turn of the century, with some which were brought with the Frazier family on their westward migration in 1867. The home also includes items from other pioneer families that were donated by area residents. The basement, which is out of the sight of the viewing public, now houses a modern kitchen, office, research and work space which are necessary to support the special events and activities held in the home and on the grounds. The property was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1986.

In addition to the house, the six acre site also includes six outbuildings: two barns, a combination carriage house, a milk barn and tack room, a small one-room cottage, a woodshed, and a chicken house. These structures were all integral parts of the working farm. Some of these structures contain old farm related machinery and other pioneer collections. The grounds include flower, herb and rose gardens, many of which are heirloom varieties, which have been added to the property.

Aside from museum events, the facility may also be rented for weddings, receptions, class reunions, and other functions. The museum gift store, another source of revenue, features a variety of items appropriate to the era, many of which are produced at the museum by a staff of volunteers.

An endowment fund of approximately $200,000 has been established to help fund maintenance and operations of the site. As an addition to the existing endowment, the Society has obtained a $50,000 matching grant from a private foundation, which they have almost matched through donations from local banks, businesses, and private citizens.

Historic Deepwood Estate
Salem, OR

Historic Deepwood Estate is a gathering place for tours, events, weddings, classes, meetings, and special events. The house, built in 1894, provides a striking example of Queen Anne architecture with stained glass windows, golden oak woodwork, and a roofline of
multiple gables and peaks.

A historic formal garden, creations of two women who gained fame for their early 20th century landscape design, surrounds the house. Hedge lined corridors, flower and grape adorned arches lead from one “outdoor room” to the other, creating a unique and ornate outdoor space to complement the home.

In addition to its manicured landscapes, the five and a half-acre estate also includes a wooded nature trail, winding creek, native trees, plants, and springtime flowers.

The historic home and grounds are owned and maintained by the City of Salem. To maintain the grounds, the city makes use of prison inmate labor as well as volunteers. In 1997/98, the city provided approximately $4,000 to the Friends of Deepwood to fund the work/study tour guides.

The city also provided funds for promotion of the site through the production of brochures and signage. Historic Deepwood Estate is partially funded through revenue from the Transitory Occupancy Tax.

Friends of Deepwood manage the special events, programs, and activities on the site. Friends of Deepwood staff includes one full-time director as well as volunteers and work/study students who lead guided tours through the home. In addition to guided tours, Friends of Deepwood offer antique classes, formal afternoon teas, lectures, and a variety of special events.

In 1997, Historic Deepwood Estate generated about $60,000 in total revenue. Admission from tours generated approximately $5,000 of revenue (8% of annual revenue). Historic Deepwood Estate attracts about 3,000 visitors per year not including visitors who attend classes, weddings, and other special events.

Other sources of revenue included grants ($13,750), membership ($4,600), as well as weddings, classes, and special events ($21,000). Total revenue also includes the City of Salem contribution toward promotion and tour guides which amounted to about $7,000.

Admission is $4.00 for adults, $3.00 for students & seniors, and $2.00 for children. Wedding rates are $395 for three hours ($95 for each additional hour) for Saturdays in the summer months. Typically, one six-hour wedding is held on every Saturday (May-Sept.) with an occasional “double booked” Saturday.

In an effort to expand the programs and activities offered on the site, the City of Salem and the Friends of Deepwood plan to develop educational programs. The interpretive themes will most likely focus on residential activities and technology from 1890 to 1930 and mentor-based programs in the nature area.

**Jenkins Estate**

Aloha, OR

The Jenkins Estate is a seven-bedroom structure patterned after a hunting lodge built for the English royal family. The property includes a collection of historic buildings including a greenhouse for plants, an ornamental pool and tea house for relaxation, a carriage house, and a stable for the horses with an area for dairy cows and a covered riding area.
The estate also includes historic gardens that were planted in traditional English Picturesque style by the gardener for the Prime Minister of Canada. Miles of stone lined pathways wind through the gardens.

In 1974, the Park District purchased the entire 68 acres with funds from a voter approved bond issue for park acquisition and development.

Owned and operated by Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation District (THPRD), the estate was opened to the public as a rental facility in 1982. To manage the site, THPRD works with a Volunteer Advisory Committee made up of community leaders.

The main house and stable have been restored and are available by reservation, for weddings, receptions, business meetings, seminars, and other group functions. The general public can visit the site free of charge. The Main House, the Stable, and the Gatehouse are seen by appointment only.

A portion of the estate has been developed and is used each summer for Camp Rivendale, an outdoor program serving youth and young adults with physical or learning disabilities. Camp Rivendale is also available, by reservation, to the public for picnics and family reunions.

The facilities include one large pavilion style shelter, picnic tables, and a volleyball court. Rental cost is $40 per hour with a required 4-hour minimum. Full-time staff includes a director, 2 administrative persons, a gardener, and a maintenance person as well as fifteen part-time employees.

**Philip Foster Farm**  
**Eagle Creek, OR**

Philip Foster Farm was a gift to the Jackknife-Zion-Horseheaven Historical Society by a private individual who wished to preserve the home of Philip Foster, an early pioneer and community leader in Oregon.

The two-acre site was once part of the 640-acre donation land claim taken by Foster in the late 1840’s. The farm and home in Eagle Creek lies at the end of the Barlow Road, once a resting point for pioneers at the end of the Oregon Trail.

Philip Foster Farm, owned and operated by the Jackknife-Zion-Horseheaven Historical Society, provides visitors the opportunity to experience daily chores of pioneers through hands-on activities such as washing clothes, shelling and grinding corn, and lifting bales of hay. Special annual events include “Mother’s Day Brunch” and “Cider Squeeze/Harvest Festival”.

The farm is open to the public on the weekends from mid-June through the last Saturday in September. Admission is free to the general public while donations are encouraged. In 1997, the society collected about $870 in visitor donations.

From April through mid June and from late September through October, Philip Foster Farm offers school tours for 4th graders. 7th grade students from Eagle Creek School give the tours. Admission is $3.50 per student. In 1997, over 4,000 students visited the farm and contributed to over $14,000 in revenue.
Special events include a cider squeeze and a Mother’s Day celebration. All of the volunteers are costumed. The store carries old-fashioned items such as soaps, candy, and sodas as well as history books and memorabilia. Volunteers manage and staff the store.

Admissions are $3.50 for each school child and the general public is free. Staff includes one full-time director, an eight member volunteer board of directors, as well as approximately twenty volunteers to help with special events.

Pomeroy Living History Farm
Yacolt, WA

Pomeroy Living History Farm is an educational museum that depicts 1920’s farm life in the pre-electrical era of the rural Pacific Northwest. Assisted by costumed interpreters, visitors may grind corn and coffee, wash clothes on scrubboard, use a stereopticon, feed and pet the animals, pump water, use a crosscut logging saw, and many other activities.

Pomeroy Living History Farm is owned and operated by Pomeroy family members. The Pomeroy’s and their descendants have lived on the farm since 1910. Staff includes three part-time positions and a staff of 5-6 volunteers who give tours. Sources of revenue include admission fees, donations, and an endowment fund.

Pomeroy Living History Farm offers several different school programs for different age groups: a “Pumpkin Patch” program is offered for kindergarten through 1st grade; a program for 2nd through 3rd grade focuses on work and play on a pre-electrical farm; and program on self-sufficiency and recycling is offered for 4th through 6th grade students. Admission for students is $3.00 and $2.50 for pre-school students.

Pomeroy Farm offers a variety of special festivals and events that include activities such as craft demonstrations and workshops (e.g., candle dipping, spinning, and weaving), quilt shows, feeding the animals, scarecrow making, Native American stories and masks, hayrides, and pumpkin painting. The farm is open to the public on the first full weekend of each month, June through October. General admission is $3.50 for adults and $2.00 for children 3-11; children 2 and under are free.
The mission of the Zimmerman Heritage Farm is fundamentally to preserve, restore, and interpret the historic Zimmerman dairy farm site, house, outbuildings, and artifacts and to benefit the community by showcasing its agriculture and dairy farming past. The history museum complex is a cultural heritage resource that educates visitors about the unique history of the Zimmerman family as well as dairy farming in the region through a variety of interpretive exhibits, educational programs, and special events.

OVERVIEW

The primary planning focus is restoration of an historic turn-of-the-century farmhouse and remnant dairy farmstead on the lower Columbia as a living historical farm museum. To this end, the master plan emphasis is to create a compelling comprehensive image for the total six acres as an integrated restored farm complex.

The challenge in developing facilities and programs for Zimmerman Heritage Farm will be to communicate history of a dairy farm without the dairy operation in existence. With only the domestic remnant of the historic farm in existence, interpretation of the dairy farm without farm buildings or agricultural artifacts will in the short-term influence how the stories are communicated.

Opportunities for recreational experiences are also planned for the benefit of the community. These recreational experiences are envisioned as low-key forms of recreating that are consistent with the overall mission or purpose of the heritage park.

Museum Planning Goals

The principal objectives of the farm museum are education of the visiting public and preservation of the Zimmerman collection, which includes the house and grounds. The museum will not be a “collecting museum” in the conventional sense, given the extensive collection that exists and the interpretive focus on the family. The museum can obviously consider appropriate purchases or gifts of thematically related objects if they are consistent with the museum’s mission and education program.

The following represent facility goals to be achieved in implementing the masterplan:

- Demonstrate historical significance and uniqueness.
- Convey historical accuracy.
- Provide authentic visitor experiences.
- Provide low-impact recreational opportunities.
- Promote stewardship of cultural heritage resources.
- Preserve and restore the integrity of the historic house, artifacts, and site.
- Provide positive educational and recreational experiences.
- Seek revenue generation opportunities.
- Foster partnerships within the cultural heritage community.
SITE DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT

In the process of arriving at a final design concept for Zimmerman Heritage Farm, three preliminary site development concepts were explored in diagrammatic form. The site development concepts were evaluated from the standpoint of the following considerations:

1) programming
2) operation of the museum site and the park site
3) public access
4) site security
5) pedestrian and vehicular circulation and parking
6) functional “zoning” or organizing of the site for museum activities and park day-use and event activities
7) park maintenance and museum and administrative activities.

An overarching design goal for the entire project site in addition to the National Register property, is to restore the historic landscape of the farm to the extent possible and preserve the historic scene. The historic home and its setting will be visible in the surrounding area along NE Sandy Boulevard. Site lines to the house museum from both the east and west along NE Sandy are unobstructed.

The design development concept organizes the entire 5.98 acre project site into two sub-areas or individual sites: the Museum Site of 2.38 acres and the Park Site of 3.6 acres. Furthermore, within the Museum Site is the 1.5-acre National Register property that contains the historic house and associated structures and grounds.

The Master Plan Site Design drawing on the next page illustrates that the National Register site will not have access from NE Sandy. However, a service drive will provide access to the rear of the historic site within a buffer zone east of the historic site fence line. The historic fence lines will define the museum. New fences will be constructed to replicate the originals. The front walk from the house and the driveway will terminate at the line of the original garden fence. The south line of this fence will run just inside and north of the proposed new sidewalk on NE Sandy.

The public entrance for visitors arriving by vehicle, bicycle, and on foot will be through a main site gate on NE Sandy approximately 100 feet east of the project site's west property boundary. Parking is located at the rear of the property, out of view, screened by the higher grade of the park meadow. The east, west and north property boundaries are planted to screen out contemporary development.

A proposed Visitor Center on the park site will have a barn or agricultural design. Restored outbuildings will be adapted for museum operations, thereby maintaining the same look and feel of the historic farm.

Additional parking on the grass for ± 30 additional cars will be available along the entrance drive west of the paved parking area. Just south of the east end of the parking lot, a turn around will provide a drop off for buses, vans, etc. West of the turn around an open area
LEGEND

1. Zimmerman House
2. Buttery
3. Bunk House
4. Wood Shed
5. Service Road
6. Greenhouse Area
7. Staff Parking
8. Horse Barn
9. Gardens
10. Grape Arbor
11. Visitor Center
12. Livestock Shed
13. Pasture
14. Pear Orchard
15. Meadow
16. Entrance Gate/Sign
17. Entrance Road
18. Foot Path
19. Picnicking
20. Picnic Shelter
21. Overflow Parking
22. Parking
23. Visitor Drop-Off
of turf grass and trees will be designated for group and general day-use activities.

South of the visitor drop-off and turn-around area is a proposed new Visitor Center. The Visitor Center is proposed to house community activities, gatherings, and special events and is designed to appear as a farm-type building. The Visitor Center building will also contain restrooms for park and museum users.

A plaza/terrace area will be developed between the Visitor Center and the activity lawn to accommodate group gatherings, a temporary pavilion or tent structure, or possibly a permanent open gazebo or pavilion. Immediately south of the Visitor Center is proposed a shelter or loafing shed and small pasture area for a dairy animal exhibit. Dairy animal(s) would be exhibited during peak season and on special occasions.

East of the turn-around and the Visitor Center, the fence line for the National Register site will provide for control points for public access to and from the museum and a gate for service, maintenance, and emergency vehicles.

Pedestrian circulation through the park site and the museum site will be on standardized compacted gravel paths with steel edging, width allowing for two people abreast, and a fine surface and gradient for ADA accessibility. These pathways will contribute to the casual historic character of the site, guide pedestrians through fragile areas of the lawn and garden and serve for easy maintenance of the grounds with machinery and power equipment.

The greater area of the two west parcels will remain as open meadow and/or pasture. The area will be bordered by farm fencing of the perimeter for controlled access and security and to contribute to the farm setting for the museum site.

Near the center of the two west parcels is a row of seven Pound Pear trees, the remainder of what was an orchard or grove of approximately twenty-four trees. The merit of restoring the Pound Pear grove should be discussed further between the City and FOHZ beyond the time constraints allowed in this master plan.

The proposed meadow area can be used to pasture farm livestock, for large gatherings or events, or held for future recreation activities. On the north and west boundary of the site a dense row of conifer trees will be planted to screen the railroad, the adjacent development to the west and to enhance the farm setting of the museum and the park sites.

If there are any ground-disturbing activities, it is recommended that an archaeologist is present to monitor these activities in the event that cultural material (prehistoric or historic) is encountered.

General site development will provide stub-outs for power and water to accommodate phased improvements for the Visitor Center and picnic facilities as well as special events.

A small pathway will be required from museum staff parking to the house. A chipping and composting area as well as grounds maintenance needs will be located in the proposed greenhouse area.
MASTER PLAN COMPONENTS

Zimmerman Heritage Farm Master Plan is organized around seven comprehensive planning components. The components are the following:

- VISITOR FLOW
- LANDSCAPE AND OPEN SPACE
- BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES
- FACILITY PROGRAMMING
- MUSEUM INTERPRETATION AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS
- MUSEUM COLLECTIONS MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
- VOLUNTEERS PROGRAM

VISITOR FLOW

In designing the overall visitor experience for the Zimmerman Heritage Farm, the design concept incorporates six basic planning elements to handle movement of visitors. These six elements and their required sequence are as follows:

- Arrival
- Decompression
- Reception
- Orientation
- Interpretation
- Feedback

The planning scenario for the flow of visitors at Zimmerman Heritage Farm will encompass the following sequence:

Arrival

Visitors will locate the museum site with minimal effort and difficulty. Facility identification and directional signs at strategic locations along I-84 and the local street system will lead visitors directly to the museum site. A site identification sign and/or appropriate symbol will be located at the Farm entrance to announce arrival to the museum and direction to parking and visitor services.

Decompression/Transition

From off-site to on-site, decompression is the transition in travel time that allows visitors to leave the contemporary world and its associated obligations, and to enter the world of another era and perhaps another culture.

At the Zimmerman project site, this transition will happen within a restful zone along an “country-style” access road through a small field of meadow grass and a dense backdrop of native conifers. The access road will lead visitors slowly to a small parking area near the site reception area with a drop-off zone at the Visitor Center.

Reception

From the parking area, visitors to the Farm will enter an appropriately themed walkway and arrive at an exterior reception area at the Buttery Building. Ticketing and admission occurs at this interval. In the best possible scenario, visitors will be welcomed by an
informed individual such as a docent/volunteer, preferably in historic attire. When this is not possible, appropriate signage will direct visitors to the next step in their visit. The public can also receive information on related and regional tourism sites at this time.

**Orientation**

At this interval visitors are informed about and directed to the interpretive exhibits and daily programs and activities at the farm museum complex. A variety of educational media and knowledgeable docents will augment this function. A retail sales function within the orientation area will offer the opportunity to purchase related educational material, gifts, and memorabilia.

**Interpretation**

The interpretive process of communication occurs during this interval within the farm complex. At the Farm visitors will choose from an array of interpretive exhibits, live programs, and education/recreational activities of the farm museum. Volunteers can also assist in fulfilling this function. The basic interpretive objective at the farm is to create an authentic and engaging experience for visitors, regardless of their age or knowledge level.

**Feedback**

Monitoring the public’s opinion with regard to their experience is critical to improving facilities and programs, and ultimately the success of the Zimmerman facility. Visitors return to the reception area on their way to their vehicles. At this point visitors should be intercepted by staff or volunteers for opinions on their experience. Visitor opinions are elicited and tabulated for management analysis as part of an ongoing cycle of improvement.
LANDSCAPE AND OPEN SPACE

Setting

The site layout and existing conditions have shaped a site concept plan that will preserve the house and garden site in an historical state. A meadow west of the house will be developed as a general-use park for day-use activities and support facilities such as group picnic shelters, individual picnic tables, parking, visitor facilities, and restrooms, for the Zimmerman house and gardens.

The entrance to the park and the historic site will be provided off NE Sandy Boulevard at the west end of the park site. The entrance road will serve as a buffer to the west boundary industrial zone and the north boundary along the railroad.

The entrance road leads to the parking along the north boundary, which will be obscured, from view by the higher grade and the pear orchard in the center of the park area.

A conifer tree buffer along the west and north property lines will provide an evergreen background and screen the park from the railroad and the industrial development. Large deciduous shade trees will be planted in a loose arrangement along the park road to complete the park setting for the picnic areas and the group shelter. The possibility of restoring the Pound Pear orchard to the original 24 trees should be discussed further.

A larger portion of the west pasture area will be established as an open meadow for open space activities and to preserve the farm setting as approached from the west. The entire project site will require a perimeter fence and gates to control the presence of vehicles on the site. Paved parking for 26 cars will be provided for museum visitors and day use in the park along with overflow parking of 36 spaces in the turf area in the northwest portion of the site.

A wider path running east-west along the north side of the garden plots will act as the main entrance to the historical site. This pathway will lead from the entrance turnstile on the west boundary of the garden, past the stairway to the lawn terrace, continuing east to the small terrace/patio in front of the buttery.

It is imperative this path is located as shown, as this pathway is the watercourse for drainage for a greater portion of the park site's open space meadow lying west of the historical site. A drain pipeline at least eight inches in diameter in a gravel-filled trench will extend east past the buttery and bunk house, to an exit discharge north of the bunk house.

The lawn terrace south of the house will be bordered on three sides with planting of the historical plants inventoried and preserved at the site. One of the most notable plants in the front yard was a large, trailing wisteria that will be re-introduced at the front porch. (See the Appendix for the plant lists.)

A special feature of the garden will include reconstruction of the grape arbor along the west side of the house. The exit for the house and garden tour will be through the arbor as this route will be ADA accessible with regard to grade (percentage slope).
The yard east of the garden and house in the historical site will be maintained as a mown farm service yard. This area will be the setting for the buttery, bunk house, and ultimately the reconstructed horse barn. Simple borders of woody flowering shrubs will line the fences to complete the setting.

**Gardens**

The master plan proposes to establish a series of planting beds with ADA accessible walkways between, perhaps of grass, barkdust, or wood chips. The restoration of the gardens is illustrated on the next page. The beds would be elongated along a north/south axis for the best sun exposure for all plantings. It is envisioned the garden west of the central walk will be planted with floral displays and the area east of the walk will be for vegetable plots. Planting the borders adjacent to the central walk to permanent perennials will add somewhat to the structure of the garden in the dormant seasons.

Restored gardens and grounds will capture the appearance and fragrances of the historic landscape of the farmhouse. Note the wisteria trailing along the front porch.
Interpreters in the restored gardens will explain to visitors how the Zimmermans tended the kitchen and flower gardens and their importance in family’s daily life. The restored horse barn and fences are shown reassembled to their original appearance and location.
BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES

The architectural components of Zimmerman Heritage Farm represent both historic and new structures and are allocated between the two project partners, the City of Gresham and FOZH. The historic architecture includes both restoration and rehabilitation of existing buildings and structures and reasonably accurate reconstruction of former farm buildings. These represent only those historic structures that existed within the National Register Site. New buildings will be compatible with farm buildings of the period of interpretation, i.e. late 1800’s – early 1900’s.

Museum Site Buildings

Historic Buildings:

Zimmerman House (restored) 2,525 sq. ft.
Buttery Building (restored) 350 sq. ft.
Privy (reconstructed) 20 sq. ft.
Wood Shed (reconstructed) 750 sq. ft.
Bunkhouse/Caretaker’s Quarters (reconstructed) 1,500 sq. ft.
Horse Barn (reconstructed) 3,000 sq. ft.

New Building:

Green House (new) 200 sq. ft.

Temporary Building:

Caretaker’s House (existing) 1,500 sq. ft.

Park Site Buildings

New Buildings:

Visitor Center (new) 3,000 sq. ft.
Livestock Shed (new) 1,000 sq. ft.
Picnic Shelter (new) 900 sq. ft.

The historic home’s exterior and interior will be restored to its original elegance at the turn of the century.
Museum Site Buildings

Zimmerman House

In 1997, a restoration-rehabilitation and accessibility master plan for the house was completed for FOHZ and is currently being implemented in phases as funding becomes available. A number of exterior and interior improvements are scheduled throughout for rehabilitation of the two-story, historic structure. The improvements include exterior painting, roofing, interior rehabilitation, electrical, among others.

Guided tours of the house will provide visitors insight into the life and times of the Zimmerman family and their dairy farm. Docents in period dress will guide visitors through the individual rooms of the house beginning at the front door and exiting at the dining room door, thereby reducing congestion of groups touring the house.

Initially, a small museum store sales area is envisioned in the kitchen area as visitors exit. Once the buttery building is restored, the museum sales function will be relocated from the house to the buttery. The store area will offer a range of appropriately themed and related merchandise for sale to generate revenue.

All improvements will be consistent with the conditions of National Register of Historic Places. Improvements to the historic house should abide by the U.S. Secretary of Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings.

Buttery Building

Proposed museum uses for the buttery include visitor reception and ticketing, education demonstrations/presentations, and a small museum store. A terrace area outside the buttery will serve as the arrival and assembly area for visitors. Museum visits will begin at

“Tip” in front yard. Gate, fence, and buttery beyond.

Buttery and bunk house beyond fenceline.
the buttery. Living history demonstrations will explain the history and function of the buttery for the Zimmerman family. In later years of the museum’s operation, a small section of the buttery will be set aside for admissions and museum store sales.

Privy

Authenticity would suggest considering reconstruction of a typical outhouse of the era as an additional and necessary architectural element of the historic landscape of the site. The time period for overall interpretation of the family’s history would include the existence of the privy.

Wood Shed

The new wood shed addition will be reconstructed as part of the overall historic site restoration program. The wood shed will be used for house museum operations that will be determined in the future, either as public programming spaces, “back of house” management spaces, or perhaps collections storage and curation.

Bunk House

The new bunk house will also be reconstructed as an important architectural element in the site restoration plan. The existing wood-framed garage occupies the site of the original bunkhouse. The garage will be dismantled due to its deteriorated condition. The new bunk house will expand the opportunities for museum operations and programs, such as administration, education, site storage, among others. The second floor of the bunk house is proposed as quarters for the on-site caretaker.

Horse Barn

The horse barn will be rebuilt in the long-range plan to accommodate a range of museum programs. Given the potential of a large interior volume of space and smaller associated spaces, the new horse barn would provide additional museum programming space, such as large exhibits of farm machinery, changing exhibits and exhibit preparation, or ancillary support functions.

Greenhouse/Grounds Area

Although not part of the historic architectural record for the farm, a new greenhouse will be constructed out-of-view for the historic site’s restoration and maintenance program. The greenhouse will provide space for plant propagation and storage for materials and equipment used in vegetable and flower garden curation. The greenhouse will also be used for general propagation of period plant specimens for public sale as part of an ongoing museum revenue development program.

Grounds maintenance needs will be located here for equipment, supplies, chipping, composting, and trash deposit.
**Park Site Buildings**

**Visitor Center**

A new Visitor Center will be constructed as a central focal point for visitor arrival and departure. The Visitor Center will be a multi-use facility for park and museum programming. The building will contain spaces for museum arrival, reception, and orientation as well as for a range of year-round indoor education programs and activities, special events, restrooms, and regional visitor information.

The structure will be designed within the architectural vernacular style of barns or farm structures, thereby adding to the overall character of the historic landscape of the site. The exterior of the Visitor Center will be characterized by a pitched roof, wood siding, and windows and building details typical of the period.

An alternative to a newly designed Visitor Center is to renovate an existing barn, if one should become available in the area. The barn could be relocated to the park site and adapted for Visitor Center operations.

Interior spaces can be expressive of wood-timber barn loft construction, but will be outfitted with furnishings and equipment to accommodate the market for special events in unique settings. All interior spaces will be environmentally conditioned for comfort and will meet contemporary mechanical and electrical codes for energy efficiency.

Associated with the Visitor Center is an arrival and drop-off area that features a plant covered arbor structure, perhaps modeled after the grape arbor on the museum site.

**Livestock/Loafing Shed**

Adjacent to the Visitor Center, but detached, will be a small livestock “loafing shed” that will be an element of the heritage education program. The livestock shed and associated open-space pasture along NE Sandy will provide a shelter and space for a dairy cow(s) on a limited or seasonal basis.

The physical character and appearance of the shed should contribute to the historic site’s ambiance. Educational programming will take place here for livestock demonstration activities such as milking, feeding, and livestock management. A regulated animal maintenance program will control animal waste and objectionable odors.

**Picnic Shelter**

In the western portion of the project site close to parking, a group picnic shelter(s) will be available for leisure activities. The shelter will be designed for 50 or more visitors and constructed within the agricultural architecture vernacular of the overall project site in order to contribute to the historic landscape appearance. The shelter will be available for reserved use by groups.
Future Visitor Center, west of the Zimmerman house, will be designed to accommodate a wide range of activities and to enhance the overall historic landscape setting.
Picnic Table Area

In the same general area as the Picnic Shelter, park facilities are allocated for casual drop-in picnicking where visitors can use the park at any time when the park is open, without needing a reservation.

FACILITY PROGRAMMING

A variety of educational and recreational activities are envisioned for the site. Some activities will directly serve the educational mission. Other complementary uses will help sustain the site economically.

- Cultural Heritage Tourism - General admission museum tours operated by FOZH, living history program, and changing exhibits.
- Visitor Information - Information and orientation of area and regional attractions; combined with retail sales operations.
- Schools - Grade school programs (on-site and off-site) and tours. Tied to State of Oregon's Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM) and Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM) higher education benchmarks.
- Community Education Programs - Programs offered through the Gresham Parks and Recreation Division for all ages (such as heirloom gardening, genealogy, restoration techniques, old-fashioned craft skills, watercolor painting, etc.).
- Community Service - Community service and/or internships with middle and high schools for on-grounds projects or volunteering in programs and events.
- Other Partnerships - Relationships with other appropriate groups such as Elderhostel and Regional Arts and Culture Council.
- Special Heritage Events - Annual Zimmerman seasonal thematic events that relate to the mission of the history museum could include:
  
  Spring:
  - Easter Egg Hunt - egg-dying and other traditions.
  - Mother's Day Tea - with flower displays, art show, musical concert.
  - Regular sale of plants - at farm site, at Farmer's Markets, and other venues.
  
  Summer:
  - Regular sale of produce, plus plants, flowers, and herbs.
  - Isobel Zimmerman July 3rd birthday party.
  - July 4th celebration.
  
  Fall:
  - Dairy Days/ Harvest Fair - live dairy cow(s) & other livestock, antique tractors and farm equipment demonstra-
- Regular sale of produce, plus plants, flowers, and herbs.
- Domestic events – box socials, quilting bees, church suppers.

Winter:
- Christmas on the Farm - sale of ornaments, appropriate traditional crafts, and other hand-made items; lighted Christmas tree in the yard through the season; caroling.

Other related special events: sponsored on the grounds by City or FOZH (such as evening concerts and art exhibits in the park).

Site Rentals - Reserved use of grounds and group-shelter for private gatherings, picnics, receptions, small weddings, meetings, business events, and tourism tours, coordinated with the local visitor/lodging industry.

General Site Use - Use of non-museum areas of site by general public for strolling, jogging, picnicking, and viewing.

Thematic events such as "Dairy Days" would allow visitors to become involved in an array of educational experiences. Live dairy cows would be on exhibit for visitors to experience and understand life on a traditional dairy farm of the Pacific Northwest.
INTERPRETATION AND EDUCATION PROGRAM

Two primary goals for the Zimmerman Heritage Farm’s interpretive and education program are:

← Conveying historical accuracy.
← Providing authentic visitor experiences.

Interpretive Approach

Interpretation for the Zimmerman Heritage Farm will focus principally on the lives and times of the Zimmerman family and on dairy farming in East Multnomah County region. History will be communicated through living history presentations, exhibits, and educational programs and activities.

Interpretation like restoration should be thoroughly analyzed and planned. Just as the grounds and the house will have a long-range plan, so will the interpretation and public education program. House and garden interpretation and educational programming should go hand in hand and complement each other, thereby creating a seamless transition between the two.

In developing a long-range educational program, the surrounding museums and related visitor facilities will be surveyed and visited in order not to duplicate programs and/or information. In the greater Portland area visitors can learn about: the Oregon Trail, Fort Vancouver and HBC, Oregon State history, the Columbia River, Native Americans, and natural history.

While many similar institutions have been contacted for market research information, additional contacts will to be made when fully developing an interpretation and educational program. These contacts should be helpful in determining what information should be included, but also in forming partnerships for developing shared programming, marketing, and technical assistance.

This master plan offers an overview of the educational potential and preliminary interpretive opportunities of the Zimmerman family and the historic site. An interpretive master plan should be undertaken in the future to create a comprehensive plan for interpretation and educational programming for the facility.

Interpretive Design Factors

Interpretive design is a specific process of communication that is intended to educate, perhaps entertain, and hopefully motivate museum visitors to learn more. Interpretation is not a product or particular thing, but a process.

With regard to the Zimmerman Heritage Farm, it is important to realize interpretation is a communication process, designed to reveal meanings and relationships of our natural and cultural history - in this case, the stories of domestic and field life of the Zimmerman family on a dairy farm in East Multnomah County, Oregon. This is accomplished through direct, first-hand experiences with state-of-the-
Interpretive Opportunities

The typical historic house museum offers to visitors the opportunity for a glimpse of a place, people, time period, and/or activity, i.e. a “snapshot” in time. In order to avoid confusing visitors and depleting resources, a specific time period to interpret has been selected.

With the time period for interpretation selected, a detailed history research of visual and textual resources can begin and can be refined to provide visitors with as much accurate, exciting and enjoyable information as possible.

The broad interpretive time period of the Zimmerman family ranges from 1851 with the arrival of Jacob & Lena Zimmerman in the Oregon Territory to 1992 with the death of Isobel Zimmerman, the youngest and last granddaughter of Jacob and Lena.

The years between 1899 and 1915 are the fullest and happiest for the Zimmerman Family. This could arguably be considered the “golden age” of the Zimmermans. The last child, Isobel, had been born, extensive remodeling to the house had been completed, the dairy farm with its large herd of Holsteins was operating over an extensive land area with numerous barns and outbuildings constructed, and the family was ready to take on the world. This is also a dynamic and exciting time for the United States, Portland, and the region.

One approach to explore further would be developing the overall interpretive strategy around Isobel’s life as a youth and, through the eyes of this young girl, interpret the life and times of the Zimmerman family at the turn of the century on their dairy farm in East Multnomah County. Using young Isobel as the story-teller and a “window into the way things were,” interpretive and educational programs could present a comprehensive and compelling picture of the family’s history and the social, political, and economic times at the turn of the century. Expanded interpretation could also talk about the future of young Isobel as she makes her way through life as she lives out her years in the family house in North Gresham.

The proposed time period for interpreting the historic house as an architectural artifact is 1874 to perhaps the 1920’s. This encompasses
the original structure and subsequent renova-
tion and expansion along with associated
outbuildings.

In order to provide on-going educational
programs for both adults and school age
children there are several related themes that
can be developed into special programs. These
can take place in the form of workshops,
lecture series, or programs related to special
events, such as the upcoming Lewis and Clark
celebration.

Developing partnerships with other
cultural history organizations for public
programming would also be beneficial and
cost saving in addition to broadening the
audience and support base.

**Preliminary Education Programs and Related
Activities**

- Permanent indoor interpretive exhibits.
- Living history interpretation/presen-
tation/demonstration.
- Outdoor agricultural exhibits.
- Outdoor hands-on exhibits (schools)
- Docent-guided tours; self-directed tours.
- Changing exhibits.
- Special educational events, performances.
- Regional visitor information on other
cultural heritage attractions.

While working on the restoration of the
house and grounds, Friends of Zimmerman
House need to cultivate relationships and
partnerships, create public awareness, and
develop support. Public programming is a
good tool to this end. Gresham Parks and
Recreation Division would be the most logical
partner for such workshops, but perhaps not
the only partner.

Each hands-on, “doing” workshop would
highlight a particularly instructive aspect of
the Zimmerman House or its collection as well
as the restoration of the house and the gardens
and grounds. A small sampling of workshops
could include:

- These Old, Old Houses and Restoring
  Them.
- Arts and crafts of the late 19th – early 20th
century.
- Creating a Victorian Garden.
- Plant identification by Lewis and Clark.
- Following your family tree across the
  Oregon Trail.

A once-a-year event to highlight the house
and the work being done could be a “Birthday
Party” for Isobel. This could be a “ticketed”
(paid admission) event or volunteer donation.
Activities could include: sponsored ice
cream social on the lawn, tours of the house
and grounds, updates on restoration project
and future plans, children’s games on the lawn,
open air concert, antique car show, making ice
cream, churning butter and cow milking
demonstrations.

When developing any sort of public
programming, the temptation is to do too
much. Thought needs to be given to schedul-
ing, budget, logistics, location, public safety
and wear and tear on the house and grounds.
A variety of “hands-on” educational activities will be available for visitors of all ages as they learn “what it was really like” to live on a turn-of-the-century dairy farm.
Visitors to the farm can learn about traditional dairy farm life through live interpretation and "hands-on" exhibits and activities such as cream separation or butter churning.

"One cow in the herd bows to none—she's the boss. She has uncontested access to the best pasture, the deepest shade, the choicest spot in the milking line-up, or any other privilege she desires."

— The Complete Cow.
Related Themes for Interpretive Programming

Principal thematic subject areas to research and develop for an overall interpretive theme structure and storyline content include the following:

- Zimmerman family.
- Dairy farm life – daily domestic and field routine.
- Dairy agriculture - Late 19 C. to early 20 C. in the Lower Columbia River region.
- Dairy farming practices, techniques, and products.
- Dairy farming technology & innovation.
- Historic farmhouse styles and barn types of the region.

Listed below is an elaboration of the topics outlined above. These are possible sub-topics to explore with regard to the content in interpretive storyline development and for use in a variety of educational programs and activities at the museum site.

Zimmerman Family.

Family background:
- Jacob and Lena.
- George and Jessie.
- Daughters: Jessie, Olive, Mabel, and Isobel.

Zimmerman Dairy Farm Life.

Roles on the farm:
- Family: Adults, children.
- Hired help.
Zimmerman domestic life:
- Daily routine of family members.
- Seasonal changes and routine.
- Culture - local venues, travel.
- Education - local schools (Wilkes School).
- Recreation - activities of family, friends.
- Social - neighbors, civic participation.
- Religion - local Methodist Church.

Zimmerman field life:
- Daily work routine.
  - livestock feeding,
  - cow milking,
  - animal management.
- Seasonal work routine.
  - summer pastures v. winter hay,
  - breeding, calving, de-horning.

The Zimmerman's front porch was a popular gathering spot. Buttery and bunk house can be seen behind the fence and gate.
Dairy agriculture (Late 19 C. - early 20 C. in the Lower Willamette Valley/Lower Columbia region witnessed by Zimmerman Family)

Farming developments and practices.
Donation Land Claim Act.
Farm locations: land selection.
Farm landholdings, sizes.
Dairy herd sizes.
Dairy breeds and selection.
Techniques: Milking, pasturing, haying, silage.
Products: Milk, cream, butter, cheeses.
Hay, other crops.
Markets, sales.
Local creameries, distribution.

Technology & Innovation.

Barn function, configuration, and operation.
Milk processing machinery.
Field machinery.

Buildings & Structures.

Historic farmhouse styles and barn types of the Willamette Valley/Lower Columbia.
Regional influences and responses.
Victoria era farmhouses.
Barns, butteries, milking parlors, and typical outbuildings & structures.

Although not found on the Zimmerman farm, this "off-the-shelf" barn ventilator/weather vane can still be seen on dairy barns in the area.
Zimmerman dairy barns along Sandy (Boulevard) Road.
1851-1992 Historical Period
1899-1915 Interpretive Period

[ Isobel Faith Zimmerman as a youth ]

NATIVE AMERICANS
- Chinooks
  - Lifeways
  - Resources
  - Ne-cha-co-kee Village
- Indian John
  - Zimmerman friend

LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER
- Exploration
  - Fur Trade
  - Overland Migration
    - Oregon Trail
    - Immigrant farmers
    - Settlement in region

ZIMMERMAN FAMILY
- Jacob (1816-1899)
  - Lebolina (1827-1887)
    - Immigrants to U.S.
    - Married, 1845
    - Oregon Trail, 1851
    - Moved onto farm, 1870
- George H. (1852-1915)
  - Jessie (McCall) (1862-1943)
    - Married 1883
- Daughters:
  - Jessie May (1884-1968)
  - Olive Hope (1889-1980)
  - Mabel June (1891-1914)
  - Isobel Faith (1899-1992)

Roles:
- Traditional/Custodial
  - Zimmerman Family
    - Adults
    - Children
    - Hired help

DOMESTIC LIFE
- Domestic Life:
  - Daily, Seasonal Routine
  - Social/Cultural
    - Travel, Grange
    - Education
      - Wilkes School
      - U. of Oregon
    - Religion

Field Life:
- Daily, Seasonal Work
  - Hired Help

Foods & Meals:
- Traditional menu
- Kitchen garden
- Meal preparation
- Dining traditions

SOURCE: SLUSARENKO ARCHITECTURE, PC
COLLECTIONS MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

The collection is often referred to as the “heart and soul” of the museum – it is the essence of the museum. For history museums, collection and preservation of the material culture from our past, i.e. the objects, is one of the most important museum functions.

The Zimmerman Heritage Farm has an extensive, intact collection of household artifacts that spans over 115 years of the Zimmerman family’s day-to-day residence in the house and occupation of the farm. The historic house itself along with the associated buildings, gardens, and landscape are part of the material collection of the family. Therefore, given the extent of the collection, the Zimmerman Heritage Farm will not be a “collecting” museum in the traditional sense, but will draw extensively upon the diverse collection to interpret the Zimmerman family and its past.

The quantity and quality of the Zimmerman collection sets it apart from a large majority of historic house museums that typically have an historic house or site as the cultural artifact, but must furnish and outfit the house exhibits with period pieces of a particular time. With the richness of its collection, the Zimmerman Heritage Farm can authentically interpret Zimmerman history with actual objects of the family.

The “household” collection of the family is quite extensive, while objects relating to their dairy farming history are limited in number. In this case, it will be necessary to research and acquire appropriate farm machinery and implements to add to the material collection of the museum and to use for educational exhibits. Much of the Zimmerman object collection is organic and therefore will deteriorate until a controlled interior environment is established.

Preparation of the Collections Management Plan is a high priority in the near future even though preliminary documentation of the collection is proceeding. The Collections Management Plan is a written document that will establish the policy and procedures for caring for the Zimmerman collection.

The collections management plan is simply a detailed, written document that sets forth the purpose of the Zimmerman Heritage Farm and its goals, and explains how these goals are interpreted in its collections activity. The policy serves not only as a guide for staff, but more important as a public statement of the museum’s professional standards regarding objects and materials in its care.

The management document should be comprehensive, but does not necessarily need to be extremely detailed. This document will be an important resource in writing grants and fundraising.

The implementation of the management plan will be the responsibility of the House and Garden Curators and the Director. The management plan should address both the “human-engineered” objects and the “natural” objects of the gardens.

The management plan for the long-term care of objects and plants of the Zimmerman collection should be written with the following
priorities in mind:
 ← Improve environmental conditions of the collection.
 ← Inventory, register, and catalogue objects to achieve documentary control of the collection.
 ← Conserve objects within the collection.
 ← Expand knowledge through in-depth research of the collection.
 ← Enhance public understanding and appreciation of the collection through dissemination of information about it.

In writing the Zimmerman Heritage Farm’s collection management plan, the following aspects should be addressed through policies and procedures:
 ← Museum mission or purpose.
 ← Collecting goals.
 ← Loaning procedures (incoming and outgoing objects).
 ← Criteria and methodology for acquiring objects.
 ← Deaccessioning (selling or disposing of artifacts) procedures.
 ← Documentation, registration, and cataloging procedures.
 ← Criteria and conditions for storage of artifacts and archival materials.

Professional development of curatorial personnel will be a high priority. Continuing education opportunities are available through local, state, regional, and national museum and cultural heritage associations in the form of workshops, seminars, classes, books, videos,
VOLUNTEERS PROGRAM

In a small museum such as Zimmerman Heritage Farm, volunteers are often considered the lifeblood for day-to-day operations. Throughout the year, they provide countless hours of service performing a vast array of tasks in support of the museum’s mission and programs. Small museums typically have few full-time, paid professional staff and therefore rely on the efforts of a group of dedicated volunteers.

Volunteers, sometimes referred to as docents, are not substitutes for paid professional staff. Their work should complement, not duplicate, the work of the paid staff. Volunteers bring many diverse skills to a museum. The early years of any fledgling museum preparing to operate for the public benefit must rely heavily on the contributions of enthusiasm, time, and money from a group of volunteers.

From its inception to subsequent on-going operation, volunteer groups must be organized to effectively utilize their time. An effective volunteer group will advance the museum’s mission when it works within the parameters of an organized Volunteers Program.

The preparation of a Volunteers Program for Zimmerman Heritage Farm must be a high priority in the early years of development and when completed and in place will effectively coordinate and direct the volunteers’ efforts. Volunteers for the Zimmerman Heritage Farm will be giving their time to the museum. They must be treated with every courtesy, made to feel welcome, and appropriately acknowledged for their valuable contributions.

The typical considerations in preparing the Zimmerman Heritage Farm Volunteer Program include the following:

- Job Descriptions and Responsibilities
- Recruiting Volunteers
- Selecting Volunteers
- Placement of Volunteers
- Training
- Performance Review
- Coordination Meetings
- Time Scheduling and Documenting
- Recognition of Volunteers

The Volunteer Coordinator will have responsibility for directing the Volunteer Program and coordinating volunteers. This will be done in association with the Director. Membership in the American Association of Museum Volunteers (AAMV) should be considered when funds allow. AAMV is an invaluable professional resource for information, assistance, and training for the Volunteer Coordinator and museum volunteers.
Implementation of Zimmerman Heritage Park is expected to occur in phases over an extended period of time. Development of programs and construction of facilities as presented in the preceding section is outlined in the following sub-sections:

→ PROJECT PHASING
→ MANAGEMENT AND OPERATION

Three phases for facility development and operations are outlined below with regard to facility management, programming, and site improvements. Suggested division of responsibilities between FOHZ and the City is offered. However, these recommendations are intended to be flexible and dependent upon available resources and ability of either or both parties or others to participate in the implementation process.

Updates of this Master Plan should be completed after each 5-year interval to recognize completed activities, acknowledge any new implementation and operation activities, and evaluate changes in priorities. Annual reviews of implementation progress should be completed as well.

Each project development phase contains a range of activities to be undertaken within the designated time period. No attempt has been made to prioritize these activities, since the project partners should review and prioritize each phase annually to assess and establish new priorities.

It should be noted that the historic site is “gated”; that is, has an admission charge for entering the grounds, while the park site is “ungated” and is open to the public without an admissions charge.

All Gresham Parks & Recreation site regulations will apply to the site. This includes the operating hours, i.e. open from dawn to dusk.

PROJECT PHASING

PHASE 1. 1-5 YEARS
STABILIZATION OF THE HERITAGE RESOURCE

PHASE 2. 6-10 YEARS
FULL TIME OPERATION

PHASE 3. 11+ YEARS
LONG RANGE OPERATION

PHASE 1. 1-5 YEARS
STABILIZATION OF THE HERITAGE RESOURCE

Management Activities

a. Legal relationships/documents:
   ← Revise Partnership agreement between City & FRW.
   ← Revise agreement between FRW & FOZH.
   ← Develop mission statement, bylaws, policies and procedures for Zimmerman Heritage Farm.
   ← Develop ZHF Board of Directors.
   ← Develop Caretaker’s Agreement.
b. Museum Staffing:
- Museum Director (Part time).
- House/Collections Curator (Volunteer).
- Garden Curator (Volunteer).
- Volunteers Coordinator (Volunteer).
- Caretaker (On-site; special agreement)

c. Professional Development:
- Training and development of Board, staff, and volunteers.
- Professional development workshops, continuing education.
- Network with cultural history institutions.

d. Prepare Fundraising Plan:
- Establish membership development program.
- Establish capital campaign.
- Enhance existing operations/maintenance endowment.

e. Volunteers Program:
- Develop volunteer partnerships, recruitment.
- Establish Volunteers Program.
- Initiate internship program with colleges, universities.

f. Collection Curation:
- Establish curation criteria.
- Continue evaluating and editing collection.
- Continue filing and storing.
- Document and develop computer database of existing historic plant material.
- Complete archival research.
- Establish interim collection storage plan.

g. Resolve Caretaker’s temporary residence permitting status.

h. Prepare Business Plan.
i. Prepare Marketing Plan.

Programming Activities

a. Building awareness, Friends of Zimmerman Heritage Farm group, and funds:
- Formally identify and sort resource groups.
- Continue July 4th annual event.
- Limited volunteer partnerships to help preserve house and build gardens.
- Limited off-site programs & traveling cultural heritage educational “product”.
- House open on “special” limited basis.
- Develop education program with schools for CIM/CAM benchmarks.
- Develop separate brochures and materials for schools.

b. The City’s role in supporting and building programs includes the following that can begin now and continue to build through the “opening doors,” first phase:
- Advertise and publish materials.
- Provide set up space to display at other community events.
← Develop programming for S.U.N. Schools/Community schools.
← Jointly manage volunteer programming with FOZH; includes maintaining database, recruitment, set up, and recognition.
← Develop link to Seniors Center, Senior Citizens coalition and ECC (East Co. Caring Community) to develop seniors and inter-generation programming.
← Strengthen relationship with Chamber of Commerce and Gresham Area Visitor Association.

Site Development Activities

MUSEUM SITE DEVELOPMENT (FOZH):

Site
← Remove non-conforming plants.
← Complete planting beds around house and on upper terrace.
← Build holding garden beds in lower terrace.
← Restore picket fence.
← Restore grape arbor.
← Restore wisteria trellis.
← Implement fire protection program.

Estimated Construction Cost: $55,000.
(See Appendices for Development Budgets and Construction Cost Breakdown.)

Buildings
← Repair chimney, roof & north porch, install gutters & drainage.
← Paint exterior of house.

← Construct ADA access to house.
← Dismantle, record, and store the Buttery Building for future reconstruction.
← Dismantle existing garage.
← Establish interior preservation conservation criteria.
← Install furnace, air-conditioning; upgrade electrical.
← Solicit estimates for interior restoration of house.
← Relocate Caretaker's Residence.

Estimated Construction Cost: $67,000.
(See Appendices for Development Budgets and Construction Cost Breakdown.)

PARK SITE DEVELOPMENT (CITY):

Park Site
← Install security fence around perimeter of park site.
← Grade site and overseed with meadow grass.
← Prepare Wayfinding Plan. Install identification and directional signage for project site.
← Erect temporary grounds storage building.
← Begin water, sewer utilities planning.
← Install underground electric utility.
← Develop drainage plan for park surface drainage through historic site.
← Begin park site landscape design.
← Install security lighting.
← Plant perimeter landscape buffer of conifer trees.
← Coordinate street improvements on Sandy
Boulevard with Oregon Department of Transportation.

Estimated Construction Cost: $66,200. (See Appendices for Development Budgets and Construction Cost Breakdown.) Note: Portions of implementation work can be completed or coordinated by the City with non-traditional resources, e.g. Multnomah County Corrections crews, Oregon National Guard.

**PHASE 2. 6-10 YEARS FULL TIME OPERATION**

**Management Activities**

a. Museum Staffing:
   - Director (Full time).
   - House/Collections Curator (Part time).
   - Garden Curator (Part time).
   - Education Coordinator (Part time).
   - Volunteers Coordinator (Volunteer).
   - Caretaker (On-site).

b. Professional Development:
   - Staff/Volunteer continuing education.
   - Board of Directors training.

c. Fundraising:
   - Pursue grants.
   - Sustain membership campaign
   - Update fundraising plan.

d. Collection Curation:
   - Develop Collection Management Plan.
   - Develop computer database for collection registration.

e. Plan museum shop.

f. Implement Marketing Plan.

g. Develop an Education-Interpretation Master Plan.

h. Establish museum accreditation goals, process.

i. Establish an Emergency/Disaster Plan.

j. Update Facility Master Plan.

k. Coordinate with transportation agencies for “brown” heritage freeway identification signs on I-84 and directional signage to facility.

**Programming Activities**

a. Open to public with regular visiting hours for historic house and gardens.

b. Schedule regular site visits with school groups through the school year.

c. Implement garden education programs.

d. Sponsor two annual fundraising events; accommodate smaller events in park.

**Site Development Activities**

**MUSEUM SITE DEVELOPMENT (FOZH):**

- Install water to garden; investigate reactivating existing well.
Complete pathways and garden beds in lower front terrace.
Erect greenhouse.

Estimated Construction Cost: $105,000.
(See Appendices for Development Budgets and Construction Cost Breakdown.)

Historic Structures
Reconstruct Buttery Building and add new terrace gathering area.
Complete ground floor restoration, excluding kitchen & bathroom.
Install interior exhibits in house.
Develop external collection storage system.
Create interpretive signage.
Create small sales area for museum shop in house.
Install monitoring devices for measuring interior environmental conditions.

Estimated Construction Cost: $61,700.
(See Appendices for Development Budgets and Construction Cost Breakdown.)

PARK SITE DEVELOPMENT (CITY):
Park Site Improvements
Complete sewer and water service.
Develop gravel entry road with site entrance gate & parking.
Construct visitor arrival plaza and arbor.
Plant perimeter landscape screen/buffer.
Install irrigation system; investigate re-activating well(s) in park area.

Estimated Construction Cost: $230,900.
(See Appendices for Development Budgets and Construction Cost Breakdown.)

Park Buildings Improvements:
Construct picnic shelter(s).
Install portable restrooms within fenced-screen enclosure; permanent restrooms will be built in Phase 3.

Estimated Construction Cost: $75,000.
(See Appendices for Development Budgets and Construction Cost Breakdown.)

PHASE 3. 11+ YEARS
LONG RANGE OPERATION

Management Activities
a. Staffing:
Museum Director (Full time).
House/Collections Curator (Part time).
Garden Curator (Part time).
Education Coordinator (Part time).
Volunteers Coordinator (Volunteer).
Caretaker (On-site).

b. Continued professional development.

c. Fundraising:
Pursue grants.
Sustain membership campaign
Update fundraising plan.
d. Update facility master plan.
e. Update interpretation master plan.
f. Update collections management plan.
g. Prepare house/facility maintenance plan.
h. Implement museum accreditation process.
j. Achieve and maintain museum accreditation.

**Programming Activities**

a. Expanded learning opportunities for older students, internships.
b. Host educational day camps on site.
c. Provide Parks & Recreation classes.
d. Stage quarterly/seasonal events.
e. Provide changing exhibits in the Visitor Center.
f. Farm animals reside or are present on-site.

**Site Development Activities**

**MUSEUM SITE DEVELOPMENT (FOZH):**

- Site Improvements
  - Reconstruct Wood Shed (Collection Storage).
  - Reconstruct Privy.
  - Reconstruct Bunkhouse (Administrative Office, Caretaker Quarters).
  - Reconstruct Horse Barn (Programs, Agricultural Exhibits).

  Estimated Construction Cost: $23,500.
  (See Appendices for Development Budgets and Construction Cost Breakdown.)

**Historic House Improvements**

- Complete upstairs restoration.
- Restore kitchen and bathroom.
- Sustain preventive conservation for house & collection.

  Estimated Construction Cost: $519,500.
  (See Appendices for Development Budgets and Construction Cost Breakdown.)

**PARK SITE DEVELOPMENT (CITY):**

- Park Site Improvements
  - Maintain historic farm landscape.

  Estimated Construction Cost: $111,300.
  (See Appendices for Development Budgets and Construction Cost Breakdown.)

- Park Buildings
  - Construct Visitor Center
  - Construct Livestock Loafing Shed.

  Estimated Construction Cost: $385,000.
  (See Appendices for Development Budgets and Construction Cost Breakdown.)
OPERATIONS AND MANAGEMENT

Attendance Demand Forecast

Investigating comparable facilities provides valuable information regarding attendance demand that historic homes typically experience. Demand for Zimmerman Heritage Farm is projected based on the attendance demand of other historic homes in the region as well as attendance trends reported by historic homes through a national survey. Projected attendance is shown in Table 3.

During Phase 1, attendance is projected at less than 1,000 visitors per year. Annual attendance is fairly limited due to the necessary repair and restoration work on the home as well as the need to manage the on-site collections. School group programs will not be established in this phase. Interpretive programs for the general public will be fairly limited to volunteer support; as a result, general public attendance reflects limited demand. An annual 4th of July celebration will provide an opportunity to attract visitors as well as potential donors. In 1999, this event

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase 1 Years 1-5</th>
<th>Phase 2 Years 6-10</th>
<th>Phase 3 Years 11+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Events</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized School Groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weddings/meetings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>21,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dean Runyan Associates
attracted approximately 200 visitors to the project site.

As the Zimmerman Heritage Farm engages the activities associated with Phase 2, annual attendance increases to approximately 14,000 per year; although, in actual practice this increase would occur gradually as the historic home begins "full-time operation". At this stage, general public attendance has increased substantially, education programs have become established and special events serve as a primary draw for visitors. The focus on special events as a primary attraction is typical for other historical homes. For example, Bybee House within a short drive of the Portland Metro market attracts approximately half of its annual attendance over a single weekend with the special event "Wintering In". Other historic homes also find that special events serve as a primary attraction, particularly for historic homes where weddings, meetings, and education programs are not a primary function.

During Phase 2, education programs will also attract a significant number of visitors. Within the region, Philip Foster Farm and Pomeroy Living History Farm both provide good examples of historic farms with established education programs. For these two historic farms, school group attendance ranges from 4,000 - 5,000 per-year, which does not include attendance from special events. With a well-developed school program supported by dedicated staff volunteers, Zimmerman Heritage Farm would also attract approximately 4,000 school age visitors per year.

As Zimmerman Heritage Farm enters Phase 3, annual attendance is projected at over 21,000 visitors. The increase represents continued development of interpretive exhibits, established education programs and activities as well as enhanced special events. In addition, the historic grounds will have the facilities and appeal to attract small weddings and groups to the site. Historic Deepwood Estate and Jenkins Estate provide two good examples of historic homes that have developed a strong demand for wedding and meeting activities. With the proper facilities and well-managed grounds, Zimmerman Heritage Farm can continue to develop and expand the potential for these types of revenue generating activities.

Considering that over half (60%) of historic homes that responded to a nationwide survey reported an annual visitor level of under 10,000 persons per year, these long-term attendance estimates may seem optimistic. However, given the proposed programming and site development achievements combined with the site’s proximity within the Portland Metro market, the projected estimates provide a realistic and achievable target for the Zimmerman Heritage Farm.

Operations Plan

This section presents a staffing plan and operating budget for the Zimmerman Heritage Farm. The staff plan and budget, which is projected for each of the three phases, is presented for both Friends of Zimmerman House (FOZH) and the City of Gresham. These
Financial projections indicate the number and type of staff that will be required, the costs for staff and other expenses, and the sources of revenue for covering these costs.

As reflected in the staff plan and budget, annual expenses for the City of Gresham relate solely to maintenance of the grounds with the exception of the historic garden. Annual expenses for FOZH relate to a variety of responsibilities including administration, historic garden care, fundraising, and management of special events.

**Preliminary Staffing Plan**

For Phase 1 (years 1-5), the staffing projections are modest and call for a half time director and limited site management, coordination, and public relations support for FOZH. The City of Gresham will provide staff to support basic ground maintenance.

For Phase 2 (years 6-10), FOZH will require a full-time director and add two part-time curator positions for the house and garden as well as a part-time education coordinator position. The City of Gresham will provide additional labor to support the ground maintenance standards typically associated with picnic shelters, which will be present on the site. Labor costs for this phase and beyond reflect annual cost of living increases.

For Phase 3 (years 11+), FOZH will convert the curators and education coordinator positions to half time. The City of Gresham will contribute slightly more staff time to the support the grounds area associated with the visitor center/barn. Overall, the entire facility will be managed by 3 FTE (full time equivalent) positions in “Long Range Operation”.

The staffing plan is based on several assumptions, as follows:

- Limited administrative staffing, with the director responsible for fundraising as well as operational oversight
- Strong support from volunteers
- An educational program that is based on volunteer interpretive staff who are available to interact with classes
- A relatively small membership pool that requires only limited management

In terms of annual salary, the total projected cost ranges from approximately $32,000 in Phase 1 to $128,000 in Phase 3, as shown in Table 4. These salary estimates are in 1999 dollars and do not include fringe benefits.

### Table 4  
**Preliminary Staffing Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Phase 1 Years 1-5</th>
<th>Phase 2 Years 6-10</th>
<th>Phase 3 Years 11+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CITY OF GRESHAM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Maintenance Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$52,500</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$43,750</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$4,375</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,775</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$5,775</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,775</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$5,775</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds Crew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$43,750</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$4,375</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,219</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>$7,219</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,219</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>$7,219</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$4,375</td>
<td>$12,994</td>
<td>$14,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOZH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$43,750</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$21,875</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House/Collections Curator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,563</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>$7,563</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$17,188</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$17,188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Mgt., Coord., and Public Rel.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$54,688</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$5,469</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,836</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>$6,836</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Coordinator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,250</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>$8,250</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18,750</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$18,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$27,344</td>
<td>1.9 $67,329</td>
<td>2.6 $113,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$31,719</td>
<td>$89,823</td>
<td>$127,856</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Labor costs in Phase 2 and beyond reflect annual cost of living increases.  
Source: Dean Runyan Associates
Preliminary Operating Budgets

Preliminary operating budgets are shown for both FOZH and the City of Gresham in Tables 5 and 6. These budgets project annual revenues and expenses for each of the three development phases. Annual revenues are based on projected attendance and on a number of revenue factors. These assumptions reflect estimates of admission fees, retail sales, membership revenues, education programs, and special events.

In Phases 2 and 3, revenue from special events and meetings is divided evenly between FOZH and the City of Gresham to reflect a shared responsibility and contribution. Revenue for special events is generated through a nominal fee to enter the park as well as sales of food, drinks, and various farm-related crafts and activities. With the help of volunteers, FOZH would manage the sales and special event activities.

Expenses relate to the preliminary staffing plan as well as various cost factors that relate to labor benefits, administration, operation and maintenance costs. These revenue and cost factors are shown in Tables 7 and 8. In the remainder of this section, annual operating costs and revenues are discussed as a combined total, as well as with regard to particular impacts for both FOZH and the City of Gresham.

Phase 1 (years 1-5)

During Phase 1, annual operating costs for the Zimmerman Heritage Farm are projected to be approximately $39,000, which includes expenses for both FOZH and the City of Gresham. Revenue sources are limited due to the necessary restoration and collections management activity as well as the time required to establish good education programs and special events.

During this initial phase, the City of Gresham would not generate revenue from the site. For FOZH, revenue sources include donations, membership dues, City of Gresham support (in-kind contributions), and public/private support (source unidentified). Given the other projections and goals of the proposed master plan, annual public/private support of approximately $22,000 per year is required to balance the budget through this initial development phase. The director of FOZH will be responsible for raising these necessary funds.

Phase 2 (years 6-10)

During Phase 2, combined operating costs would increase to approximately $123,000 per year, as the “full-time operation” gets underway. The largest portion of these additional costs is associated with new paid staff positions for FOZH as well as the additional maintenance and landscape requirements necessary for the City of Gresham to manage a more developed site, which includes picnic shelters.

The remaining expenses relate to the purchases of goods as part of the retail operations and special events and expenses for
overall operations such as utilities, supplies, and equipment.

During this phase, the City of Gresham will begin to generate revenue from picnic reservations, special events, community programs and meeting space reservations. For FOZH, a variety of new revenue sources include admission fees, special events, retail sales, and education programs related to the house museum programs.

Public/private support of approximately $45,000 per year will be necessary for FOZH to fund the programming and site development activities associated with this phase. As FOZH begins Phase 2, the full time director is expected to have established some consistent funding sources; however, fundraising will continue to remain a priority throughout this phase and beyond.

**Phase 3 (years 11+)**

During Phase 3, combined operating costs would increase slightly to $174,000 per year, as FOZH continues to expand interpretive and programming activities. The additional costs are primarily associated with additional paid staff time for the curator and education coordinator positions. For the City of Gresham, grounds management costs for the City of Gresham would remain consistent with the requirements of the previous phase; however, revenue would increase as well established special events, community programs, and meeting space facilities attract more local and regional demand.

Through this “long-range operation” phase of development, City of Gresham revenue would exceed the costs associated with ground maintenance and generate net revenue. For FOZH, revenue from general admission, retail sales, education programs, and special events would likewise increase as these programs become more established within the community.

At this stage, the site and home would also appeal and be available for small wedding parties, an additional source of revenue. As with the previous development phase, FOZH will need to continue to raise a similar level of funds from public and private sources to sustain the proposed level of programming and site development activity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF GRESHAM</th>
<th>Phase 1 Years 1-5</th>
<th>Phase 2 Years 6-10</th>
<th>Phase 3 Years 11+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Reservations</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Events</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Programs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Space Reservations</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$8,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td>$40,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Expenses**    |                 |                 |                 |
| Labor (includes overhead/benefits) | $4,375 | $12,994 | $14,766 |
| Operating expenses | $2,391 | $18,066 | $20,530 |
| **TOTAL**       | $6,766 | $31,060 | $35,296 |

| **Net Revenue** | -$6,766 | -$8,560 | $5,454 |

Note: Expenses include labor and operating costs for mowing, weed spraying, and portable restroom service. Cost and revenues in Phase 2 and beyond reflect annual cost of living increases.

Source: Dean Runyan Associates
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FOZH</th>
<th>Phase 1 Years 1-5</th>
<th>Phase 2 Years 6-10</th>
<th>Phase 3 Years 11+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Admission</td>
<td>$693</td>
<td>$4,860</td>
<td>$11,520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Sales</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Programs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Events</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Private Support (includes donation)</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weddings</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Gresham Support (in-kind services)</td>
<td>$5,469</td>
<td>$6,016</td>
<td>$6,836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Dues</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$6,250</td>
<td>$12,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$32,362</td>
<td>$92,126</td>
<td>$138,981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor (includes overhead/benefits)</td>
<td>$27,344</td>
<td>$76,828</td>
<td>$113,086</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. &amp; office expenses</td>
<td>$1,230</td>
<td>$3,457</td>
<td>$5,089</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses</td>
<td>$2,461</td>
<td>$6,915</td>
<td>$10,178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail sales &amp; special events purchases</td>
<td>$385</td>
<td>$3,300</td>
<td>$8,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and Supplies</td>
<td>$410</td>
<td>$1,152</td>
<td>$1,696</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$31,830</td>
<td>$91,652</td>
<td>$138,849</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$532</td>
<td>$474</td>
<td>$132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: City of Gresham support represents the annual value of labor services for volunteer coordination, event coordination, general site management, public relations. Cost and revenues in Phase 2 and beyond reflect annual cost of living increases. Figures are rounded to the nearest dollar.

Source: Dean Runyan Associates
### Table 7
Projected Revenue Factors By Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Phase 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years 1-5</td>
<td>Years 6-10</td>
<td>Years 11+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Admissions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Paid Admissions</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Adult Admissions</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admission Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Fee</td>
<td>$2.20</td>
<td>$2.70</td>
<td>$3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retail Sales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Sales/Admission</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Membership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Members</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Membership Fee</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Fee</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shelter Rental</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Sessions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Fee</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Events</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Revenue/Person</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of events</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental fee</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weddings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of events</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental fee</td>
<td>$395</td>
<td>$395</td>
<td>$425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dean Runyan Associates
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Factors</th>
<th>Phase 1 Years 1-5</th>
<th>Phase 2 Years 6-10</th>
<th>Phase 3 Years 11+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor Benefits Cost</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Sales</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Cost Labor</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opr/Adm Cost Allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Administration</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment/Maintenance</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dean Runyan Associates
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Symphoricarpos mallis
Snowberry
Thuja plicata
Western Red Cedar
Typha latifolia
Cattail
Vaccinium ovatum
Huckleberry

Abies procera
Noble Fir
Acer macrophyllum
Big Leaf Maple
Alnus rubra
Red Alder
Berberis sp.
Oregon Grape
Camassia quamash
Camas
Corylus californica
Hazelnut
Fragaria sp.
Wild Strawberry
Gaultheria shallon
Salal
Lysichitum americanum
Skunk Cabbage
Oenothera sp.
Wild Strawberry
Pinus monticola
Western White Pine
Populus trichocarpa
Black Cottonwood
Pseudotsuga menziesii
Douglas Fir
Quercus garryana
Acorns
Rubus macropetalus
Blackberry
Rubus spectabilis
Salmonberry
Rubus ursinus
Trailing Blackberry
Sagittaria latifolia
Wappato

ZIMMERMAN HERITAGE FARM
Selected Native Plants in the Project Area at the time of Lewis and Clark Expedition
Plant Material Mapped on Drawing at end of Appendix C.
27 July 1999

A. Acer palmatum 'Threadleaf'
Threadleaf Japanese Maple
B. Acer palmatum
Japanese Maple
C. Aucuba japonica
Japanese Aucuba
D. Buxus sempervirens
Common Box
E. Calocedrus decurrens
California Incensecedar
F. Camellia japonica
Common Camellia
G. Chaenomeles lagenaria
Common Flowering quince
H. Cotoneaster francheti
Franchet Cotoneaster
I. Crataegus var.¹
Hawthorn
J. Ficus carica
Common Fig
K. Forsythia var.
Forsythia
L. Forsythia suspensa
Weeping Forsythia
M., Hydrangea macrophylla (pink)
Bigleaf Hydrangea
N. Hydrangea macrophylla
Bigleaf Hydrangea
O. Ilex aquifolium
English Holly
P. Juglans regia
Persian Walnut
Q. Kerria japonica 'Double'
Double Japanese Kerria
R. Lonicera japonica halliana
Halls Japanese Honeysuckle
S. Magnolia soulangeana
Saucer Magnolia
T. Malus pumila var. 1.
Apple
U. Malus pumila var. 2.
Apple
V. Malus pumila var. 3.
Apple
W. Oemleria cerasiformis
Osoberry
X. Parthenocissus quinquefolia
Virginia Creeper
Y. Prunus var. 1.
Z. Prunus var. 2.
AA. Prunus laurocerasus
Common Laurelcherry
BB. Quercus garryana
Oregon White Oak
CC. Rhododendron var. 1. (red)
Rhododendron
DD. Rhododendron var. 2 (white)
Rhododendron
EE. Azalea mollis
Chinese Azalea
FF. Rhododendron var. 3. (red)
Rhododendron
GG. Rosa var. 1. (pink)
Rose
HH. Rosa var. 2. (pink)
Rose
II. Rosa var. 3. (red)
   Rose
I. Rosa multiflora 4.
   Japanese Rose
KK. Rosa borboniana 5.
   Bourbon Rose
LL. Rosa var. 6. (pink)
   Rose
MM. Rosa var. 7. (pink) (Dorothy Perkins)
   Rose
NN. Rosa var. 8. red)
   Rose
OO. Rosa rugosa 9.
   Rugosa Rose
PP. Rosa var. 10. (seedlings)
   Rose
QQ. Rosa var. 11. (yellow)
   Rose
RR. Salix discolor
   Pussy Willow
SS. Spiraea douglasii
   Douglas Spirea
TT. Spiraea thunbergii
   Thunberg Spirea
UU. Spiraea vanhouttei
   Vanhoutte Spirea
VV. Symphoricarpos albus
   Common Snowberry
WW. Syringa vulgaris
   Common Lilac
XX. Viburnum opulus roseum ‘Common
     Snowball’
     Common Snowball European
     Cranberrybush
YY. Viburnum tinus
   Laurestines viburnum
ZZ. Vitis vinifera
   European Grape
AAA. Wistaria sinensis
   Chinese Wistaria
BBB. Clematis paniculata
   Sweetautumn Clematis
CCC. Corylus avellana
   European Filbert
DDD. Pseudotsuga menziesi
   Common Douglasfir
EEE. Comus alba sibirica
   Siberian Dogwood
FFF. Ligustrum vulgare (shrub)
   European Privet
GGG. Pleioblastus argenteo-striatus
   Sasa
HHH. Ligustrum vulgare
   European Privet
III. Ligustrum vulgare ‘Golden’
     Golden European Privet
III. Pyrus var.
   Pear
KKK. Rosa var. 12. (pink)
   Rose
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Herbaceous Plants Inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aegopodium podograria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bishops Goutweed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aegopodium podograria variegatum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silveredge Bishops Goutweed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Allium scorodoprasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giant Garlic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Allium schoenoprasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Aquilegia vulgaris. (blue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European Columbine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Aquilegia vulgaris var. (double white)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European Columbine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Arabis var. (white)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rockcress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Armoracia lapathifolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horseradish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bergenia cordifolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heartleaf Bergenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Caltha palustris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common Marshmarigold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dracunculus vulgaris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common Stinkdragon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dicentra formosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific Bleedingheart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Foeniculum vulgare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common Fennel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Galanthus nivalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common Snowdrop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Glecoma hederacea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ground Ivy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Hedera helix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Ivy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hedera helix 'Needlepoint'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needlepoint English Ivy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Hemerocallis var.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daylilly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hesperis matronalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dames Rocket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hydrophyllum var.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waterleaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Hypericum calycinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aaronsbeard St. Johnswort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Iris cristata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crested Iris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Iris germanica (lt. yellow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German Iris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Iris germanica var.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German Iris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Iris sibirica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siberian Iris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Iris var. (lt. blue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Linaria var.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toadflax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Lunaria annua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dollarplant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Lychnis coronaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rose Campion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Melissa officinalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common Balm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mentha piperita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peppermint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Mentha sauveolens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applemint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Muscari botryoides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common Grapehyacinth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Narcissus pseudonarcissus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common Daffodil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Narcissus pseudonarcissus bicolor 'Double’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Double Bicolor Common Daffodil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
36. Narcissus jonquilla
Jonquil
37. Narcissus pseudonarcissus bicolor
Bicolor Common Daffodil
38. Narcissus pseudonarcissus
(white/white)
Common Daffodil
39. Origanum vulgare
Common Origanum
40. Paeonia lactiflora ('Madelon'?)
Chinese Peony
41. Paeonia lactiflora ('Ballerina'?)
Chinese Peony
42. Paeonia lactiflora ('Festiva Maxima'?)
43. Phalaris arundinacea
Reed Canarygrass
44. Polygonatum odoratum
Solomonseal
45. Polystichum munitum
Western Swordfern
46. Ranunculus occidentalis
Western Buttercup
47. Ranunculus repens
Creeping Buttercup
48. Smilacina stellata
Starry False Solomonseal
49. Symphytum caucasicum
Caucasian Comfrey
50. Tellima breviflora
Fringecup
51. Trillium ovatum
Pacific Trillium
52. Tulipa var. (yellow)
Tulip
53. Tulipa var. (yellow/red stripe)
Tulip
54. Urtica dioica
Bigsting Nettle
55. Vinca major
Bigleaf Periwinkle
56. Vinca minor ‘Bowles’
Bowles Periwinkle
57. Vinca minor ‘White’
White Periwinkle
58. Scilla hispanica alba
White Spanish Squill
59. Scilla hispanica ‘Blue Queen’
Blue Queen Spanish Squill

1 Exact species not identified; flower and/or fruit not observed. Annotate document when identification is made.
## Phase 1. Project Development Cost (1999 dollars)

**MUSEUM SITE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Museum Site Improvements</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Historic House Improvements</td>
<td>67,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>122,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Design &amp; Estimating Contingency (15% of Line C)</td>
<td>18,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Sub Total Costs</td>
<td>140,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Contractor's Mark-Up (13% of Lines E)</td>
<td>18,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. <strong>TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST</strong></td>
<td>158,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Design Consultants (12% of Line G)</td>
<td>19,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Client Administrative Cost (1% of Line G)</td>
<td>1585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROJECT COST</strong></td>
<td>$179,149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARK SITE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Park Site Improvements</td>
<td>66,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Park Buildings</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Sub Total</td>
<td>66,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Design &amp; Estimating Contingency (15% of Line C)</td>
<td>9,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Sub Total Costs</td>
<td>76,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Contractor's Mark-Up (13% of Lines E)</td>
<td>9,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. <strong>TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST</strong></td>
<td>86,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Design Consultants (12% of Line G)</td>
<td>10,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Client Administrative Cost (1% of Line G)</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROJECT COST</strong></td>
<td>$97,210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Slusarenko Architecture, PC/Atlas Landscape Architecture

Note: See Appendix for Cost Estimates
### Phase 2. Project Development Cost (1999 dollars)

| MUSEUM SITE                                                                 |      |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|---|
| **A. Museum Site Improvements**                                           | 105,000 |
| **B. Historic House Improvements**                                        | 61,700  |
| **C. Sub Total**                                                           | 166,700  |
| **D. Design & Estimating Contingency (15% of Line C)**                    | 25,005  |
| **E. Sub Total Costs**                                                     | 191,705  |
| **F. Contractor’s Mark-Up (13% of Lines E)**                              | 24,922  |
| **G. TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST**                                            | 216,627  |
| **H. Design Consultants (12% of Line G)**                                 | 25,995  |
| **I. Client Administrative Cost (1% of Line G)**                          | 2166  |
| **TOTAL PROJECT COST**                                                    | $244,788  |

| PARK SITE                                                                   |      |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|---|
| **A. Park Site Improvements**                                              | 230,900  |
| **B. Park Buildings**                                                      | 75,000  |
| **C. Sub Total**                                                           | 305,900  |
| **D. Design & Estimating Contingency (15% of Line C)**                    | 45,885  |
| **E. Sub Total Costs**                                                     | 351,785  |
| **F. Contractor’s Mark-Up (13% of Lines E)**                              | 45,732  |
| **G. TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST**                                            | 397,517  |
| **H. Design Consultants (12% of Line G)**                                 | 47,702  |
| **I. Client Administrative Cost (1% of Line G)**                          | 3975  |
| **TOTAL PROJECT COST**                                                    | $449,194  |

Source: Slusarenko Architecture, PC/Atlas Landscape Architecture

Note: See Appendix for Cost Estimates
### Phase 3. Project Development Cost (1999 dollars)

**MUSEUM SITE**

| A. Museum Site Improvements | 23,500 |
| B. Museum Buildings Improvements | 519,500 |
| C. Sub Total | 543,000 |
| D. Design & Estimating Contingency (15% of Line C) | 81,450 |
| E. Sub Total Costs | 624,450 |
| F. Contractor's Mark-Up (13% of Lines E) | 81,179 |
| G. TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST | 705,629 |
| H. Design Consultants (12% of Line G) | 84,675 |
| I. Client Administrative Cost (1% of Line G) | 7056 |
| **TOTAL PROJECT COST** | **$797,360** |

**PARK SITE**

| A. Park Site Improvements | 111,300 |
| B. Park Buildings | 385,000 |
| C. Sub Total | 496,300 |
| D. Design & Estimating Contingency (15% of Line C) | 74,445 |
| E. Sub Total Costs | 570,745 |
| F. Contractor's Mark-Up (13% of Lines E) | 74,197 |
| G. TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST | 644,942 |
| H. Design Consultants (12% of Line G) | 77,393 |
| I. Client Administrative Cost (1% of Line G) | 6449 |
| **TOTAL PROJECT COST** | **$728,784** |

Source: Slusarenko Architecture, PC/Atlas Landscape Architecture  
Note: See Appendix for Cost Estimates
# Phase 1. 1-5 Years

## Museum Site Development (FOZH)

### Historic Site Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Gates</td>
<td>$6,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Site drainage</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Soil preparation - garden</td>
<td>$14,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Seeding</td>
<td>$5,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Picket fence</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Grape arbor</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Wisteria trellis</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal Historic Site: **$55,000**

### Historic House Museum Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Roof &amp; north porch repair</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exterior painting</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. HVAC installation</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Electrical upgrade</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal Historic House Museum: **$67,000**

**Total Phase 1 Museum Site Development:** **$122,000**

## Park Site Development (City)

### Park Site Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Perimeter fence</td>
<td>$16,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Gates</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Clear site</td>
<td>$15,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Strip site</td>
<td>$4,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Grade site</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Seeding</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Signage &amp; wayfinding</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal Park Site Improvements: **$66,200**

### Park Buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal: **$0**

**Total Phase 1 Park Site Development:** **$66,200**
### PHASE 2. 6 - 10 YEARS

#### MUSEUM SITE DEVELOPMENT (FOZH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Historic Site Improvements</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Historic Site Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Buttery terrace</td>
<td>$3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>North perimeter fence</td>
<td>$3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Irrigation &amp; well</td>
<td>$56,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Greenhouse (10'x20')</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Driveway (gravel)</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Board fence (east &amp; west)</td>
<td>$8,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Accessible ramp</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$105,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Historic Buildings Improvements</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Historic Buildings Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>House ground floor restoration</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Buttery reconstruction</td>
<td>$31,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Privy reconstruction</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>External collection storage unit</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Interpretive signage</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$61,700</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL PHASE 2 MUSEUM SITE DEVELOPMENT** $166,700

#### PARK SITE DEVELOPMENT (City)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Park Site Improvements</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Park Site Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Sewer, water &amp; utilities</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Entry road &amp; parking (gravel)</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Irrigation system</td>
<td>$15,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Perimeter landscape buffer</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Visitor plaza &amp; terrace</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Visitor Center area arbor</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Corral fence</td>
<td>$5,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Portable restrooms enclosure</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$230,900</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Park Buildings</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Park Buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Picnic shelter</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$75,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL PHASE 2 PARK SITE DEVELOPMENT** $305,900
## PHASE 3. 11+ YEARS

### MUSEUM SITE DEVELOPMENT (FOZH)

1. **Historic Site Improvements**
   - a. Concrete stairs: $400
   - b. Service road (gravel): $13,800
   - c. Security lights: $2,000
   - d. Restore concrete sidewalk: $3,800
   - e. Security system (motion): $3,500
   
   **Subtotal**: $23,500

2. **Historic House Museum Improvements**
   - a. House second floor restoration: $15,000
   - b. House kitchen restoration: $12,000
   - c. House bathroom renovation: $2,500
   - d. Wood Shed reconstruction: $120,000
   - e. Bunkhouse reconstruction: $130,000
   - f. Horse Barn Reconstruction: $240,000
   
   **Subtotal**: $519,500

**TOTAL PHASE 3 MUSEUM SITE DEVELOPMENT**: $543,000

### PARK SITE DEVELOPMENT (City)

1. **Park Site Improvements**
   - a. Asphalt path: $6,000
   - b. Restore pear orchard: $3,200
   - c. Tree planting: $15,000
   - d. Picnic pads: $14,400
   - e. Group picnic area: $10,000
   - f. Lighting: $25,000
   - g. Concrete curbs: $7,900
   - h. Road/parking drainage: $13,000
   - i. Asphalt road: $16,800
   
   **Subtotal**: $111,300

2. **Park Buildings**
   - a. Visitor Center: $330,000
   - b. Livestock Shed: $55,000
   
   **Subtotal**: $385,000

**TOTAL PHASE 3 PARK SITE DEVELOPMENT**: $496,300
July FOZH Meeting - Review of Master Plan Scope of Work for RFP.
October 6, 1998 - City Council Meeting – Contract Award to Consultant Team.
October 21, 1998 - Project Kick off Meeting w/ Staff, Friends of Zimmerman House (FOZH), Fairview-Rockwood-Wilkes Historic Society (FRW) members, and Consultant Team.
November 2, 1998 - Business Leaders Focus Group Meeting.
November 14, 1998 - Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #1 - Concept Workshop w/ Staff, FOZH & FRW.
January 20, 1999 - Update to Parks & Recreation Citizen Advisory Committee (PRCAC).
January 22, 1999 - Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #2 - Programming Concept Review.
March 31, 1999 - PRCAC Meeting w/ Historic Resources Advisory Committee (HRAC) for Vision and Site Concept Approval.
April 9, 1999 - Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #3 – Operational Concept Review.
April 13, 1999 - Public Open House at City Hall.
May 4, 1999 - City Council Presentation – Update.
June 16, 1999 - FOZH/Staff Work Session – Refine program, operation and management concept.
June 22, 1999 - Work Session w/ Consultant Team, Staff & FOZH – Review and refinement of program and management concept.
July 3, 1999 - Public Open House Celebration at Zimmerman Farm.
July 16, 1999 - Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #4 – Implementation Plan Review w/ FOZH, FRW, Staff and Consultant Team.
August 18, 1999 - PRCAC Meeting - Review Implementation Plan.
September 1, 1999 - HRAC Meeting - Review Implementation Plan.
December 7, 1999 - City Council Meeting – Review and Adopt Final Master Plan.
All photographs except those noted below are from the Zimmerman Photographic Collection, courtesy of Fairview-Rockwood-Wilkes Historical Society/Friends of Zimmerman House.
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