NPS Form 10-900
(Rev. 8/86)
NPS/WHS Word Processor Format
(Approved 03/88)

OMB No. 1024-0018

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
REGISTRATION FORM

This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations of eligibility for individual properties or districts. See instructions in Guidelines for Completing National Register Forms (National Register Bulletin 16). Complete each item by marking "x" in the appropriate box or by entering the requested information. If an item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, styles, materials, and areas of significance, enter only the categories and subcategories listed in the instructions. For additional space use continuation sheets (Form 10-900a). Type all entries. Use letter quality printers in 12 pitch. Use only 25% or greater cotton content bond paper.

1. Name of Property

historic name Castle Creek Power Plant

other names/site number City Shops/ 5PT561

2. Location

street & number 1080 Power Plant Road N/A not for publication

city, town Aspen N/A vicinity

state Colorado code CO county Pitkin code 097 zip code 81611

3. Classification

Ownership of Property	Category of Property	No. of Resources within Property	
		contributing	noncontributing
___ private	_X_ building(s)	1	___ buildings
_X_ public-local	___ district	___	___ sites
___ public-State	___ site	___	1 structures
___ public-Federal	___ structure	___	___ objects
	___ object	1	1 Total

Name of related multiple property listing:

Historic Resources of Aspen

No. of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register 0

4. State/Federal Agency Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this __ nomination __ request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property _ meets__ does not meet the National Register criteria.
__See continuation sheet.

_____ _____
Signature of certifying official Date

_____
State or Federal agency or bureau

In my opinion, the property __ meets __ does not meet the National Register criteria. __ See continuation sheet.

_____ _____
Signature of commenting or other official Date

_____
State or Federal agency or bureau

5. National Park Service Certification

I, hereby, certify that this property is:

__ entered in the National Register
__ See continuation sheet _____ _____

__ determined eligible for the National
Register. __ See continuation sheet _____ _____

__ determined not eligible for the
National Register. _____ _____

__ removed from the National Register _____ _____
__ other, (explain:) _____
_____ _____ _____

Signature of the Keeper Date

6. Functions or Use

Historic Functions (enter categories from instructions)	Current Functions (enter categories from instructions)
INDUSTRY/PROCESSING/EXTRACTION	GOVERNMENT/Public Works
Power Plant	

7. Description

Architectural Classification (enter categories from instructions)	Materials (enter categories from instructions)
OTHER: Industrial Vernacular	foundations Sandstone
	walls Brick
	roof Steel
	other N/A

Describe present and historic physical appearance.

In 1892 the Roaring Fork Electric, Light and Power Company commenced the erection of a hydroelectric station, known as the Castle Creek Power plant, on the west bank of Castle Creek, just west of the city limits of Aspen.

Completed in April, 1893, the main building was 110 feet by 36 feet, with two small exterior projections to contain the valves in the main lines, pressure regulators and relief valves. Charles Doolittle, patentor of the Doolittle Differential Governor, designed the building and determined the placement of water wheels, shafting, pipe lines and was responsible for other construction details.

The building has stone foundations, brick walls, a steel roof and a concrete floor. The only timber used were the door and window casings, and a timber bed for each dynamo. At the time of recording the roof contained the original Berlin Bridge Company, anti-condensation, fireproof lining, which has been determined as hazardous asbestos and will be removed.

"The Roaring Fork Electric Light and Power Company", published in Electric Review, January 5, 1907, described the station as having a four ton traveling crane, which ran on nine inch beams, and spanned the entire width of the building. The power was produced by five Pelton wheels, each with two nozzles. The wheels were enclosed in wheel cases of masonry and cast iron, with stuffing boxes around the shaft, so that the water was confined to the wheel case. The shafting, carried on adjustable pillow blocks set on masonry piers, was arranged so that any part of the line shaft or pulley could be released. The nozzles supplying water to the wheels were originally equipped with butterfly valves, which all operated at the same time. These were later replaced by a gate mechanism designed by Doolittle, to open or close in rotation and resulted in a great water savings.

Today the shell of the building remains very similar to what it was historically. The exterior retains its corbelling and decorative brickwork, similar to that found in many late nineteenth and early twentieth century industrial buildings. It is clearly pre-automotive in character.

The structure shows signs of deterioration due to poor drainage, deferred maintenance and harsh weather conditions, with lateral mortar cracks appearing at random throughout the entire structure.

XX See continuation sheet

The interior has been heavily modified with only distribution pipes and valves and the traveling cranes remaining. All hydroelectric operating equipment has been removed. The interior brickwork, particularly the crane supports and door archways are extant. The original concrete flooring has been maintained and remains extant. The ceiling, however, has been lowered with the addition of metal panels.

There are two buildings on the site, the power plant is contributing and the equipment garage is non-contributing. The garage is a long shed-like building with stalls for the equipment. There are no doors. It was built after the period of significance.

8. Statement of Significance

Certifying official has considered the significance of this property in relation to other properties: ___ nationally ___ statewide ___ locally

Applicable National Register Criteria X A ___ B X C ___ D
Criteria Considerations (Exceptions) ___ A ___ B ___ C ___ D ___ E ___ F ___ G

Areas of Significance (enter categories from instructions)	Period of Significance	Significant Dates
ARCHITECTURE	1892-1932	1892
INDUSTRY	1892-1940	

Cultural Affiliation
N/A

Significant Person
N/A

Architect/Builder
Charles Doolittle

State significance of property, and justify criteria, criteria considerations, and areas and periods of significance noted above.

The Castle Creek Power Plant is significant under Criterion A for its historic role in the use of hydro-electric power in mining in Aspen and the Rocky Mountain West. It is significant under Criterion C as representative of a type of building used for nineteenth century hydroelectric power and industrial plants.

Castle Creek Power Plant is significant for its association with the history of the development of Aspen and its mining industry. The plant provided energy for industrial, commercial and residential use up to 1956.

Construction began in 1892 and was completed in 1893. The Castle Creek Power Plant augmented the Hunter Creek Station after it had reached capacity in its electricity production. The design of the building and interior arrangement of water-wheels and shafting, and its pipelines were all designed by Charles Doolittle who had developed the patented Doolittle Differential Governor, a device which maintained the constant speed of the water wheel during variations of load on the power generator.

Castle Creek Station had two supplies of water from the Midland flume on Castle Creek and from the Maroon Creek flume. As a precaution, the water company also built a reservoir in 1894 in case the flow of water from the flumes was interrupted. Electricity was carried from the station on one main pole-line to supply approximately twenty different mine and mills with ten to one-hundred and twenty-five horse-power units.

XX See continuation sheet

When the huge demand for electric power dropped in 1893 due to the collapse of the silver mining industry, the Castle Creek station continued operation to supply power to the community and to those mines that did re-open. In 1909, when the Hunter Creek station ceased operations, Castle Creek was the sole provider of electric power to Aspen and vicinity. The Hunter Creek Station was acquired by the city of Aspen in 1976 and was converted into the Aspen Art Museum.

Improvements were made to the Castle Creek plant in 1904 and again in the early 1910s. The construction of the Twin Lakes Water Diversion Tunnel near Independence Pass in 1932 briefly increased demand for electricity from Castle Creek Plant. For the next twenty years the demand for electric power was sporadic. The skiing industry played a significant role in increasing the demand in 1945 to operate the ski lifts.

In 1953, the Holy Cross Electric Association bought the Castle Creek Power Plant and operated it until 1956. By this time there was such a great demand for power throughout the Aspen area a substation and transmissions lines were constructed at Basalt. In 1958 Castle Creek stopped operations and was converted into the City Shops.

The Castle Creek Power Plant has architectural significance as a building type representing one of the few nineteenth century industrial buildings remaining in Aspen. The building with its decorative brickwork and corbelling and its steel roof demonstrates those architectural features associated with pre-automotive industrial buildings.

The Castle Creek Plant meets the registration requirements in the Aspen Hydroelectric Context in that it was an active generating station during the period of significance that made a contribution to the economic and industrial development of Aspen during the late nineteenth century. It is in its original location and the feeling and function of the building as a power plant remain readily apparent. The interior, however, is not considered significant in light of the removal of the critical pieces of operating equipment that would have allowed for visual reconstructions of the industrial process used to produce electricity.

9. Major Bibliographical References

Anonymous. "The Roaring Electric Light and Power Company." Electrical Review. 5 January 1907.

Menke, Kathleen Marie. "Let There Be Light." manuscript, Aspen Historical Society. Aspen, Colorado.

Previous documentation on file (NPS): XX See continuation sheet

___preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested
___previously listed in the National Register
___previously determined eligible by the National Register
___designated a National Historic Landmark
___recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey # _____
___recorded by Historic American Engineering Record # _____

Primary location of additional data:
_X_ State Historic Preservation Office
___Other State agency
___Federal agency
___Local government
___University
_X_ Other
Specify Repository:
Aspen Historical Society

10. Geographical Data

Acreage of property Approximately 2 acres

UTM References

	Zone	Easting	Northing
A	/	/ / / / /	/ / / / / /
B	/	/ / / / /	/ / / / / /
C	/	/ / / / /	/ / / / / /
D	/	/ / / / /	/ / / / / /

__ See continuation sheet

Verbal Boundary Description The tract of land contained two (2) acres, more or less, located in the northeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter (NE 1/4 SW 1/4) of Section Twelve, Township Ten South, Range Eighty-five west of the Sixth P.M., Pitkin County, Colorado, described as follows: Commencing at Corner No. 1 from which the west quarter corner of said Section Twelve bears north 80 degrees, 12 minutes, 48

_X_ See continuation sheet

Boundary Justification The boundaries as described include the power plant and the lot it sits on. The boundary as drawn contributes to the setting and feeling of the nominated resource as an industrial and power generation plant.

__ See continuation sheet

11. Form Prepared By

name/title Carol D. Mehls/President
organization Western historical Studies, Inc. date 1/27/90
street & number 1225 Atlantis Ave. telephone 303-666-6208
city or town Lafayette state CO zip code 80026

VERBAL BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION CON'T.
seconds West 1732.95 feet, being also a point which bears North 81 degrees 9 minutes East 428 feet from Corner No. 3 of the Holden Tract, thence South 75 degrees 49 minutes East 346 feet to corner NO. 2; thence North 17 degrees 31 minutes East 163.7 feet to Corner No. 3, thence North 47 degrees 46 minutes West 255.7 feet to corner No. 4 thence North 75 degrees 49 minutes West 129.7 feet to Corner NO. 5; thence South 14 degrees 11 minutes West 254 feet to the place of beginning.

"The Roaring Fork Electric Light and Power Company", Electrical Review January 5, 1907

Menke, Kathleen Marie. "Let There Be Light." manuscript. Aspen Historical Society archives.

Markalunas, James. "The Passing of an Era." manuscript.

AMENDMENT TO THE ASPEN, COLORADO MULTIPLE PROPERTY NOMINATION

HYDROELECTRIC CONTEXT, 1885-1932

Water power has played a crucial role in the development of America's industrialization from the colonial period to the present. The availability of rivers in New England made water power easily accessible. The early water powered technology consisted of a water wheel or hydraulic turbine and a steady water supply. The success of this technology was dependent upon the correct selection of a site. The height of the water fall was crucial in that it related directly to the amount of power generated. A high head system produces a greater amount of power with less water, thus reducing the size and cost of the facilities.[1] As Americans crossed the Great Plains interest in hydropower dwindled because of the lack of water. However, the settlement of the mountain West during the middle and late nineteenth century brought about a revival of interest in hydropower. The mountain West proved conducive to further development of water power because of the numerous water falls, critical to power generation. Subsequently, new changes in the area of hydrology emerged to meet the demands of the mountain West.

Western mountains could provide great falls, but the irregularity of the water flow proved to be a problem. Hydraulic turbines were constructed which provided for greater efficiency and speed at lower cost. At the same time, miners in the mountain West contributed to water technology, especially the impulse turbine, which more effectively used the low volume and high heads of western streams. This pressure allowed for efficient use of water energy by dividing the stream of water and avoiding the so-called "dead water" accumulations. The impulse turbine and its successors allowed for a flexible, low cost energy supply.[2]

While hydropower has a long history of use in the United States and revolutionized industry, the same can be said of hydroelectric power during the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The importance of electric power can not be minimized. The end of the nineteenth century witnessed major changes in American social and economic life as a result of electrification. The commercial development of electric power effectively began in the 1870s and 1880s. Thomas Edison recognized the market for interior lighting and developed an incandescent lamp in 1879. Subsequent efforts developed the widespread commercial uses of electricity. In 1882 Edison built the first central electric generating station in New York City. This early effort was based upon the idea of direct current, which was most effective in highly populated areas. Despite the drawback, this represented a major step towards electrifying American homes and factories. At the same time a hydroelectric plant began operating in Wisconsin.[3]

Approximately 10 years later, the introduction of alternating current provided a means to transmit electricity over long distances using transformers. Alternating current was cost effective in providing electricity to areas of small, non-concentrated populations. One of the earliest efforts at long distance transmission was in Bodie, California. This gold mining camp had electricity as early as 1892. The Bodie line not only serves to tighten the relationship between mining and electricity, but also proves once again that precious metal mining interests often were willing to experiment with technological advances in hydroelectric power. In this case, it was the long distance, 13 miles, transmission of electricity that was innovative. Other Western mining states also enjoyed the benefits of electricity during the late nineteenth century.[4]

In the 1880s Denver and Leadville installed arc lighting systems which were later replaced by incandescent lamps. Larger and larger generating plants became the norm and Coloradans actively participated in the electrical revolution. Other innovations increased the demand for electricity. Of importance was the invention in the 1880s of the Sprague electric motor. This allowed electrification of many machines, from small to large. Colorado miners and mine owners were quick to recognize the potential offered by electricity. Mountain streams presented an available source of water and the high cost of transporting coal also encouraged electrification. Because of the importance of electrical power to Colorado, especially for the mining industry, sites which provide evidence of electrical generation during the key period ending in 1912 are important resources.

Hydroelectric power received a great boost in 1896 when the Niagara Falls, New York hydroelectric plant was constructed. This represented one of the first facilities designed to provide large scale power generation. Government efforts to encourage hydroelectric power occurred in the 1930s with the Tennessee Valley Authority. The concept of government action to provide cheap, accessible, hydropowered electricity to rural areas in the south was very popular and water projects were necessary to provide the necessary water supply. The Rural Electrification Authority, formed also in the 1930s, offered loans to cooperatives to finance electricity. These efforts resulted in much of the United States having access to electricity and its advantages by the end of World War II.

Coloradans were ideally suited to utilize electricity for industrial/mining needs because of the availability of mountain water power combined with the remote locations of much industry. Experiments in Colorado were important in the development and acceptance of electrical power.

Hydroelectric Context

In 1885 the Aspen hydroelectric system for lighting began operations. Aspen, located at an altitude of 7,980 feet, is also near the junction of several mountain streams. The altitude provided for a rapid fall and Aspen became a leader in hydroelectric power generation and usage in the 1890s.

Residents of Aspen recognized the importance of electricity to mining operations and also recognized the possibilities offered by hydroelectric power. Aspen was the first mining camp to have a mine install an electric mine hoist and to utilize electric power generated by water power. Hydroelectric plants in Aspen also are believed to be the first west of the Mississippi River.[5]

The Hunter Creek Station and later Castle Creek plant utilized the Roaring Fork and its tributaries to provide electricity for Aspen area mines and industries. In 1885 the Aspen Electric Company was organized by E. G. Collins, Charles N. Mackey and C. A. Judkins. The next year AEC built its own plant. Others recognized the importance of hydroelectric power and the Electric Light and Power Company, headed by D. R. C. Brown and J. H. Devereaux came into operation. The AEC and ELP merged in 1887 into the Roaring Fork Electric Light and Power Company. The new company operated two small hydroelectric plants. The need for additional power plants was recognized and in 1888 construction began on the Hunter Creek power plant. This plant operated for twenty two years on Hunter Creek, near the north bank of the Roaring Fork River. A head of 866" at the Hunter Creek plant was reported to be the highest in use at that time. However, the water supply was inadequate during winter freezes and in 1891 a steam electric generating plant was added. The Castle Creek Plant was built by the Roaring Fork Electric, Light and Power Company in 1892-93. It was the second major hydroelectric plant in Aspen. The Castle Creek plant was located on the west bank of Castle Creek, approximately two-thirds of a mile south of the confluence of the Roaring Fork River.

These two plants enabled Aspen to be the first city in Colorado to serve its residential and commercial districts with electricity. Along the same lines, mines in Aspen were among the first to employ electric hoists. This electric hoist, made by the Sprague Company and Roaring Fork Electric, Light and Power, was installed in the Veteran Tunnel of the Aspen Mining and Smelting Company in 1887, to haul empty ore cars up the 3% grade. The next year the Veteran Tunnel of the Aspen Mining and Smelting Company was operating all its hoists, drills and lighting system by electricity. Shortly thereafter the Regent and Aspen mine's hoists were also electrically operated.[6]

Hydroelectric Context

Part of the early success of hydroelectric power in Aspen can be attributed to the invention of the Doolittle Differential Governor in the mid-1880's. Clarence E. Doolittle was an engineer and manager for RFE. The Differential Governor maintained a constant speed of the water wheel under great or sudden variations of load on the power generator. It raised or lowered the deflecting nozzle to send the full stream against the buckets if full power was required, or part of the stream below the buckets if only part of the power was required. This device was eventually used in hydroelectric plants throughout the world.

While Aspen was leading technology in the hydroelectric field in the early 1890s, the future of hydroelectric power was closely tied with the success of mining. The end of the mining boom in 1893 created a drop in the demand for electric power as mines were closing. Between 1893 and the early 1900s, no new generating capacity was added to the Aspen plants. Mines began to reopen and become active again in 1910. The discovery of new ore in the Free Silver shaft and at the Smuggler Mine and the need to dewater these mines created a demand for electric pumps. Consequently, the Castle Creek Plant added two new generators in 1910. Within a few years the Smuggler Mining Company signed a ten year contract with RFE to replace their steam pumps with electric. This necessitated extensive changes and additions to the Castle Creek plant. Further additions were made in 1913 and 1917 because of increased demand. In 1918 the Smuggler stopped pumping and the resultant loss of business necessitated changes for RFE.[7]

While what occurred at Castle Creek is somewhat typical of the entire United States, there are a few exceptions. While hydroelectric technology and use expanded in the years after 1900, the major expansion of use came during the 1930s. During the Great Depression water policy and hydroelectric policy in the west underwent great change as the Bureau of Reclamation took over efforts to provide cheap and efficient water powered electricity. The Twin Lakes Water Diversion Tunnel near Independence Pass in 1932 marked a change in the operational development of Castle Creek and reflected growing nationwide interest in hydroelectricity. Efforts continued to expand the base of electricity from Castle Creek under the REA which expanded into Basalt in 1941 and then downvalley to Carbondale. The war years are unmarked by significant changes in electricity but the post-war boom in recreation expanded Aspen's need for electricity.

Castle Creek ceased operation in 1958 because it was unable to meet the electric needs of the Aspen area.

ENDNOTES

1. Joseph King, Engineering Context, Colorado Historical Society, 1984.

2. Ibid., and Emil W. Billeb, Mining Camp Days (Berkeley: Howell, North Books, 1968), pp. 163-166.

3. King, Engineering.

4. Billeb, Mining Camp, pp. 162-168.

5. Kathleen Marie Menke, "Let There Be Light," Mss on file, Aspen Historical Society; and Malcolm Rohrbough, Aspen: The History of a Silver Mining Town, 1879-1893.

6. Menke, "Light,"; and no author, "The Roaring Fork Electric Light and Power Company," in Electric Review, January 5, 1907.

7. Menke, "Light"; Virginia Haberman article in The Aspen Times, July, 1988; and no author, undated mss, "The History of the Aspen Property," on file, Aspen Historical Society.

NPS Form 10-900a
(Rev. 8/86)
NPS/WHS Word Processor Format
(Approved 03/88)

OMB No. 1024-0018

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
CONTINUATION SHEET

Hydroelectric Context

I. Name of Property Type: Hydroelectric plants

II. Description: Hydroelectric plants associated with this context and property type occur in Aspen as individual historic resources. For hydroelectric plants vernacular, industrial architecture will predominate. Use of pre-manufactured windows and doors may be prevalent during the construction period and these parts may remain extant in the buildings today. The individual structures exhibit small additions of wood siding and use of more modern materials, such as roofing, for maintenance or concrete for replacement of deteriorated foundations. Buildings will generally be 1 to 2.5 stories. Common materials include stone, concrete, wood, steel and brick. The generally used footprint is a rectangle with a front oriented facade most common. Additions frequently change the footprint to an "L". Roofs of either a single or intersecting gable predominate with shed frequently present on additions. Because of a need to be functional, hydroelectric plants will not necessarily be aesthetically innovative, but rather, designed for specific, industrial usage.

Construction dates for this property type range from 1885-1935. The other characteristic that distinguishes this property type is the spatial arrangement of the structure to the necessary water source. The condition of these resources may vary widely since the structures may have been modernized either externally or internally or both. Internal modification would result in a removal of the generating equipment, including cranes, Pelton wheels, generators, turbines, etc. that could detract from the character and feeling of the interior as it was historically. External modifications could include additions or maintenance activities with either sympathetic or non-sympathetic materials.

The two local hydroelectric plants (Hunter Creek and Castle Creek) influenced the hydroelectric industry by using state of the art equipment and by setting a means of style and physical makeup for small, hydroelectric plants located in mountainous areas. In addition, these local plants were privately owned, whereby after the 1930s, federal government leadership in the hydroelectric field brought about larger, yet standardized plans for hydroelectric plants and auxiliary buildings.

The importance of the mining industry in Aspen and the mountains in relation to the development of hydroelectric power cannot be minimized. Mines needed electricity for illumination, for operation of heavy and small equipment, and for water drainage. Subsequently, the fortunes of small, privately owned hydroelectric plants were closely tied with the mining boom/bust cycles and with the subsequent growth of the mining community.

In Aspen, the association of Castle Creek Hydroelectric Plant with local mining and community growth is relatively clear. The construction date of 1891 and peak usage dates prior to federal intervention in 1932 associates with mining activity. In addition, power demand fell during periods of mining decline, while power usage rose during periods of mining activity or re-activity.

Hydroelectric Context

The period of construction for hydroelectric plants continues after World War II and into the present. However, the small, private, locally oriented project has been replaced with federal or state activity.

III. Significance: The significance of hydroelectric power in the Aspen area is tied to the growth of the hydroelectric industry. The technology and processes of managing materials (in this case, water resources) to provide goods and services (electricity) relates closely to the construction and use of the Aspen hydroelectric power plant. In addition, Aspen followed and represented the vernacular hydroelectric industrial architecture that evolved during the nineteenth century. Properties in this category must either be associated with National Register Criteria A or C under the area of significance of industry, at the local level.

IV. Registration Requirements: Resources associated with the Hydroelectric context and this property type must meet the requirements outlined below to be considered as eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. The first requirement is that the property be historically associated with the context, that is, it must have been a hydroelectric plant. Beyond that, there must be either a significant economic contribution made by the resource to the evolution of local hydroelectric development or be representative of a once vastly larger population of members of the property type which has now declined. In either case, the significance must be clearly documentable. The second requirement is that the physical characteristic of a hydroelectric plant must be present, specifically that the structure should be situated near the water source, and the buildings should be constructed of stone, wood, brick or sympathetic material. Finally, the resources must be at least fifty years old. The only National Register exceptions applicable to this property type are cases in which the property is representative of a once larger property category that has now declined and the property can be tied to a factor significant in the growth of local hydroelectric power. The individual building must be in its original location or its location during the period of significance and the setting must be present to convey their historic feeling. Additions or modifications must not impair the quality of the historic fabric (Design, materials, and workmanship) of the individual buildings. For the interiors to be considered significant major, critical pieces of equipment such as the dynamos or turbines must be present. Removal of those and other pieces of equipment shall be viewed as a compromise to the fabric of the interior thus making it non-significant. Properties associated with this context were evaluated under Criterion A, B, and C. This set of registration requirements was not intended to nor did it evaluate the historic resources in light of their potential for historical archaeological investigation and as a result, it did not evaluate them under Criterion D.

Identification and Evaluation Methods

Determination of historic contexts for Aspen were based on four factors. The first was that the contexts and survey covered structures and resources deemed to be fifty years or older. Secondly, the resources were considered important within the overall framework of Aspen's mining and industrial/recreational history. Western Historical Studies developed the hydroelectric context from the results of a study undertaken by the Aspen Planning Department. The fourth element used to determine which contexts were included in this nomination was as a result of conversations between the Aspen Planning Department and the Colorado Historical Society. The final basis for contextual inclusion in this multiple property documentation came from the resources themselves.

Typology Determination: The survey work in Aspen led to the conclusion that function and association provided the most concise and reliable ways to define property types for Aspen. Association with a context, the determining factor for this typology, was based on two considerations: 1) use of existing literature combined with the survey field results and; 2) not to include property types less than fifty years old unless they could be clearly and easily documented to be of exceptional significance.

Integrity: The registration requirements vis-a-vis integrity were developed from a knowledge of the condition of resources extant with Aspen and the publications, such as Bulletin 15, of the National Park Service, National Register of Historic Places, and through discussions with the staff of the Colorado Historic Preservation Office.