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Executive summary/Abstract:
Theodore B. (Burfield) Wells had established his architectural practice in Grand Forks by 1923. He was joined in practice soon after World War II by Myron Denbrook. In approximately 1949, Denbrook was offered a full partnership. The firm completed extensive work throughout the Upper Red River Valley and in northeastern North Dakota. To a lesser extent, their work is found throughout North Dakota and in the northwestern corner of Minnesota. Wells retired from active practice in about 1964 and Denbrook associated briefly with Edward Adams at about that time. This context focuses on North Dakota work designed by the firm of Theodore B. Wells and later as Wells-Denbrook, from the firm’s inception until Wells, Denbrook, Adams, Wagner Architects merged to form EAPC (engineers and architects) in 1978.

Required components of the context study:
1. Context narrative
2. Research methodology for review of archival resources
3. Research methodology for evaluating extant buildings on-site
4. Criteria for evaluating a property’s merit for future inclusion in the National Register
5. Defined scope of work for future intensive level survey of extant Wells-Denbrook buildings in the state of North Dakota

Part 1:
1. Archival research and review of archival collections of work by Theodore B. Wells and Myron Denbrook and development of a context narrative for North Dakota work designed by these architects.
2. Biographical background on the firm’s principals,
3. Evolution of the architects’ work and design approaches,
4. Notable hallmark works with respect to defined design periods,
5. Identification of interiors and exteriors that reflect shifts in design philosophy or marketing strategy,
6. Classification of primary interior spaces and the role of ornament and materials in conveying the functions of those spaces,
7. The relationship of interior spaces to form and massing of exteriors,
8. Other definitive design elements including analysis of functions, materials, and structural systems; designs uniquely associated with individuals or firm influences; typical or unusual ornament or decorative treatments; location and siting of buildings; and landscape treatments that are characteristic or uniquely associated with the firm and/or period.

Part 2:
1. Defined scope of work for an intensive level survey of extant buildings in North Dakota designed by Wells and/or Denbrook.
2. For a building no longer extant or a design that was never constructed, the work will be evaluated within the body of the firm’s output, determining whether or not the subject is pivotal in the firm’s evolving practice or whether the designs are typical and undistinguished in relationship to other works.

The preparation of this nomination has been financed in part with Federal funds from the National Park Service, United States Department of Interior, and administered by the State Historical Society of North Dakota. However, the contents and opinions do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the United States Department of Interior or the State Historical Society of North Dakota, nor does the mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation by the Department of the Interior or the State Historical Society of North Dakota.
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INTRODUCTION:

Together—and separately—Theodore B. Wells and Myron E. Denbrook, Jr. supplied Grand Forks and the surrounding region with important civic, institutional, and private buildings that continue serving communities faithfully and graciously. These architects built a reputation of careful and conscientious design and kept the satisfaction of clients as their top priority. Denbrook regularly asserted that their goal was not to, “build a monument to ourselves, but to design functional, economical, yet beautiful buildings that represent the best buy for the money.” Interviews with clients who worked with Denbrook affirm that this objective was fundamental to the way the firm practiced architecture. The record of work by Wells and Wells-Denbrook forms a remarkably complete documentation of the firm’s evolution over fifty-five years, from 1923 to 1978.

Theodore Wells established his architectural practice in Grand Forks in 1923. Classical Revival and Gothic Revival styles were mainstays of Wells’ architectural practice that he continued emphasizing into the 1930s. For example, the Grand Forks South Junior High School (NRHP 1999), completed in 1932, displays a sensitively competent rendition of the Collegiate Gothic Revival style. In his second decade of practice, many of Wells’ Depression-era projects were funded through the WPA and showcased his mastery of geometric Art Deco detailing. The buildings on the Grand Forks Fairgrounds of 1936-1938 (NRHP 2009), the Walsh County Courthouse of 1940 (MPS 1985), and the Park River City Hall and Auditorium of 1938 (MPDF 2010) are all examples of the Art Deco/Art Moderne WPA projects that Wells completed during the Great Depression.

The Wells-Denbrook papers collection in the OGL Special Collections section of the UND Chester Fritz Library is a remarkably complete research resource for scholars interested in tracing the evolution of architectural practice in North Dakota in the twentieth century. Arranged with Myron Denbrook and the firm of EAPC by Sandy Slater, UND libraries’ head of special collections, the gift of fifty-five years of the firm’s architectural drawings sheds useful light on broader trends in regional architecture and culture. The Wells-Denbrook body of work reveals a negotiated “tipping point” in architectural design emphasis; whereby client preferences for tradition, continuity, and shared heritage were balanced with revolutionary technology and abandonment of familiar traditions in favor of scientific rationality.

In addition to Sandy Slater and Frank Slater’s timely vision and investment of effort in accepting and organizing the Wells Denbrook collection, specific thanks is expressed to the helpful staff at UND’s Chester Fritz Library. Curt Hanson, head of special collections and archivist for the Orin G. Libby Special Collections and helpful library reference staffers graciously assisted the author with access to the voluminous Wells-Denbrook papers collection.¹

¹ Projects documented in collections OGL #1487 of the Orin G. Libby (OGL) Special Collections of UND’s Chester Fritz Library yield insight into the transformation of a “typical” North Dakota architectural practice over six decades, spanning nearly the entire twentieth century.
PROJECTS AND RELATED CONTEXTS, AND RELATED NRHP prior listings:

National Park Service guidelines emphasize that historic context studies should avoid duplicating research and narrative significance developed for earlier contexts, districts, and National Register nominations. The architectural work of Theodore Wells and Wells-Denbrook relates to several previously developed historic contexts (MPDFs and MPS district listings) and previously listed National Register properties:

*Thematic contexts and Multiple Property covers:*

- Depression-era Work Relief Construction in North Dakota, 1931-1943 (MPDF, 2010)
- University of North Dakota campus historic district MPS (NRHP, 2010)
- Downtown Grand Forks commercial historic district MPS (NRHP, 2005)
- Grand Forks Near Southside residential historic district MPS (NRHP, 2004)
- NRHP Courthouses in North Dakota (TR, 1980; notably, Walsh County Courthouse)
- Grand Forks armory context study (on file with State Historic Preservation Office, 2010)

*NRHP individually-listed properties related to this context:*

- WPA construction features at the Grand Forks County Fairgrounds (NRHP, 2009)
- Grand Forks South Junior High School (NRHP, 1999)
- Clifford Annex commercial property (delisted, razed in 2001 to accommodate new structure)
- *Grand Forks Herald* building NRHP (extant portion of 1931 addition by Theodore Wells)
- Wells-Denbrook Architects Office Building (NRHP, 2014)

Examples of Wells’ designs in the American Colonial Revival and Picturesque Tudor Revival styles associated with the UND campus include Pi Beta Phi Sorority house (1928), Gamma Phi Beta Sorority house (1930), and former Delta Delta Delta Sorority (1925, later Alpha Omega Newman House). Examples of Wells’ Collegiate Gothic design are found throughout the University of North Dakota campus. The Education Building (1954), Hyslop Sports Center (Gymnasium/Fieldhouse, 1951), are all solid examples of Collegiate Gothic architecture reflecting Wells’ architectural influence, featuring brick exterior, large windows, delicate masonry window and door detailing, and, sometimes, a central tower. Wells-Denbrook’s continuing pragmatic adaptability in adapting Collegiate Gothic motifs is reflected in later UND projects as well; Squires Hall (Wells-Denbrook, 1963), the Chester Fritz Library (1961), and Burtness Theatre (1963).

Paralleling national tendencies in architectural design, even before 1947 Wells’ designs began moving toward International Style architecture with suppressed ornamentation. In 1947, when Myron Denbrook joined the practice directly from architecture school, his inclinations reinforced the firm’s connection to post-War contemporary styles. Changes in design styles and the priorities of a growing architectural practice can be observed by comparing projects completed before and after Denbrook joined the practice. The office building designed by Myron Denbrook for the firm’s studio (NRHP, 2014) remains an excellent example of Desert Modernism’s play between heavy materials and floating planes, open and airy interiors with warm detailing, and the engineered efficiency of new material technologies of the Post-War era that allowed for protruding roofs, walls of glass, and flexible, pragmatically planned interiors that emphasized...
functionality. But the partnership of Wells-Denbrook Architects did not entirely forsake familiar classical motifs that appealed to its university clients.

The firm’s body of work reflects adaptive responses to changing historical events like the Great Depression, World War II, and the Cold War growth period, during which time communities tried to serve a Baby Boom generation with schools and healthcare facilities. Increasingly through the 1950s and 1960s, buildings designed in the Modernist idiom, like the firm’s office and studio, excised design ornament in favor of purely pragmatic, technology-based design expression. UND’s Chester Fritz Auditorium (1972, Myron Denbrook) is a typical example of this strictly functional Modernist expression, which prevailed in Wells-Denbrook work from 1965 to 1978. Denbrook was committed to the design values of Modernism, especially efficiency, economy, and elimination of applied ornamentation, which coincided with the pragmatic inclinations of many building clients in the 1950s and 1960s.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

The online inventory of Wells-Denbrook papers in the Orin G. Libby (OGL) Special Collections of the University of North Dakota was the primary documentary resource investigated to gain a sense of the range and evolution of work by styles and functional type. A summary of projects in that comprehensive collection is included as an appendix, preceded by a graphic summary of documented project types arranged chronologically, from 1923 to 1978. From the OGL inventory, a smaller number of projects from each year were highlighted for follow-up examination. A manageable number of representative projects (generally two to six projects from each year) were selected for balance in terms of style, functional type, and geographic distribution, based on architectural scope and size, relative importance to the community or organization for which the projects were designed, and to try to get a representative cross section of stylistic tendencies as the work changed over time.

In general, the shortlist of examined projects avoided minor additions to buildings, remodeling projects, and garage storage buildings unless the project name suggested some special merit. The selection summary tended to favor projects that are believed to remain mostly intact, based on the author’s familiarity with communities where the projects exist, understanding that these select projects likely form a valid framework for further detailed inventory and on-site examination as potential candidates for individual NRHP listing under this context. A sampling of graphic images is included in the context narrative to support discussion of prevailing architectural styles and tendencies in the changing nature of the firm’s architectural practice.

Architectural record drawings from Wells-Denbrook’s practice are archived at the University of North Dakota Chester Fritz Library, enabling helpful insights into his design work and the nature of local architectural practice in Grand Forks. Wells’ architecturally appealing “loose” pencil sketches and conceptual design drawings are informative about his design approach and working methods growing out of his Beaux-Arts training. Many of Wells’ designs, applied widely to various building types, fall into stylistic categories of Tudor Revival and American Colonial Revival applied in his residential
applications. Wells was particularly adept in the Collegiate Gothic Revival architectural style, used for many of his school designs. Each of these styles draws on classical precedents. Typically Wells approached his designs from a more eclectic perspective, rather than a purely classical stylistic application. Wells’ later designs have a distinctive Art Deco character in the architectural expression the drawings evoke, marking the transition from Art Deco to International style to mid-century Modernism at the time Myron Denbrook joined the firm.
**Biographical Summaries:**

Theodore Burfield Wells (1889-1976) was born in Grand Forks, Dakota Territory on September 8, 1889 to Herbert N. (“Hugh”) and Anna B. Wells. His parents opened and operated the Northern Hotel in Grand Forks where Theodore grew up the eldest of four siblings. Wells took over operations of the hotel as an adult. He attended public school in Grand Forks and graduated from the University of North Dakota in 1912 with a degree in Civil Engineering. First-qualified as an engineer, but with an acquired passion for architecture, his biographical record clearly shows that his primary focus and interest throughout his career was in architectural design. He was a member of UND’s Sigma Chi fraternity chapter and it is plausible to infer that he was well-positioned to make a comfortable transition from being an engaged member of the academic community to designing academic buildings, fraternities, and sorority houses at UND.

Wells nurtured his affinity for architectural practice as an intern draftsman working for distinguished regional architects in various North Dakota and Minnesota firms from 1913 to 1917. Wells was inducted into the military in 1917. In the course of his military service Wells took advantage of the experience of foreign travel to observe the important works of European architecture. At the end of the war, Wells augmented his preparation as an architect by studying Beaux Arts design in the prestigious and ground-breaking *Atelier Jaussely* (architectural studio) at the influential École in Paris. Historians sometimes refer to the Beaux-Arts educational precedent that was adapted to schools of architecture in the U.S. from 1880 to 1950. Wells returned to North Dakota

---

in 1920, opened his private architectural practice in Grand Forks in 1923, and became involved as a prominent member of the Grand Forks community and a respected veteran engineer.

As one of the state’s first native-born architects, Theodore Wells’ interest and experience in academic architectural design styles is remarkable. Spending his early years in the territorial frontier railroad town of Grand Forks, Wells would have observed with interest the growth of downtown commercial buildings like the Northern Hotel operated by his parents; buildings mostly in the Romanesque architectural style. Contemporary with Wells’ formative years, early architects practicing in Grand Forks included John W. Ross (who learned architecture by applied apprenticeship in LaCrosse, WI) and Joseph Bell DeRemer who studied architecture at Columbia under Professor William Ware. From 1870 to 1917 the first architecture curricula in the US were established at MIT, Cornell, University of Pennsylvania, Harvard, Syracuse, and University of Michigan. Courses in Mechanic Arts (essentially a drafting course for architects and landscape architects at land-grant colleges) were first offered at the University on Minnesota in 1913 and at North Dakota Agricultural College (NDAC) in 1914. While there may have been fine arts courses on the UND campus, it is unlikely that Wells would have studied building design in much depth during his engineering studies at the University of North Dakota (1908-1912), focusing instead on structural design, architectural engineering, and materials science. Thus, his initial grounding would have been in pragmatic building science.

Though Wells’ university education was in civil engineering, he clearly developed an interest in a more humanities-oriented, fine arts aspect of architectural design. Despite somewhat limited academic opportunities to learn about architectural styles and emergent design thinking, Wells aspired to understand the creative, expressive side of architecture, learning about architecture through travel and by obtaining architectural internships with well established architectural practices in the region; notably Robert Benjamin Stacy-Judd in Minot (in 1914-1917). First-qualified as an engineer, Wells’ biographical record clearly shows that the primary focus and interest throughout his career was in architectural applications of design, having experience as an apprentice draftsman with architectural firms in Edmonton, Alberta; Alaska, North Dakota, and Minnesota. In 1917, he registered for the draft in World War I while working in Minot. Wells served with various engineering divisions of the U.S. Army during World War I (serving in France) and was discharged as a Master Engineer, Senior Grade with the 307th Engineering Company.

Immediately after concluding his military service with the engineering corps in France in 1918, Wells seized the opportunity to study at one of the most prestigious (and earliest) schools of

---

3 At land grant universities, early mechanic arts and architectural drafting programs were often aligned with schools of mining.
4 There is scant information recorded about the Civil Engineering program in building design at UND under which Wells initially studied, except for the brief mention of his acquaintance Charles Ellis’s professorship in “architectural engineering” from 1920 to 1930. Ellis, who also served as superintendent of buildings at UND, left Grand Forks for federal service in the PWA during the depression years, and eventually practiced architecture in Harlingen, TX.
architecture in the world, the *Atelier Jaussely* studio of the École des Beaux-Arts, Paris. Wells was one of very few architects in the region who actually studied under the original École des Beaux-Arts in Paris. Wells’ limited early use of classical motifs would have been influenced by the classical Beaux-Arts training he received while studying at the École in Paris. His familiarity with emerging architectural styles and trends from 1917 to 1947 reflects the growing influence of American Colonial period revivals, Collegiate Gothic Revival, and Art Deco architecture in popular culture nationally.

Wells’ professional growth and development as an architect reflects increasing professionalization of architecture in North Dakota in the first half of the twentieth century. Wells personally designed more than 250 architectural projects, with many buildings resulting from military commissions. The body of Wells’ more distinguished work includes many residences, fraternity and sorority houses, movie theaters, schools and university buildings, and other major public buildings. Federally funded work relief projects (mostly WPA and PWA) provided Wells with architectural opportunities during the lean Depression years. Wells’ master plan and design for the Grand Forks Fairground was typical of his mix of engineering and classically derived ornamentation. Others still, like the addition to the *Grand Forks Herald* building built in 1931, provided Wells with meaningful opportunities for work besides federal projects.

Through his education and family business interests, Wells was invested in the City of Grand Forks. Wells’ long association with Grand Forks included two residential properties (a duplex at 29/31 Conklin Avenue and a delightful cottage-style home he built for his family at 1006 Chestnut Street).5 The project record of Depression-era work by Wells reflects a remarkable level of productivity, considering that some

---

5 Theodore Wells married Louise Hanna Wells in Mankato in 1923. The couple lived at 1006 Chestnut St., Grand Forks and raised three daughters; Gertude Ann (Mrs. John Anderson), Ruth Marilyn (Mrs. William Van Lanen), and Louise (Mrs. Douglas Syvertson).
of his prime years establishing an architectural practice were during the strained economy of the Great Depression. Operating an architectural practice at 419 First National Bank Building, from 1929-1934, Wells collaborated briefly with Charles L. (Lyman) Ellis, Sr., whose name also appears on a few projects from those years, but the business relationship seems to have been brief and informal. Wells’ generosity and graciousness in bringing a new generation of architects into his chosen profession was praised by his eventual business partner, Myron Denbrook, who joined the practice in 1948. Wells retired to Riverside (Sun City), California and died there (February 19, 1976) after he and his wife were struck by an automobile while crossing the street after a social engagement. Wells is buried in the newer expansion section toward the east side of Grand Forks’ Memorial Park (cemetery).

Myron E. Denbrook, Jr. (1922-2012) was born June 22, 1922, in Akron, Ohio, to Myron and Ida Denbrook. Denbrook earned a broadly liberal arts based undergraduate degree at the Ohio State University. He was drawn to the Bauhaus industrial design emphasis of the two-year professional program in architecture at the University of Washington. He married Eve May Carter in 1945 in Columbus, OH soon after completing his architectural studies at the University of Washington. Even before college graduation, Denbrook worked as a drafting intern for various architectural firms in Washington, where he was also employed as a tool designer for Boeing Aircraft in Seattle. His professional degree in architecture reflected a strong bias toward architectural engineering and emerging international trends of architectural Modernism.
Myron Denbrook’s professional affiliation with Wells resulted from one of the numerous letters that Denbrook sent to architecture firms across the nation soon after his graduation. Denbrook was Wells’ junior by 33 years, but in later years Denbrook reminisced about how warmly and graciously he was accepted into professional practice by the elder, to whom he referred affectionately as “Teddy” Wells. Denbrook worked as an intern and staff architect with Wells from 1947 to 1949, at which time the two men formalized a business partnership that continued even after Wells’ retirement from active architectural practice in about 1964. Upon Wells’ retirement, Denbrook involved several other engineering oriented architects in his practice under the firm name Wells, Denbrook, Adams, Wagner Architects, PC. After the firm merged and incorporated as EAPC in 1978, Myron continued working into his 80s, mainly involved with specifications-writing and cost estimating. He was especially proud of his architectural work on the University of North Dakota campus, particularly the Gymnasium and Field House (1947), Chester Fritz Library and additions (1957-1961), and later in his career, the Chester Fritz Auditorium (1968).

We can reasonably infer from Wells’ architectural drawings that much of the energy and opportunity had begun to disappear from his architectural practice by the Second World War. Denbrook’s interest and enthusiasm for joining the firm may have been a matter of exquisite timing, just when Wells was hoping to attract new creative energy and new marketing skills to revitalize the practice. Or the elder may simply have been inclined to do a good deed by extending an opportunity to a newly emerging architect with obvious energy. Denbrook’s letter of interest no longer exists, but he later recounted that it may have been the only prompt and timely reply he received, so clearly Wells recognized potential appropriate to the Grand Forks setting.

Denbrook phone interview with the author, in 2010. As a “senior statesman,” Myron Denbrook was delighted to engage younger architects in highly detailed technical discussions about building technology, architectural practice management, and particularly writing of technical specifications. The author values his 15-year friendship with Mr. Denbrook, and fondly recalls several lengthy conversations with Myron in 1986 and 1987 when the two served together as chapter representatives for the Red River Valley Construction Specifications Institute. One particularly arcane task on which they collaborated was development of standard language for construction insurance requirements on architectural projects. At a conference reception held in the limestone caves under Kansas City, MO; Myron shared his clean-living advice that by scheduling a 45-minute nap each afternoon at 1:00 pm right after lunch, a committed architect should be able to continue working productively and energetically well into his 80s.

Throughout this context study report, except where otherwise noted the author has adopted the dating convention of referring to projects by the year in which the work was catalogued in the firm’s project files. In most instances, this date is a year or even two years earlier than the date the building was completed and occupied.
Myron Denbrook, in about 1978
about the time the Wells-Denbrook firm merged to form EAPC

As a junior partner in Wells’ firm, Myron Denbrook was ambitious, hardworking, enthusiastic, and particularly technically-oriented. Material science, technical detailing, and specification writing were among his specialties. He was a lifelong member and active proponent of the Construction Specifications Institute (CSI) as a vehicle for improving construction communications.\(^{13}\) In redirecting the Wells-Denbrook firm’s design emphasis, Myron Denbrook’s anticipated that the emergent direction of architecture after World War II would reflect pure Modernism, expressing technology, rationality, and material science as the cultural values in demand. Denbrook joined the Wells firm full of energy, apparently unimpaired by self-doubt, and thoroughly committed to progress in exploring new ways to serve client needs and expectations with efficient, machine-like buildings and architectural methods. In the 1950s Myron Denbrook aggressively expanded the firm’s marketing reach to smaller towns in northeastern North Dakota and northwestern Minnesota, substantially increasing the amount of architectural work in small communities where there was post-war growth need for schools, medical facilities, and other institutional infrastructure to serve the Baby Boomer generation.

By all accounts, Mr. Denbrook was well-liked by clients who appreciated his dutiful commitment to the pragmatic aspects of their projects. Clients who worked closely with Myron Denbrook remember his patiently dutiful personal manner and concern for satisfying clients’ expectations above all else. For example, an interview with longtime (1957-1998) UND facilities management director LeRoy Sondrol was especially generous, gracious, and appreciative in acknowledging Denbrook’s

\(^{13}\) At the time Myron Denbrook was educated, architects emanating from programs like University of Washington were influenced by the Bauhaus model school of design, emphasizing simplified purity of form and designs with no more ornamentation or detail than was absolutely necessary to function. Modernists are often characterized as strident. Some professional colleagues who worked contemporarily with him have characterized his confidence about the absolute rightness of each of his decisions.
meticulous care and primary attention to understanding the client’s expectations. He was respected by professional peers for his conscientious commitment to technical details, project budgets, and construction practices. Denbrook is remembered by successive generations of architects as a fastidious, dutiful, spunky, and a fairly obsessive proponent of pragmatic, prosaically functional Modernist design. At the time the National Register nomination for the Wells-Denbrook Office was presented at a public meeting, two professional colleagues attended and spoke favorably of Myron’s competencies. It was important to them that Mr. Denbrook be well-remembered for his longstanding commitment to architecture in the Grand Forks region. As an expression of his commitment to the story of a profession he loved, Denbrook made special effort to assure that the architectural records from his firm should be preserved. Beginning in 2004, Denbrook and the management staff at EAPC worked with UND Special Collections director Sandy Slater to assure that the collection of the firm’s papers was added in its entirety to the OGL archives at UND’s Chester Fritz Library. That collection provides a remarkably comprehensive and useful resource for future scholars studying evolution of the architectural profession in North Dakota during the twentieth century. Myron Denbrook died April 10, 2012, at a retirement center in Chisholm, MN, and is buried at Gallipolis, OH near his birthplace.

Theodore Wells and Myron Denbrook were very different in their personalities, demeanor, and especially in their approach to architectural design. Wells started as an engineer and spent most of his working life looking for ways to humanize his architectural designs. He experimented and explored using loose, pencil graphic design techniques learned from his education at the Paris École des Beaux-Arts. He was flexible, even during difficult practice circumstances of the Great Depression, and could comfortably work in a wide variety of architectural styles, using pencil sketch drawings as a mean of exploration and architectural discovery. Myron Denbrook was the consummate Modernist; essentially an architectural engineer who believed in technology and rational problem-solving as the most constructive design modes that would satisfy his clients’ aspirations for economical, efficient, functional buildings in a post-war growth era. One of the more fascinating and reassuring aspects of the partnership between Wells and Denbrook is how affable and sustainable their contrasting approaches became, and the comfort level with which they grew to collaborate in a twentieth century era of dramatically changing architectural priorities.

---

15 Though some professional associates have characterized his personal style as “bombastic,” the author is personally acquainted with Myron Denbrook’s likable, affable demeanor and his strident commitment to construction specifications essential to construction communication. While affirming their appreciation for his patience and kindly, understanding personal manner, Denbrook’s former employees acknowledge that Myron could seem dogmatic and inflexibly committed to a single “right” way of always doing things in the same, proven method over a period of twenty-five years, with very little unnecessary experimentation or deviation. These traits seem well-suited to a Modernist approach.
16 The 1972 photo of the two of them working together over a drawing is revealing in the way it portrays Wells in a tweedy sport coat resting casually on one elbow, while Denbrook is eagerly at his side with a starched white shirt open at the collar and sleeves rolled up, ready for action, looking over a profoundly geometric floor plan drawing.
Professional Associations and Civic Contributions:

Typical of most successful twentieth century business people, both Wells and Denbrook were actively engaged in civic, professional, and fraternal organizations. Wells served on the North Dakota State Board of Architecture (1931-37). Patriotic and community spirited, as a former military engineer himself, Wells had a strong reputation and trusted relationship with Major General Heber L. Edwards (1895-1962), North Dakota National Guard Adjutant from 1937 to 1962. This working relationship translated to Wells-Denbrook’s design work for auditoriums and armories in several North Dakota communities.

Wells became a member of the Masonic Lodge in 1914 and was active in that organization throughout his life. Following the cue of his mentor, Denbrook was a member of the Scottish Rite Masons, Lions International (50-year member), an active member of his church congregation, and participated in other civic membership organizations. Denbrook’s long and dedicated service to the Construction Specifications Institute (both nationally and at the local chapter level) merits special mention of his being a vigorous advocate for improved technical documents and construction industry communications. The distinguished work of Wells and Denbrook on the University of North Dakota campus was the basis for a “Lifetime Achievement Award” nomination from the North Dakota chapter of American Institute of Architects in 2003.\(^{17}\)

\(^{17}\) Unpublished, confidential paperwork on file with the Chapter Awards Committee of the North Dakota Chapter of American Institute of Architects. Shared by Fawn Behrens-Smith of the UND Physical Plant staff, in support of the nomination.
Throughout history, national events and commemorations have renewed public interest in cultural heritage and revival architectural styles as trends spread across the country and defined the architectural character of emerging American cities. Drawing from traditional precedents and eclectic combinations of classical architecture, national expositions influenced popular tastes for architecture in ways that are typically perceived as architectural stylistic movements. The City Beautiful Movement followed the 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago, reviving interest in rediscovered Greek and Roman classical architecture. In the context of changing architectural styles in America, early stylistic influences on Wells briefly employed Neoclassical and Beaux Arts architectural motifs. Popular from about 1895 to 1950, Neoclassical architecture is often described as an eclectic style that fused traditional precedents together, lending to its use on various types of mostly-public buildings. The more elaborate and more stiffly formal Beaux Arts style of architecture was most popular from about 1895 to 1930.

Spurred by the Philadelphia Centennial Expo of 1876, the Colonial Revival movement reached its peak in popular taste during the sesquicentennial celebration of the American Revolution in 1926. The Colonial Revival architectural style remained popular throughout the country until after World War II, often seen as an affirmation of the Jeffersonian values of grassroots democracy in its patriotic architectural motifs. Promulgated by popular publications like the White Pine monographs, Colonial Revival details drew on early classical elements and included the use of symmetry, columns and pilasters for porch supports, pediments, and cornices decorated with dentils or modillions. The American Colonial Revival architectural style was especially popular for residential architecture and ranged from elaborate high style adaptations to modest, small-scale homes. In the eclectic mix of house styles, there are a number of modest Colonial Revival houses in the Riverside Park neighborhood dating from the 1930s and 1940s. As a later-day reaction to the severity of machine-age Modernism, American Colonial Revival architecture experienced a popular resurgence in the 1950s. Thus, examples abound in South Grand Forks neighborhoods like Lincoln Park, where tasteful and restrained Colonial Revival motifs have been applied to suburban ranch house forms.

Attracting cultural tourism from aspiring communities throughout the U.S., Daniel Hudson Burnham’s design for the Great White City at the Columbian Exposition drew its inspiration from Classical Revival and Greek Revival motifs and charted the direction of architectural tastes for more than 30-years.

The White Pine monographs and related “Pencil Points” series were bi-monthly architectural trade publications distributed by the White Pine Bureau (1915-1940), marketing and promoting architectural use of standard details and ornamentation. Many of these detail oriented publications, based on carefully measured and reproduced trim details from Colonial Williamsburg, Virginia, continue being circulated in reprint editions.
Tudor Revival architecture emulated rural-residential motifs of medieval Elizabethan England, largely as an arts and crafts reaction to the modern machine-age. Tudor Revival architectural designs are casual, informal, and reposeful. Popular motifs include simulated thatch roofs, elaborately handcrafted brickwork, stone trim, and prominent chimneys. Tudor Revival architecture is most commonly associated with residentially scaled buildings. However, in Grand Forks there are also some excellent larger-scaled, commercial buildings informed by these medieval motifs. Tudor Revival details were popular on fraternity and sorority houses, like those at the University of North Dakota. Picturesque-rustic details are also associated with many federal work-relief construction projects, as with the Grand Forks County Fairgrounds. Reacting against machine-age technology, picturesque twentieth century revival movements (Arts and Crafts/Craftsman details, Tudor Revival and WPA Rustic) were promoted in popular journals and appealed to popular tastes. In some respects the Elizabethan Tudor Revival can be considered a precedent for the Victorian Collegiate Gothic.

**Collegiate Gothic details and late-Gothic Revival** (1920 to 1950);

With its design roots in Cambridge and Oxford, and following directly from stylistic precedents set at Bryn Mawr and Princeton, the Collegiate Gothic architectural style is exemplified by cream colored limestone surrounds at door and window openings, grouped multi-pane windows, and a stylized (often crenellated) parapet edge at the roofline. There is an interesting, coincidental association between Princeton University’s extensive use of Collegiate Gothic architecture, and American President Woodrow Wilson, who personally regarded Gothic Revival architecture as well-suited to the expression of learning. In December 1902, six months after being elected as President of Princeton, Woodrow Wilson asserted in the *Princeton Alumni Weekly* that “Gothic architecture has added a

---

thousand years to the history of the university, and has pointed every man’s imagination to the earliest traditions of learning in the English-speaking race.” 21

Wilson enthusiastically avowed that in constructing Collegiate Gothic buildings, Princeton had "declared and acknowledged [its] derivation and lineage." As Princeton’s supervising architect in the 1910s and 1920s, Ralph Adams Cram, the Yale-trained architect characterized by architectural historians as the "high priest" of Collegiate Gothic, was even more explicit. "By building [in the Collegiate Gothic style]," he wrote, "Princeton was committed to the retention for all time of that collegiate style of architecture which alone is absolutely expressive of the civilization we hold in common with England and the ideals of liberal education now firmly fixed at Princeton." At a local level, the Collegiate Gothic university and public school buildings in Grand Forks aspire to claim a place in that Anglo-American lineage of learning. Street names around UND 22, as well as the unified architecture of its campus buildings, affirm the same Progressive values in education that were carried forward in the design of public schools by Theodore Wells (and other capable North Dakota architects).

The Collegiate Gothic architectural style had an especially long period of influence, particularly at the University of North Dakota, but also in public schools and other educational architecture in communities of all sizes in eastern North Dakota. This is attributable to several factors and influential proponents. Influencing local school districts, national education experts like architect William Ittner of St. Louis (architectural design consultant to the state Board of Education on leading edge thinking about functional design of schools. The architectural expression merited by these public buildings emphasized “the lamp” of universal learning as one of the most important cultural values for civic investment in a democratic nation. At UND, a succession of university administrators during the main campus growth periods consistently supported application of Collegiate Gothic stylistic motifs.

---

21 For a contrasting viewpoint, see Robinson Meyer in The Atlantic, (2013). “American colleges and universities look medieval, in part, because of envy, industrialism, and racism.”

22 Grand Forks streets intersecting University Avenue are conspicuously named for prestigious, mainly Ivy League universities modeled after the distinguished British precedent; Princeton, Oxford, Harvard, Cambridge, Hamline, Cornell, Columbia.
Summary overview of International Style and twentieth century late-Modernism movements.

The Wells-Denbrook context study affords a particular opportunity to consider the emergent design values of twentieth century architectural late-Modernism, a stylistic movement that has only recently begun to receive consideration as an expression of historical values and cultural priorities. Architects of all eras aspire to serve the preferences and tastes of their clients by making a good-faith effort to understand the client’s wishes and priorities (which are usually the products of broader cultural movements that shape public tastes). Architects collaborate with clients to give the building users what they want (or think they want) as an expression of agreed-upon cultural values at a particular time. Following from World War II and continuing through the Cold War period to the present day, pervasive twentieth century Late-Modernism has only recently begun to be appreciated as the architectural expression of unadorned, technology-based, formulaic pragmatism in design. The Late Modernist movement of architecture marked a shift away from Classical motifs to expressed functionalism. In the latter half of the twentieth century, new construction techniques, availability of new materials, and changes in architectural values and theories provided the framework for architects to embrace this new way of thinking.

“Modernism” is a broad umbrella term for many other subsets of design. The wartime International Style anticipated Late-Modernist designs that favored technologically-derived materials, precisely gridded plans and elevations, and sleek glass boxes. Consciously expressed interior and exterior planning grids showcased modularity as an irrefutably pragmatic basis for design. The implied spatial grid pattern is emulated on the exterior by means of a sub-grid of window mullions and “reveals” (recessed articulated dividers) that separate materials into planar surfaces. This implicit grid is a character-defining detail of modern design. Designers relied heavily on gridded patterns to drive interior arrangements, exterior composition, and even the furniture layout. Late Modernist architecture celebrated honest, expressive use of materials and structure, cleanly minimalist open planning, rationally pragmatic functionalism, and affordable design for all social groups. Scientifically based and rational, architectural Modernism emphasized efficiency and economy of means as substitutes for humanistic values like poetic expression, human-scaled embellishments, visual balance and proportion. Eliminating ornament and visual judgment in favor of simplified, (ruthless) engineered efficiency reflects an oppressive cultural precedent and faith in functional technology that continues to have pervasive influence on architectural training and popular tastes to the present day.

In post-war Europe, Modernist architectural thinking was vigorously advocated as a necessary, egalitarian response to the need to plan and rebuild cities, using scientifically advanced materials like steel, glass, and concrete. Proponents like Corbusier and Mies van der Rohe noted the positive force technology played in people’s lives. They and other Modernist architects believed that for a home to

---

perform efficiently, it should have the purity of form of a well-designed machine. From 1940 to 1970, internationally recognized architects created a few heroic examples of the best of architectural Modernism, but regionally and locally most attempts at avant-garde Modernist architecture have proven disappointing and short-lived. The national context of post WWII growth in the U.S. is reflected regionally in schools for the post war baby boom, and in rationally planned growth in institutions and business infrastructure. Modernist architectural design thinking found its way into mid-sized communities throughout the central U.S. following World War II, virtually displacing the Classical Revival motifs embodying the Beaux Arts training for public commissions.

The groundwork for architectural Modernism was laid during the interwar period in Europe, and continued apace with post WWII rebuilding. In North Dakota, architects followed developments through journals and writings by Corbu, Gropius, and Mies van der Rohe. Soon after WWII, U.S. schools of architecture began to move away from Beaux-Arts style education toward the scientifically rational Bauhaus model. Situated in the airline production center of Seattle and the northwest, University of Washington was an “early adopter” of Bauhaus education, which emphasized Modernist design efficiency and technology. In Grand Forks and smaller North Dakota communities, the post war period of the 1950s and 1960s was a significant period of growth in buildings and infrastructure. Thanks to Myron Denbrook’s energy, enthusiasm, and background training as an architect, Wells-Denbrook was well-positioned to play a substantial part in the growth of schools, churches, hospitals, and other public buildings as well as continuing to assist property owners with residential design. Since the end of World War II, in the post-war consumer age Americans continue struggling to develop a comfort level with valuing engineering. Many building clients continue to appreciate NOT being asked to engage aesthetic issues or aspects of expression in building design, defaulting to the adage, “Beauty is in the eye of the beholder.” How do we value and appreciate buildings that are designed to strictly accommodate convenience and efficiently for productive purposes? How do building users deal with the cultural inclination to use machine goods (or electronic equipment) by consuming them, life-cycle costing, and then disposing or replacing buildings before there is much to change or repair?

In public perception, Modernist architects have often been characterized as a bit arrogant and self-assured in hoping to change the world with their ambitious design principles. But Modernist design must be fairly regarded as a realistic reflection of emergent cultural values and post-war priorities of clients, more so than an architectural style. In the 1950s, the public grew to associate the Modernist

---

25 In the 1950s and 1960s there was diminishment nationally in the extent to which architects designed private residences, but the Wells-Denbrook collections show several instances where clients approached them with “model homes” published in popular journals, and then worked with Myron Denbrook to tailor those designs to the family’s personal needs and tastes.

26 The stereotypical impression of a Modern “hero architect” seems based on the persona assigned by Ayn Rand to her character Howard Roarke in The Fountainhead, derived from the often strident writings of Frank Lloyd Wright: “So here I stand before you . . . exalting the simple laws of common sense – or of super-sense if you prefer – determining form by way of the nature of materials.” [Frank Lloyd Wright, An Organic Architecture, 1939]; “and . . . the use of new materials like glass and steel to achieve more spatial architecture, and the development of a building’s architectural ‘character’ which was his answer to the notion of style.” [Wright’s essay “New Architectural Principles” quoted from Kimberly Elman.]

aesthetic with prosperity and progress. Architecture promised the potential to elevate living conditions and social infrastructure of emergent, techno-centric society by placing trust in scientific rationality as the only defensible cultural priority. Academic critiques of Modernist architecture inevitably sound harsh, but Modernist architects were never apologetic for having carefully met their client’s expectations for purposeful, cost effective, functional design.28

Modernist masterworks can be categorized in terms of academic *avant-garde* Modernist design (evident in city planning and larger commercial buildings), distinct from (Organic) Desert Modernism that is more often associated with residential-scaled design. As a variant on Late Modernism, Desert Modernism was a distinct architectural style that was popularized in southwest California in the 1950s and 1960s.29 The emergence of this west-coast style in the practice of Wells-Denbrook was certainly due to the influence of young Myron Denbrook who studied at the University of Washington at just the time Modernism was becoming pervasive throughout North America. In the Grand Forks region, much of Denbrook’s residential design in the 1950s and 1960s was guided by his unaltering conviction in the design principles of Desert Modernism. In non-urban regional settings like North Dakota, Modernist architecture was rational, literal, explicit, and often emphasized open space planning. Expressively honest and unadorned use of materials, balance of vertical and horizontal elements, exposed structure and broad overhanging roof planes are design tendencies that characterize Denbrook’s residential work as a particularly restrained version of Organic Modernism, characterized as California Modern or Desert Modern based on mostly-residential precedents in the Palm Springs/Palm Desert area of California.

Architects of the Desert Modernism style took a more contextual approach and responded to the sunny skies and warm climate typical of southern California. Desert Modern designs (by architect-developers John Lautner, E. Stewart Williams, Donald Wexler, A. Quincy Jones, Joseph Eichler, and brothers George and Robert Alexander in the Palm Springs/Palm Desert area) were vigorously promoted in professional journals and advertising literature.30 In all regions of the country, published journals permeated schools of architecture and architectural offices, influencing design thinking among emerging architects during the post-war growth era. Dramatic rooflines, functional outdoor spaces, expanses of glazing, flexible interior plans, and expressive use of a simplified palette of materials were common. Local stone (and occasionally brick), paired with prefabricated engineered wood elements, connected holistic residential-scaled designs with the efficient, machined buildings popular in other contemporary designs of the day.31

---

28 Admittedly, from the smug perspective of 65-years’ distance we are tempted to be critical of 1950s America, but culturally that is “the way we were.” Modernist architects were rightfully unapologetic in dutifully delivering on clients’ articulated wishes and aspirations. Directing editorial criticism to the obvious shortcomings of Modernist buildings compares to the old adage of “hating the sin but loving the sinner.”

29 Alan Weintraub, 2006.


31 Slaton, Deborah and Rebecca A. Shiffer. 1995. *Preserving the Recent Past.*
In the upper Midwest/northern Great Plains region, some of the more skillful architects associated with leading-edge exploration of Modernist design principles include the international architect Marcel Breuer, regionally recognized architects like Ralph Rapson (Minneapolis), Ellerbe Associates (Minneapolis) and Ed Sovik (Northfield, MN), and local practitioners like Seifert-Staszko (Fargo), Lightowler-Johnson (Fargo), Foss-Engelstad-Foss (Moorhead, MN), and Bruner-Hoeffel-Bohrer (Minot). There were also a few individual local practitioners known for their commitment to Modernist design principles who worked in local architectural offices, notably Harold Jenkinson, Harlan Ormbreck, Ralph Rullifson, Leo Grobe, and Myron Denbrook. Much of the architectural legacy of Modernism is regarded as obsolete or has been demolished less than fifty years after it was constructed. Objectively, it is difficult to identify more than about forty or fifty buildings still standing in North Dakota that can be shown to meaningfully reflect and closely follow the design principles of twentieth century Modernism with distinction. On the darker side, Modernism is often regarded as callously inhuman, mass-produced design, emphasizing technology and rationality over humanism. Beyond architectural tastes, those were cultural values that prevailed during the 1950s. By the end of the twentieth century, most architects had discovered that many of the emerging material technologies could not be trusted to perform reliably in the long run, and today, the most austere, minimalist Modernist buildings are generally difficult for people to enjoy or appreciate.

Late Modernist architecture can be fairly criticized as,

... offering pleasure and (rational) meaning to some while leaving others aesthetically unimpressed. Politically, is modernism authoritarian and radical, a movement to remake human behavior (and cultural values) according to a new standard set by its proponents, or is it pluralistic and liberal, a movement that advances individuality, tolerance and choice? Both strands existed in 20th-century modernism, but radicalism ruled. For all its aesthetic innovation and progressive rhetoric, historic modernism was an intolerant design ideology. Its absolutists preached absolutist principles like “truth in materials,” rejecting pleasure as an autonomous value. They believed in a hierarchy of taste, ignoring differences among individuals. Modern architecture got a bad reputation because radical modernists told the public they had to accept buildings they hated and give up buildings they loved. 32

Retrospectively, it is difficult to characterize mainstream Modernism as an architectural movement without making it seem rather simplistic and short-sighted.33 As a non-negotiable, revolutionary expression of post-War culture, Late Modernist architecture rejected earlier cultural tastes and styles, particularly affirming a shift away from overtly ornamented designs like the Collegiate Gothic that was so familiar and comfortable for architects like Theodore Wells, and clients like the University of North Dakota. Beginning with the spare, geometric ornament of later Art Deco and Art Moderne precedents,

32 Virginia Postrel in the critical design journal Dwell (January/February 2004):100-2. “Truth in materials” and rejecting pleasure as an autonomous value embodied Myron Denbrook’s pragmatic, uber-rational engineering approach to building design. In no way does that imply that he was less than competent as an architect, rather, that his ear was closely tuned to the priorities and cultural preferences of clients in the 1950s and 1960s.

33 Retrospective critiques of avant-garde late-Modernism abound. See, for example; Clendenin and Cooperman, 2009; Hession and Wright, 1999; and Crouch, 1999. Weighing the evidence of architectural design drawings and boxy buildings constructed according to Modernist dogma, it is difficult to celebrate functional efficiency and absolute first cost economy as the highest cultural aspirations or sufficient basis for design of the built environment.
the 1940s International Style presaged a new revolutionary new order for design. Following from those precedents, 1950s functional Modernism favored a ruthless pragmatism, scientific technology, highly regularized gridded organizing patterns, while emphasizing unadorned structural expression, thinner “more efficient” building envelopes (the building skin), using new and often untried material technologies well-suited to high volume, production line buildings that tend to leave people uninspired.  

Many architectural historians argue that American culture is still under the influence of Late Modernist design thinking at the beginning of the twenty-first century.

In seeking priorities for appreciation and preservation of architectural heritage, preservationists continue to struggle with the discomfiture Americans feel toward Late Modernist buildings that seem dated, flatly uninspired, rhetorically formulaic, and undistinguished in terms of the artfulness with which they carry out their now-less-revolutionary manifesto of “design for the masses” or Corbu’s professed “machine for living.”

Frankly, sixty years after the great promise of 1950s technology, many people now express boredom and disillusionment at the suggestion of being reduced to cogs in Late Modernist machines for living. Because Modernist buildings are so rational, reasoned, and logical, a tremendous level of self-conscious rigor is necessary to appreciate their material details. Nationally and internationally, some outstanding Modernist work was accomplished mid-twentieth century; work that met the expressive standards of proportion, composition, beauty, and purposefully crafted architectural details. But sadly, there are precious few outstanding masterworks of architectural Modernism in North Dakota communities, where client aspirations were driven more by strict economy and utilitarian constructability than by architectural integrity in an intellectually critical sense.

The Grand Forks’ Historic Preservation Commission’s willingness to consider a potentially contentious critical analysis of the Wells-Denbrook context is both ambitious and commendable. This is believed to be the first context study in North Dakota so heavily influenced by trends and patterns of late-Modernism. Being so close to the recent past, it can be difficult to be objective or fair in evaluating which Modernist buildings are the most architecturally “distinguished” in terms of the integrity with

---

34 Few people today find assembly lines spiritually fulfilling, but the assembly line is a reasonable metaphor for the cultural values prioritized by much Modernist architecture. There is rarely a public outcry when a decision is made to demolish exemplary Modernist buildings like Rapson’s Fargo City Hall, when a determination has been that such buildings are used up and overdue for replacement with something more efficient, more economical to maintain, and more accommodating to human comfort. Other Modernist innovations, such as female urinals, designed for efficiency by expert all-male sanitary engineers and marketed nationwide for public buildings, may be regarded as character-defining in telling the story of rational design, while at the same time seeming so culturally inappropriate and ill-conceived from the perspective of potential users.


37 See Glazer (2007), “The Modernism that Failed.” Articulated by both academic critics and popular willingness to demolish or extensively renovate buildings in ways that obscure their severe Modernist character, people seem more than willing to let go of less distinguished examples of architectural Modernism. Judging from highly-visible failures and the celebrated demolition of unlivable Modernist “masterpieces” like the Pruitt-Igoe housing development in St. Louis, a great many Modernist buildings seem oppressively simplistic, poorly weathered, and hard to maintain. It may be useful to remember that from its onset, Modernism was advocated as a non-fixed, changeable application of emerging consumer-age technology; available to be consumed and replaced when a more serviceable technology became available.
which they conform to an idealized model or formula for using materials, forms, and rules. But preservation advocates should not be reluctant to engage and discuss the changing cultural importance of buildings from the recent past. Myron Denbrook’s personal generosity in placing all his firm’s architectural plans, records, and papers on the record for scholarly examination is commendable, enabling academic analysis and critical evaluation of successful projects people continue to value, while at the same time lending understanding to less distinguished work that falls short of the rhetorical promise of Modernist dogma. Because of its completeness, the comprehensive collection of Wells-Denbrook papers, drawings, and specifications is a valuable and informative resource for understanding the relationship of architecture to changing cultural priorities.

38 The 1998 National Register Bulletin 22, “Guidelines for Evaluating and Nominating Properties that Have Achieved Significance Within the Past Fifty Years” comments, “In short, the application of scholarship—not popular social commentary—does not demand the presence of a published book. A wide and growing array of scholarly interest in historic properties can greatly assist evaluation of recent properties.”
PROJECTS BY WELLS AND DENBROOK;
EVOLUTION OF STYLISTIC TENDENCIES AND DESIGN APPROACHES:

This context narrative recommends an interpretive framework for the firm’s fifty-five years of work divided into three chronological periods; the 1923 to 1947 timeframe of Theodore Wells’ independent practice, the 1948 to 1964 transitional period after Myron Denbrook joined the partnership and before Wells’ retirement from active practice, and the 1965 to 1978 period of Denbrook’s practice after Wells’ retirement and before the firm merged with EAPC in 1978.\(^{39}\) Summarily, the following numbers of projects in each period are inventoried in the UND archives OGL collections\(^{40}\):

- **269 projects identified** Theodore Wells, 1923-1947 (including a few projects by Wells and Ellis)
  - Classical Revival and Beaux-Arts
  - Early American Colonial Revival
  - Picturesque Rustic and Tudor Revival
  - Early period Collegiate Gothic

- **418 projects identified** Wells and Denbrook projects, 1948 to 1964
  - Unnumbered mixture of mainly Collegiate Gothic, Desert Modernist residences, *Avant-garde* commercial Modernism, and a few American Colonial Revival designs

- **183 projects identified** M. Denbrook working independently of Wells, 1965 to 1978
  - Almost exclusively functional Modernism in character and design emphasis

For the consultant’s further reference, notations about each building’s style were made at the time the project records were examined, but due to the extreme volume of work in the collection, no systematic tabulation of numerical count was made based on building style. The author appreciates that property owners’ names and street addresses for many of the illustrated projects were graciously provided by Marsha Gunderson and Peg O’Leary, based on their exhaustive familiarity with Grand Forks historic homes and neighborhoods.

**Early work by Wells** (1923-1931):
*Wells limited work in the Classical Revival and Beaux-Arts Classicism:*

Perhaps belying his limited early academic training in architecture as a humanities discipline, Wells was less a “purist” in his formal application of these academic styles than were Grand Forks’ precedent-setting architects John W. Ross and Joseph Bell DeRemer. Wells’ long association with Grand Forks included two residential properties he built for himself; a brick duplex at 29/31 Conklin Avenue in the Riverside Park neighborhood and the architect’s own, delightful, Tudor Revival cottage-style residence with Colonial motifs applied for his family’s home at 1006 Chestnut Street on Grand Forks’ near southside. The body of early work includes many residences, fraternity and sorority houses, and a limited number of commercial buildings.

---

39 Mr. Denbrook continued working part-time for another 14-years as an adjunct partner emeritus with EAPC, and occasional contributor to architectural project development, specifications, and project marketing. He eventually retired from active practice in 1992.

40 “Inventoried” projects refers to projects that appear on the compiled list prepared by the Special Collections staff. The numbering sequence suggests that there may be other projects that were constructed but are not included in the Wells-Denbrook papers OGL collection #1487, and which may be discovered later from other sources. “Documented” projects are those for which architectural drawings were identified and consulted for this study and are known to exist.
Partially obscured behind a later addition, Wells’ very early 1924 design for Our Lady of Perpetual Help church in Reynolds, ND is a tastefully proportioned example of Romanesque Revival in a traditional basilica-plan vocabulary.

Medieval influence on Theodore Wells’ design for the Pierce County Memorial Bldg.; Rugby (1930)

Wells design for Medieval Gothic, Tudor Picturesque Lyons Garage (1930); contemporary view at right.
Wells’ work in the American Colonial Revival style:

Like other regional architects, Wells became versed in this style at the time of the American Revolution sesquicentennial in 1926, through popular literature (like the “White Pine” monographs) and in the course of his internships (1914-1917) with Minot architect Robert Benjamin Stacy-Judd. In accommodating the design tastes of his well-heeled and conservative clientele, Wells continued to work extensively in the American Colonial Revival style (particularly for residences) from 1923 well into the 1950s. Wells’ perfected a highly effective technique for graphically proposing a preliminary design concept with a loose colored pencil sketch and accompanying floor plan to give the client a preliminary idea of the concept he proposed to develop. Wells’ adeptness with American Colonial Revival designs served him well in satisfying clients’ wishes for tidy, neat, respectable residences with applique ornament that affirmed their family’s place within the proper social order.

Willard Smith Residence, Design concept sketch (Wells; 1938)
Notice the delightfully “loose” pencil sketch technique with graphic character sketch placed above the well-resolved floor plan.
Project street address on “Vernon Ave.” was changed to Reeves Drive south of 8th Ave. S.

---

41 See discussion of White Pine monographs and Pencil Points series on p.18-19.
Brick Colonial Residence for Dr. M.B. Ruud, (1926); 425 Vernon Ave., [subsequently known as the Clifford Home, 1125 Reeves Drive, Grand Forks].

Original design for American Colonial Revival Beta Theta Pi Fraternity House at UND (1925).

**Wells’ Picturesque Rustic Tudor-revival architectural designs (mainly 1920s and 1930s):**

The south Grand Forks home Theodore Wells designed for his family in 1928 reflects a stylistic mixing of American Colonial Revival motifs and more casual Tudor Revival composition. There is a substantial body of Wells’ distinguished Tudor Revival design work among the fraternity and sorority houses surrounding UND. This reposeful, informally picturesque style had a great popular appeal in the 1920s and 1930s, when Wells’ career was being established, and he became practiced in graphically studying the motifs and composition.
Current photo and realtor’s published image provided by Marsha Gunderson
Residence for Theodore and Louise Wells family (1928); near Southside Grand Forks
[a tasteful albeit eclectic mix of Tudor Revival and Colonial Revival themes and details].

Mr. & Mrs. Charles Larkin Residence; Tudor Revival (1926);
Subsequently Keith Danks residence @ 717 Reeves Drive.

T. Wells; Architect’s sketch for a Tudor Revival residence.
Drawing and site photos of Tudor Revival design for Pi Beta Phi Sorority at UND (1928) (Note: Denbrook’s 1949 Modernist Theta Chi fraternity house appears cropped at left).

Tudor Revival design for Gamma Phi Beta Sorority at UND (1930).

Duis and Lycke Filling Station; intended for Grand Forks (1930); an interesting (and somewhat unexpected) commercial application of Tudor Revival motifs applied to gasoline retailing; with popular appeal in magazines during the 1930s.
In the 1930s, Wells designed several innovative and expressive buildings using Period Revival themes and motifs. They included prototypes for several gasoline filling stations and amenities to accommodate automobile tourism (park shelters, laundry and kitchen facilities, or comfort stations for tourist parks including Riverside Park). Though it is not possible to ascertain which of these proposals were ultimately built, the Duis and Lycke Filling Station is an exceptionally well-proportioned design for a diminutive Tudor Revival service station. From the same time-frame, the LaMarre Super Service Station for Grafton (Wells & Ellis; 1931) is best described as Byzantine, and the Leeds Service station (1934), commissioned by Cities Service Oil Company of Tulsa OK, was Colonial Revival. The capricious use of whimsical styles demonstrates that even industrial architecture can celebrate the human spirit with good-natured fun, unexpectedly in the midst of the Great Depression.
Wells’ confident capability with Collegiate Gothic Revival architecture:

Many public schools in northeastern North Dakota dating from the 1910s and 1920s, in particular, adopted Collegiate Gothic motifs for the same reasons as did institutions of higher education. Advocated by national education experts such as William Ittner of St. Louis, the Collegiate Gothic style was encouraged by the state Superintendent of Schools. Though tending to be somewhat spatially “cellular,” Collegiate Gothic planning principles proved surprisingly flexible, and unifying ornamental motifs proved to be very adaptable as architectural tastes changed toward the era of Modernism. Numerous late additions to Wells’ Collegiate Gothic designs on the University of North Dakota campus confirm that although Myron Denbrook provided a youthful connection to Modernist styles, the Wells-Denbrook firm did not entirely abandon classical architectural motifs when they suited client tastes and popular preferences.

Skillfully employed, the Collegiate Gothic style had a lasting effect on Wells’ work (and his partnership with Denbrook), particularly in school designs and on the stylistically unified campus of the University of North Dakota. The Collegiate Gothic was handsome, tasteful and well-suited to design expression of British and Ivy League education as the “lamp of learning,” vigorously advocated by Princeton University President (later U.S. President) Woodrow Wilson. Based on the precedent set at UND by Frederick Keith’s 1918 design of the Gillette Hall Chemistry building and Joseph Bell DeRemer’s subsequent development of Merrifield Hall (1929), the Collegiate Gothic style eventually became the unifying architectural expression throughout the UND campus, consistent with the inclinations of campus administrators during major growth periods on the campus.42

---

42 Michelle Dennis. “University of North Dakota Historic District” (NRHP, 2010). Extended discussion of UND’s commitment to Collegiate Gothic architectural expression unifies the feeling of an Ivy League type of campus throughout its important middle period of campus growth. Theodore Wells first Collegiate Gothic design work on the UND campus probably grew out of his collaboration with the Minneapolis firm of Wheeler & McEnary on Memorial Stadium (1927).
Numerous examples of Theodore Wells’ skill with the Collegiate Gothic style are found throughout the University of North Dakota campus. While Myron Denbrook provided a youthful connection to Modernist styles, the architectural firm of Wells-Denbrook did not abandon classical architectural motifs that were well-suited to campus planning principles and administrative tastes. Science Hall/Medical Science Building (two phases, beginning in 1947, later renamed O’Kelly Hall), the Hyslop Sports Center (Gymnasium/Fieldhouse, built in 1951); Education Building (built in 1954); the Chester Fritz Library (built in 1961, with subsequent additions); and Squires Hall (built in 1963); are all solid examples of Collegiate Gothic architecture, featuring brick exterior, large windows, light masonry window and door detailing, and sometimes a central tower that marks the entrance and extends above the parapet.

Architect’s rendering (Wells-Denbrook) and contemporary photo of Science Hall (Medical Science Bldg.; 1947); later renamed O’Kelly Hall.

Architect’s rendering (Wells-Denbrook, 1947) Medical Science Bldg.; and 1952 expansion Note the well-studied and practiced development of Collegiate Gothic detailing updated to a more contemporary design vocabulary under Denbrook’s participation.
In the 1950s and 1960s the two partners collaborated on several very successful institutional projects (at UND and in a series of armories/auditorium buildings) that combined construction sophistication and new material systems, with sensitively developed exterior cladding in traditional materials, reflecting updated historicist motifs (Burtness Theatre, Squires Hall, UND Student Center/Union, and structurally sophisticated Hyslop Fieldhouse/Auditorium). In seeming contradiction to Denbrook’s inclination toward pure twentieth-century Modernism, later projects by Wells-Denbrook continued to faithfully follow the stylistic precedent of Collegiate Gothic design on the UND campus into the 1960s, such as UND Chester Fritz Library (1961), where modern building layouts and building systems were cloaked in the masonry details and motifs of earlier buildings. With familiar Collegiate Gothic details treated in a refreshingly updated way, this work demonstrates that, as careful listeners attuned to client expectations, the architects acceded to UND’s President and administrators’ inclinations, tastes, and desires.
UND Burtness Theatre (Wells-Denbrook, 1963); Fresh, flexible adaptation of Collegiate Gothic motifs.

University of North Dakota Memorial Union (Grosz & Anderson, 1951 original; Wells-Denbrook entrance addition, 1964). Modernist with Collegiate Gothic elements and applied motifs.

Squires Hall dormitory (Wells-Denbrook, 1963), part of the Squires-Hancock-Bek-Walsh complex, (earlier parts by DeRemer and various architects); showing simplified vocabulary of ornament and applique Collegiate Gothic motifs.
Wells accomplished a remarkable amount of architectural work, considering that some of his prime years as an architect were during the Great Depression. Actively involved as a member of many civic and fraternal organizations, in 1936 Wells served on the board of the Grand Forks State and County Fair Association. In that capacity, he assisted the fair managers with design work and submission of an application to the Works Progress Administration for needed renovation and modernization of the fairgrounds, including a plan for maintenance and designs for many new pavilion buildings. The drawing of his masterplan for the 1937-39 Fairgrounds rehabilitation was clearly the basis of all work funded under the WPA sponsorship application.

Wells’ delightfully “loose” conceptual pencil sketches and design drawings for as many as ten pavilion buildings are also informative, as is his substantial body of architectural work extending geographically all across northern North Dakota (all the way to Crosby on the western edge of the state) and in Minnesota. The adjective “delightful” with respect to the architect’s method is emphasizes a characteristic trait of Wells approach, independent of the style in which he was designing. The British writer Sir Henry Wotton is most often quoted for his seventeenth century translation of the Roman architect Vitruvius, for the three most essential conditions of architecture; “firmness, commodity, and delight.” Wells’ technique consistently meets the standard of delight in the respect that, at least in the considered judgment of an architect, the drawings are fresh, dynamic, divergent, creatively exploratory, and uplifting to the human spirit.
Wells’ concept sketch for Metro Theater; Crosby (1938) and contemporary photo of the Crosby Theater (2005).

Notably, Wells was especially capable in designing longspan building structures like the Fairgrounds grandstand canopy and the UND Winter Sports Building. In the 1940s and 1950s he applied this structural engineering expertise to various kinds of innovative longspan wood girders, like his design for lattice trusses that were applied to more “pedestrian” buildings and warehouses. In the 1930s longspan structures embodied the design expression of Streamline Art Moderne designs.

UND Winter Sports Arena (1935), (demolished); Wells special engineering competency with longspan structural methods paid dividends on several federal work-relief construction projects.

Wells’ designs for several individual buildings on the Grand Forks fairgrounds -- and particularly the overall fairgrounds masterplan he conceived and documented in eliciting financial support from the WPA program -- reflect the circumstances of architectural practice North Dakota in the 1930s. The surviving buildings and construction features, together with the archival documentary record of Wells’ architectural work, have local significance for their distinctive design characteristics and methods of construction that embody circumstances of the Depression-era. Events of the Great Depression were intertwined with the career of an important early North Dakota architect, whose career affords an interesting case study of the emerging architectural profession in North Dakota during the first half of the twentieth century.
Theodore Wells' engineered design for the Grand Forks Fairgrounds grandstand and canopy reflect his engineering background, while Art Deco pavilions and picturesque fieldstone WPA features at the Fairgrounds reflect Depression-era design values all carried out under a federal work-relief program. (Grand Forks Herald photo at the time of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's visit to the project).

Mindful that the grandstand and related features at the Grand Forks County Fairgrounds were constructed on a compressed schedule during winter weather that was generally inclement, this structurally ambitious building's durability is a testament to the soundness of the grandstand’s construction and structural engineering design concepts applied by Theodore Wells to an important public building. The grandstand was considered “leading edge” construction technology when it was built in 1937. Interior rooms below the grandstand building are architecturally modest, utilitarian, and generally unadorned. At the time the grandstand was initially dedicated, the interior functions included concessions, ticket office, secretary, police and jail, livestock office, shower baths, band room, sign painting room, and toilet rooms. Subsequently, the interior rooms were altered for general storage, food concessions, and a beer garden, consistent with Wells’ original schematic sketch (shown on p.38) for a freestanding “biergarten” pavilion.

Over time, Wells’ geometric Art Deco designs transformed into more streamline Art Moderne, with wraparound banners and streamline ornament reminiscent of designer Edward Loevy (1893-1986). Wells design sketches for these distinctively geometric, site cast concrete buildings demonstrate his familiarity with both Art Deco and Art Moderne styles that were favored for many labor intensive WPA and PWA projects during the Great Depression. The 2010 statewide context study for “Depression-Era Federal Relief Construction in North Dakota, 1931-1943” emphasizes the statewide importance of this period of Theodore Wells’ work.
Inkster City Hall and Auditorium in Grand Forks County (WPA, 1938).

Park River City Hall and Auditorium (left) in Walsh County (WPA and PWA: 1938), like the Cavalier City Hall/Auditorium (1938; pictured at right), was a dual purpose civic facility, constructed of site cast reinforced concrete in a streamline Art Moderne design vocabulary that began to anticipate the International Style of architecture.

Theodore Wells’ Walsh County Courthouse (1936-38) in Grafton, for the federal FERA/PWA. The architect’s highly crafted Art Deco design and elaborate materials in this building established the high water mark for all public works construction in North Dakota. photo by Steve C. Martens, with discussion excerpted from Buildings of North Dakota (2015).
Though Theodore Wells had been well known for pragmatic, architectural engineering work early in his career, the lavishly Art Deco 1938-40 Walsh County Courthouse is a master architectural achievement during the Great Depression. As reflected by this Grafton project, Wells was thoroughly familiar with the design tenets of the 1925 Paris Exposition International des Arts Decoratifs et Industriels Moderne. Given the timing and circumstances of the Great Depression, the Walsh County Courthouse was his one, best opportunity to demonstrate his understanding of Art Deco themes and motifs. Note the abstract geometrically carved stone spandrels and fluted pilasters flanking the entry; the rotated chevron pattern of transom windows above the entrance; the restrained, balanced composition with side wings just slightly projected forward; and, above all, that luxurious palette of interior materials, procured with encouragement from the PWA. This architecturally sophisticated courthouse (NRHP-listed, 1987) has been exceptionally well cared-for through the years by the county maintenance staff, showing appropriate appreciation for its lavish material quality.

Decorative elements on the exterior include recessed fluted pilasters flanking the front door, topped by medallions, and a frieze displays the name “Walsh County Courthouse” in stylized letters. (All these details were carefully worked out in the architectural drawings, for PWA approval.) A diverse array of extravagant metals, woods, and marble decorate the building. Rainbow granite from St. Cloud, MN, frames the front door, and Indiana limestone clads the steel frame. Aluminum embellishes the front doors, stair rails, and the exterior grillwork above. The interior corridor is sheathed with Montana travertine wainscot and terrazzo flooring. Tennessee gray marble pilasters are located throughout the second floor corridor. The judge’s bench is a composite of Brazilian Rosewood and White African Zebrwood inlays. Benches are African walnut with red birch inlays. Monumental and formal, the courthouse windows are punched openings, grouped in sets of four, with carved limestone spandrels. When construction of the courthouse started in 1938, numerous delays in shipping the range of exotic materials held up completion of the courthouse until late 1940. News stories proclaimed the dedication of this courthouse as “one of the greatest events in county history.”

Wells’ World War II transitional period (1942-1948) and advent of the International style:

Though Theodore Wells maintained a vigorous and productive architectural practice in Grand Forks through the 1930s, with many notable design commissions under various federal work-relief programs, by World War II most clients for architectural services were seeking less-embellished, functionalist designs with minimal attention to visual aspects of architectural composition. Wells’ 1940s design projects in the OGL collection, mainly consisting of storage warehouses, agricultural buildings, and longspan garage structures, seem rather “dispirited.” Aspiring high style buildings by Walter Gropius and LeCorbusier appeared in architectural publications but locally, popular tastes led local architects to market a restrained, pared-down, purely functional vocabulary. By the time Myron Denbrook joined the firm in 1948, with few exceptions the spirited graphic development of Wells’ early concept sketches had

---

44 Grand Forks Herald feature article, July 25, 1940. Shared from the scrapbooks of Bernice Flanagan in Edinburg.
largely disappeared from his more technically oriented working drawings. Wells demonstrated understanding of client preferences for the pared down, purely functionalist International Style, but the commissions called for little more than longspan joisted structures with uninspired patterns of fenestration and materials.

architect's concept for Pembina County Memorial Hospital (1948); Cavalier, ND. (Design of Hallock Minnesota Memorial Hospital, 1952 was virtually identical.)
Large auditoriums and assembly halls were an important growth area following World War II, reflecting a changing national cultural context and changing priorities of architectural practice. Based on his longstanding professional relationship with National Guard Adjutant Maj. Gen. Heber L. Edwards, Wells, a former military engineer himself, was awarded the commission for design of the Grand Forks Auditorium and Armory project (1956). Together with UND Hyslop Hall Fieldhouse (1956), this would have been one of the first, large public building projects commissioned under the Wells-Denbrook partnership, soon after Denbrook joined the practice in 1948. The Grand Forks armory/civic auditorium building also represented a significant national period of expansion of the ready reserve military National Guard following World War II. Designed mainly by Denbrook the Armory was constructed to support the readiness mission of the ND National Guard’s 1-188th Air Defense Artillery Regiment. The building’s architectural features are instructive about emerging design priorities and working methods of late-Modernist architecture. The armory/auditorium project reflects a transition from Wells’ reliably meticulous longtime exploration of period-revivalist motifs, toward overtly pragmatic Modernism under Denbrook’s design influence. The building’s architectural treatment contrasts with the Collegiate Gothic UND Hyslop Fieldhouse of the same year, reflecting a marked difference in the values each client expected to have expressed. Other architectural commissions for several similar National Guard Armory buildings followed in other North Dakota communities.

Architectural development of the pragmatically prosaic Grand Forks Auditorium/Armory; Myron Denbrook, 1956 (demolished, 2011). This prosaic example of Modernist functionalism displayed rich material features, particularly in its exposed glue-laminated timber structure and the most tastefully over-detailed interior brick masonry telephone booth the author has ever seen.
A significant part of 1950s post-war growth was in industrial and agricultural infrastructure. The Wells-Denbrook firm broadened its approach and expertise in order to market design services for these specialized industrial-process buildings. The architectural concept sketches here appear to have been delineated by Wells, as a method of talking out the design concept with Denbrook. Wells-Denbrook papers collection reflects that the architects effectively kept abreast of potential new growth areas for marketing design services, including articles from specialty popular journals that gave impetus to these architectural concepts. Wells honed the architectural approach and Denbrook took the marketing mission to outlying communities in the Grand Forks region.
Graphic development of selected commercial and public building proposals:

In the 1950s, awkwardly Cubist concept sketches are vaguely reminiscent of the technique of graphic artist Ben Shahn. The architect’s note on Hanson-Anderson funeral home design sketch reads, “posts should not encourage kids to climb.”

Modernist architect Denbrook’s simplistic concept sketch for a standardized “Whirl-A-Whip” ice cream concession stand. Several of these were built in North Dakota and Minnesota towns.

The OGL collection of Wells-Denbrook papers show that Myron Denbrook’s approach to graphically developing a design solution was markedly different from Wells’. At first it may seem a matter of haste and urgency in the technique, but there is an uncomfortable hard-edged quality to the drawings. Making such a nuanced judgment call about the architects’ ways of working depends on a careful and critical analysis of the firms architectural records, and comparisons of this kind would not be possible were it not for the remarkable completeness of the Wells-Denbrook papers collection. A few continuing projects, begun by Wells and continued by Denbrook, demonstrate important differences in visual refinement and the design aesthetic. Before 1940 building clients assumed that their architects would graphically explore and ultimately make recommendations on the suitable appearance of a well-proportioned, artful design. By the 1950s and 1960s, priorities had changed to emphasize speed, economy, and efficiency. Building clients and architects were complicit in the risky proposition that graphic study was unnecessary. Standard machine-age building technologies could simply be assembled in exactly the proportions they were manufactured, and rationally logical designs would meet the new standard for visual appearance and aesthetic sensory appeal. As reasoned by Modernist architect Eero Saarinen’s, “modern architecture could be made to achieve a far wider range of expressive and spiritual goals than had been supposed in the early years of the modern movement, and it would do so through the reintroduction of customized design. Thus, as he noted in numerous articles and speeches, each project would be approached as a new beginning in which the particulars of time, site, context, audience, and materials were carefully studied until an original solution was discovered by the architect or artist.”

45 Wells’ richly ornamented 1931 to 1946 designs for Grand Forks’ Black’s Bakery Purity Sweet Shop, compared with the 1951 redesign as Eddie’s Bakery may be one of the more illustrative examples.

46 Saarinen’s viewpoint as interpreted by Alice Friedman, in Places journal article (2010), “Eero Saarinen: Modern Architecture for the American Century.”
LATE MODERNIST BUILDINGS BY WELLS-DENBROOK, GROUPED BY FUNCTIONAL TYPE /
TRANSITIONAL RELATIONSHIP AND EMERGING ROLE OF MYRON DENBROOK (1949-1976):

Because Modernist buildings aspire to be machine-like, industrial design, with all ornamental
expression suppressed in favor of functionalism, Denbrook’s late-Modernist designs may be grouped
or characterized based on their functional purpose or type.

Selected residential projects:

“The Architect’s Dream House” (1952). Depicting Myron Denbrook’s idealized design concept for his own home. Many modernist renderings renounced any suggestion of context while emphasizing the free flow of space from interior to exterior. 47

Selected, representative late-Modernist educational projects:

Generically identified in the project renderings folder, this prototypical (or generic) Rural School for Walsh County (1953; Myron Denbrook) compares with 1958 Dundee School concept proposal; Erasures on the title block for similar rural schools (Edinburg, Davenport, McVille) imply that the plan layout may have been interchangeable. Many regional architectural firms used this time-saving and cost-proven method in the 1950s. The Modernist illustration is light and breezy, whereas the architectural character is much more rigorously disciplined.

47 Note the severely ordered, hard-edged configuration, with rigorously organized gridded layout implying a regimented, perfectly ordered routine, consider the comparison to Wells earlier, casual family home.
Representative religious buildings in the late-Modernist idiom:

Generic, Modernist EUB church in Fargo (1960); structure and prosaic functionalism as expression of faith. (One of three similar EUB churches in various North Dakota communities.)

As an aspect of the post-war national growth economy churches, too, were faced with the need for new facilities for worship and assembly, at the same time they were wrestling with theological issues like Humanism and social mission, congregations sought practical architectural advice. Abandoning the cultural precedent for places of worship, universal principles of Modernist architecture may not have been especially well-suited to the design of churches.\(^48\) With 1946 reorganization of the Evangelical church in North Dakota as the Evangelical United Brethren (EUB) church leaders managed the post-war expansion of congregations in North Dakota communities (Fargo, Jamestown, Williston, and also nearby Warren, MN.)\(^49\) As the pace of architectural production increased through the 1960s, some of the less-distinguished Modernist work could be characterized as increasingly “formulaic” in the way it applied rational design principles of technological efficiency. Certainly the clients’ wishes were treated with respect and given architectural consideration, but the collection of Wells-Denbrook drawings reflect that church designs were generally treated as interchangeable assembly halls. With little liturgical differentiation between protestant congregations of differing faiths (Methodist Episcopal, EUB, United Methodist, Lutheran) the template for this somewhat generic A-frame church was replicated by other 1960s Modernist architects. Efficiently developed in a production-oriented architectural practice, according to rational scientific principles for efficient, functional design, this genre of uninspired, Modernism was not especially well-suited to places of spiritual worship. Following from the 1968 merger of EUB congregations as part of the United Methodist Church, many of the small, too-pragmatic Modernist church designs have been abandoned, repurposed, or demolished.

\(^{48}\) Although there are definitely some Modernist inspired church buildings that effectively celebrate the architectural richness of their faith, as in Modernist designs by Lutheran church architect Edward Sovik.

\(^{49}\) Robinson, 1994 reprint:p.540
Selected Fraternal/Social organizations’ buildings:

Former Theta Chi fraternity house at UND (1949; Denbrook, architect’s rendering left, and site photo by the author) Currently reused as extension of Tudor Revival style Pi Kappa Phi fraternity.

This conceptually clear fraternity house is an especially pure rendition of the Desert Modernist vocabulary, and has been little altered. The fraternity house is characterized by an open plan, together with the large expanse of windows, the cantilevered upper story, projected thin deck roof planes, anchored to a masonry fireplace “spine.” Like so many Modernist buildings, it may have suffered from being conceived as complete, perfect, and unalterable from the day it was first occupied, leaving precious little possibility for functional change or energy-conserving modification of the building envelope.

Selected late-Modernist commercial projects:

Myron Denbrook’s residentially-scaled Desert Modern design for the firm’s 1959 office and studio at 1701 Cherry Street in Grand Forks (NRHP, 2014) explores design implications of Organic Desert Modernism in Grand Forks.

As discussed in the 2014 National Register nomination form, this restrained version of mid-century Desert Modernism emulates mostly-residential precedents in the Palm Springs/Palm Desert area of California. The studio’s expressively honest and unadorned use of materials, balance of vertical and horizontal elements, exposed structure and broad overhanging roof planes are design tendencies that characterize Myron Denbrook’s architectural work. This property, like much of Denbrook’s work regionally, displays a fastidious precision in detailing. Though the simplified palette is extremely pared down, this studio building consciously expresses interior planning grids and showcases modularity of materials and structure.
The late-Modernist architect’s inelegantly simplistic pencil and crayon sketch emphasizes grids, subgrids, and intersecting planar elements. Based on a comparison of the firm’s architectural drawings, the most successful 1950s and 1960s commercial designs invoke motifs and characteristics of avant-garde late-Modernist idiom\(^5\) including:

- Mechanistic, uber-rational, logically reasoned design,
- A sparse palette of materials, forms, details of assembly laid bare and exposed to view,
- Infatuation with emerging material technologies (including many that now seem dated or obsolete),
- Heroic, egocentric, assertive design, seemingly modeled on a military regimen,
- Disclaiming aesthetic consideration of manipulated “beauty” or visual judgment,
- Strongly expressed structure evident as exterior pattern and spatial organizer,
- Open interior space-planning and spatial flow,
- Overtly expressed grids and subgrids,
- Differentiating structure from skin,
- Strong preference for glass curtainwalls and gridded metal panel cladding (or stone veneers),
- Expressed flow of space from interior to exterior, through transparent expanses of glass,
- Integration of natural lighting and ventilation, often with clerestory windows and skylights,
- Planar elements (space is organized by walls and roofs); flat or low-sloped roofs,
- General conformity with orthogonal planning grids,
- Sparse palette of materials, often emphasizing steel framing and reflective glass,
- Consolidated grouping of fenestration features (using perimeter frames and spandrel bands),
- Geometric, mathematical patterns, contrasted at times with exotic freeform space-age shapes,
- “Reveals” (separator strips or bands), and built-up layers articulating the building’s parts, including floating stair treads and pendant lighting globes and
- Experimental use of innovative (often unproven) building materials, components, or mechanical system technologies.

Discussion of US Immigration Service Border Patrol Headquarters as one of Denbrook’s purest “high-style” examples of the late-Modernist idiom. Avant-garde Late Modernism in governmental/institutional work:

Much as Theodore Wells’ elaborate design for the PWA Walsh County Courthouse embodied the culmination of his evolution from period revival to Art Deco High Style, the Border Patrol Headquarters Station in Grand Forks may be Denbrook’s best example of his confident use of avant-garde late-Modernist concepts and motifs in commercial/institutional design.51

Myron Denbrook’s (1959) commercial Late-Modernist design for the Grand Forks Border Patrol Station for the U.S. Immigration Service.

In terms of late-Modernist style and embodiment of the best of Modernist design principles, the purity of this design originates with its logically program-driven, well-articulated planning and interior spatial configuration. The internal spatial structure is confirmed by the cast concrete frame. Together with requisite flagpole and site lighting, siting of the building on a slightly raised “plinth” in the middle of paved parking areas reinforces the expression of a monumental public building.

The feature that marks this building most as avant-garde late-Modernism is the adventuresome folded plate cast concrete structure, with its one-way span on raised piers emphasizing column structure, clad with limestone panels. The raised arrival pavilion, too, is clad with limestone panels. Expansive bands of curtainwall glazing in the center arrival bay are perched atop a limestone clad podium. On flanking office bays, planar brick wall panels alternate with fenestration panels, grouped to form unified bands of windows and spandrel panels. Grouping of fenestration into vertical bands with stone spandrel panels is another common characteristic of late-Modernist buildings.

The horizontal roof plane is capped with a limestone parapet coping. The raised brick chimney service stack forms a mast at the center of the articulated bays. Rhythmically grouped service doors and raised back service bay reflect the scale of interior spatial volumes. For a headquarters facility for a federal agency, the building has a self-assured monumental presence. The design is reasoned, practical, logical, and largely driven by mathematical ratios. The design has withstood the test of time for 55-years, with little alteration and it retains high integrity of setting, feel, and association according the National Register guidelines.

51 Architectural historians routinely attach the term “avante-garde” to high-style late-Modernist design as a way of acknowledging leading edge, forward thinking design judgments that were motivated by the pretense of a well-learned set of theoretical principles.
Work of the Wells-Denbrook firm subsequent to Wells’ retirement (1965-1978);

Selected institutional public buildings:

- UND Chester Fritz Auditorium (1968),
  Considered by the client (UND) and many public users of the building as perhaps Denbrook’s best-functioning, and most lasting late-Modernist projects.

Myron Denbrook’s fascination with emerging material technologies led to this ground-breaking structural design in precast concrete double-tee wall panels. In a retrospective interview, UND’s facilities management representative credited Myron Denbrook’s design of the Chester Fritz Auditorium as being one of the acoustically best-designed buildings in the region. “The Chester Fritz Auditorium building tested the limits of Myron Denbrook’s technical expertise, but by constructing a physical model large enough to stand inside, the design eventually led to an auditorium with less than 9-decibels acoustic loss from front to back.”

- An exception to the patterns of late-Modernism, tastefully evoking regional vernacular the Grand Forks County Historical Society’s Myra Museum Carriage Display (1971).

---

52 LeRoy Sondrol, interview with the author and Peg O’Leary, Grand Forks, June 15, 2015. Sondrol emphasized what a careful listener Denbrook was and the way in which he always placed the client’s need for reliable performance above all other construction issues. Not all of Denbrook’s experimentations with new and untried material technologies had successful outcomes. The 1966 Kittson County Courthouse project (a Minnesota project outside the scope of this context study, but a building that embodies the vulnerability of an architect placing trust in emergent material science technology) was the subject of some embarrassment for the firm when the “Granolux” wall panels failed in performance. Mr. Denbrook prided himself in being a careful, critical evaluator of technical materials.
Denbrook’s continued work after the death of Wells (1976-1979):

Though Myron Denbrook clearly developed a strong, lifelong infatuation with academic late-Modernist architectural motifs, several of his late projects in collaboration with the successor firm EAPC show meticulous detailing and sensitivity to issues of scale, proportion, and stylistic expression. The NDAIA award-winning Myra Carriage Museum (1971) and Denbrook’s structural design involvement at the Mahnomen, MN Shooting Star Casino (1980) reflect this patient and meticulous detailing and study of proportion, particularly related to structural assemblies. Mr. Denbrook was proud and pleased with the precision he instilled in construction details built to last, and in unambiguous technical specifications. Alan Dostert who worked with Denbrook during the EAPC era (after 1978) relates that one of the design features Myron often spoke of most proudly, was his successful technical detailing of single-pane windows with wood framing surrounds, like the ones seen at the Wells-Denbrook office and studio. Denbrook was most proud that even after many years’ weathering, they never leaked. Custom-crafted building components of that kind performed relatively well according to the design assumptions of the 1950s, but over time they were supplanted by prefabricated unit window systems with integral moisture shedding, thermal barriers, and triple glazing. For all their designers’ leading edge technological aspirations and self-confidence, Modernist buildings were surprisingly difficult to keep current with adaptability and changing technology. Essentially, late-Modernist designs were so hybridized that they sacrificed the ability to adapt well as new technologies and new performance expectation became available.
Summarizing changing patterns of cultural preference and changing nature of architectural practice from 1923 to 1978 (NRHP Criterion “A”); conclusions about evolution in Wells-Denbrook process:

Academic research and National Register guidelines suggest that “context” is useful framework of patterns or trends, in this instance the patterns of events and cultural preferences as influences on nature of architectural practice. The OGL collection of Wells-Denbrook drawings and specifications suggest NRHP significance under Criterion “A” because of historical events associated with an architectural practice that evolved over fifty-five years, in a shifting context of cultural priorities. The collaborative working relationship between the two architects and their clients is actually a more central aspect of the context than is a historian’s critical assessment of whether the buildings are “good and pure” embodiments of a particular style. Examining the Wells-Denbrook drawings and firm records in the OGL Special Collections suggests several observations about the changing nature of architectural practice in North Dakota during the twentieth century.

In the earliest years of Theodore Well’s career, he built a client base largely on his background as a member of the Grand Forks community and through members of fraternities and sororities on the UND campus, based on acquaintances from his years at UND. Wells’ internship under Minot architect Robert Benjamin Stacy-Judd and his brief, but substantial, experience at the École des Beaux-Arts prepared him well to work in then-popular styles like the American Colonial Revival, Tudor Revival, and Collegiate Gothic, practicing in competition with similarly experienced Grand Forks architects like John W. Ross and the DeRemers (Joseph Bell DeRemer and his son Samuel Teel DeRemer). At about the time Samuel Teel DeRemer joined his father’s practice, during the years of the Great Depression, Wells was also exploring and implementing new popular design styles like the Art Deco-Moderne that were well-suited to federal sponsorships by the Works Progress Administration and Public Works Administration. Most commercial projects “dried up” during the Depression years, but Wells continued cultivating residential-scaled commissions by appealing to client tastes for picturesque and “safe” Colonial Revival and Tudor Revival designs.

Perhaps owing to the timely involvement of Myron Denbrook in 1948, Wells’ architectural practice was one of only a few North Dakota architectural firms to continue through the post World-War II period. Architectural drawings from 1942 to 1948 suggest that, with the transition from Art Deco to the unornamented International Style, much of the design spirit had disappeared from Wells’ work. In fact, the OGL listing of projects includes only eight projects in 1941 and no North Dakota commissions documented in the drawings from 1942 and 1943. Wells managed to “pay the rent” by working on prosaic commissions, mainly small industrial buildings, warehouses, and unaspiring commercial remodeling projects (e.g.; thirty-five such projects in 1945). A noteworthy exception in these mundane years of Wells’ practice is suggested by the few commercial storefront projects that may have been financed by the federal “Modernization Credit Plan” (MCP), an incentive policy promoting local
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53 Wells almost certainly had several architectural commissions in 1942 and 1943, but drawings and specs for those projects have been lost from the rather complete Wells-Denbrook papers collection at OGL.
revitalization investment. Though the popular trend by the 1940s was elimination of all ornamental embellishment from architecture, and relying on functionality as the only acceptable expressions of the International Style and mid-century Modernism, MCP grants encouraged experimentation with modern storefront materials like neon, chrome striping and signage, Vitrolite (opaque and colored structural glass) that suited the Streamline Art Moderne style.\textsuperscript{54} There was clearly a continuing marketing benefit from Wells’ familiarity with how these New Deal federal incentive programs worked. The collection of Wells-Denbrook papers includes a number of intriguing storefront and commercial interior design proposals that no longer exist and may not have been carried to completion.\textsuperscript{55}

The 1950s post-war period associated with acculturation of the Baby Boom generation was an action-oriented growth era with a “get it done” mindset and little tolerance for self-doubt. With near-certain confidence in the pragmatic, industrial design vocabulary, human-scaled motifs and embellishments, and visual judgments about beauty and proportion were overpowered in favor of egalitarian machine-aged design. Given the rapid growth in post-War material technologies, the material palette was surprisingly spare and severe. Modernist buildings were usually thought of as reflecting industrial design, complete and perfect with little room for negotiation or alteration. But interiors soon proved inflexible, color palettes quickly began to seem dated. Universal detailing standards like the floating, open-riser staircases and planar flat roofs have proven endlessly problematic. In terms of celebrating the human spirit, now-outdated material technologies probably reflect post-War tastes of project clients as much as a lack of sensitivity on the part of architects. By reducing buildings to machines engineered to efficiently contain human activities, much Modernist architecture came to be regarded as meaningless and surprisingly inflexible, with the aesthetic appeal of assembly line production. Apparently that was just what 1950s property owners were seeking, orderliness and tidy efficiency, unencumbered by emotional excesses like inspiration or creative exploration.\textsuperscript{56}

The Wells-Denbrook firm’s approach to architectural practice changed significantly in 1948 when Myron Denbrook joined the firm. As Theodore Wells’ enthusiasm for design seemed to diminish in the 1940s along with dwindling opportunities for creative architectural embellishment, Myron Denbrook brought important new energy to the practice. In the technology-oriented growth period from World War II to about 1960, national trends in architecture were consistent with Wells and Denbrook’s systematic working methods and increasingly mechanistic industrial design emphasis. There is an obvious “universality” to much/most architecture from this period, particularly in the U.S. where

\textsuperscript{54} This interesting investment-grant program influenced commercial storefront design in many communities of all sizes throughout the United States, as discussed by Gabrielle Esperdy in Modernizing Mainstreet (2008).

\textsuperscript{55} e.g.; 1939 Mahowald Store improvements #3903, a 1936 remodeling proposal for Manufacturer’s Trust Co. of New York City #3605, 1941 Hughe’s [sic] Store remodeling #4112, and especially the elaborately ambitious 1941 Bray Store concept proposal for Judge J. F. T. O’Connor #4105. (A native of Grand Forks, O’Connor served as U.S. Comptroller of the Currency during the New Deal era.)

\textsuperscript{56} Though it seems a harsh (but necessary) architectural critique, the large majority of Wells-Denbrook projects after 1948 are formulaic, purely functional renditions of Modernist architecture, consistent with aspirations of clients and building users in an increasingly pragmatic, cost-conscious, technologically motivated consumer culture.
popular taste for the pragmatically prosaic and unadorned vocabulary of obsessively techno-Modernist architecture was accepted with little question. As a critical aspect of academic analysis, this context poses the secondary question, “are there aspects that distinguish Denbrook’s Modernist work from other architects working in North Dakota at the same time?” Much of Denbrook’s architectural work could be characterized as “formulaic,” in that it approached design as a rationally balanced set of scientifically articulated design objectives. The work, embodied in reams and reams of drawings and with built projects, is more typical of work being designed by other area architectural firms regionally and nationally in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. Thus, except for the early work that was “style-based,” this may be considered more of a vernacular context than an architectural high-style context.

Dramatic expansion in productivity of Wells-Denbrook’s practice in the post-War growth period was characterized by rather formulaic and repetitive designs of schools. From 1953 to 1963, the Wells-Denbrook firm produced an average of fifty-two projects per year (a project each week), although admittedly much of this was undistinguished work in a purely production mode. Project documentation shows Myron Denbrook making “cold calls” offering professional design services to prospective clients in scattered towns throughout the region, followed by nominal billings of an hour or two of architects’ consulting time to produce a simple sketch proposal. Many of the projects were unassuming interior remodelings, updated mechanical systems, and window replacement jobs. Except for continued work at the University of North Dakota in the Collegiate Gothic style, few of the commercial or residential commissions from the 1950s are architecturally noteworthy in terms of their style, but they do reveal the changing nature of practice and the cultural preference of building users following World War II. By continuing to work closely with previous clients, and collaborating with the clients to establish well-defined project emphasis in terms of architectural tastes, motifs, and details, several of the firm’s more distinguished projects were carried out beginning in 1959, including the Collegiate Gothic-influenced Burtness Theatre, Squires Hall dormitory, UND Chemistry Building, and Denbrook’s purest late-Modern “structuralist” commercial project, the U.S. Immigration Border Patrol Station in Grand Forks. Although most of Denbrook’s small Modernist schools, commercial projects, and residences go out of their way to suppress all stylistic pretense, the Border Immigration Station is a structural “tour de force” with a site cast concrete folded plate roof, which follows all the more adventurous and committed tenets of Modernism.

Few projects from the large volume of production-line architectural work by the Wells-Denbrook firm in the 1950s and 1960s could be considered “exemplary” or “exceptional” compared with the best Modernist work nationally or regionally. Much of the work could be justifiably criticized as lacking “artfulness” in the way it applied the plausible rationale of functional technology and precise articulation in details. In the end, this context study is less a matter of “is the architectural work any good?” and more a question of “how did these architects work with their clients and market to popular tastes?” Analysis of Wells-Denbrook’s body of work enables us to discern the changing
answer to these questions over time. There is scholarly research benefit in examining the full range of
the firm’s projects, even including the more mundane work of high-volume, production-line,
functional Modernist projects of the 1950s and 1960s. The evolved context of Wells-Denbrook’s work
reflects a difficult and uncomfortable cultural negotiation between an agreed-upon past that was full
of borrowed motifs and agreed meanings, compared with an austere, overtly ordered, uber-
technological expression of universal machine culture.

Denbrook’s approach to architecture as industrial design is embodied by his meticulous writing of
technical specifications, with defined construction relationships, precisely descriptive technical
language, and systematic evaluation of new material systems. These values were well-suited to
building a satisfied client base of return “customers.” Importantly, architectural specifications are
retained as part of the OGL Wells-Denbrook collection, enabling an overview of prevalent
construction practices during the late-Modernist era, many of which continue in the present day. In
marketing architectural services, the Wells-Denbrook firm consistently emphasized its reliability,
technical expertise, thoroughness for carefully worked out details, and dutiful responsibility for
shepherding clients’ budgets. Myron Denbrook asserted his blue collar objective without apology;
“not to build a monument to ourselves, but to design functional, economical, yet beautiful buildings
that represent the best buy for the money.” Though it may not be the highest aspiration for
architectural critics, economy of means is a persistently American definition of the value of design.

It is challenging for a context narrative to be thoughtfully reflective about the work of Modernism
without sounding uncharitably hypercritical of people who were committed good-faith proponents of
the rational values it embodied. Many North Dakota architecture firm’s struggled with integrating the
Modernist architectural engineering approach into their design expression. Building projects by capable,
established architects like William Kurke (Fargo), the DeRemer firm (Grand Forks), Ritterbush Brothers
(Bismarck), and Ira Rush (Minot) grew to appear bland and uninspired in the 1940s and 1950s when a
generation of new Modernist-inspired architects began joining the architectural profession. A newcomer
to Grand Forks, Myron Denbrook was a true believer in the promise and potential of architectural
Modernism as he learned it at the University of Washington. Architectural drawings developed mainly
by Denbrook’s hand reflect absolute confidence in the correctness of Modernist architectural thinking,
particularly the architect’s unquestioning certainty about emergent technology.

Much of Myron Denbrook’s Modernist work regionally, displays a fastidious precision in detailing
that borders on obsessiveness. Though the simplified palette is extremely pared down, Denbrook’s
work in the Modernist vein disdains ornamental embellishment. It is hard to find evidence of change in
Denbrook’s design approach, implying an insufficiently self-critical approach in the working
relationship with clients. Partly owing to the assembly-line production approach necessary to
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57 e.g.; elaborately worked out details for typical features like custom-cast concrete rainleader splashblock pads, floor tile patterns,
and that meticulously detailed interior phone booth in the now-demolished Grand Forks Auditorium/Armory.
accomplish as many as two projects per week in a small office, there was a substantial amount of replication, for example, from one school design to the next. Virtually his only flirtation with applied ornament can be seen in the interlocking geometric rectangular tile patterns that ornamented entrances on projects like the Grand Forks Armory and Auditorium (demolished 2011). Naive trust in emerging (and often unproven material technologies) was the basis for efficiency of new material technologies of the Post-War era that allowed for protruding roofs, walls of glass, and flexible habitable spaces. At its best, gracefully restrained ornamentation, meticulous detailing, and a commitment to rational, functional, utilitarian design demonstrates the architect’s competence and diligence in modestly unassuming, prosaically functional buildings that are responsive to budgets set by a client.

The documentary collection of Wells-Denbrook papers presents the entire, unvarnished body of evidence, and as such we can accept and appreciate the thought provoking questions that ensue with respect to architectural process, designed products, and broader cultural priorities. In trying to identify masterworks of architectural Modernism, a question arises; “why were the 1950s so blah?” Without being ungracious, the context narrative must confront the question of why so few examples of late-Modernist architecture in North Dakota towns and regionally merit NRHP nomination. Much like vernacular buildings, many Modernist buildings are more noteworthy for the patterns and cultural values they reflect, than for their distinctive architectural characteristics. Disappointingly little architectural work in the late-Modernist idiom anywhere in North Dakota communities approaches the standard of praiseworthy as an embodiment of architectural style. Regrettably, the large majority of constructed Modernist buildings designed by regional firms can only be regarded as prosaic, serviceable, and unaspiring, while falling short of the National Register standard of “exceptional” for their mastery of a style or method of construction.

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, many of the unresolved contradictions between humanistic and technological design values represent difficult challenges for interpretation of late-Modern architecture. Though the designs were calculated to satisfy popular tastes and preferences of the 1950s, few historians or preservationists would be vigorous advocates for celebrating such modestly workmanlike examples that embody commonplace vernacular Modernism, rather than expressing the avant-garde aspirations of a cultural aesthetic movement. Consummate Modernist proponent Mies van der Rohe proselytized, “Less is more.” Two decades later, post-Modernist Robert Venturi rebutted, “Less was a bore.” However, that does not diminish the importance of the historical context as demonstrating pattern of historical change and cultural preferences.

Representative buildings discussed under this context may meet NRHP eligibility for National Register listing in terms of style and method of construction, but the broader story of the defined context is in lessons the work teaches about emergent methods and priorities of architectural practice during the twentieth century. In examining Wells-Denbrook’s work in terms of architectural styles and expressive values, bear in mind that the choice of stylistic expression reflects architects’ academic
training, combined with clients’ popular tastes and preferences and marking a shift in cultural values of clients and architects. Without embarrassment or apology, architecture changed to be more value engineering and performance based, with unadorned expression of materials, assembly, composition. From a design standpoint and in terms of working methods, under Myron Denbrook’s influence the firm’s vigorous practice in the 1960s actually differed very little from other practices in terms of marketing, skill level, or design influence. Much of the work (school additions, for example) could be characterized as “formulaic,” and the formula was not very complicated or challenging from the standpoint of design complexity. The firm produced a substantial amount of work in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s that was justified by clients’ tacit endorsement of functional, efficient Modernism as the “way of the future” for architecture.

Summarizing evolution of styles and design methods from 1923 to 1978 (NRHP Criterion “C” significance):

Theodore Wells’ work from his first twenty-five years of practice is easily characterized by defined styles. The large majority of Wells’ projects from the 1940s in the OGL collection appear as dispirited warehouses and utility buildings with little potential for architectural expression. In 1948 Myron Denbrook brought new energy and new possibilities into Wells’ practice. In confidently and irrevocably departing from the familiar Classicism of previous eras, Wells-Denbrook’s Late-Modernist projects (1948 to 1978) reflect the evolving nature of architectural practice in North Dakota (and the rest of the country) in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. Theodore Wells had mastered the Beaux-Arts graphic technique for patiently hand-studied concept sketches, accommodating widely varied architectural programs that were reconciled with familiar stylistic motifs. The collection of Wells-Denbrook architectural papers demonstrate how these hand-drawn, graphically analytic study sketches were consistently the preferred thinking mode of Theodore Wells, and clearly NOT the comfortable exploration mode of Myron Denbrook. Wells’ drawings are loose, tentative, speculative, and open-ended, whereas Denbrook’s delineation technique was more hard-edged, technical, and assertive. One preliminary concept proposal (for Hanson-Anderson Funeral Home) includes a hastily entered notation, “posts should not encourage kids to climb.”

Because of the large volume of Wells-Denbrook’s work was done in the twentieth century late-Modernist styles, this context narrative necessarily gives special attention to addressing the 1948 to 1978 period of Myron Denbrook’s influence, distinct from the earlier stylistic influences on Wells’ work. The national context of post WWI growth in the United States is reflected regionally in baby boom schools and engineered growth in business infrastructure. In post-war Europe, Modernist thinking was advocated as a necessary, egalitarian response to the need to plan and rebuild cities, using scientifically advanced materials like steel, glass, and concrete. Proponents like Corbusier noted the positive force technology played in people’s lives. He and other Modernist architects believed that for a home to perform efficiently, it should have the purity of form of a well-designed machine. Denbrook’s passion
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58 Architect’s notation on 1957 concept proposal for Hanson-Anderson Mortuary, (OGL#5728)
and commitment for Modernist design expression is also apparent in a few of the commercial interiors, like the UND Memorial Union and Architect’s Dream house.

Representative interior concept sketches for late-Modernist interiors:  

Interior rendering of floor lounge at UND dormitory  
Lobby interior at UND Memorial Union (1964); curved openings open stair risers, geometric tilework, and pendant globe lamps are typical of Denbrook’s Modernist interior vocabulary. Spaces like this still exist intact inside the Student Union and Chester Fritz Library.

At the time this narrative was presented to the public meeting of the Grand Forks Historic Preservation Commission, the author characterized the context study as being too much like Modernist architecture, in that the interpretation was a bit hard-edged, rational, and perhaps unsympathetic to the human qualities that motivated two architects to be good representatives of their clients’ wishes. Particularly with respect to the 1948 to 1978 period of late-Modernism, patterns of historical change, changes in cultural priorities and social values, and the changing nature of architectural practice are generally far greater aspects of the Wells-Denbrook context than are the characteristics of particular styles, as revealed through the collection of the firm’s papers. The context is really more about the way two architects worked collaboratively with local clients in accommodating changing cultural priorities.

However, in setting priorities for preservation and National Register eligibility, late-Modernist buildings present difficulties in addition to their recent completion dates. In identifying the most significant architectural achievements of a community, we focus our critique on reasoned arguments and well-supported academic citations, much the way late-Modernist designers focused on precisely defined building programs and scientifically testable material technologies. Certainly most Americans who are currently fifty years old or older are products of Modernist thinking and a technologically-

---

Though academic scholars may be offended by it, the best popular culture comparison the author can suggest is the televised cartoon series “The Jetsons.” Since the 1950s, popular culture has parodied, satirized, and at times lampooned the Modernist design idiom with graphic representations like the obviously dated animation sets that portrayed the space-age consumer world of the future. The forms, colors, and shapes depicted in many late-Modernist architectural renderings will remind readers of the way the “space race” portrayed an unfamiliar and hyper-energized future world, but represented in a light-hearted way so that we could laugh at ourselves and our self-assuredness; all in good fun.
based scientific culture that glorifies “STEM” above humanities and fine arts. To the extent that Americans are largely uncomfortable with inherited late-Modernist buildings that seem inflexible and outdated in the present-day context, it is really more a critique of whether we still trust and believe in the promise of 1950s technology and what it predicted for architecture and quality of life. As demonstrated by the narrative context analysis, consistent with the property owners’ wishes, an unusually high percentage of Modernist buildings were motivated mainly by pragmatic design factors like efficiency and economy. The Modernist standard of a building “not being a monument,” should not preclude the building being thought of as more than merely utilitarian, efficient, and affordable. As defined by flexible NRHP criteria and guidelines, significance is less a matter of whether we like the way a building looks, but rather a more encompassing meaning of the term “aesthetic,” aspiring to an articulate concept as a meaningful basis for design beyond pragmatic rationalism. Significant buildings embody features and characteristics that affirm the context, uplift us spiritually (delight), and often celebrate an aspect of the human condition beyond being affordable and useful.

STEM is the increasingly familiar, current acronym for the same “Science, Technology, Engineering and Math” that promised machine-like efficiency in the 1950s. Unresolved tensions between American’s belief in scientific technology and the universal human desire for meaningful, fulfilling aesthetic environments suggests one final quote from popular culture (which is our humanistic way of laughing off our hubris). It was the cartooned possum philosopher Pogo who suggested that, “we have met the enemy and he is us.” Walt Kelly. “Pogo”, in We Have Met the Enemy and He Is Us, (1972).
EVALUATION CRITERIA

Significance
The National Register criteria recognize that historic resources may have associative value, design or construction value, or informational value. When evaluated within its historic context(s), a resource must be shown to be significant in at least one of the following areas to be considered potentially eligible for listing on the National Register.

Criterion A: Events/Patterns of History
The resource is associated with an event (or events) and/or with a pattern of events or historic trend(s) that has made a significant contribution to the history of a community, the state, or the nation; or

Criterion B: Person(s)
The person(s) associated with the resource is (are) individually significant and made demonstrated contributions to the history of a community, the state, or the nation; and the resource is associated with the person(s)'s productive life, reflecting the time period in which the person achieved significance; or

Criterion C: Design/Construction
The resource embodies distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction; and/or the resource represents the work of a master; and/or the resource possesses high artistic value; or the resource is significant and distinguished even though its components may lack individual distinction; or

Criterion D: Information Potential
The resources have yielded information important to history or prehistory; or the resource may be likely to yield information important to history or prehistory. Criterion D is usually applied to archeological resources. It is unlikely that any resources associated with this context will be eligible under this criterion. If a resource can be demonstrated to have yielded or is likely to yield information important to patterns of local history in the context of Wells-Denbrook, that resource may be considered. No Criterion D properties have been identified for this context.

Projects within this context are unlikely to be eligible under Criterion B. To be considered eligible in this context, the resource must also represent the most important property associated with the person, or be the last remaining property associated with that person, to be considered eligible. No known resources have been identified for projects with local significance under Criterion B.

All resources identified with this context share the common associative attribute that they were designed by Theodore B. Wells or Myron E. Denbrook, Jr. Construction of these resources would have occurred between the time when Wells established his firm in Grand Forks in 1923, Denbrook’s emerging role in the firm after 1948, and the transition of Wells-Denbrook to EAPC in 1978.

Resources eligible for the National Register consideration under this context will most likely be significant under Criterion C as works of a master. Many of Wells’ designs embodying distinctive characteristics associated with Classical Revival, Neoclassical and Beaux Arts, Collegiate Gothic and picturesque Period Revivals, and Art Deco styles, so they may also be significant for their architectural style. Only a very few exemplary projects designed by Myron Denbrook in the various idioms of late-twentieth century Modernism may be eligible as examples of the takeover and dominance of that style in the second half of the twentieth century. A few projects merit Criterion C evaluation for their use of building materials or construction methods that are distinctive and significant, such as Wells’ innovations in long-span construction girders or Denbrook’s experimentation with new precast concrete panel technology on the Chester Fritz Auditorium.

Resources may also be eligible under Criterion A if they also have locally significant associations with historic events or patterns of history. The significance may be in a category reflective of the property’s original function. For example, a bank building may have been the first in a community signaling that community’s pattern of development. Select, representative examples of Wells-Denbrook projects (suggested on the spreadsheet tables) based on style and period of construction may have Criterion A significance locally because of the patterns they reflect of changing architectural practices during the period of this context.
Special Criteria Considerations:

Certain types of resources are usually not considered eligible for listing on the National Register without special justifications (referred to as “Criteria Considerations”). These include properties owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes, resources removed from their original locations, birthplaces, graves and cemeteries, reconstructed resources, commemorative properties, and those that have achieved significance within the past 50 years. If a resource falls within any of these categories, it must meet the National Register Criteria Considerations (in addition to meeting regular requirements) to be considered eligible. A resource must derive its significance for architectural distinction or exceptional historic importance (further information about Criteria Considerations can be found in the National Register bulletins).

Generally speaking, resources associated with this context should be considered locally significant. If a specific resource represents the only known example in the state of a particular resource type or if it is one of few remaining examples of that resource type or if its history is significant to the state rather than local community, it might be considered significant on a statewide level.

To be considered eligible under Criterion “C”, stylistically distinct Wells or Wells-Denbrook buildings built earlier than 1964 are significant for their style, method of construction, and mastery of design. Most Wells-Denbrook and Myron Denbrook buildings completed after 1964 lack the degree of compelling local significance for their embodiment of distinct late-Modernist architectural style. A minimal number of Wells-Denbrook buildings fitting Criteria Consideration “G” have been previously listed on the National Register, and it is possible that others may be eligible. Criteria Consideration G establishes a high standard for significance of buildings newer than 50 years, only if they are of “exceptional importance” locally.

Resources constructed as part of a larger complex generally are evaluated in terms of the broader contexts associated with the complex. This would likely be the case with grouped complexes of buildings such as university campuses and campuses of state institutions like the Grafton or Bathgate developmental schools. Several Theodore Wells and Wells-Denbrook buildings constructed within the context of the University of North Dakota campus historic district have been listed on the National Register. If further research can demonstrate a similarly planned relationship between other Wells-Denbrook buildings, they should be evaluated in terms of a complex, or as part of a district.

Integrity and Condition:

Integrity is the authenticity of a resource’s historic identity, or its intactness of historic form and original construction materials. Integrity is essential to the resource’s ability to convey its significance. Alterations, either historic or contemporary, should be examined for compatibility.

Condition of a historic resource should not be confused with integrity. Condition is generally defined as “state of repair.” A resource can be in poor condition but retain a high degree of integrity. The reverse may be true when a resource is in good condition but may have lost a good deal of its historic integrity. Ideally, a resource will have a high degree of integrity and be in good condition, but it is not necessary for a resource to be in good condition to be considered eligible for the National Register. The use of condition as a criterion for evaluation, however, may be useful when deciding which resources to protect and preserve. Those that are determined to be significant and have a high degree of integrity, but are in poor condition, may be a lower priority for preservation simply for pragmatic reasons.

There must be identifiable evidence in all or some of the seven aspects of integrity discussed below for a historic resource to be considered eligible for the National Register. Integrity of specific properties should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis based on a detailed intensive level survey, since some aspects are more important in conveying significance than others, depending on the resource type. Generally, the integrity of known extant buildings by Wells or Wells-Denbrook is high according to most defined categories of significance.

A resource must possess sufficient integrity to convey its significance within its context. Generally, a resource will possess several, and usually most, of the following aspects of integrity: Location, Design, Setting, Materials, Workmanship, Feeling, and Association. Information about each of these aspects of integrity is explained in the National Register bulletins.
CONSIDERATION OF NATIONAL REGISTER ELIGIBILITY FOR PROJECTS BY 
THEODORE B. WELLS AND MYRON DENBROOK:

NOTE: To be eligible for individual National Register listing under this context, projects should generally follow the usual guideline of being more than 50 years old at the time of nomination. Thus, projects dated earlier than 1965 (about the time of Theodore Wells retirement) would be eligible for consideration without the need for special Criteria Considerations, provided they meet other eligibility standards outlines in the context study. Generally only exceptional projects built after 1965, which satisfy Criterion “C” as exceptional examples of late-Modernist architectural style would likely be candidates for individual nominations.

A. Suggested eligible representative residential properties from each stylistic period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Property name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Style/ Designer</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Integrity</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>J.G. Brundin Bungalow 110 8th Ave. S</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Colonial Revival (T.Wells)</td>
<td>NRHP-district</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Earliest Wells residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Dr. M.B. Ruud residence 425 Vernon; 1006 Chestnut</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Colonial Revival (T.Wells)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Carl G. Steen residence 101 Reeves Ct.</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Colonial Revival (T.Wells)</td>
<td>NRHP-district</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Theodore &amp; Louise Wells residence; 1006 Chestnut</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Colonial Revival/Tudor Revival (T.Wells)</td>
<td>NRHP-district</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Mr. &amp; Mrs. Charles Larkin residence</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Tudor Revival (T.Wells)</td>
<td>NRHP-district</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Farm Home for George Saumer</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Dutch Colonial Revival (T.Wells)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Dean O.H. Thoromsangard residence; 417 Princeton</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Colonial Revival/ w Tudor alternate scheme (T.Wells)</td>
<td>Recently surveyed</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Contributing feature to potential district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Farm Home for Mr. &amp; Mrs. Willard Smith</td>
<td>Rural GF County</td>
<td>American Colonial Revival (T.Wells)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>“The Architect’s Dream House” (Denbrook’s Dream); 417 17th Ave. S</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>late-Modernist Organic/Desert Modern (M.Denbrook)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>(scheme implemented from Better Homes &amp; Gardens; Jan. ’52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Larson House</td>
<td>Park River</td>
<td>Late-Modernist high-style functionalist (M.Denbrook)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Weisser House 1713 Chestnut St.</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>late-Modern California Desert Modern (Denbrook)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Representative fraternal, sorority, and social organization properties from each stylistic period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Property name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Style/ Designer</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Integrity</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Delta Delta Delta sorority house</td>
<td>UND GrandForks</td>
<td>Colonial Revival (T.Wells &amp; Ellis)</td>
<td>NRHP-district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Beta Theta Pi fraternity house</td>
<td>UND GrandForks</td>
<td>Colonial Revival/Georgian (T.Wells)</td>
<td>NRHP-district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>original Pi Beta Phi fraternity house</td>
<td>UND GrandForks</td>
<td>Tudor Revival (T.Wells)</td>
<td>NRHP-district</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Alpha Phi sorority house</td>
<td>UND GrandForks</td>
<td>Tudor Revival (T.Wells)</td>
<td>NRHP-district</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Representative educational properties from each stylistic period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Property name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Style/Designer</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Integrity</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Residence Hall for Mayville State U.</td>
<td>Mayville</td>
<td>Colonial Revival (T.Wells)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Possibly Demo’d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Blooming School District rural school</td>
<td>Rural GF County</td>
<td>Colonial Revival (T.Wells)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Crystal School Bldg.</td>
<td>Crystal, ND</td>
<td>Art Deco / Art Moderne (T.Wells)</td>
<td>extant</td>
<td>Fair; altered</td>
<td>PWA Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>UND Winter Sports Arena Bldg.</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Art Deco / Art Moderne (T.Wells)</td>
<td>not extant</td>
<td>Demo’d</td>
<td>PWA sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>South Jr. High School</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Collegiate Gothic (T.Wells)</td>
<td>NRHP-district</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>Renovated Alcott Manor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Hancock Hall dormitory</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Collegiate Gothic (T.Wells)</td>
<td>NRHP-district</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947, 1952</td>
<td>UND Science Hall &amp; Medical Science addition (O’Kelly Hall)</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Collegiate Gothic (Wells-Denbrook)</td>
<td>NRHP-district</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Gymnasium/Fieldhouse Hyslop Sports Center and additions</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Collegiate Gothic (Wells-Denbrook)</td>
<td>NRHP-district</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957, 1961</td>
<td>Chester Fritz Library and additions</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Collegiate Gothic (Wells-Denbrook)</td>
<td>NRHP-district</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Squires Hall dormitory</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Collegiate Gothic / Modernist influence (Wells-Denbrook)</td>
<td>NRHP-district</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Burtness Theatre</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Collegiate Gothic / Modernist influence (Wells-Denbrook)</td>
<td>NRHP-district</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Memorial Union / Student Center entrance additions</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Collegiate Gothic / Modernist influence (Wells-Denbrook)</td>
<td>NRHP-district</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>1951 original Grosz / Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-1972</td>
<td>Chester Fritz Auditorium</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Late-Modernist vernacular influence (M.Denbrook)</td>
<td>Soon NRHP eligible;</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>Criteria Consideration “G”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Walsh County Rural School (typical of several others)</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Late-Modernist high-style functionalist (M.Denbrook)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>UND Abbott Hall (second Chemistry Bldg.)</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Collegiate Gothic w/ Modernist interiors (Wells-Denbrook)</td>
<td>Excluded from NRHP-district</td>
<td>Fairly low</td>
<td>Determined ineligible because of alterations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959, 1964</td>
<td>Squires Hall dorm and UND Memorial Union interiors</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Late-Modernist high-style functionalist (M.Denbrook)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Fair?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Representative commercial/retail trade properties from each stylistic period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Property name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Style/Designer</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Integrity</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1930-1932</td>
<td>Lyons Garage</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Medieval early Gothic picturesque eclectic (T.Wells)</td>
<td>Extant; NRHP-listed</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Duis &amp; Lycke Filling Station</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Tudor Revival (T.Wells)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>exceptional concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Grand Forks Herald southwest elevation</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Art Deco / Art Moderne (T.Wells)</td>
<td>NRHP-district</td>
<td>high/ altered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930, 1951</td>
<td>Barker Bakery and Eddie’s Bakery Renov.</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Crafts / Art Deco (T.Wells)</td>
<td>extant</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>exceptional concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Metro Theater</td>
<td>Crosby, ND</td>
<td>Art Deco / Art Moderne (T.Wells)</td>
<td>extant</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Renamed “Crosby”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>J. Friedman Store Bldg.</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>undefined (T.Wells)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933, 1939</td>
<td>Jos. Mahowald Store Renov. / storefront</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>undefined (T.Wells)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Stevenson’s Store for Mfrs. Trust, NYC</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Art Deco influences (T.Wells)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Possible Modernization Credit Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Wells-Denbrook Architects Office Bldg. 1701 Cherry St.</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>late-Modernist Organic / Desert Modern (M.Denbrook)</td>
<td>NRHP-listed, 2014</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Grand Forks Country Club Clubhouse</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>eclectic, Late Colonial Revival with Modernist influences (M.Denbrook)</td>
<td>not extant</td>
<td>Demo’d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>E.J. Lander Store and Apartments</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Late-Modernist high-style functionalist vernacular (Denbrook)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Possible Modernization Credit Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Griffith Store</td>
<td>Devils Lake</td>
<td>Late-Modernist high-style functionalist vernacular (Denbrook)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Possible Modernization Credit Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954, 1974</td>
<td>First Federal Savings &amp; Loan Association Bldg.</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Late-Modernist high-style functionalist vernacular (Denbrook)</td>
<td>extant; altered</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>Possible Modernization Credit Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Representative religious properties from each stylistic period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Property name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Style/Designer</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Integrity</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Our Lady of Perpetual Help Catholic Church</td>
<td>Reynolds, ND</td>
<td>Colonial Revival/ Romanesque eclectic (T.Wells)</td>
<td>extant w/ addition</td>
<td>fairly high</td>
<td>Earliest Wells church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Chapel for Deaconess Hospital</td>
<td>Northwood</td>
<td>Colonial Revival (T.Wells)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>First Church of Christ Science renovation</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Beaux-Arts / neoclassical (T.Wells)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>St. Ann’s Mission</td>
<td>Belcourt</td>
<td>International style / Modernist vernacular (Wells &amp; Denbrook)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958, 1960</td>
<td>EUB Churches</td>
<td>Jamestown, Fargo</td>
<td>Late-Modernist A-frame vernacular functionalist (M.Denbrook)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Criteria Consideration “A”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. Representative *civic/governmental/public* properties from each stylistic period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Property name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Style/Designer</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Integrity</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Pierce County Memorial Bldg.</td>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>Medieval early Gothic revival eclectic (T.Wells)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Grand Forks County Fairgrounds pavilion</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Art Deco / Art Moderne (T.Wells) proposals</td>
<td>not extant</td>
<td>Mostly Demo’ed</td>
<td>WPA Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Cavalier City Hall Auditorium</td>
<td>Cavalier</td>
<td>Art Deco / Art Moderne (T.Wells)</td>
<td>Extant; NRHP eligible</td>
<td>fairly high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Park River City Hall / Auditorium</td>
<td>ParkRiver</td>
<td>Art Deco / Art Moderne (T.Wells)</td>
<td>NRHP eligible</td>
<td>high; rehab’d</td>
<td>WPA Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Inkster City Hall Auditorium</td>
<td>Inkster</td>
<td>Art Deco / Art Moderne (T.Wells)</td>
<td>NRHP eligible</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>WPA Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Walsh County Courthouse</td>
<td>Grafton</td>
<td>Art Deco / Art Moderne (T.Wells)</td>
<td>NRHP listed</td>
<td>exceptional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Edmore City Auditorium</td>
<td>Edmore, ND</td>
<td>modest Art Deco vernacular (T.Wells)</td>
<td>Extant</td>
<td>Fairly high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>U.S. Immigration Service Border Control Station</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>Late-Modernist high-style functionalist (M.Denbrook)</td>
<td>Extant; NRHP eligible</td>
<td>exceptional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Representative *healthcare/institutional* properties from each stylistic period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Property name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Style/Designer</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Integrity</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Pembina County Memorial Hospital</td>
<td>Cavalier, ND</td>
<td>Art Moderne / International Style (T.Wells)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H. Representative *industrial/warehouse* properties from each stylistic period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Property name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Style/Designer</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Integrity</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Creamery Bldg.</td>
<td>Lakota, ND</td>
<td>vernacular?? (T.Wells)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Walsh County Arena</td>
<td>Park River</td>
<td>Art Deco vernacular influence (T.Wells)</td>
<td>not extant</td>
<td>Demo’d</td>
<td>PWA project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Cities Service Oil Co. Station proposal</td>
<td>prototype</td>
<td>Industrial/International Style (T.Wells)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>O.J. Sunden Implement Dealership</td>
<td>Lakota</td>
<td>Industrial/International Style (T.Wells)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Odin Hovdeness Implement Dealership</td>
<td>Tolna</td>
<td>Industrial/International Style (T.Wells)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>GF Auditorium / Armory</td>
<td>GrandForks</td>
<td>mid-century Modernist vernacular (M.Denbrook)</td>
<td>not extant</td>
<td>Demo’d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH AND SURVEY

Research for this context study identifies projects associated with Wells and the Wells-Denbrook firm. However, much of the information that was examined in the OGL collection of the firm’s architectural records, simply illustrated the projects’ design intent and did not elaborate on whether or not the projects were ever seen through to completion. Likewise, it is difficult to know which projects were constructed but are no longer extant. Although a number of Wells or Wells-Denbrook designed buildings have previously been surveyed and several are listed on the National Register, there is an opportunity to do further research and intensive level survey work on the firm’s most significant commissions, particularly early work by Wells and more distinguished late twentieth century Modernist work by Denbrook that has only recently reached the customary 50-year standard for eligibility suggested for National Register consideration (i.e.; built earlier than 1965 when Theodore Wells retired from active practice.)

**SCOPE OF WORK FOR INTENSIVE LEVEL SURVEY OF EXTANT BUILDINGS:**

A. Defined scope of work for an intensive level survey of extant buildings in North Dakota designed by Wells and/or Denbrook.

B. For a building no longer extant or a design that was never constructed, the work will be evaluated within the body of the firm’s output, determining whether or not the subject is pivotal in the firm’s evolving practice, or whether the designs are typical and undistinguished in relationship to other works.

*The recommendation for future research and survey work:*

First, a more detailed, intensive-level survey of individual buildings identified as having been designed Wells or Denbrook should be conducted according to NDCRs guidelines, to determine (a) if...
they were actually built, (b) and if so, are they extant, and (c) if they are extant, are they potentially eligible for listing on the National Register. A systematic, intensive-level survey would help clarify and substantiate which, if any, resources are eligible for National Register listings based on criteria of this context. The buildings that should be included are those with “Unknown” noted in the “Status” column on the list in Appendix B. Some of these resources are located in Grand Forks, but several are located in scattered communities throughout northeastern North Dakota. In some cases, the research will entail locating actual address of the buildings associated with Wells or Denbrook. It is likely that GoogleEarth ground-level aerial mapping could enable a determination about known works in specific communities without extensive travel and field work. Local accounts from the 1930s, published in daily and weekly newspapers, particularly the Grand Forks Herald (1932-1939), are prospectively an informative local resource, but in general not much coverage was given to work by area architectural firms unless a building was associated with a particular federal funding program.

Secondly, this context document may be used to create a National Register Multiple Property Document for projects designed by Theodore B. Wells or Wells-Denbrook. This would allow for property owners to pursue National Register listings under the cover of a multiple property listing, an approach that can simplify the process greatly. In addition to the recommendations for future research and survey work, the author recommends that individual National Register listings be considered for at least ten representative buildings known to exist with high integrity. Each of these buildings is notable for its exceptional architectural design and detail. Criteria and descriptions for property types are suggested here, based on the evolution of architectural styles and functional purpose. In addition to known masterworks that embody a defined architectural style, there are also a number of buildings that the author was able to determine are extant but the degree of historic integrity and potential eligibility was not determined. This is a second group of buildings to be surveyed, listed as “Extant” in the “Status” column.

Resources associated with this context may be considered significant under Criterion C, based on direct design associations with the work of a known master architect; in this instance either Theodore B. Wells or Myron E. Denbrook, Jr. If a property represents the work of a master builder or possesses high artistic values, it may be eligible under this criterion as outlined in the National Register guidelines.

Distinctive characteristics of properties eligible under Criterion C include:

- use of local building materials and construction methods,
- regional adaptations of architectural styles, particularly the then-popular American Colonial Revival, Tudor Revival, Collegiate Gothic Revival, Art Deco and Streamline Art Moderne styles,
- the more characteristic examples of mid-twentieth century Modernism, either residentially scaled Desert Modernism or academic high-style functional Modernist principles,
- documentary evidence of design work or construction supervision that distinguish the work as being associated with an identifiable architect, sponsoring agency, or client.
General Registration Requirements

As there is a common associative attribute for local significance of these properties, including:

1. A resource (property) designed or supervised by either Theodore B. Wells or Myron E. Denbrook, Jr. If a property represents the work of a master builder or possesses high artistic values, it may be eligible under this criterion as outlined in the National Register guidelines.

2. Construction should have been substantially completed prior to 1965.

3. A resource should be considered locally significant, unless it represents the only known example in the state of a particular property sub-type within a general property type, or is one of the few remaining examples of that property type associated with a specific work program. In these cases, a resource might be considered significant on a statewide level.

4. An individual resource constructed as part of a complex may not be considered eligible unless a sufficient number of components survive from the original complex, which can interpret the historic function of the complex. Only in the case where an individual resource, constructed as part of a larger complex, is the only remaining resource associated with that complex should it be considered eligible in the absence of a sufficient number of components associated with the original complex.

5. An individual resource may be considered eligible if it represents a significant example of an architectural style, an innovative or distinctive engineering or construction method, or the work of a master, OR it alone best represents a significant person’s productive life.

6. A resource must possess sufficient integrity to convey its significance. Generally, a resource will possess several, and usually most, of the following seven aspects of integrity:

   a. **Location:** Because the relationship between a resource and its historic associations is usually destroyed if the resource is moved, the resource should remain in its original location. Buildings, structures and objects moved from their original locations must meet Criteria Consideration B for moved properties as indicated in the National Register guidelines.

   b. **Design:** A resource should retain a combination of elements that convey its original design. These elements may include the form, plan, organization of space, structural systems, technology, materials, and style. Generally, a resource should retain its overall original form and massing. Subsequent additions to resources should be either set back so as to not obstruct the original form, should be of a compatible scale, and should not be on the primary facade of a building. Window replacement in buildings may be acceptable if fenestration patterns remain intact. Enlargement of window and door openings may render a building ineligible if the alterations significantly change the wall to opening ratio. The filling in of openings, if the original openings are still readable, may be considered on secondary facades only. Original plans and organization of space should be evident, even if the use of the space has changed over time. Textures and colors of original surface materials should remain intact. The type, amount and style of ornamentation must reflect the original design. In the case of designed landscapes, the original arrangement and type of plantings, as well as the overall site plan should be intact. Design elements related to specific resource types are noted, as appropriate, in the property description sections.

   c. **Setting:** The physical environment in which the resource exists should reflect its historic features, including topography, vegetation, simple constructed features (such as paths or fences), and the relationships between the resource and its surroundings.

   d. **Materials:** A resource must retain the key exterior materials dating from the period of its historic significance. Retention of original materials is essential for resources constructed under federal relief programs that emphasized use of local building
materials. If a resource has been rehabilitated, historic materials and significant features must be preserved. A resource whose historic materials have been lost and then reconstructed may be eligible only if it meets Criteria Consideration E for reconstructed properties as indicated in the National Register guidelines.

e. **Workmanship:** Because labor-intensive work relief and construction was paramount in the federal relief programs, resources should retain the physical evidence of workmanship. This workmanship should illustrate aesthetic principles and technological practices associated with federal relief programs, as well as individual, local, and regional applications of both. A resource should retain evidence of federal relief workers’ labor and skill, as well its original design and materials.

f. **Feeling:** A resource should retain sufficient original physical features that, when taken together, convey the resource’s historic character. This will generally include the combination of original design, materials, workmanship and setting. Because feeling depends on individual perceptions, its retention alone is never sufficient to support eligibility for the National Register.

g. **Association:** To retain association, the direct link between the resource and its association with an important historic event or person must be sufficiently intact to convey that relationship to an observer. Association, like feeling, requires the presence of original physical features that convey the resource’s historic character. Because association depends on individual perceptions, its retention alone is never sufficient to support eligibility for the National Register.

7. A resource needs not retain its original function if its historic physical integrity is intact.

**ASSOCIATED PROPERTY TYPES**

Brief descriptions are provided to supplement the information presented in the historic context. Statements pertaining to each property type and registration requirements are specific to that property type. As further research and intensive-level survey work is conducted, the information pertaining to the descriptions of some Associated Property Types may need to be amended.

**I. NAME OF PROPERTY TYPE; GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS:**

A. **MUNICIPAL BUILDINGS, CITY HALLS, POLICE AND FIRE STATIONS**

Municipal buildings, also called city halls, town halls, or village halls, were a frequently constructed structural type regionally where there was a perceived need for local embodiment of the civic and administrative aspects of government. Stylistically, municipal buildings represent a range of architectural designs, popular twentieth century period revival styles, and emerging post-War technologically oriented late-Modernist designs.

B. **BORDER IMMIGRATION CONTROL HEADQUARTERS**

A variety of functional buildings are used as border crossing inspection stations, customs clearinghouses, and international Ports of Entry along the North Dakota border with Canada. Because of this distinctive local condition, the Grand Forks Immigration/Border Patrol station merits further investigation for its late-Modernist architectural characteristics.

C. **ARMORIES AND MILITARY FACILITIES**

Traditionally, the National Guard presence in local communities was often defined by an armory building. In North Dakota, the stylistic expression of armories for the military reserve training is generally much more architecturally modest than in surrounding states.
REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS FOR GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS

Government Buildings are architecturally significant as many of the most prominent and visually significant buildings in the community. A variety of well-executed designs were constructed, including the prevailing styles of the day -- distinctive architectural expressions associated with an emergent, defined architectural style. The programmatic requirements for such projects often resulted in the use of monumental building materials.

A Government Building should possess integrity of location, design, materials, workmanship, and association, and should be without substantial alterations. Original materials and prominent features should remain intact, and any alterations should be modest in scale without impacting or obscuring major facades, elements, or design features. An eligible Government Building should generally represent a building that was constructed new during the years of this context, rather than being an addition or minor expansion of a previous structure.

II. NAME OF PROPERTY TYPE; EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES:

A. PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Primary and secondary schools were built in cities and rural communities of all sizes throughout North Dakota during the time period of this context study. These projects clearly served a multi-fold purpose; providing work relief and upgrading the standard infrastructure for a broadened educational curriculum in towns and cities. School facilities were subject to review of the state Superintendent for Public Instruction. Within the Wells-Denbrook context, schools designed according to the Collegiate Gothic architectural style are generally most significant, whereas purely pragmatic school designs of the late-Modernist era reveal only minimal information lending to the interpretation of a local context.

B. EDUCATIONAL BUILDINGS ON CAMPUSES OF STATE INSTITUTIONS

University buildings are generally large multi-story brick and reinforced concrete or masonry structures, which served as auditoriums, sports facilities, classrooms, research laboratories, or libraries. Several excellent examples at the University of North Dakota have previously been NRHP-listed as part of the campus historic district. The now-demolished Winter Sports Building at the University of North Dakota in Grand Forks was a more typical example of a large public facility built for quasi-educational purposes on a university campus.

REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS FOR EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES

An Educational building should be eligible under National Register Criterion C for incorporating the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values. A building should possess integrity of location, design, materials, workmanship, and association, and should be without substantial alterations. Original materials and prominent features should remain intact, and any alterations should be modest in scale without impacting or obscuring major facades, elements, or design features. For example, a school with a modern addition may be considered eligible if the integrity of the original construction is not impaired.

III. NAME OF PROPERTY TYPE; CIVIC AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

A. CIVIC AUDITORIUMS, FAIRGROUNDS, AND COMMUNITY BUILDINGS

Civic Auditoriums and Community Buildings varied widely in scale and design, representing large and small structures in a variety of architectural styles, ranging from simple vernacular to the distinctive Streamline Art Moderne style often associated with WPA-construction. Materials also varied and included wood, reinforced concrete, brick, and native stone. Larger auditoriums sometimes had barrel vault roofs. Fenestration patterns varied, but typically included ventilating sash windows placed high on the exterior walls, and fairly
elaborate entrances with two-, three-, or more pairs of doors. As community gathering space, auditoriums and community buildings usually included large open spaces for various ceremonial purposes and performances. Sometimes used as a community gymnasium and/or theater, some auditorium/community buildings were equipped with hardwood floors and/or stages. In addition to the large primary space, an office, a kitchen, and restrooms may have been included.

B. SWIMMING POOLS, BATH HOUSES AND TOURIST CAMPS

Transient campgrounds were sometimes developed in conjunction with local parks. Improvements frequently included picnic shelters and sanitation buildings, and modest recreation buildings.

REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS FOR SOCIAL AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

A Civic or Recreational Facility should represent the best or only known example of a particular category of resource within this property type, or one of the few remaining buildings of its type. A Social or Recreational Facility should possess integrity of location, design, materials, workmanship, and association, and should be without major alterations. Original materials and prominent features should remain intact, and any alterations should be modest in scale without impacting or obscuring major facades, elements, or design features.

IV. NAME OF PROPERTY TYPE; RESIDENTIAL, SOCIAL AND WORSHIP FACILITIES

A. FRATERNITIES AND SORORITIES

Fraternities and sorority houses were significant features of university life during the time period of this context study. Most fraternities and sororities nearby the University of North Dakota are previously listed under the well-defined National Register historic district. Within the Wells-Denbrook context, fraternities and sororities that are generally most significant were most often designed according to Period Revival architectural styles. Designs according to the late-Modernist era may embody information lending to the interpretation of a local context.

B. PRIVATE RESIDENCES

Within the Wells-Denbrook context, National Register eligible private residences with local significance were most often designed according to Period Revival architectural styles. Designs according to the late-Modernist era may also embody information lending to the interpretation of a local context.

C. CHURCHES

Within the Wells-Denbrook context, a small number of National Register eligible churches with local significance were designed according to Period Revival architectural styles. Designs according to the late-Modernist era may also embody information lending to the interpretation of a local context. Special attention should be given to National Register Criteria Considerations for architectural characteristics and interpretation of properties used for religious purposes, and properties that were built within the past fifty years.

REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS FOR RESIDENTIAL, SOCIAL AND WORSHIP FACILITIES

A private residence, fraternity or sorority house, or place of worship should represent a superior, or excellent example of a particular category of resource within this property type, or one of the few remaining buildings of its type. Particular attention is given to buildings before 1950 that closely match one of the defined styles of Classical architecture, designed by a known master architect or builder. For late-Modernist work after 1948, projects that represent the best of their type in the region or community setting, and which are demonstrative or exemplary of the tenets of late-Modernist architectural design should be given careful consideration. A Social, Residential, or Worship Facility should possess integrity of location, design, materials, workmanship, and association, and should be without major alterations. Original materials and
prominent features should remain intact, and any alterations should be modest in scale without impacting or obscuring major facades, elements, or design features.

V. NAME OF PROPERTY TYPE; COMMERCIAL, RETAIL TRADE FACILITIES

A. RETAIL STORES and other COMMERCIAL BUSINESS PLACES

Within the Wells-Denbrook context, a small number of National Register eligible retail stores and commercial trade properties with local significance may embody information lending to the interpretation of a local context.

REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS FOR COMMERCIAL AND RETAIL TRADE FACILITIES

A commercial business, storefront, or retail trade building should represent a superior, or excellent example of a particular category of resource within this property type, or one of the few remaining buildings of its type. Particular attention is given to buildings before 1950 that closely match one of the defined styles of Classical architecture, designed by a known master architect or builder. Intact properties having known associations with federal incentive programs for financial sponsorship, such as the Modernization Credit Plan (MCP) merit special consideration. For late-Modernist work after 1948, projects that represent the best of their type in the region or community setting, and which are demonstrative or exemplary of the tenets of late-Modernist architectural design should be given careful consideration. A Retail Store or Commercial Trade Facility should possess integrity of location, design, materials, workmanship, and association, and should be without major alterations. Original materials and prominent features should remain intact, and any alterations should be modest in scale without impacting or obscuring major facades, elements, character-defining or innovative design features.
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Projects by year in other states

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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Projects by year in North Dakota

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Residential/Other</th>
<th>Commercial/Industrial</th>
<th>Education/Healthcare</th>
<th>Religious/Worship</th>
<th>Public/Fraternity/Social</th>
<th>Governmental/Civic</th>
<th>Healthcare</th>
<th>Residential/Other</th>
</tr>
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NOTES: Each horizontal rectangle represents two projects. Project dates correspond with the firm's numbering system, whereas project construction and occupancy may be a year or two later. Project counts are based on drawings in the OGL collections, and there may be additional projects in any year for which documentation has been lost.
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Wells-Denbrook Architects
in North Dakota, 1923-1978

Part II
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Steve C. Martens; Architect
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and
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State Historical Society of North Dakota
List of Wells-Denbrook projects documented in OGL Collections:
(compiled July 20, 2015)

Type of property:
(R)=Residential, (E)=Educational, (C)=Commercial Business, (H)=Healthcare,
(W)=Religious/Worship, (F/S)=Fraternal/Social, (G/P)=Governmental/Public, (I)=Industrial,
(O)=Other functional type

Form of documentation: (B) Blueprint construction drawing, (S) Specification, (P) Photo,
rendering, or other.

Works of pivotal importance
Works of average importance
Works of lesser importance and/or projects located outside North Dakota
Projects graphically documented by arrangement with OGL Special Collection #1487 at UND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year/Completion Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Colonial Bungalow for J.G. Brundin; Grand Forks</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>1922-23 (R); (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delta Delta Delta Sorority House at UND; Grand Forks</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>“Wells and Ellis” (F/S); (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Our Lady of Perpetual Help Church; Reynolds, ND</td>
<td>Reynolds, ND</td>
<td>1923 (W); (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glenwood Sanitarium (remodel into apartments); Enderlin, ND</td>
<td>Enderlin, ND</td>
<td>(R); (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thompson School Bldg.; Thompson, ND</td>
<td>Thompson, ND</td>
<td>(E); (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Rugby High School proposal; Rugby, ND</td>
<td>Rugby, ND</td>
<td>(E); (B); (P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stock plans for State Superintendent; Willow City and Larimore schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>(E); (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Bismarck Clinic Bldg.; Bismarck, ND</td>
<td>Bismarck, ND</td>
<td>(H); (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta Theta Pi Fraternity House at UND; Grand Forks</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>(F/S); (B) (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Falconer Township Town Hall; rural North Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td>(G/P); (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addition to the UND Armory, University of North Dakota</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>(E); (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(unnamed) Apartment Bldg.; Grand Forks</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>(R); (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Store Bldg. remodel at Corner DeMers and Fifth Street; Grand Forks</td>
<td></td>
<td>(C); (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J.E. McFadden Stucco Residence, Grand Forks</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>(R); (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Apartment Buildings for W. G. Stevens, Grand Forks, North Dakota</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stucco Residence for Charles Larkin; Grand Forks</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>(1926) (R); (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O. Young Store and Office Bldg.; Grand Forks</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>(C); (B) (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lynch Garage and Apartments; Grand Forks</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>(C) (R); (B) (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First National Bank Office Remodeling; Grand Forks</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>(C); (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brick Colonial Residence for Dr. M.B. Ruud; 425 Vernon Ave.; Grand Forks</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>(R); (B) “Colonial”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Forks Seed Co. Warehouse addition; Grand Forks</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>(C); (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Duplex residence in Riverside Park neighborhood; Grand Forks</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gilby School Bldg. Heating, Plumbing, Wiring; Gilby, ND</td>
<td>Gilby, ND</td>
<td>(E); (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Dakota Wheat Growers Office Partitions, Grand Forks</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Devils Lake School for the Deaf, Devils Lake, ND</td>
<td>Devils Lake, ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Store and Office for C. F. Sweet, Grand Forks</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UND Delta Zeta Fraternity House for Upsilon Building Association; Grand Forks</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>(F/S); (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F.O.E. Eagles Lodge; East Grand Forks, MN</td>
<td>East Grand Forks, MN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(286) W.T. Borden Duplex; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(287) Residence Hall Dormitory for State Normal School; Mayville, ND (1927) (R); (B) “Colonial”

1928

(288) Girls’ Dormitory at University of North Dakota; Grand Forks (E); (R); (B)
(290) P.R. Fields Residence; Grand Forks (R); (B) “Tudor Rev.”
(291) Warwick School; Warwick, ND (E); (B) (S)
(295) Carl G. Steen Residence; Grand Forks (R); (B) “Tudor Rev.”
(296) Alpha Phi Fraternity / Sorority House at UND; Grand Forks (F/S); (B) “Tudor Rev.”
(297) Pi Beta Sorority House at UND; Grand Forks (F/S); (B) (S) “Tudor Rev.”
(298) Trades Bldg. at State School for the Deaf; Devils Lake, ND
(299) Skarsbo 20-Unit Apartment Bldg.; Grand Forks (R); (B) (S)
(302) Dr. F.C. Sweet Store and Office Bldg.; Minot, ND (C); (S)
(302-A) Apartments for Dr. C.F. Sweet; Minot, ND (R); (B)

1929

(300) H.F. Phelps Office Bldg.; Minto, ND (C); (B)
(301) Duis and Lycke Filling Station; Grand Forks (C); (B) “Tudor Rev.”
(302) Gamma Phi Beta House at UND; Grand Forks (F/S); (B) “Tudor Rev.”
(304) Residence for Carl G. Steen (R); (B) “Am. Colonial Rev.”
(305) Architect’s Residence for Mr. & Mrs. T.F. Wells; Grand Forks (R); (B) (S) “Tudor Rev.”
(322) Thorwaldson-Johnson GF Auto Supply Store Bldgs.; Grand Forks (C); (S)
(311) Bakery Bldg. for Barker Baking Co.; Grand Forks (C); (S)
(314) Hanson and Anderson Mortuary addition and remodel; Grand Forks (S)
(320) Creamery Building for Lakota, ND (C); (B)
(321) Tourist Cabins for East Grand Forks, MN
(323) Addition to Guy Elken Residence, Mayville
(324) Gymnasium for State Normal School, Mayville (E); (B) (S)
(325) Lyons Motor Company Garage; Grand Forks (C); (S)
(332) Geo. Schwam Apartment Bldg. at 106 South Third St.; Grand Forks (R); (S)

1930

(307) Building Remodeling for T.J. Smith
(309) Alpha Chi Omega Sorority at UND; Grand Forks (F/S); (B)
(310?) Larimore School; Larimore, ND (E); (B)
(312) Apartments for J.D. Bacon in Old Mercantile Bldg.; Grand Forks (1930)
(318) Tourist Shelter for Riverside Park; Grand Forks (O); (B)
(319) 14-unit Apartment Bldg.; Grand Forks? (R); (B)
(331) Unknown project proposal (unidentified location) (R); (B) (P) “Tudor Rev.”
(333) 9-car Garage for Northern Packing Co. (I); (B)
(334) unidentified storage garage project. (I); (B)
(335) Pierce County Memorial Bldg.; Rugby, ND (F/S); (B); (P); (S)
(338) Brick Residence for H.F. Smith at 1002 Reeves Drive; Grand Forks (R); (B) (S)
(340) Super Service Station concept proposal (n.c.) (C); (B); (P)
(342) Black’s Purity Sweet Shop Bakery; Grand Forks (C); (B) (S)
(343) Farm Home Residence for George Saumer (R); (B)
(345) Addition to State Normal School, Dickinson (E); (B)
(347) Basement for proposed church at Florian, MN
(348) Tourist Cabins, Kitchen and Laundry Bldg. for Riverside Park; Grand Forks (O); (B); (S)
1931

(3100) **Grand Forks (South) Junior High School** (E); (B)
(3101) **R.J. Lamarre Super Service Station** (n.l.) Wells & Ellis; “Byzantine” (C); (B)
(3106) **L.C. Stein remodel DeRoche Apartments; Grand Forks** (R); (B)
(3108) **Kasper Mortuary; Grand Forks**? (C); (B)
(3109) **Delta Delta Delta Sorority House improvements; Grand Forks** “Wells and Ellis” (F/S); (B)
(3120) **Potato Warehouse (1931)**
(3111) **Grand Forks Herald Bldg.; Grand Forks** (C); (B)
(3113) **W.L. Nelson Residence, [n.c.]** (R); (S)
(3115) **Powerplant remodel & addition, Institution for the Feeble Minded; Grafton**

1932

(3202) **J. Friedman Store Building; Grand Forks?** (C); (B) (S)
(3211) **M.J. Moran store building proposal (B);** (C); (B)
(3225) **Panovitz Co. remodel of Dinnie Block Apts. on 3rd St.; Grand Forks** (R); (B)
(3226) **Rolette Community Hospital remodel & addition; Rolette, ND** (H); (B)
(3227) **Grafton Developmental Home Powerplant Coal Bin; Grafton, ND** (I); (B)

1933

(3302) **Ross Creamery; Ross, MN**
(3305) **Mahowald Store second-story addition; Grand Forks** (C); (B)
(3307) **Mrs. J. Scott residential addition; Gilby, ND** (R); (B)

1934

(3401) **Coulee Township Hall; Penn, ND** (F/S); (B)
(3404) **Norman School District Building; Clifford, ND** (1935) (E); (B)
(3405) **Grade School/High School addition & remodel; Hatton, ND** (E); (B)
(3408) **Leeds Service Station; Leeds, ND** (for Cities Service Oil Co.; 6/15/1934) (C); (B) “Colonial”
(3411) **Chapel, Northwood Deaconess Hospital & Home Assoc.; Northwood, MN** (W); (B)
(3412) **Remodel, Mrs. C. Gertson Residence; (n.l.)** (R); (B)
(3420) **Northwood School addition and remodel; Northwood, ND** (E); (S)

1935

(3503) **Grygla Co-op Creamery Association building; Grygla, MN** (May, 1935) (I); (B)
(3509) **Kiwanis Hobby Show display tables; Grand Forks**
(3513) **Grygla School; Grygla, MN** (E); (B)
(3515) **Warren Co-op Creamery Association building; Warren, MN** (I); (B)
(3516) **Gonvick Co-op Creamery Association building; Gonvick, MN** (I); (B)
(3518) **Rabinovich Jewelry storefront remodel; Grand Forks** (I); (B)
(3519) **Wm. DePuy apartment remodel (1935)** (I); (B)
(3521) **Valley Motor Company Garage Bldg.; Grand Forks** (C); (S)
(3530) **Grade and High School Building Addition and Remodel, Mayville, ND**
(3532) **Fessenden School Building remodel/proposal; Fessenden, ND** (E); (S) (P)
(3533) **Grade School and High School building; Portland, ND** (E); (S)
(3534) **UND Winter Sports Arena; Grand Forks** “PWA” (E); (B)
(3535) **Marshall County School District 115 building; Grygla, MN** (E); (B)

1936

(3601) **UND Dean O.H. Thormodsgard Residence; Grand Forks** (R); (B) “Colonial”; “Tudor”
(3602) **Colonial Revival Residence for Mr. & Mrs. H.F. Hills; Grafton, ND** (R); (B) (S)
(3603) First Church of Christ Scientist; Grand Forks (W); (B)
(3604) Grand Forks Country Club Clubhouse; Grand Forks
(3605) Stevenson’s Store remodel, for Minneapolis Trust Co., 24-26 3rd St.; Grand Forks (C); (B)
(3608) Women’s Toilet, Grand Forks Fairgrounds; Grand Forks
(3610) S. Friedman 3rd floor remodel, Central Block, Grand Forks
(3612) Hillsboro High School remodel; Hillsboro, ND
(3614) J.S. Lamb residential remodeling (proposal); Michigan, ND (R); (B)
(3615) R.L. Douglas residence sleeping porch; East Grand Forks, MN (R); (B)
(3616) Piggly Wiggly Store Building for Quality Food Stores; Grand Forks (C); (S)
(3618) Mr. & Mrs. H. Webster residence; Northwood, ND (8/26/1936) (R); (B)
(3630) WPA Grandstand at Grand Forks County Fairgrounds; Grand Forks (F/S); (B)/(R)
(3631) Biergarten & pavilions at Grand Forks County Fairgrounds; Grand Forks (F/S); (B)/(R)
(? Unbuilt proposal for Renville Co. Courthouse (1936, E. Molander design); Mohall, ND

1937
(3701) Roseau Grade School/High School remodel & addition; Roseau, MN (E); (B)
(3703) Grafton City Hall; Grafton, ND (F/S); (S)
(3706) YWCA/YMCA renovation work?; Grand Forks (F/S); (B)
(3706) Chancel for Federation Church; Grand Forks
(3707) Knapp Store and Apartment; Grand Forks
(3711) George Kasper Funeral Home; Grand Forks (C); (B) (S)
(3712) Mork Residence; Grand Forks
(3714) Farmer’s Union Creamery; Devils Lake, ND (I); (B)
(3715) Winter Sports Arena; Crookston, MN
(3716) Viking School District building; rural Trail County, ND
(3718) PWA Dormitory addition to North “B” annex at State Developmental School; Grafton, ND
(3719) Winter Sports Arena; Grafton, ND (WPA, 1937) (F/S); (S)
(3720) WPA/PWA Park River City Hall; Park River, ND (WPA, 1938) (F/S); (S)
(3721) Mork Residence; Grand Forks

1938
(3800) Neche School; Neche, ND (E); (B)
(3801) Maddock School Gymnasium / Auditorium addition; Maddock, ND (E); (B)
(3803) Sharon School addition; Sharon, ND (E); (B)
(3804) unidentified City Hall proposal
(3805) Metro Theater; Crosby, ND (C); (B) (S)
(3806) Walhalla City Hall; Walhalla, ND (G/P); (B)
(3807) UND Hancock Residence; Grand Forks
(3808) Farm Home for Mr. & Mrs. Willard Smith; St. Thomas, ND (R); (B) (S)
(3809) WPA/PWA Cavalier City Hall; Cavalier, ND (G/P); (B)
(3810) Crystal School Bldg.; Crystal, ND (PWA, 1938)
(3811) Michigan School addition; Michigan, ND (E); (B)
(3812) Stephen School Auditorium addition; Stephen, MN? (E); (B)
(3814) Grafton Elementary Grade School; Grafton, ND (E); (B)
(3815) FERA/PWA Walsh County Courthouse, Grafton, ND (G/P); (B)
(3819) Sheppard Store and Apartments; Grand Forks
(3820) David Miller Company Store Bldg.; Grand Forks (C); (S)

1939
(3901) Plummer School Addition; Plummer, MN (E); (S)
(3902) Phillip Woutat Residence; Grand Forks (R); (B)
1940

(3903)  (Joseph) Mahowald Store addition; Grand Forks (C); (B)
(3903)  Grand Forks High School Bleachers; Grand Forks
(3904)  Lystad & Redick, Inc. addition; Grand Forks
(3905)  Dr. Victor S. Quale Residence; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(3906)  Grafton Milk Company building; Grafton, ND (I); (B)
(3907)  East Grand Forks City Hall; East Grand Forks, MN (G/P); (B)
(3910)  Clifford Annex (NRHP listed prior to demo, ca. 2001) (C); (B)
(3913)  Stephen School Auditorium addition; Stephen, MN (E); (B)

1940

(4000)  National Youth Administration Boys Dormitory; Mayville, ND (R); (B)
(4000)  National Youth Administration Girls Dormitory, UND; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(4001)  First National Bank, Wilson Storefront remodel; Grand Forks (C); (B) (S)
(4002)  Sarles School Gymnasium addition; Sarles, ND (1940)
(4003)  Edmore Auditorium; Edmore, ND (PWA, 1940)
(4004)  Saint Thomas Auditorium; St. Thomas, ND (G/P); (B)
(4005)  Hallock City Hall; Hallock, MN (G/P); (B)
(4006)  City Hall Proposal; Hoople, ND (G/P); (B)
(4008)  Walsh County Machine Shed; Grafton, ND (I); (B)
(4010)  Blooming School District building; rural Grand Forks
(4011)  Valley Motor Company Second Story addition; Grand Forks
(4012)  R.C. Staley Residence; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(4013)  Ticket Office at UND Memorial Stadium; Grand Forks
(4015)  Grand Theater alterations; Michigan, ND
(4016)  Mayville State Teachers’ College campus repairs work & proposal; Mayville, ND
(4017)  ND Highway Department Bldg.; Devils Lake, ND (I); (B)
(4018)  Dorothy Zimmerman Residence; Grand Forks
(4019)  Sweet Clover Zimmerman garage addition; East Grand Forks, MN (I); (B)
(4020)  Cities Service Oil Co. Station (Industrial/International Style); Grand Forks, ND
(4022)  Old People’s Home addition and remodel; Grand Forks, ND
(4025)  YWCA Building (alterations?); Grand Forks [original GF YMCA Building is attributed to Joseph Bell DeRemer, 1906]

1941

(4101)  Plummer School Addition; Plummer, MN
(4102)  First Church of Christ Scientist; Devils Lake, ND (W); (B)
(4103)  Grand Forks Armory; Grand Forks
(4105)  Bray Store Bldg.; Grand Forks (C); (B)
(4108)  National Youth Administration Bldg. at State Teacher’s College; Mayville, ND “Colonial”
(4109)  Grafton Armory Building; Grafton, ND
(4110)  GF City Administration Offices at Grand Forks Municipal Airport; Grand Forks
(4111)  Gym addition for State Teachers College; Mayville, ND? (E); (B)
(4120)  Proposed Apartments at 118 ½ S. 3rd St.; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(4123)  Norman Building; Grand Forks
(? )   Proposal for Pennington County Courthouse; Thief River Falls, MN (G/P); (B)
(? )   Mrs. J. Elton apartments proposal; Grand Forks? (R); (B)
(? )   UND Girls’ Dormitory; Grand Forks (E); (B)
(4146?)  Roosevelt School remodel; Grand Forks (E); (B)
1942

(4201) City Auditorium remodeling; Warren, MN (G/P); (B)

() No other projects indicated in inventory

1943

() No projects documented in inventory

1944

(4407) Pierce Co. Farmer’s Union Locker & Processing Plant; Rugby, ND (I); (B)
(4408) Farmer’s Union Oil Co. Machine Shop; Rugby, ND (I); (B)
(4411) Dakota Hotel; East Grand Forks, MN
(4414) 906 Master Service: Gordon Loft, owner; Grand Forks (I); (B)
(4415) Butler Construction Co. Office Building; Grand Forks (C); (B)
(4418) Wright Bldg., GF Glass & Paint Co. remodel; Grand Forks (C); (B)
(4419) Mr. & Mrs. Walter Dougherty Residence remodel; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(4420) Uptown Bar remodel; Grand Forks, ND (C); (B)
(4421) F.O.E. Lodge vestibule addition; East Grand Forks, MN
(4422) Grand Forks County Courthouse Counter Screens remodel; Grand Forks, ND (G/P); (B)
(4423) O.B. Burtness Residence remodeling proposal; Grand Forks (R); (B)

1945

(4502) Apartments remodel & addition, 118 ½ S. 3rd St. and Uptown Rec Center; Grand Forks
(4503) Art Greenburg Store rebuild; Grand Forks (C); (B)
(4504) G.I. Housing Units & UND Harrington Hall Stairwell; Grand Forks
(4504) Mr. & Mrs. Lloyd C. Thompson Residence remodel; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(4505) M.J. Benson Co. Grain Elevator addition; Grand Forks (I); (B)
(4506) Farmer’s Union Grain Supply Co. Seed House; Williston, ND (I); (B)
(4508) Arnold Wige Radiator Repair Shop; Grand Forks
(4511) Farmer’s Union Supply Co-op; Williston, ND
(4512) Pioneers Coffee Co. Store proposal; Grand Forks
(4514) Red River Produce Co. Hatchery Bldg.; Grand Forks (I); (B)
(4515) Johnson Stores Warehouse Bldg.; Larimore, ND (C); (B)
(4516) Potato Warehouse for Art Greenberg; Grand Forks
(4516) Herberger Residence (1113 Reeves) & Herberger Store remodel (12 S. 3rd St.); Grand Forks
(4517) Farmer’s Union Oil Co. Machine Shop; Rugby, ND
(4518) Zelda Theater: Ted Hoffman, owner; Grafton, ND (C); (B)
(4519) Garage/Implement Bldg: H.H. Haas, owner; Cando, ND
(4520) A. Lund Machinery Bldg; East Grand Forks, MN
(4523) Hotel Proposal for J.H. Axdal, owner; Cavalier, ND (1945)
(4524) Mr. & Mrs. O.W. Thomas Residence; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(4525) Milk Plan: Harold Glidden, owner; Hallock, MN (I); (B)
(4526) Forkenbrock Motor Co.; Thief River Falls, MN (C); (B)
(4527) Brightman Co. Receiving & Bottling Rooms addition; Grand Forks (I); (B)
(4528) Valley Motor Co.; Grand Forks (C); (B)
(4529) Saint Anne’s Indian Mission School Bldg, addition; Belcourt, ND
(4530) Overbye & Skidmore Implement Bldg.; Grafton, ND (C); (B)
(4532) Lake Supply Co. Implement Bldg.; Devils Lake, ND (C); (B)
(4533) UND McNie Hall remodel; Grand Forks
(4534) Kjelmer Implement; Leeds, ND (C); (B)
(4535) Norby’s Store: DeMers Ave. and 4th St.; Grand Forks
1946

(4601) UND Medical Science Bldg.; Grand Forks (E); (B) “Collegiate Gothic”
(4602) J.H. Mikkelsen Implement Bldg.; Grand Forks (C); (B)
(4603) O.J. Sunden Implement Bldg.; Lakota, ND (C); (B) “International Style”
(4604) Bridgman Co. Garage Bldg.; Grand Forks
(4605) Red River Produce Co.; Grafton, ND (I); (B)
(4607) Municipal Powerplant Bldg.; Cavalier, ND (I); (B)
(4609) Potato Warehouse: Frances Boushea, owner; East Grand Forks, MN (I); (B)
(?) KATO Store; Grand Forks (C); (B)
(4610) S&L Store Basement remodel; Grand Forks (C) (B)
(4611) Hotel & Store Proposal: S. Hoffman, owner; Grand Forks
(4614) T.M. Cable Residence; Hillsboro, ND (R); (B)
(4615) KVGF Radio Station; Grand Forks (C) (B)
(4622) Bridgeman Creameries Milk Plant addition; Thief River Falls, MN
(4623) Poppler Furniture Bldg.; Grand Forks (C) (B)
(4625) Western Auto Parts Co. Basement work; Grand Forks (C) (B)
(4626) Lattice Truss for Garage; Cavalier, ND
(4627) R.B. Griffith Co. Store; Grand Forks (C) (B)
(4632) Dr. Stratte Residence ??

1947

(4700) UND Recreation Bldg. remodeling proposal; Grand Forks
(4701) Camp Wabanaquat Central Lodge & Mess Hall; Ogema, MN
(4702) Lystad-Redick Co. Office remodel in Kedney Warehouse; Devils Lake, MN
(4703) Warren Community Hospital Elevator addition; Warren, MN
(4704) UND Infirmary & Hospital Bldg. #38; Grand Forks
(4705) UND Hyslop Gymnasium & Field House; Grand Forks
(4709) Northwood Farm Supply Co. Potato Warehouse; Northwood, ND
(4710) Absey Motors Garage Bldg.; Grand Forks
(4711) Grafton State School Kitchen Bakery mechanical & electrical; Grafton, ND (I) (B)
(4714) Roseau School; Roseau, MN
(4715) Lincoln School; Grand Forks
(4716) Galesburg School Mechanical addition; Galesburg, ND (I) (B)
(4718) UND Science Building, University of North Dakota; Grand Forks (E) (B)
(4725) Pembina County

1948

(4802) Alsen School proposal; Alsen, ND (E) (B)
(4803) Minto School Gymnasium addition; Minto, ND [prosaic]
(4804) Swingen Residence; Grand Forks (R) (B)
(4806) Valley Motor Co. Garage addition; Grand Forks (I) (B)
(4808) Mahnomen Dairies; Mahnomen, MN (I) (B)
(4809) Office/Store: W.T. DePuy, owner; Grand Forks (C) (B)
(4810) Grafton Municipal Light Plant addition; Grafton, ND
(4811) Saint Benedict’s Church; Belcourt, ND (W) (B)
(4812) Galesburg School Gymnasium addition; Galesburg, ND (E) (B)
(4814) KROX Radio Transmitter Station; Crookston, MN (I) (B)
(4816) Trailer Camp Bldg.; C.C. Olson, owner; Grand Forks
(4816) Apartment Bldg. Proposal: Frank C. Parker, owner; Grand Forks (R) (B)
(4817) Implement Bldg.; Odin Hovdenes, owner; Tolna, ND (I); (B)
(4818) Hvidson Transport Garage Bldg.; Grand Forks (I); (B) “Wells & Denbrook”
(4819) Potato Association Bldg.; Grand Forks
(4820) Grand Forks Country Club Members’ Clubhouse; Grand Forks
(4822) National Lignite Research Laboratory; Grand Forks (I); (B)
(4824) Bridgeman Creameries remodel & addition; Crookston, MN (I); (B)
(4825) Pembina County Memorial Hospital; Cavalier, ND (H); (B) “International Style”
(4826) Grafton State School Refectory Bldg. Main Kitchen remodel; Grafton, ND

1949
(4902) Mr. & Mrs. Wige Residence; East Grand Forks, MN (R); (B)
(4903) UND Girls’ Dormitory #1 original tracings; Grand Forks
(4904) St. John’s Cemetery Mausoleum; Grafton, ND (W); (B)
(4907) VFW Post #1902 building addition; Crookston, MN (S/F); (B)
(4908) UND Engineering Building; Grand Forks (E); (B)
(4910) Theta Chi Fraternity House, UND; Grand Forks (S/F); (B) “late-Modernist”
(4911) S&L Storefront; Devils Lake, ND (C); (B)
(4912) Federated Church??; n.l.
(4916) Walt Johnson Residence; (n.c.)

1950
(5001) Tolna School; Tolna, ND
(5002) Bridgeman Creamery Whirla-Whip Stand; Crookston, MN
(5004) St. Ann’s Mission; Belcourt, ND (W), (E); (B) “International Style”
(5007) E.J. Lander Residence; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(5008) E.J. Lander Store and Apartments; Grand Forks (C); (B)
(5011) Grafton Public School addition; Grafton, ND (E); (B)
(5017) Osmundson Residence; East Grand Forks, MN (R); (B)
(5020) St. Ann’s Mission, Rectory; Belcourt, ND
(5022) Hvidson Garage; Fargo, ND
(5023) Michael F. Murray Residence; Grand Forks (R); (B)

1951
(5100) Minot Civic Auditorium; Minot, ND
(5101) St. Thomas Warehouse; St. Thomas, ND
(5102) Mr. & Mrs. Tom Walsh Residence; Hope, ND (R); (B)
(5103) Dr. D.W. Fawcett Residence; Devils Lake, ND (R); (B)
(5104) Mr. & Mrs. Paul B. Griffith Residence addition; ??? (R); (B)
(5105) UND Medical Science Building phases; University of North Dakota; Grand Forks
(5106) Eddie’s Bakery; Grand Forks (C); (B) “Art Deco”
(5108) Mohall School; Mohall, ND (E); (B)
(5109) UND Education Building; University of North Dakota; Grand Forks (E); (B)
(5110) Grand Forks County Courthouse proposed addition; Grand Forks
(5114) H. Robertson Residence; Grand Forks, ND (R); (B)
(5115) Walsh County Arena; Park River, ND
(5118) Valley Home Society, Old People’s Home; Northwood, ND?
(5119) Linwell Apartments at 100 Cottonwood; Grand Forks (R); (B)

1952
(5201) George Phelps, Jr. Attic remodeling; Grand Forks
(5202) Newfolden School addition; Newfolden, MN (E); (B)
(5203) Tower City School; Tower City, ND (E); (B)
(5204) Farmers Union Oil Co.; Finley, ND
(5205) Sigma Alpha Epsilon Fraternity House remodel at UND; Grand Forks (F/S); (S)
(5206) Walhalla School Building addition; Walhalla, ND (E); (S)
(5207) Grafton State School Shop Bldg.; Grafton, ND
(5208) A.A. Powell Residence addition; Devils Lake, ND (R); (B)
(5213) Hallock Hospital; Hallock, MN (H); (S)
(5215) City of Crookston Swimming Pool and Bath House; Crookston, MN
(5217) Williston High School Gymnasium; Williston, ND

(5221) Griffith Store; Devils Lake, ND (C); (B)
(5224) 608 Belmont Residence; Grand Forks (R); (B)

(5228) Denbrook Dream House (concept sketch); Grand Forks (R); (B); (P) “Desert Modern”

(5301) ND State Highway Dept. Office & Shop Bldg.; Grand Forks (I); (B)
(5302) Cooperstown High School; Cooperstown, ND (E); (B)
(5303) UND Winter Sports Bldg. remodeling; Grand Forks
(5304) R.R. Smith Office Building; Grand Forks (C); (B)
(5305) Buxton School Addition; Buxton, ND (E); (B)
(5306) Mr. & Mrs. ? Morgan Residence; ??
(5307) Munich School; Munich, ND (E); (B)
(5308) Egeland School addition; Egeland, ND (E); (B)
(5309) Sorenson Addition Elementary School addition; Williston (E); (B)
(5310) New Noonan School; Noonan, ND (E); (S)
(5313) Karlsbad School Addition; Karlsbad, MN (E); (B)
(5314) Oslo School Building; Oslo, MN (E); (B)
(5315) Fordville School addition; Fordville, ND (E); (B)
(5316) ND National Guard Armory; Grand Forks [no longer extant]
(5317) Grafton Armory; Grafton, ND
(5318) Williston Clinic; Williston, ND (H); (B)
(5319) Mayville School addition; Mayville, ND (E); (B)
(5321) Holmes Residence; Penbrook??
(5325) Strausbaugh (Skarsbo?) Apartments, proposal; ??
(5328) Sheppard Residence; East Grand Forks, MN (R); (B)
(5331) Baukol Residence proposal; Grand Forks, ND
(5332) Schroeder Cottage proposal; ??
(5333) Grafton State School Residence; Grafton, ND

1954

(5401) Dunlevy Service Station, East Grand Forks, MN
(5402) Adams School addition; Adams, ND
(5403) Robbins Residence; Cavalier, ND (R); (B)
(5404) Garske Building?; Garske, ND [misspelled “Gatzke” in OGL entry]
(5405) Kensington School addition; Kensington, MN
(5407) UND President’s House remodeling; Grand Forks

(5408) Wells & Denbrook Office & Studio Remodeling; Grand Forks (C); (B) “Desert Modern”
(5410) Crary School Gymnasium addition; Crary, ND (E); (B)
(5412) Goodman Warehouse & Office; Grand Forks
(5413) Newfolden School Home Economics Room; Newfolden, MN
(5414) Goodridge School Heating Plant alteration; Goodridge, MN
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(5415) First Federal Savings & Loan Association Commercial addition; Grand Forks (C); (B)
(5416) McDonald Residence proposal; ?? (R); (B)
(5417) Larson Residence; Park River, ND (R); (B)
(5418) Grafton Clinic; Grafton, ND (H); (B)
(5421) First Federal Savings & Loan; Grand Forks (C); (B)
(5422) Ziegler Residence; Kennedy, MN
(5424) Anderson & Blair Residence
(5425) Grand Forks City Hall remodel; Grand Forks
(5432) West School addition; Grand Forks
(5433) Williston Armory; Williston, ND
(5434) Kenneth Peterson Residence; Crookston, MN
(5435) Ryan Residence proposal
(5439) Fischer residence proposal
(5441) UND Administration Bldg. proposal, University of North Dakota; Grand Forks (E); (B)
(5443) Walsh County Record Newspaper proposal

1955

(5501) Crystal School addition; Crystal, ND (E); (B)
(5502) Medical and Dental Clinic; Grand Forks
(5503) Grafton Central School second addition; Grafton, ND (E); (B)
(5504) Grand Forks Transportation Garage Addition; Grand Forks
(5505) UND Rehab Center, University of North Dakota; Grand Forks
(5506) Lewis and Clark School addition; Grand Forks (E); (B)
(5507) Williston High School addition; Williston, ND (E); (B)
(5509) Parish School addition; Williston, ND (E); (B)
(5510) Argyle School addition; Argyle, MN
(5511) Cooperstown Grade School Toilet remodel; Cooperstown, ND
(5512) Viking School; Viking, MN
(5514) Graham Residence addition; (n.c.)
(5515) UND President’s House alterations; University of North Dakota; Grand Forks
(5516) Strandquist School Gymnasium addition; Strandquist, MN
(5517) Beta Theta Pi Fraternity remodeling at UND; Grand Forks
(5518) Beta Theta Pi Fraternity addition at UND; Grand Forks
(5520) UND Core storage; Grand Forks
(5521) Blair Residence proposal; (n.c.)
(5523) Kramer School; Kramer, ND (E); (B)
(5524) Park River School addition; Park River, ND (E); (B)
(5525) Home for the Aged; Grafton, ND (H) (R); (B)
(5527) West Green Apartments; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(5528) UND Fulton Hall, University of North Dakota; Grand Forks (E); (B)
(5534) Baudette School addition; Baudette, MN
(5535) H. Blair Burner Residence proposal; (n.c.)
(5536) Lundquist Residence proposal; (n.c.)
(5537) Roseau School addition; Roseau, MN
(5537?) Model House for Harper Construction Co.; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(5539) Anderson and Blair Residence proposal (R); (B)
(5542) Warroad School addition; Warroad, MN
(5543) Four Plex Residential proposal; Grand Forks
(5547) Clifford Residence; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(5549) Building addition at 18 N 4th St., for Sam Cooper; Grand Forks
(5550) Burdick’s Residence; Williston, ND (R); (B)
(5552) First Lutheran Church; Goodrich, MN
(5556) South Junior High School addition; Grand Forks (E); (B)
(5558) First Lutheran Church of Stephen; Stephen, MN
(5559) Baukol Apartment Project proposal; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(5560) Sigma Chi addition & remodel at UND; Grand Forks
(5561) Grafton State School Maintenance Shop; Grafton, ND
(5564) Ardoch School Toilet Room alterations; Ardoch, ND
(5565) Lake Bronson Public School Heating System redesign; Lake Bronson, MN

1956

(5602) St. Joseph’s Church; Brooks, MN
(5603) Weisser Residence; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(5604) Fagstad Residence; Larimoure, ND (R); (B)
(5605) Lycke Residence; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(5606) Ed Lander Residence addition; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(5607) Bolger Residence; Inkster, ND (R); (B)
(5609) Vernon Geston Residence; East Grand Forks, MN (nicely proportioned Modernist ranch)
(5610) City Hall Fire Hall addition; Williston, ND
(5611) Mr. & Mrs. Scott Residence remodel; Gilby, ND (R); (B)
(5616) Milton School addition; Milton, ND
(5620) Tolina School addition; Tolina, ND
(5623) Nielsville Public School Heating & Plumbing system work; Nielsville, MN
(5629) Kensington School addition; Kensington, MN
(5632) Presbyterian Church; Williston, ND (W); (B)
(5636) Evangelical United Brethren Church; Williston, ND (W); (B)
(5637) Immanuel Lutheran School; Grand Forks (E); (B)
(5642) Red Lake Nursing Home; Red Lake, MN
(?) UND Fulton Hall (R); (S) (P)

1957

(5701) Thompson School addition; Thompson, ND (E); (B)
(5703) Northwood School additions; Northwood, ND (E); (B)
(5705) J.A. Cronquist Residence; Gilby, ND (R); (B)
(5706) Fairdale School addition; Fairdale, ND (E); (B)
(5707) Plaza Motel; East Grand Forks, MN
(5711) UND Women’s Gym remodel, University of North Dakota; Grand Forks
(5712) Davenport School; Davenport, ND (E); (B)
(5713) Pembina School Gymnasium; Pembina, ND (E); (B)
(5714) Northern Woodworking Shop addition; Thief River Falls, MN
(5715) Dr. John Graham Residence addition (R); (B)
(5717) Bill Micklin Residence (R); (B)
(5718) UND Chester Fritz Library, University of North Dakota; Grand Forks (E); (B) (1961)
(5720) T.F. Geise Residence; East Grand Forks, MN
(5722) Walhalla School Heating alterations; Walhalla, ND
(5723) Nash School; Nash, ND (E); (B)
(5724) Iowa-Illinois Telephone Co. Garage addition; Devils Lake, ND
(5725) Crystal School Heating Plant alterations; Crystal, ND
(5726) UND Walsh Hall Men’s Residence, University of North Dakota; Grand Forks (E) R); (B)
(5728) Hanson-Anderson Mortuary remodel; Grand Forks (C); (B)
(5729) UND Little Theater, University of North Dakota; Grand Forks
(5730) UND Medical Research Laboratory; Grand Forks
(5731) F.O.E. Lodge addition; Grand Forks
(5732) Ivan Jenson Residence, Grand Forks
(5734) Mezzanine Remodeling in Ryan Hotel, Grand Forks
(5736) Valley Promotions Broadcasting Studio, Grand Forks
(5740) Baukol Row Housing proposal; Grand Forks
(5744) Galesburg School Classroom Addition; Galesburg, ND (E); (B)
(5747) Arvilla School; Arvilla, ND (E); (B)
(5748) Public Housing; Williston, ND (R); (B)
(5753) Northern State Bank Second Floor Apartment; Thief River Falls
(5754) Baudette School Industrial Arts addition; Baudette, MN
(5755) Hoople School addition; Hoople, ND (E); (B)
(5756) New Rockford Telephone Bldg. addition; New Rockford, ND
(5757) McVille School; McVille, ND (E); (B)
(5759) John Tsoumpas Residence; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(5760) Cooperstown School addition; Cooperstown, ND (E); (B)
(5763) Drayton Liquor Store remodel; Drayton, ND (C); (B)

1958
(5801) Greenbush American Legion Club; Greenbush, MN
(5802) Vaaler Residence addition; Grand Forks
(5809) Brookfield Apartments for Kupiers Construction; Brookings, SD
(5911) Plentywood School Gymnasium and Remodeling, Plentywood, MT
(5812) Plaza Motel addition; East Grand Forks, MN
(5814) Dr. Frey Office Bldg.; Drayton, ND
(5819) Iowa-Illinois Telephone Co. Second Floor remodel; Devils Lake, ND
(5822) Kimball Brothers Turkey Plant; Grafton, ND
(5827) R.C. Smith Duplex; Grand Forks
(5828) Lewis & Clark Elementary Second addition; Williston, ND
(5831) Jamestown E.U.B. Church; Jamestown, ND
(5836) Grace Baptist Church; Grand Forks
(5837) Airport Shop; Thief River Falls, MN
(5838) Grand Forks Country Club Kitchen addition; Grand Forks
(5840) Your Host Restaurant; Crookston, MN
(5841) Warroad Hospital addition; Warroad, MN
(5842) North Central School proposal; (n.c.)
(5843) Edinburg School addition; Edinburg, ND
(5844) Our Redeemer’s Lutheran School; Williston, ND
(5847) Absey Motors Garage; Grand Forks
(5849) Co-op Supermarket and Café; Williston, ND
(5852) Walhalla Post Office; Walhalla, ND
(5855) Dundee Rural School; rural Walsh County, ND
(5860) Grygla School addition; Grygla, MN
(5861) John Evenson Residence; Edinburg, ND (R); (B)
(5862) Wahpeton Indian School; Wahpeton, ND (E); (B)

1959
(5901) Robert Peterson Residence; Warren, MN
(5905) Starkweather School addition and remodel; Starkweather, ND
(5906) Strandquist School; Strandquist, MN (E); (B)
(5907) Powers Lake School; Powers Lake, MN (E); (B)
(5909) Baulkol Housing Project #3; Grand Forks
(5911) Plentywood School Remodeling and New Gymnasium; Plentywood, MT (E); (B)
(5912) McGregor School addition; McGregor, ND (E); (B)
(5913) Petersburg School addition; Petersburg, ND (E); (B)
(5914) Calvin School addition; Calvin, ND (E); (B)
(5920) Wilcox & Malm; Grand Forks
(5922) Burtness Theatre, University of North Dakota; Grand Forks (E); (B) “Collegiate Gothic”
(5923) UND Chemistry Building, University of North Dakota; Grand Forks (E); (B)
(5925) S.A.E. Fraternity remodel; UND; Grand Forks
(5926) UND West Green 2, University of North Dakota; Grand Forks
(5932) UND Home Economics Bldg. remodel; Grand Forks
(5935) Lloyd Allen Residence; Warren, MN
(5938) Dr. Richard Leigh Residence; Grand Forks
(5939) Roseau Community Hospital; Roseau, MN
(5947) Roseau Home for the Aged; Roseau, MN
(5949) Dr. & Mrs. R.D. Doss Basement remodel; Grand Forks
(5950) U.S. Immigration Station; Grand Forks (G/P); (B) “late-Modernist”
(5951) Northwood School addition & remodeling; Northwood, ND (E); (B)
(5952) St. Joseph’s Rectory; Williston, ND (W); (B)
(5953) Grafton Milk Company addition; Grafton, ND
(5954) Delta Delta Delta Fraternity House remodel at UND; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(5958) Grafton Milk Company addition (revised); Grafton, ND
(5959) Cooperstown Courthouse addition; Cooperstown, ND (G/P); (B)
(5962) Weisser Bldg. remodel; Grand Forks
(5963) Alpha Phi House addition at UND; Grand Forks, ND (R); (B)
(5967) UND Squires Hall Men’s Dormitory; Grand Forks (1963) (E) (R); (B) “Collegiate Gothic”
(5969) Mr. & Mrs. Ivan Knudson Residence; Larimore, ND (R); (B)
(5971) Lakota Brocket School; Lakota, ND (E); (B)
(5977) McVille Bank remodel; McVille, ND (E); (B)
(5978) Northwest Elementary School; Williston, ND (E); (B)
(5979) Karlstad School addition; Karlstad, MN

1960

(6003) Washington School remodel; Grand Forks (E); (B)
(6004) Belmont School addition; Grand Forks (E); (B)
(6005) Elroy Schroeder Junior High School; Grand Forks (E); (B)
(6006) Neche School addition; Neche, ND (E); (B)
(6009) UND Chemistry Bldg., University of North Dakota; Grand Forks (E); (B)
(6013) Anderson & Blair Realty Co. Office Building; Grand Forks
(6014) Lancaster School addition; Lancaster, MN (E); (B)
(6015) Baudette School addition; Baudette, MN (E); (B)
(6016) Cavalier Hospital addition; Cavalier, ND
(6018) Cando High School addition; Cando, ND (E); (B)
(6020) VFW Club; Thief River Falls, MN
(6022) Evangelical United Brethren (E.U.B.) Church; Fargo, ND
(6024) Motel Lounge Café; Minot, ND
(6025) UND Chemistry Bldg. Equipment; Grand Forks
(6026) Cavalier School addition; Cavalier, ND (E); (B)
(6030) Harvey School addition; Harvey, ND (E); (B)
(6034) Bottineau Clinic; Bottineau, ND (H); (B)
(6035) Mr. & Mrs. M.H. Graham Residence; Grafton, ND (R); (B)
(6043) Lutheran Student Chapel; Grand Forks
(6044) Rehab & Treatment Center Rendition to UND; Grand Forks
(6046) Schroeder/Belmont School Equipment; Grand Forks (E); (B)
(6047) UND Walsh Hall addition; University of North Dakota; Grand Forks
(6048) Dunlevy Residence; Grand Forks
(6049) St. Ann’s Indian Mission Warehouse; Belcourt, ND
(6052) Cooperstown High School; Cooperstown, ND (E); (B)

1961

(6101) UND Ireland Cancer Research Lab addition; Grand Forks
(6103) St. Paul’s Episcopal Church addition; Grand Forks
(6104) Munich School Science Equipment; Munich, ND (E); (B)
(6112) Devils Lake Armory; Devils Lake, ND (F/S); (B)
(6113) Lake Region Clinic addition; Devils Lake, ND
(6115) Lindsay Building; Grand Forks
(6117) The Spot; Pembina, ND
(6118) UND Core Storage Bldg. addition; Grand Forks
(6122) Earl Glidden Residence addition and remodel; Hallock, MN
(6123) Rugby Motel; Rugby, ND (C); (B)
(6126) Oslo School addition; Oslo, MN
(6127) Phi Beta Phi Sorority Front Terrace at UND; Grand Forks
(6129) University addition and remodel; Grand Forks
(6134) Emerado Grade School; Emerado, ND (E); (B)
(6135) J.B. Martin Residence; Hamilton, ND
(6136) Mayville School addition; Mayville, ND (E); (B)
(6143) Red River Cement Co. Office Bldg.; Grand Forks
(6145) Belcourt Indian Mission Sisters’ Residence; Belcourt, ND
(6146) Wahpeton Indian School Dormitories; Wahpeton, ND (R); (B)

1962

(6202) Goodman Store; Grand Forks (C); (B)
(6205) First Evangelical Lutheran Church; Warren, MN
(6207) UND Geology Bldg.; University of North Dakota; Grand Forks (E); (B)
(6208) Wilkinson School addition; Williston, ND (E); (B)
(6209) Warroad School Window Replacement; Warroad, MN (E); (B)
(6213) Roseau Law Enforcement Center; Roseau, MN
(6214) Greenbush School addition and Boiler replacement; Greenbush, MN (E); (B)
(6219) Trinity Lutheran Church; Bemidji, MN
(6221) Lounge and Off-Sale Package Store for Baukol Construction Co.; Grand Forks
(6223) Grand Forks Transit Co. Garage addition; Grand Forks
(6225) Langdon Elementary School; Langdon, ND (E); (B)
(6226) Grand Forks Air Force Base Medical Inspection Facility; GFAFB near Grand Forks
(6244) Grygla High School addition; Grygla, MN (E); (B)

1963

(6300) Denbrook Splitter; Grand Forks (O); (B)
(6301) Munich School additions; Munich, ND (E); (B)
Wells-Denbrook context; list of projects in OGL #1487

1963

(6302) Kittson County Courthouse; Hallock, MN
(6304) Grand Forks Country Club; Grand Forks (F/S); (B)
(6305) First National Bank Trust Dept.; Grand Forks
(6307) Leeds School addition; Leeds, ND (E); (B)
(6308) Goodridge School additions; Goodridge, MN (E); (B)
(6309) Central Park Towers; Grand Forks
(6311) Northwood Nursing Home addition; Northwood, ND
(6312) Gully School addition; Gully, MN (E); (B)
(6313) Lambda Chi Alpha Fraternity Residence at UND; Grand Forks (F/S); (B)
(6319) Oslo School remodel; Oslo, MN (E); (B)
(6320) First National Bank; Williston, ND
(6321) Rickard School addition; Williston, ND (E); (B)
(6323) Kimball Brothers Turkey Plant; Grafton, ND
(6327) Walsh County Civil Defense Center; Grafton, ND
(6333) St. Anne’s Indian Mission Employee Residence; Belcourt, ND
(6336) Dr. Richard Frank Residence in Boyd’s Addition; Grand Forks
(6341) Rite Spot; Grand Forks
(6342) Wilder Elementary School addition; Grand Forks (E); (B)
(6343) Hallock Hospital Nursing Home addition; Hallock, MN
(6344) Lake Region Junior College Phase 2 work; Devils Lake, ND (E); (B)
(6345) Schroeder High/South Junior High School addition & remodel; Grand Forks (E); (B)
(6347) Powers Lake Elementary and High Schools additions; Powers Lake, ND (E); (B)
(?) UND Smith Hall (R); (S) (1963)
(?) UND Memorial Union Addition (E); (S) (1964) “Collegiate Gothic influences”

1964

(6402) Eagles Lodge Room remodel; East Grand Forks, MN
(6405) Pembina School Gymnasium addition & Boiler replacement; Pembina, ND (E); (B)
(6406) Mahnomen School addition; Mahnomen, MN (E); (B)
(6409) Wells and Denbrook Office remodel; Grand Forks
(6411) Oslo School Entrance; Oslo, MN (E); (B)
(6412) Goodman Store addition; Grand Forks
(6416) YMCA Roofing and Duct work; Grand Forks
(6417) Emerado School addition; Emerado, ND (E); (B)
(6420) Lakota High School Rewindowing; Lakota, ND
(6422) Midwestern Electric Office Bldg.; East Grand Forks, MN
(6423) United Campus Christian Fellowship at UND; Grand Forks
(6424) Tolna School addition and heating revisions; Tolna, ND (E); (B)
(6425) A Sign for UND, University of North Dakota; Grand Forks
(6427) UND Squires Hall Air Conditioning; Grand Forks
(6428) Northwood Deaconess Hospital and Nursing Home; Northwood, ND
(6430) Lake Region Junior College Phase 1; Devils Lake, ND (E); (B)
(6432) Arthur Maetzold Residence; Churches Ferry, ND
(6433) Border States Electric Supply addition; Grand Forks
(6435) West Green 4 Apartments at UND; Grand Forks
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1965
(6503) Medical Arts Building Corp. Apartments; Grand Forks
(6504) Aneta School addition; Aneta, ND (E); (B)
(6511) Emerado Grade School Second Addition; Emerado, ND (E); (B)
(6512) Arnold Residence remodel; Langdon, ND
(6513) Viking School additions; Grand Forks (E); (B)
(6515) Sunset Nursing Home; McIntosh, MN
(6516) Hallock Nursing Home Boiler Replacement; Hallock, MN
(6520) Beta Theta Phi Remodeling at UND; Grand Forks
(6521) Roseau School additions; Roseau, MN (E); (B)
(6522) Hvidsten Implement Bldg.; Grafton, ND
(6528) Goodman Warehouse; Grand Forks
(6535) Stephen School addition; Stephen, MN (E); (B)
(6538) Twining Elementary School Second Addition, Grand Forks Air Force Base; Grand Forks

1966
(6602) The Windsor House; Cooperstown (R); (B)
(6603) L.A. Rudh Residence; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(6608) St. Anne’s Mission Gymnasium; Belcourt, ND (E); (B)
(6609) Grand Forks Fire Station; Grand Forks
(6615) Continental Homes; Grand Forks
(6617) Sacred Heart Church Rectory; Minto, ND
(6619) Dun-A-Matic Car Wash; Grand Forks (C) (I); (B)
(6621) Grand Forks Public Schools remodel; Grand Forks (E); (B)
(6624) Social Security Bldg.; Grand Forks
(6626) Lutheran Sunset Home addition; Grafton, ND
(6628) The Big “G”; Fargo, ND (C); (B)
(6629) Goodridge School addition; Goodridge, MN (E); (B)
(6634) Motel addition for Mr. George Lahaise; Grafton, ND
(6636) TwelvePlex; Grafton, ND
(6637) Lake Region High School Phase 4; Devils Lake, ND (E); (B)
(6638) Harvey High School; Harvey, ND (E); (B)
(6654) UND Classroom Bldg., University of North Dakota; Grand Forks (E); (B)
(6656) Turtle River State Park Swimming Pool; Arvilla, ND (O); (B)

1967
(6704) Nelson & Mack Law Office; Grand Forks (C); (B)
(6708) Lake Region Junior College Dormitories & Union addition; Devils Lake, ND
(6709) Lake Region Junior College Paving plan; Devils Lake
(6714) Valley Home Society addition; Thief River Falls, MN
(6715) Park River City Hall rehabilitation; Park River, ND (G/P); (B) “WPA Art Moderne”
(6717) UND University Center remodel, University of North Dakota; Grand Forks
(6718) Langdon High School; Langdon, ND (E); (B)
(6721) Thompson School addition; Thompson, ND (E); (B)
(6722) UND Bureau of Educational Research Metal Bldg., Grand Forks
(6726) Calvary United Methodist Church; Fargo, ND (W); (B) pragmatic “functional Modernist”
(6728) UND Montgomery Hall Interior remodel; Grand Forks
(6729) Michigan Shopping Center; Michigan, ND
(6731) Mr. & Mrs. Clifford Residence remodel; Grand Forks (R); (B)
### 1968

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Langdon Hospital</td>
<td>Langdon, ND</td>
<td>(H); (B) “International style influences”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kearney Housing</td>
<td>Kearny, NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Betts Residence remodel</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>(R); (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Webb (Wells) Family Residence remodel</td>
<td>Grafton, ND</td>
<td>(R); (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Region Junior College Phase 5 Dorms &amp; Union addition</td>
<td>Grafton, ND</td>
<td>(E); (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gliiddon Residence</td>
<td>Hallock, ND</td>
<td>(R); (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A. Fladland Company remodel</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devils Lake Housing</td>
<td>Devils Lake, ND</td>
<td>(R); (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Care Unit</td>
<td>East Grand Forks, MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowning Glory Beauty Salon</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>(C); (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kramer School</td>
<td>Kramer, ND</td>
<td>(E); (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus Housing</td>
<td>Columbus, NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Fritz Auditorium, University of North Dakota</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>(E); (B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wood Residence</td>
<td>Pembina, ND</td>
<td>(R); (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallock Clinic</td>
<td>Hallock, MN</td>
<td>(H); (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont, Roosevelt, Washington Schools remodel</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>(E); (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemmah Residence</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>(R); (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thief River Falls Housing</td>
<td>Thief River Falls, MN</td>
<td>(R); (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagles Club</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>(F/S); (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota Employment Bldg.; Bismarck, ND</td>
<td>(G/P); (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UND West Green 6 Married Student Housing Facility</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburg School addition</td>
<td>Edinburg, ND</td>
<td>(E); (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson School addition</td>
<td>Thompson, ND</td>
<td>(E); (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing Center addition and remodel</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaaler Insurance Building</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>(C); (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordville School addition</td>
<td>Fordville, ND</td>
<td>(E); (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UND West Green 7 Married Student Housing</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Forks Country Club Swimming Pool Cover</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>(O); (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unruh Housing</td>
<td>(n.c.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.E. Eeverson Office Bldg.; Grand Forks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First National Bank Bldg. remodel</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>(C); (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Lake Falls Motel restoration</td>
<td>Fosston, MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. &amp; Mrs. Don Mrdjenovich Residence</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langdon Elementary School addition 2</td>
<td>Langdon, ND</td>
<td>(E); (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagen Property proposal</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwood revisions</td>
<td>Northwood, ND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unruh Apartments 2</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pembina County Memorial Hospital</td>
<td>Cavalier, ND</td>
<td>(H); (B) “International style”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavalier County Memorial Hospital addition</td>
<td>Langdon, ND</td>
<td>(H); (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winship School</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>(E); (B) “restrained Modernist influences”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myra Museum Carriage Display Facility</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>(O); (B) “Victorian Gothic Rev.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langdon High School addition</td>
<td>Langdon, ND</td>
<td>(E); (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagles Club</td>
<td>East Grand Forks, MN</td>
<td>(B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(7136) Larson Lounge and Offsale; Grand Forks (C); (B)
(7138) H.E. Everson addition; Grand Forks
(7139) South Forks Shopping Center; Grand Forks (C); (B)
(7143) Stardust Manor Motel Pool addition; Grand Forks (C); (B)
(7146) Wells Denbrook Adams, Inc. Office; Grand Forks
(7147) North Star Motel Pool addition; Grand Forks, ND (O); (B)
(7153) Edinburg School addition; Edinburg, ND (E); (B)
(7159) Goodman’s Store; Grand Forks (C); (B)

1972

(7204) PWD’s Glidden Residence; (n.c.) (R); (B)
(7207) Mr. & Mrs. George Unruh, Jr. Residence; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(7209) Elderly Housing Phase C; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(7210) UND West Green 9 Married Students Housing; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(7261) Strinden’s Hardware Store; Grafton, ND (C); (B)
(7268) Grafton American Legion Club; Grafton, ND (F/S); (B)
(7269) Grand Forks Salvation Army remodel; Grand Forks (G/P); (B)
(7275) Employment Security Bldg.; Devils Lake, ND (G/P); (B)
(7287) Thief River Falls Housing, Phase 2; Thief River Falls, MN
(7288) Elderly Housing Phase A; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(7289) Elderly Housing Phase B; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(7290) Grand Forks Homes, Inc., Elderly Housing Phase C; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(7298) Bonanza Remodeling; Grand Forks (C); (B)
(7299) Cavalier X-Ray Hospital; Cavalier, ND (H); (B)

1973

(7304) United Hospital revised tracings; Grand Forks
(7310) Airport Service Equipment Bldg.; Grand Forks International Airport
(7312) Thompson School; Thompson, ND (E); (B)
(7313) Sunset Home Addition; Grafton, ND (R); (B)
(7322) Medical Park Townhomes; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(7328) Ready Builders Store Building; Grand Forks (C); (B)
(7340) Belmont Builders Office Bldg.; Grand Forks
(7346) Grand Forks International Airport Terminal addition; Grand Forks
(7362) Hallock Courthouse resurfacing; Hallock, MN
(7365) Colonial Estates Housing; Mayville, ND (R); (B)
(7373) Zitzer; Crookston, MN
(7375) Armory/City Hall remodel; Grand Forks (G/P); (B)
(7376) Argyle School Gymnasium addition; Argyle, MN
(7377) UND McCannel Hall remodel, University of North Dakota; Grand Forks (E); (B)
(7385) Belmont Builders University Avenue Office Bldg.; Grand Forks
(7391) Grafton Vocational School; Grafton, ND

1974

(7403) Morrison Residence; Northwood, ND (R); (B)
(7404) South Forks Shopping Center; Grand Forks (also see 7134) (C); (B)
(7412) South Forks Shopping Center; Grand Forks (also see 7134)
(7414) Newport Apartments; Ellendale, ND (R); (B)
(7415) Northwood Clinic addition and remodel; Northwood, ND (H); (B)
(7416) Mahnomen Elementary School Re-windowing; Mahnomen, MN
(7422) Tolna School addition and remodel; Tolna, ND (E); (B)
(7428) H.E. Everson Warehouse; Grand Forks
(7440) Minnkota Power Co-op, Inc. Office & Warehouse remodel; Grand Forks
(7445) Bethel Church addition; Grand Forks (W); (B)
(7446) Grand Forks Police Station; Grand Forks (G/P); (B)
(7447) Elroy H. Schroeder Junior High School addition; Grand Forks (E); (B)
(7450) A&W; Grand Forks (C); (B)
(7457) Fosston Elementary School re-roof, Bus Garage, High School addition; Fosston, MN
(7463) Lake Bronson work; Karlstad, MN vicinity

1975

(7501) Olso School addition; Oslo, MN
(7503) Oakes Housing; Oakes, ND
(7510) First National Bank, Trust Department remodel; Grand Forks
(7516) Tom Light – Speed Queen – Kendaco; Grand Forks
(7528) Oakes Clinic; Oakes, ND (H); (B)
(7529) Innes Apartment Complex; Grand Forks
(7538) Marshall County Courthouse; Warren, MN
(7539) Fergus Falls State Hospital; Fergus Falls, MN
(7541) Langdon Junior High School addition; Langdon, ND
(7542) Gary Ray Farm Riding Stable; rural Grand Forks
(7544) Thief River Falls Mall; Thief River Falls, MN

1976

(7603) Gonvick School addition; Gonvick, MN
(7605) Edmore School Music addition; Edmore, ND
(7608) FivePlex for Mr. & Mrs. Keith Moon; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(7619) Midwest Motor; Thief River Falls, MN
(7621) Mik-Lan Planned Unit Development; Grand Forks (O); (B)
(7623) Gonvick School Existing Bldg. Masonry Restoration (E); (B) (S)
(7625) Hillsboro School Window and Acoustical Treatments; Hillsboro, ND (E); (B)
(7630) Herzog Lake Home; Lake Crystal, MN
(7632) Blair Satrom Elderly Housing; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(7636) Scheflo-Hafeez Clinic; Grafton, ND (H); (B)
(7643) Belmont Gallery Office; Michigan, ND
(7645) UND Primary Care Center, University of North Dakota; Grand Forks
(7650) Walsh County Courthouse remodel; Grafton, ND (G/P); (B)
(7651) UND West Green 11 and 12 Student Housing; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(7653) Grand Forks Police Station Second Floor; Grand Forks (G/P); (B)
(7654) Fernwood Beta Homes; Grafton, ND (R); (B)

1977

(7710) Davenport School Re-Roofing; Kindred, ND (E); (B)
(7712) House Relocation; Grand Forks
(7714) Drayton Clinic remodel; Drayton, ND (H); (B)
(7716) Red Lake Reservation Housing, Phases 1 and 2; Red Lake, MN
(7733) Michigan Mall #2; Michigan, ND (C); (B)
(7739) United Hospital Radiology Addition; Grand Forks (H); (B)
(7743) Blair-Satrom Family Housing; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(7747) Vaaler Rental Office; Grand Forks (C); (B)
(7749) Herbergers Store remodel; Grand Forks (C); (B)
1978

(7801) Blair Satrom Galdis Family Housing; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(7802) Valley Memorial Home Skilled Nursing Facility; Grand Forks (H) (R); (B)
(7806) UND West Green 12 Student Housing; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(7808) Department of Energy Environmental Control Facility; Grand Forks (E); (B)
(7810) Birchmont Condominiums (R); (B)
(7815) Blair Satrom Future Housing related projects; Grand Forks (R); (B)
(7839) UND Geology Department Dinosaur Display Platform; Grand Forks (E); (B)
(7844) Red River Cement Office/Lounge Addition; Grand Forks (C); (B)