

**HISTORIC SITES REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES
ARIZONA STATE PARKS BOARD ROOM, PHOENIX, ARIZONA
MARCH 23, 2012**

A. CALL TO ORDER

- a. Terry Majewski called the meeting to order at 9:35 AM

B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS

1. HSRC Committee Members present

- a. Terry Majewski
- b. Kathleen Henderson
- c. Don Ryden
- d. John Jacquemart
- e. Patricia Olson
- f. Doug Kupel
- g. John Lacy
- h. Jan Balsom
- i. Brooks Jeffery

2. SHPO Staff Members present

- a. Vivia Strang
- b. Bill Collins
- c. Mary Robinson
- d. Jim Garrison
- e. Robert Frankeberger

3. HSRC Chair and Vice Chair Elections for 2012

Majewski requested John Lacy chair the election.

Lacy asked existing chair, Terry Majewski, and vice chair, Don Ryden if they would wish to continue in their positions. Both answered in the affirmative.

Lacy next asked the committee if anyone would volunteer to run for the positions. There were no volunteers.

Lacy called for a vote affirming the retention of Terry Majewski as Chair of the committee and Don Ryden as Vice Chair. Vote was 8 in favor of Terry Majewski as Chair and Don Ryden as Vice Chair.

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. NEW NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS

Camp Naco Historic District, Naco, Cochise County

Collins - Provided a brief overview of the Camp Naco Historic District nomination.

Motion: **Brooks** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Camp Naco Historic District on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria "**A**" at the **National** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Henderson**

Discussion:

- **Bill Doelle, Archaeology Southwest** – Spoke in favor of the nomination. He is trying to get grants in order to do necessary rehabilitation at the camp and having the nomination go forward would be helpful in the grant process
- Why change out the asbestos tile?

- Until asbestos is in a deteriorating state it can be safely left in place. The asbestos and cement roof tiles need to be replaced, since they were damaged in an arson fire and now pose a health threat.
- Why National level of Significance as opposed to State Significance.
- **Jennifer Levstik:** Camp Naco – National Significance:
 - It is the only one of its type remaining. Being made of adobe may have saved this installation.
 - The stick structure cantonments were dismantled.
 - It was part of the early attempts to secure our border, making it eligible for national importance and not state.
- Should it be under Criterion “C” as well?
- Page 5 – Association – Calls it one of the best-preserved examples of adobe remaining. It would be helpful to have a list of the other adobe forts or military structures in the nomination along with their status.
- Context under Criterion “A” of border protection, there are two sub-parts. It would be better to separate the two and not try to include two under one. The second one of African American contributions during World War I. Having them separate would make the argument for National significance stronger.
- What happens after 1923? A paragraph or two bringing the history up to the present and describing the preservation activities that have taken place.
- Need a table for contributors and non-contributors in the nomination.
- Need dates on photographs.
- Departure from previous layouts of camps along the border needs further explanation.

Majewski: Called for the vote
8 Ayes, Motion Carried



Wadin, John, House, Yuma, Yuma County

Collins - Provided a brief overview of the **Wadin, John, House** nomination.

Motion: **Balsom** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Wadin, John, House** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria “**B & C**” at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Jacquemart**

Discussion:

- Why did the period of significance end in 1964 when John Wadin died in 1946? He is the predominate person in this nomination and the end of the period of significance should be tied to him. The period of significance should be from 1912 – 1946.
- **Marty McCune, preparer:** The house was occupied by family member until 1964. The end of the period of significance can be changed to 1946.
- The word “rare” in “rare 1 ½ story” should be omitted.
- Are any of the other Wadin designed buildings on the National Register?
- **McCune:** Most of the other Wadin buildings are no longer in existence, but this information can be checked and added if there are any.
- Was he an architect or a builder?
- **McCune:** He wasn’t an architect and that term can be removed from the nomination.

Majewski: Called for the vote
8 Ayes, Motion Carried



Rincon Heights Historic District, Tucson, Pima County

Collins - Provided a brief overview of the Rincon Heights Historic District nomination.

Jeffery recused himself from this nomination

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Rincon Heights Historic District on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria "**A & C**" at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Lacy**

Discussion:

- **Jonathan Mabry, Tucson Historic Preservation Officer:** Spoke in favor of the nomination and commended Brooks Jeffery and his students for their work on this nomination.
- There were three major influences to this neighborhood over time:
 - The relationship between the development of this neighborhood and the University of Arizona
 - The build out of this neighborhood over an extended period of time. It represents the microcosm the university and historic housing types in Tucson.
 - This is one of the first neighborhoods affected by the development of a transit system in Tucson
- In the beginning of the nomination it states there are 490 properties, but on page three it states there are 280 and 210
- **Brooks Jeffery, preparer:** There is a mistake but the correct answer concerns property boundaries and how far to the west the boundary should be. The total properties are 436 with 237 considered contributing and 139 considered non-contributing.
- Needed within the table of properties is the year of construction, a key to the inventory numbers, property style, and the type of property. Also the maps need to more clearly show types and names of specific properties i.e. school, residential, or commercial.
- How is a property determined non-contributing due to vacancy? This occurs on page 7 and 11. Needs to be clarified.
- Why was 1970 chosen as the ending of the period of significance?
- If it is not important omit the section on page 6 that refers to zero as the address.
- Dates of substantial build out needs to be within the 50-year rule.
- Rincon shows the evolution of building over time and is part of the story of the neighborhood. Could state build out goes to 1970, but we are nominating only the ones within the 50-year mark. Put asterisk on table to designate properties that are not eligible due to age, but could be eligible at a later date.
- Brooks will work with Strang on changes. No need to see nomination again.

Majewski: Called for the vote

7 Ayes, Motion Carried



University Indian Ruin Archaeological Research District, Tucson, Pima County

Collins - Provided a brief overview of the University Indian Ruin Archaeological Research District, Tucson, Pima County nomination.

Motion: **Henderson** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the University Indian Ruin Archaeological Research District on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria "**A & D**" at the **State** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Balsom**

Discussion:

- **T. J. Ferguson, University of Arizona:** Spoke in favor of nomination
 - The University of Arizona (U of A) values this property because of its role in the educational ambition of U of A and its school of anthropology. U of A would like to see it placed on the National Register of Historic Places.
 - This nomination is the product of students that work at U of A as a class project in the Cultural Resources Management Class taught at U of A. Allowing Ian Milliken to take this project through the complete process is part of his class work.
- Is it common to have multiple periods of significance that are discontinuous?
- It is not common, but it is OK to do so for an “A & D” nomination, which is one of the most rare combinations. They are dependent upon each other.
- Fine tune maps, designating historic buildings for clarification.
- Vivia will work with preparer.

Majewski: Called for the vote
8 Ayes, Motion Carried

**Governor Moeur, Benjamin B. House, Tempe, Maricopa County**

Collins - Provided a brief overview of the **Governor Moeur, Benjamin B. House** nomination.

Motion: **Olson** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Governor Moeur, Benjamin B. House** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria “**B**” at the **State** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Henderson**

Discussion:

- No captions on photographs.
- Which is the correct start date for the period of significance, 1896 or 1898?
- Was the adaptive reuse completed prior to the determination of eligibility for this property?
- **Joe Nucci, City of Tempe Historic Preservation Office:** No the determination of eligibility was done for a Heritage Grant and the City of Tempe still owns the property.
- In the first paragraph, location and setting statement “allowing unparalleled views as he tended to patients and conducted business”. At that point it hasn’t been identified who “he” is. Include identification earlier or move that sentence to after “he” has been identified.
- Need an explanation of the “Orchid House” and it should also be identified on the site map.
- Need dates for the evolution of the house on the floor plan.
- There should be an explanation regarding Hatton House.

Majewski: Called for the vote
8 Ayes, Motion Carried

**DEVCO Model Home # 1, Sun City, Maricopa County**

Collins - Provided a brief overview of the **DEVCO Model Home # 1** nomination.

Motion: **Jeffery** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **DEVCO Model Home # 1** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria "**A**" at the **State** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Balsom**

Discussion:

- **Ed Allen, Sun City Historical Society:** Spoke in favor of the nomination. It was the 1st of 5 model homes for this new style of senior citizens community.
- Where are the other 4 model homes? Why are not the others being nominated?
- **Helena Reuter, preparer:** The Model Home # 1 is being used as a museum. The other model homes are private homes and there are concerns about integrity and changes to the properties over time. Also, the owners of those homes objected to having their homes listed on the National Register.
- If the majority of the group of owners refuses to have their houses listed, then none of them will be listed.
- The whole set should be the unit rather than the house as a part of the story under "A".
- Why not nominate the entire district and not just one?
- The owners are not behind the nominations.
- If only one home is being nominated then describe just the one model and use only the floor plans for that Kenworth model.
- Aerial photographs – indicate the Model Home # 1.
- Map of area with the property indicated.
- Request the owners of the other 4 properties nominate their properties.

Majewski: Called for the vote
8 Ayes, Motion Carried



Mountain View Officers' Club, Fort Huachuca, Cochise County

Collins - Provided a brief overview of the **Mountain View Officers' Club** nomination.

- A request has been made from Fort Huachuca to table this nomination. The opinion of the Fort is that this nomination is premature and they request postponement until ongoing structural and historical assessment and National Register of Historic Places evaluation is completed.
- **Lieutenant Colonel Dan Haws, US Army, Fort Huachuca:** I am speaking on behalf of Colonel Faulkner, Garrison Commander of Fort Huachuca regarding the nomination.
 - On September of 2011 Fort Huachuca committed \$50,000 for a structural and historic assessment of the Mountain View Officers' Club to be completed by the US Army Corps of Engineers Research Laboratory. The assessment will be completed by the end of May 2012. It is anticipated that the assessment will be an up to date and in depth assessment of the property. What did and didn't happen in the building and its context will be in this report.
 - On February 8, 2012 we received the first notice regarding this building being nominated for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). This was the notice for this building being on the 3/23/12 HSRC agenda.
 - Up to that time there was no opportunity for comment by Fort Huachuca regarding this nomination. It was thought the nomination is pre-mature.
 - The Garrison Commander sent a letter requesting that this matter be tabled until we have the report in hand from the Corps of Engineers in order to assess the building and our position on it being placed on the National Historic Register. (The Army was notified that the NRN would be heard on 3/23/12 as scheduled.).
 - Based on the available information, we are not convinced that the building qualifies as a NRHP eligible under Criterion "A" eligibility.

- We have received information that some of the data in the packet you received is not accurate. The committee should not move forward without correct information, it does not serve anyone well.
 - We have been in contact with the Federal Preservation Officer at the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army. They hold the same opinion as the Fort regarding this nomination.
- **SHPO:**
- **Garrison:** The letter in question was not forwarded to the HSRC. Marty Tagg, Preservation Officer Fort Huachuca, was notified as soon as SHPO received the nomination. The nomination was sent to the Fort along with the 3/23/12 agenda.
 - Who in this room has inspected this building?
 - **Ralph Comey, Registered Architect in the State of Arizona,** responded.
 - **Ralph responded:** The building is a World War II well constructed building and still retains its integrity. Any changes to the interior are reversible, therefore not negating its integrity.
 - **Robert Frankeberger, SHPO Architect, Registered Architect in the State of Arizona,** could we have your opinion?
 - **Frankeberger:** The building has integrity. Integrity means – it conveys its historic significance. It certainly conveys that.
 - **Garrison:** The question on this table is whether or not this property is eligible for the State Register of Historic Places (SRHP). We are acting on a nomination forwarded to our office by the Tucson Preservation Foundation (TPF). I spoke to the Keeper of the National Register, Carol Shull, two weeks ago regarding this issue. Her advice to me was that this nomination can come before this committee and it should be forwarded to the Army Preservation Officer for concurrence and that office would then forward the nomination to the Keeper. My recommendation to the committee is to proceed in that manner. Therefore the Army is still in control of this National Register nomination even though the nomination for State Historic Register is coming before this committee.
- **Tagg:** We are not questioning the structural integrity of the building, but we are questioning a statement used throughout the nomination. “This remains the only example of World War II era Military Service Club built specifically for African American Military service men and women.” This statement is never cited and at this point the Corps haven’t found reference that this building was constructed specifically for African American use at Fort Huachuca. The plan for that building is a classic example of a World War II service club. There were 100s of that type of club throughout the country. This one happened to be used from the beginning to the end as an Officers’ Club for Black Officers. When the cantonment was planned for Fort Huachuca it was not known that they would be receiving the 92nd and 93rd Black Infantry. One of the points stressed in this nomination is that this building was built specifically as an Officers’ Club for Black Officers.
- **Majewski:** It is known that the building was used exclusively for Black Officers. It is known that Fort Huachuca was a common place, since Buffalo Soldier Days to send Black Soldiers. The nomination doesn’t depend on whether there was a deliberate intent to house the Black Officers Club in this particular building, but rather the actual usage of the building as such.
- **Dr. William O’Brien, National Park Service Historian, Desert Southwest Cooperative Ecosystems Studies Unit (CESU), Cultural Resource Specialist:** I have worked with this project for the past decade with the Southwest Association of Buffalo Soldiers.
- Anyone around when Fort Huachuca housed black soldiers is aware of the social unrest of the time.
 - This building was constructed as a concerted effort to bring a halt to the racial violence occurring in the Fort Huachuca area.
 - There was no place in the area for these soldiers to recreate, so they would go to Tucson or over the border into Mexico.
 - The building is not exceptional, but the uses it was put to were. John Jordan, prominent black man involved in theater, was asked to run a black recreation program out of Fort Huachuca. Individuals involved in the Harlem Renaissance were asked to perform at the Fort as well as Sporting events.
- **Demion Clinco, Preparer:** This building was determined eligible in 1998 and is still a remarkable resource.
- **Jennifer Levstick, Preparer:** There indeed were thousands of service clubs constructed at the same time across the United States. The difference being:

- At this fort as with other segregated forts there were two service clubs on each fort. Another example was Fort Leonard Wood.
- There were two service clubs Lakeside and Mountain View at Fort Huachuca. The Mountain View Building was built to support the black soldiers and Lakeside was built to support the white soldiers and not just another Service Club.
- The Service Club used by the black soldiers at Fort Leonard Wood was an existing building altered to serve that population.
- This building is well documented and not much research had to be done by me. The information was readily available.
- **HSRC** – We have two options:
 - Defer until the next meeting, waiting for the additional report.
 - Move forward with the nomination as is.
- **Garrison**: In an ideal situation the Army would handle this building under Section 110 of the Preservation Act. All World War II temporary buildings have been or allowed to be, demolished by the military. I have always felt that agreement about certain buildings being preserved in Michigan and other states that represent World War II these building types was a “C” issue. If there was an “A, B, or D” issue related to these World War II buildings, then that should be taken up. When Williams Air Force Base was decommissioned there were a number of temporary buildings that hadn’t been torn down. The military had to deal with them as part of the transference of the property to ASU, the Town of Mesa, and the Airport Authority. Those buildings remain eligible today and have to be managed by the Airport facility and the University. A temporary building owned by the military should be given consideration as to its integrity and eligibility for consideration for the National Register and preservation.

Motion: **Lacy** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Mountain View Officers’ Club** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria “**A**” at the **National** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Army Preservation Officer. Motion Seconded: **Balsom**

Discussion:

- Matthew Bishoff, qualified historian completed the first study of Mountain View Officers’ Club. There was not the funding to go to the National Archives to do research.
- **Clinco**: There has been a concerted effort to rehabilitate this building and to put it forward for nomination both locally and nationally.
- Photographs need to be labeled and dated.

Majewski: Called for the vote
8 Ayes, Motion Carried



2. REVIEW OF RECLASSIFICATION APPLICATION FOR PROPERTIES

102 West Cyprus, Phoenix, Maricopa County

Jacquemart recused himself from this nomination

Majewski gave an overview of the previous meeting concurrence with de-listing the property located at 102 **West Cyprus, Phoenix, Maricopa County**.

- There needs to be a motion for reconsideration premised on the lack of notification of the owner.
- The guidance that we use is the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. (Criteria of Eligibility).

Lacy moved the HSRC reconsider the action of this committee related to the home at **102 West Cyprus, Phoenix, Maricopa County**. Motion Seconded: **Jeffery**

Majewski: Called for the vote
8 Ayes, Not in Favor of the Motion

Discussion:

- **Brandon Oliver, Owner:**
 - I was never notified of the first hearing and that the property was being de-listed. I didn't attend that meeting because I didn't know it was on the agenda at the last HSRC meeting.
 - I need to know who put the house up for declassification and why.
- **Eric Vondy, SHPO:** Your house was put in the State Property Tax Program in January 2011. Delisting and National Register Eligibility are two different issues. The City of Phoenix requested a formal determination of eligibility for your property. The reasoning was that the amount of work done on the house, some without permits, made the house ineligible for the National Register and would also remove it from the Tax Program.
- **Vivia Strang, SHPO:** Notices were sent out prior to the previous meeting.
- Changes made by previous owner and current owners are what created the issue of delisting. At the time of listing the property was considered eligible, but it should not have been.

Kupel moved the HSRC reconsider the reconsideration related to the home at 102 West Cyprus, Phoenix, Maricopa County.
Motion Seconded: Henderson

Majewski: Called for the vote
8 Ayes, in Favor of the Motion

Kupel moved the HSRC consider the eligibility of the property at 102 West Cyprus, Phoenix, to be a contributor to the Willow Alvarado Historic District. Motion Seconded: Balsom

Majewski: Called for the vote
8 Ayes, in Favor of the Motion

- **Oliver:** Presentation on the eligibility of the property:
- After discussion:

Motion: **Ryden** moved that the property located at 102 West Cyprus, Phoenix retain its contributor status in the Willow Historic District and remain on the National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: Balsom

Majewski: Called for the vote
8 Ayes, in Favor of the Motion



3. SANDRA DAY O'CONNOR NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATION/ UPDTE

There was a conference call with the Keeper of the National Register regarding this nomination. The Keeper is writing a letter confirming points discussed in the conference call. Those points being:

- The Keeper questioned this property being the one most associated with Sandra Day O'Connor.
- The discussion led to nominating this property under "C" for design per 1957/ 58. If it is nominated under "C" the Straub Addition not moved with the home will not be an issue.
- Association with O'Connor may be mentioned, but is not the reason for nomination.
- The Keeper recommends a stronger, better written nomination.



4. THE ARCHITECTURE AND PLANNING OF JOSIAS JOESLER AND JOHN MURPHEY IN TUCSON, PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA, 1927 -1956 UPDATE

There was an issue with the multiple property nominations of Joesler homes as to clarification of the threshold of eligibility. Under Criterion "C", design, we need date of construction as the primary date of significance. Changes that occurred after its original construction may affect that integrity. The Keeper returned nominations around that issue. We need to advise the preparers and the owners of this properties in a more specific way, what the criteria eligibility really is. It has been difficult to come up with character defining features or approaches to architecture. Bob Frankeberger has compiled a document to assist in this process. We are at the point that a decision needs to be made. Do we adopt the document as it is or do we need additional direction? Do we hire someone for that purpose and not put this back on the original preparer?

Discussion:

- Is every single Joesler eligible for the National Register?
- The purpose of the document is to give us a means to measure Joesler homes and make a determination of eligibility.
- A scope of work statement for the document needs to be crafted, then it should be sent out for bids.
- The historic context in the document is fine as it is. Section 8, registration requirements, is the portion that needs to be developed.
- The MPDF document needs to be completed by the next meeting, so we can review the Joesler nominations that are currently on hold.
- **Comey:** Gave an overview of the 15-year process working on the Joesler nominations and the Mother document they created. The Mother document as it is worked except for a few Joesler nominations that were returned.
- The proof of how appropriate the document is and how well it works is the Keeper is returning nominations, it doesn't work. Both the HSRC and SHPO are stating that the Mother document does not work. Adding a few more facts will not work. The document is too subjective.
- Would having an intensive workshop of people with expertise in the field assist in this process?
- A draft document would have to be completed first as a framework for the discussion.



5. STYLISTIC ISSUES

- a. Committee Report/Update on Stylistic Issues - Stylistic Terms need to be developed that may be shared with Certified Local Governments (CLGs) and preparers in order to identify in a cohesive way the styles of architecture in Arizona. We need:
 - 1) Subcategories to the list the Keeper uses need to be developed to further describe structures unique to Arizona.
 - 2) There should be a common nomenclature in use.
- b. Wall Policy Application – Colonia Salana, Wall Policy Application.
 - 1) Houses hidden by walls considered non-contributing.
 - 2) Construction of a wall right next to the house, obstructing the view compromises the integrity of the house.
 - 3) Correct determinations based on wall policy.

D. OLD BUSINESS

Approval of minutes from the following meetings.

July 29th, 2011

November 4, 2011

November 18, 2011

Lacy moved to approve the minutes from HSRC meetings July 29th, 2011, November 4, 2011, and November 18, 2011.
Seconded by Henderson

For 11/18/11 minutes forward changes to Mary Robinson for revisions.

Majewski: Called for the vote
8 Ayes, in Favor of the Motion with appropriate changes made



E. STAFF REPORT

1. The Arizona Centennial Conference (History Conference, Museum Conference) April 18-20, 2012.
2. The Preservation Conference is coming up June 13 – 15, 2013 and conference registration fees will be paid for HSRC members.
3. There will be sessions at the Preservation Conference involving HSRC. It is a panel discussion and would like for as many of you as can attend the discussion.
4. Strang gave out list of listed properties. 36 in 2011 and 4 so far in 2012.
5. The search for State Parks Director has been narrowed down to four.



F. PUBLIC COMMENT

No Comments



G. CALL FOR AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING

No Suggestions



H. ADJOURNMENT AT

1:33 PM

