

**HISTORIC SITES REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES
CANEGIE LIBRARY, PHOENIX, ARIZONA
July 27, 2012**

A. CALL TO ORDER

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

B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS

1a. 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

1b. HSRC Committee Member absent

- a. Brooks Jeffrey

2. SHPO Staff Members present

- a. Bill Collins
- b. Mary Robinson
- c. Jim Garrison
- d. Robert Frankeberger
- e. Eric Vondy
- f. Tanachy Bruhns

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. NEW NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS

San Rafael Estates, Tucson, Pima County

Collins - Provided a brief overview of the **San Rafael Estates** nomination.

Motion: **Henderson** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **San Rafael Estates** 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: **Kupel**.

Discussion:

Bob Frankeberger, SHPO Architect, comments read into the record by Majewski:

"Although the detailed history of Tucson's growth and development, including a reference to Father Keno's presence in 1694, makes interesting reading, it is not germane to the issue of San Rafael Estates historical significance. Moreover, and this is the crux of the matter, it fails to establish how this property influenced, and made a significant contribution to, Tucson's development (criterion A); or demonstrated that San Rafael Estates was an important phase of architectural development in the community that had an impact, as evidenced by later building (criterion C). The biography of Lusk and his corporation similarly do not lead to a basis of eligibility. (Criterion B) This extraneous material must, at the very least, be subordinate to a compelling argument for eligibility, which directs the narrative and is supported by relevant documentation. Some inventory photographs were taken with the principal façade in deep shadow, which obliterates rather than illustrate qualifying and disqualifying features.

The context for Community Development and Planning aside, the houses do embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, namely: California Ranch Style; and constitute a concentration, linkage and continuity of features so as to constitute an eligible district under criterion C. This fact should be the central issue of the Summary Paragraph. However some of the terms in that paragraph should either be dropped or

require further elaboration to be relevant, namely: eclectic desert landscaping as a primary character defining feature appears to elude precise definition; and characterizing San Rafael Estates as a "planned community", rather than a small tract of houses platted to leave the commercially viable commercial corner intact, falls short of convincingly within the family of Sun City or Dobson Ranch. Since the commercial site was an integral part of the development plan as platted, it seems questionable that it should be dismissed from the district. Other terminology such as the use of "picturesque" is confusing since the term is used in architectural criticism in application to the nineteenth century romantic period exemplified by Downing et al, and attributing the introduction of curvilinear streets to the desire to "distinguish affluent neighborhoods" shows a lack of discretion in accepting questionable research sources.

The non-contributing properties that have been eliminated for reason of altering the "defining character" of the house, is not supported by identifying that defining character nor documenting how the alteration or addition adversely affected it. This has, in the past, been the issue most cited in the Keeper's review of nominations; and it is the most problematic in evaluating appropriate treatment both subsequent and previous to listing, and in sorting the contributing from the non-contributing. Proposed future additions and alterations are evaluated pursuant to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Past alteration should be evaluated by the same Standards informing the nomination. "

- **Jonathan Mabry, Tucson Historic Preservation Officer:** Spoke in favor of the nomination. Also: Tucson was awarded a CLG Grant to do a follow up study on historic context for post World War II Residential Subdivisions, which has been completed. That original study didn't identify which neighborhoods would be eligible for National Register consideration. The CLG grant project will identify those neighborhoods by developing registration requirements and identify specific neighborhoods. This neighborhood would be one of those neighborhoods identified as eligible for the National Register.
- Statement of significance on page 8 is weak. The Criterion "A" statement of significance on Page 17 under the heading of "Development in the 30s" is a much stronger statement of significance and it should be use in place of the statement on page 8.
- Use "Community Planning and Development" instead of "Community Development and Planning", since that is the wording used in the National Register Guidelines.
- On page 20, the statement, "Between the start of the Great Depression and the end of World War II there was almost no residential construction", is incorrect. There was residential construction during that time. FHA loans start in that time period. In fact the first example is in Mesa. While it isn't called FHA, it was the precursor.
- There was more building in county areas where there was less regulation than in cities with more regulations.
- On Page 3, 2nd paragraph – The Wilmot Public Library is mentioned along with other properties. Since the Wilmot Public Library is listed, the narrative should state that it is listed on the National Register.
- Also, St Michaels and All Angels Episcopal and Parrish Day School have been identified for their historic significance – are they listed or not.
- On page 7, under Architect Builder, Lusk and the Lusk Corporation are mentioned. On page 8 do they belong in the discussion about the designers as well?
- Use of Wikipedia as a reference source is not acceptable.
- How can this nomination be used in the future to determine what changes will be allowed.
- **Demion Clinco, Preparer:** On page 27 there is discussion of what features contributed to lack of integrity and determinations of homes being non-contributing. Those same features would fall under the category of not allowed.
- It would be helpful to have that information earlier in the nomination.
- CC&Rs can be helpful when in effect and used.
- In most cases commercial plus residential should be included since one affects the other.
- **Clinco** – I left commercial district out because it had lost integrity and will be demolished in the few years.
- Perhaps mention it and state it is non-contributing.

Majewski: Called for the vote

7 Ayes, Motion Carried

- **Collins** – There has been no guidance for SHPO on how to proceed and assist preparers with this nomination. Also, Bob' comments haven't been addressed. It appears to have been approved as is, with minor tweaking. SHPO needs to know if that is what HSRC intends.
- Include historic information.
- Design review is not being done and page 27 gives information as to what is eligible and what is not.

- There is a fundamental difference in philosophy between how HSRC reviews a nomination and how SHPO staff reviews a nomination.
- From SHPO's perspective Design review is critical. It provides guidelines for what is critical for the integrity of a property.
- The nomination overemphasizes what to avoid and not enough of what to is appropriate.



Tucson Health Seeker's Architecture MPDF, Tucson, Pima County

Collins - Provided a brief overview of the Tucson Health Seeker's Architecture MPDF nomination.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Tucson Health Seeker's Architecture MPDF on the Arizona Register of Historic Places and recommend it be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for inclusion on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Olson**

Discussion:

Frankeberger: SHPO Architect, comments read into the record by Majewski:

"This updated version of an earlier Multiple Property Listing does not advance the notion that a distinct architectural typology or "Architecture of Tuberculosis". Even the tent shelters on wooden platforms should any still exist, have a precedent in earlier mining camps; and are not exclusively associated with "Tucson's Sanatoria". In that regard rooming or boarding houses intentionally developed to serve a market of health seekers are not distinguishable from rooming or boarding houses intended for a less restrictive market. Even sanatoriums and hospitals are not a distinguished typology that would convey the nature of either the occupants or the administered care, differentiating a tubercular hospital or multiple occupancy residential property from other hospitals or apartments including garden apartment, courts or even resorts.

Particularly unsupported in the nomination is the notion that "Tucson's Sanatoria" solidified the popularity of revival style architecture.

The MPL strategy is redundant as all the properties contemplated under this dubious context, are eligible, or not, under criterion C for association with design characteristics of type period and method of construction.

Although a lot of effort has gone into the development of this MPL, it has no practical application. "

- **Mabry** – Spoke in favor of the MPDF
- This should be a History of Arizona being an asylum for the health seekers of the time and not a history of the buildings themselves.
- Its not a MPDF but should be listed under Criterion "D: as history and a community of architecture - a Non-Contiguous District, revealing something about this historic event.
- The architecture varies. There is not one architectural type or style that can be looked at and state that is a property used for tubercular patient(s).
- **Jennifer Levstick, Preparer:** There were 2 books published in the 1920s and 30s that were basically architecture for sanatoriums. The architecture was dependent upon the degree that person had tuberculosis. The stage of recovery the patient was in determined the facility the person would be housed in. Both publications had specific design plans describing how patients should be housed. They didn't recommend one style, but they did recommend where you built in relation to the city, the site plan, the grouping of buildings, ventilation, and landscaping. Basically the technology for housing and care of tubercular patients. Most of the properties are gone and the few still in tact have a story to tell.
- Perhaps the title needs to be changed from "Tucson Health Seekers Architecture" since all of the properties are not going to be eligible under architecture and since there is no specific architecture tied to this nomination. Some may be eligible under "A" with Community Planning and Development.
- The "Canvas Period" is mentioned. If there is a canvas period then there are other periods that need to be mentioned as well.
- Section E Page 1 – Architecture of Tuberculosis is mentioned – instead, there was evidence of community planning in zoning, building forms, and in response to tuberculosis patient treatment.
- **Levstick:** The title can be changed.
- **Levstick:** This MPDF will be available to the public as a starting point for other communities to create their own MPDF.

- **Mabry:** As to the usefulness of MPDFs – From a practical point of view they assist preparers in getting properties listed and as such are of value to the community. In addition the MPDF helps to create awareness of the types of properties discussed and may lead to additional nominations of eligible properties.
- There were inaccuracies regarding statement of law and the “Homestead Act of 1862” in the nomination on page 28, the Homestead Act was not a means of acquiring inexpensive land, but rather a means of acquiring free land. Also, land that was sold was done so under the Public Land Sales Act, which occasionally converted homestead land into cash entries.
- **Corky Frost, Poster Frost Mirto Architects:** Spoke in favor of the MPDF and its usefulness for nominations.
- Need a list for photos.
- Need discussion of properties no longer in existence to establish that this was once a common type of property and now is a rare example of a once prevalent type.
- **Levstick:** In the packet there is a map with the properties identified may have the integrity to be listed.
- Preparer:
 - *Title change- take some of the emphasis off of Architecture and give it a broader scope*
 - *Tucson Sanatorium contributed to the influence of Revival Style Architecture*
 - *Registration requirements*

Majewski: Called for the vote
7 Ayes, Motion Carried



Tucson Medical Center, Tucson, Pima County

Collins - Provided a brief overview of the Tucson Medical Center nomination.

Motion: **Henderson** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Tucson Medical Center 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: **Balsom**

Discussion:

Frankeberger: SHPO Architect, comments read into the record by Majewski:

“The fact that the buildings accommodate a new use with no appreciable alteration belies the notion that they are specific to” Architecture of Tuberculosis”; and that their nomination is in any way aided by the existence of a “Tucson Health Seekers Architecture (MPL)”. They embody the distinctive characteristics of the Pueblo Revival Style, and in that qualification reference to the proposed MPL is superfluous.”

- The narrative explains why Pueblo Revival was used in the construction of the Tucson Medical Center Facility. That style has all the characteristics listed in the MPDF as conducive to care of Tubercular patients.
- The correct term is the Pueblo Indians and not the Puebloen Indians.
- Photo Key designating modern and historic photos.
- Use the MPDF as a reference point instead including unnecessary explanations.
- The boundary discussion on page 19 needs to be streamlined.
- A chart denoting which are eligible and ineligible. Give an explanation for the ineligible properties.
- On page 23, the water tower is shown with several photos and it is not being nominated. Leave extraneous sites out, since they confuse the issue.
- Preparer:
 - Nomination was a good example of the MPDF under Criteria “A & C”
 - Boundary justification needs to be simplified and assisted with visual elements and perhaps charts

Majewski: Called for the vote
7 Ayes, Motion Carried



Owen Homestead, Tucson, Pima County

Collins - Provided a brief overview of the **Owen Homestead** nomination.

Motion: **Balsom** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Owen Homestead** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria “**A & D**” 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: **Kupel**

Discussion:

Frankeberger: SHPO Architect, comments read into the record by Majewski:

“The fact that the homesteader homesteaded because he had contracted Tuberculosis is not evident or a distinguishable characteristic conveyed in what appears to be an example of folk architecture with a later, more substantial Pueblo Revival house. This nomination could advantage the Homestead context without reference to his medical problem or even his ethnicity. The proposed MPL is useless in this regard.”

- How does this nomination hold up to the criteria for selection that reflects treatment of tuberculosis?
- **Jennifer Levstick, Preparer:** Based on the location of the property, the time period of the homestead, the illness and the relationship of the property to the city along with the high numbers of people coming to Tucson for Tubercular treatment most of which could not afford treatment, this property represents the type of living conditions of a large number of those people. This is one of the few remaining examples of such properties. Representing a type of Community Development. Making this a rare surviving type.
- In the nomination it’s under the area of significance “Community Planning and Development”. Could it be under Medicine or Homesteading?
- The characterization of this as a homestead is inaccurate. It was homesteaded in the 1920s and this property was purchased, continuing to refer to the property as a homestead only confuses the issue.
- This should relate to Health Seeking and not homesteading.
- Reference to moving the building from Davis-Monthan Air Force Base in the 1930s is incorrect. That Air Force Base didn’t exist until 1940s. It might have been moved from the City of Tucson Air Port. The language might state the City of Tucson Air Port now known as Davis-Monthan Air Force Base.
- Criterion “D” has the potential to yield information – does this property still have the potential to yield information?
- **Levstick:** The property owner found the articles mentioned while digging a flowerbed and there appears to be more areas capable of yielding additional information on the property.
- On page 4, in the paragraph at the top of the page mentions potential for archaeological information unknown. That section needs to be strengthened.
- On page 4, Chinese Juju bead tree – need correct name for tree.
- Dates on photos.
- **Mabry:** Spoke in favor of nomination.
- Need correct USGS map
- Period of significance goes to 1970 that is when the property was sold. Since the MPDF stops at 1945 the period of significance in the nomination should stop there as well.
- Preparer:
 - Change title to reflect Health Seeking a
 - Criterion “D” strengthen the information regarding information that may be gained
 - In the nomination emphasize health seeking and deemphasize homesteading
 - Period of Significance changed
 - What can and can’t be changed physically to the property and it remain on the National Register and in the Tax Program

Majewski: Called for the vote

7 Ayes, Motion Carried



Coalter Country Place, Phoenix, Maricopa County

Collins - Provided a brief overview of the **Coalter Country Place** nomination.

Motion: **Henderson** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Coalter Country Place** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria “**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: **Balsom**

Discussion:

Frankeberger: SHPO Architect, comments read into the record by Majewski:

“The property is nominated under criterion C for Architecture, which is appropriate; but I find it’s association with the Arts and Crafts Movement, as exemplified by the Greene Brothers or that it is a bungalow, somewhat of a stretch. It is simply a product of its time, probably the result of plans purchased through a pattern book and is an eclectic result of Shingle Style and American Colonial Revival revised with Beaux Art Style influences with a serious nod to the work of McKim, Mead and White (note the paired columns on the porch and the attic story window with a reference to Palladian set in a shingled gable). Nevertheless it does possess high artistic value. The nomination could benefit from a more realistic assessment of it’s architectural qualities; and, while interesting, the biographical information is more suited to a nomination under criterion B.”

- In the nomination it states in numerous places that the property has been precisely maintained. What is original and what is not?
- **Billy Kiser, Preparer:** The floor plan shows the original structure in the front and all the additions made at the rear of the property.
- There are a lot of features that have been changed out. There was an accident that took out the back wall of the house and the wall fell in. How was the wall repaired and how much of the original fabric was retained?
- There is no site plan in the packet. The work on the site including the construction of a matching garage and landscape shed in the northwest corner of the property. As non-contributing features on the property they need to be discussed and indicated on a site plan. Need to be specific.
- There needs to be more information as to the level of integrity within the house as well, specifically the kitchen.
- **Kiser:** The house hasn’t been expanded. The trees mask the garage/ guesthouse in the rear.
- Floor plan needs to include both first and second floor.
- The side porch hasn’t been mentioned. It mimics the original house so accurately and doesn’t meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standard.
- Are we considering withdrawing the motion and requesting revision before we consider this property for the National Register?
- The date of construction doesn’t appear to be appropriate.
- **Kiser:** The owners gave me the date of 1901 as the construction date. 1907 was the first record of sale.
- There is a transition from Colonial Revivals to Bungalows approximately 1910. This is not only a good example of its type, but it is an early example of its type. A Historic Archaeologist needs to validate the date of construction using the hardware; doors and other evidence or an assessor’s property evaluation showing when the property was improved will give a more accurate date.
- Keep the Historic information
- Return to revise:
 - Date of construction
 - Modification
- **Henderson** amended the motion to defer to the November 2012 meeting. Motion Seconded: **Balsom**

Majewski: Called for the vote

7 Ayes, Motion Carried



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

Collins General Statement: There is debate over the best usage of the MPDF format. Since we have had difficulty with this one and some of the previous MPDFs. We have looked back at the ones we have accumulated over the past 20 years and look at which ones succeeded well, in terms of assisting properties being listed, and which ones did not, in terms of not assisting in properties being listed. And use that information to determine best practices for new MPDF formats.

- Writing an MPDF around a known inventory as opposed to a presumed inventory. The greater number of properties that can be assessed within the known inventory assists in what should be covered in the MPDF.
- A narrow MPDF seems to be more practical than a more generalized MPDF in terms of its usage.
- Advice to the preparers of the Joesler MPDF as to the broadness of that MPDF versus the nominations that are in the queue to be reviewed.
 - Deal with backlog first, while tweaking the original MPDF document
 - Registration requirements need to be more specific primarily for Catalina Foothills Joesler Residences in order to schedule those nominations at a September 28, 2012 meeting. The meeting will be set up to facilitate a tour of some of the Joesler homes and the meeting.
 - In order to proceed with the September meeting the MPDF must be completed so the nominations can be tweaked enough to be reviewed by the HSRC
 - We need your (tweaked) nominations in 30 days in order to review and
 - Notifications must be sent out to CLGs and interested parties
 - The focus has been on the residential architecture portion of the Joesler portion of the MPDF and have an approach for the assessment of the criteria considerations for eligibility
 - The remainder will be assessed when Brooks Jeffery has time to assist and after we have dealt with the backlog
- SHPO's recommendation is to accept the MPDF with the preparers recommended modifications. SHPO has some additional guidance to propose in regards to registration requirements after a vote:
 - In the packet you received there is a section with areas highlighted in yellow. What is being proposed is that the committee vote those highlighted areas on as acceptable changes to the MPDF today. Allowing them to be used by the preparers of the Joesler nominations in preparation for the September meeting.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the recommendations in the section with highlighted in yellow be accepted as changes to the MPDF.

Motion Seconded: **Lacy**

Majewski: Called for the vote

7 Ayes, Motion Carried

- "Registration Requirements Document" reviewed and explained by Garrison.
- Point of clarification - individual nominations – both interior and exterior need to be considered eligible.
- Nominations must clearly state both the must and should in the Registration Requirement Document as they apply to the property being nominated.
- All of the effort for the next 30 days is to focus on the pending nominations and not on the MPDF.



D. OLD BUSINESS

Lacy moved to approve of minutes with changes from the March 23, 2012 HSRC minutes **No Second**

Majewski: Called for the vote

8 Ayes, in Favor of the Motion with appropriate changes made



E. STAFF REPORT

- **Luke Solar** – SHPO signed off on Davis-Monthan. The supplier of the solar panels at Davis-Monthan was requested to have a survey done. SHPO thinks the supplier went to the Governor’s office and complained we were holding up the project. Davis-Monthan had neither had the survey done nor consulted with the tribes at that time, but when done only one thing was found that was ineligible historic trash debris. Davis-Monthan was not encumbered by anything SHPO was doing and we were defended strongly by the State Land Commissioner and the Director of State Parks. Discussions via emails settled the issue quickly.
- **Forth Huachuca Black Officer’s Club** – A letter was sent to the Governor’s Office eleven weeks after the meeting complaining that the two representatives from Fort Huachuca were unprofessionally treated in the HSRC meeting. Remember they were asked to make professional judgments in the meeting several times which they refused to do. Unprofessionalism was embodied in their own actions and not in ours. The Governor’s representative for military affairs has been in contact with Fort Huachuca and the SHPO office. He was told that everything was on hold until the Condition Assessment Report and the Eligibility Study by the Army was completed. Both should be finished by the end of July. The commander who wrote the letter is no longer at Fort Huachuca but has been reassigned.
- **Lacy:** “As a former JAG Officer from Fort Huachuca I was extremely offended by the arrogance expressed by the presenters from Fort Huachuca. I think it is extremely unprofessional and I was appalled that the United States Army would send up representatives to act in that fashion.
- **Vondy:** Thanked the HSRC for their participation in the Preservation Conference. That session was well received.
- Eric Vondy is the new Main Street Manager.
- Ann Howard is the new Deputy SHPO, Archaeology.
- New intern Tanachy Bruhns is with SHPO, through the University of Maryland in collaboration with the SRI Foundation.
- There is an advertisement out for Ann’s old position.



F. PUBLIC COMMENT

No Comments



G. CALL FOR AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING

No Suggestions



H. ADJOURNMENT AT 1:25 PM