

**HISTORIC SITES REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES
ARIZONA STATE PARKS, PHOENIX ARIZONA
NOVEMBER 15, 2013**

A. CALL TO ORDER

- a. Terry Majewski called the meeting to order at 9:37 AM

B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS

1. HSRC Committee Members present

- a. Terry Majewski
- b. Brooks Jeffrey
- c. John Jacquemart
- d. Patricia Olson
- e. John Lacy
- f. Kathryn Leonard
- g. Don Ryden
- h. Doug Kupel

2. HSRC Committee Members Absent

- a. Jan Balsom

2. SHPO Staff Members present

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

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS

a. Tucson Community Center Landscape, Tucson, Pima County - Revised

Strang gave an overview of Tucson Community Center Landscape

Motion: **Jeffrey** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Tucson Community Center Landscape - Revised on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion "**C**" 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: **Jacquemart**.

SHPO Comments:

Frankeberger: *There can be no question that landscape architect Garret Eckbo was acknowledged, by his professional peers, as an influential Master of Modernist Landscape Design; and the nomination references this fact as if this fact alone assures the nomination's success. But the stated basis for the nomination's argument of 'exceptional importance' of this, less than 50-year-old landscape, is that it "is a unique application of Eckbo's design principles". Yet the nomination neither enumerates his principles "in formulating the conceptual elements and characteristics of the style" nor does it suggest through what means, unique or not, they are evidenced in the Community Center Landscape.*

Rather than explain how the features and characteristics of the Community Center Landscape signify the qualities of modern landscape design, the features are merely described without mention of their supposed contextual import, as if evaluation within the broader context of "Modern" landscape design were irrelevant to significance.

Yet, absent this level of specificity, the basis for distinguishing between contributing and non-contributing features remains unexplained; and any indication of appropriate treatment of this landscape in order to protect those features and characteristics that qualify it for listing is equally absent.

Discussion:

- ✦ Do the changes made by the preparer address concerns as stated by the HSRC and SHPO?
 - Exceptional Importance with respect to the 50-year rule. Is it of exceptional significance?
 - Comparison to other landscape architects at a national level.
 - It is special in the Tucson area, but how does it compare to the work of landscape architects elsewhere in the country at that time.
 - More examples of how Eckbo compares to the Modern Landscape Architects working at the time.
 - This information was referenced in letters and supporting materials and it also needs to be in the actual nomination.
 - Need more discussion about what makes his work exceptional, how was he a leader in his field and how did he influence others.
 - There are relatively few of these urban parks remaining, discuss them and use them to show how Eckbo's work on this property is exceptional.
 - Is Eckbo a Master?
 - Yes, Eckbo is a Master and the Tucson Community Center Landscape embodies those things that make him a Master.
 - Tell us why he is a Master.
 - Give references from his peers.
 - Use Helen Erickson's response letters.
 - Only civic landscape in Arizona.
 - The Tucson Community Center maintains its integrity as a masterwork.
 - EDAW that Eckbo founded was one of the first landscape architecture firms and as such is considered a leader in the industry.
 - The property retains integrity in design, but not in materials.
 - The nomination is inconsistent regarding the integrity of materials.
 - In some instances it states that there is a high degree of integrity of materials, but there is not enough supporting documentation
 - In the summary it states that there are some problems with materials.
 - Integrity of materials should not be as strongly weighted as design.
 - It is eligible, but needs more work to strengthen the discussion on design and setting to support Criterion G.
- ✦ Does it have integrity?
 - One of the jobs of the HSRC is to recognize the work of Masters as well as to preserve those properties that are works by those Masters and worthy of long-term preservation.
 - A concern is that much of the landscaping on this property consists of non-native plants that require more water than native plants. The current political push in the City of Tucson is to encourage the public to change to desert landscaping which uses less water.
 - Would changes to the current landscape affect the integrity of the property?
 - Would leaving it landscaped with non-native plants be a problem for the community in the future?
 - Strengthen the argument by naming publications used in support of the nomination and including those publications in the bibliography.
 - Discuss what aspects of this property are needed to retain integrity including plant materials.
 - There needs to be an explicit statement before the detailed analysis of integrity.
- ✦ Eligibility
 - Not eligible because it is not 50 years old.
 - Cons:
 - There needs to be enough time to have a historical perspective of the property.

- In 1971 landscaping was different from today. How to deal with this landscape in Tucson? The focus has really changed from the non-native plants to desert landscaping and water usage/
 - The perspective of this property in regards to current landscape may change over time.
 - The 50-year rule should be followed in this instance. Perhaps proving that this property is not worth preserving. If it is that important then it will be eligible for nominating in 10 years.
 - On Page 19 there are 2 little paragraphs to discuss the less than 50-year issue. There needs to be more discussion to be eligible under Criterion Consideration G.
 - There are 2 other Eckbo properties mentioned – Fresno and Union Bank. There needs to be more to the discussion about them.
 - On page 3 it is called a unique application. If there were only 3, then it is not difficult to consider this one unique. Each one is unique. Just because it is unique doesn't mean it meets the criterion exception.
- Pros:
 - This property is emblematic of a social trend of its time to landscape with non-native plants.
 - The threat of the design being lifted out due current social trend of low water usage might cause the loss of Eckbo's signature work. Preserving it makes an argument for it's maintaining its current landscape.
 - The property is eligible now. The 50-year rule is inappropriate to gauge its importance.
 - Changes occur in materials from one time period to the next. We have to be flexible enough to deal with it logically.

Demion Clinco, speaking for the preparer: Spoke in favor of the nomination supporting the idea that Eckbo was a Master at Landscape design. There are multiple letters and supporting documents to attest to his stature in the Landscape Architect community. Modern landscape trends have no place in this discussion. This is a nationally significant property and should be viewed as such. This property needs to be preserved and in order to maintain support for this property the nomination needs to continue forward. It is important for its time and place. Landscapes are more fragile than other properties and this one is valued by the City of Tucson and deserves to be preserved. This landscape has been featured this past year in major publications highlighting the need to maintain and preserve this type of resource.

Historically: This project was built on the old historic Barrio displacing its residents and there are those who would oppose this nomination for this reason.

Majewski: When we receive nominations our job, as a committee, is to be the devils advocate, to insure that good arguments are made and after that to move nominations on to the Keeper. We may not all agree with the decisions made, but if the consensus is move this forward how do we do that? If not then someone can call the question. There are many personal issues and it is not our job to bring our personal issues to bear when something is truly significant. We must be as objective as possible. Is it or isn't it significant?

Strang: The Keeper's office is placing much more emphasis on context than they did in the past. How to evaluate a property in its Historic Context states, "The significance of a historic property can be judged and explained only when it is evaluated within its historic context. There hasn't been a lot of evaluation done on Modern Contemporary Architecture. We are on the edge and we need to look at what Eckbo was doing. Then the story line needs to be broadened to include other landscape architects. Halprin in Portland Oregon was just listed last year at the National Level of Significance in landscape architecture. Within that nomination other landscape architects working at the same time are discussed. That nomination could be used as guidance for this one.

Majewski: Called for the vote
5 Ayes and 2 Nays – Motion Carried

Majewski: Preparer to work with SHPO to complete the nomination for forwarding to the Keeper

Garrison: If the National Level of Significance cannot be supported it may be dropped to State Level to insure its success.



2. REVIEW ON JOESLER MPDF

Jeffrey: Recused himself from voting, but will be available to discuss the issue.

Jeffrey: Gave an overview of the Joesler MPDF

Motion: **Kupel** I move that the Historic Sites Review Committee approve the National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form on the residential architecture of **Josias Joesler** in Tucson and recommend to the Historic Preservation Officer that it be forwarded to Keeper of the National Register and that it serve as a guidance document for listing properties on the State Historic Register. Seconded **Lacy**

Frankeberger: *The nomination's revised Section E: Statement of Historic Contexts is intended to evaluate Joesler's work within the larger trends and patterns of history. In the earlier version, significance was based solely on his status as a master within his own historical context, as if it were a work created within an existential vacuum. His architectural vocabulary is characterized as stylistically variable, in effort to distinguish his work from that of his contemporaries who, supposedly, were stylistically consistent. Joesler's stylistic eclecticism is not evaluated for significance within the context of the architectural trends, patterns or themes of the period, nor are those stylistic characteristics and qualities identified as a means of evaluating integrity; but rather the various styles he employed are posited as significant of his personal development which is divided into three phases. The effort to place Joesler's work within a broader architectural context, in the end, merely evaluates his work within it's own context, in which significance is found in the trends, patterns and themes in the chronology of his own body of work.*

Question about meaning:

Frankeberger clarification: His body of work has not been placed into the context of Architecture in Tucson. It is merely looked at introvertably. It has to be placed in a context, since the context used does not extend beyond his own work. It is not placed in the context of those architects that designed following the pattern of the Beaux Arts School of design. There are other architects that fit that context. That in its self would lead to how to determine both integrity and treatment later on. Which means whether or not a porch can be enclosed or some other modification. Would those changes have to do with style or be an underlying design approach? Lacking that exterior context placing it within a broader context rather than just looking at it introvertably is the problem with the MPDF, because it doesn't give the proper guidance to evaluate other properties.

Garrison: In a discussion with Carol Shull, the Keeper, as to whether there were MPDFs on other architects that only looked at the architect and compared them to themselves. She answered yes. At the same time the Keeper is morphing to more discussions about those architects.

Majewski: This issue came before us in a previous meeting. We do have the Keeper's comments, SHPO's comments and the HSRC's comments. Our job is to insure that these comments have been used in the new document.

Discussion:

- ⊗ All the comments have been included in the new document and the document is ready for the Keeper.
- ⊗ Document is a more focused version of itself and is a great improvement over the previous version.
- ⊗ **Jeffrey:** Rather than focusing on the context of comparing Joesler to his contemporaries, the registration requirements becomes a useful tool at the backend of the document. They are broken up into 3 sections by building types, making this a useful document for understanding the character defining features of Joesler buildings and helps with the management of these resources in the future. Instead of looking at tangible aspects of what makes a Joesler Design important it is the intangible that makes it important which is done by using intangible things. It is virtually impossible to look at a Joesler and not know it is a Joesler. It is not the individual design elements themselves, but it is the way they are put together that indicates to the viewer that the building is a Joesler. It is beyond anyone's ability to describe the man's genius for putting everything together in a unique way.
- ⊗ There should be better comparison with his peers.
- ⊗ The section that discusses the Joesler / Murphy relationship and collaboration is more detailed and easier to understand.
- ⊗ **Jeffrey:** What I understood from this group was – To strip away all the other stuff and to focus strictly on Joesler's residential designs. Doing so eliminated many of Lisa Deline's comments.

- This was suggested primarily because these are the properties that we are trying to get listed.
 - The residential properties will be the majority of nominations in the future.
 - Individual properties or districts will be added a later date without writing a full context for each one.
- ☉ The registration requirements dealt with some of the more difficult issues such as lot splits, additions, where can additions be constructed and other issues.

Majewski: Called for the vote
6 Ayes – Motion Carried

Linda Mayro, Pima County Preservation: Thanked everyone for their work on this project. The digitization project of Joesler's plans and documents is on track to be completed by December 2013. There is a possibility of having a celebration in the early spring. It would be phenomenal if the MPDF were to be in place by that celebration. Then get some of the nominations through the Keepers office as well.

Clinco: A photo book of Joesler work being compiled under the auspices of the University of Arizona. It would be great to work with property owners who have an interest in having their properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places. He also thanked Brooks Jeffrey for his work on the MPDF.

Jeffrey: For the preparers in the room who have individual nominations in the queue, does this body advise them to wait for the Keeper to approve the MPDF before submitting their nominations or should they submit based on the registration requirements.

Garrison: We should be able to submit the MPDF and get a response from the Keeper in approximately 45 days. I would suggest they wait at least 45 days before submitting.

Majewski: SHPO staff should be thanked for their hard work and guidance in getting this document completed.

Clinco: Would the nominations that have already been to the committee need to be returned to the committee?

Strang: There were 8 nominations that were voted on by HSRC to be forwarded to the Keeper. As soon as we have the MPDF in place those nominations will be submitted. The other nominations will be reviewed by HSRC, possibly at the spring meeting, to determine if they meet the MPDF guidelines.

3. STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN

Collins: Gave an overview of the Historic Preservation Plan. In 1996 the first Historic Preservation Plan was crafted. The successive plans have built on that original plan. This is the 3rd update to that plan and the basic outline of the plan has not changed. The update is simply an update. Plugging new statistics and information into the plan. Public surveys are done and will be completed and added to the plan. Final revisions will be completed early 2014.

HSRC will forward comments and suggestions to William Collins to incorporate in the plan.

Kupel moved the Historic Sites Review Committee approve the **State Historic Preservation Plan** update of 2013. Seconded by **Jeffrey**.

Majewski: Called for the vote
7 Ayes – Motion Carried

D. OLD BUSINESS

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM – July 26, 2013

Moved to accept **Lacy** seconded by **Kupel**.

Majewski: Called for the vote
7 Ayes – Motion Carried

E. STAFF REPORT

1. SHPO REPORT

- a. National Register Update - **Strang**
 - (1. National Register Returns:
 - Thomas Gist Residences Nominations
 - Joesler Nominations

Kirklan McKinney Ditch – Property sold in 2012 and boundaries changed

Castle Juan Paisano (for revisions – Criterion C at the local level)

Community Planning and Development is not as acceptable a context as it was in the past.

Criterion B is difficult to support. Really have to put forward a strong case.

Didn't meet Criterion Consideration G.

(2. Currently in Queue

40 National Register Nominations Pending

About 7 New Nomination for the next meeting

Joeslers that needed revision and are ready to go before the committee

(3. **Garrison:** Signed a nomination for all the dams and distribution centers for the Salt River Project (SRP)

(4. ROPE update: It is being used currently as a tool for SHPO to insure that the Nomination Packets are complete.

There are 3 forms that give an overview of the process.

Application Form Instructions

Application

Recommendation of Preliminary Eligibility an in house evaluation form

Using this process, approximately 12 properties have been evaluated. This has provided us a means to evaluate properties and so far this process seems to be working. The forms are available on line and will be the new procedure.

Ian Milliken, Pima County Cultural Resources: If a consultant firm with access to AZSITE receives SHPO concurrence on a Determination of Eligibility of a property or of a property that has an AZSITE number. Can that concurrence be used instead of the ROPE?

Collins: I would be extremely hesitant to equate the 106 process with the ROPE process. There is a distinct gulf between the 2 processes. True both are determinations of eligibility, but the National Register process is a step above the 106 determinations.

b. SHPO staffing and program news

SHPO has a new staff person, MaryEllen Walsh. She is one of the compliance officers for archaeology, taking Erick Laurila's old position.

Terry Majewski is currently the Chair of the Arizona Advisory Committee.

c. Review and Compliance

Issues revolve around mines and new mines.

d. Survey and Inventory – None.

e. Grants – None. 2013 grants OK, but received too late to give out.

f. Legislative Issues- Budget not determined at this time.

g. HP 2014 Conference – Vondy gave an overview.

F. PUBLIC COMMENT:

Jennifer Levstick – Black Officers Club Update

G. AGENDA ITEMS: None

H. DATE FOR UPCOMMING 2014 HSRC MEETINGS

March 21, 2014

Adjourned at: 12:16 PM

