



HISTORIC SITES REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES  
BOARD ROOM, ARIZONA STATE PARK  
NOV 16, 2012

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

- a. Terry Majewski called the meeting to order at 9:45 AM

**B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS**

**1. HSRC Committee Members present**

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

**2. SHPO Staff Members present**

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

**C. NEW BUSINESS**

**1. NEW NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS**

**a. Residences of Thomas Gist in Southern Arizona, 1947 – 1981 MPDF, Tucson, Pima County**

Strang gave an overview of Residences of Thomas Gist in Southern Arizona

Motion: **Brooks** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Residences of Thomas Gist in Southern Arizona** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places as a MPDF at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that the MPDF be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Lacy**.

**Discussion:**

- ★ Clarification – the MPDF will be discussed and then the individual properties will be discussed.
- ★ The criteria to review of the Gist properties are well laid out in the MPDF document.
- ★ The use of terms Systematic Construction versus Standardized is confusing.
- ★ Built in furniture was used in many Gist's homes, but was not discussed in the MPDF as a character defining feature.
- ★ Was the Custom Flex business model common locally, regionally or was it specific to Gist?
- ★ Angled walls – what does that mean?
- ★ Should there be a MPDF for post war housing custom or production in order to compare architects and workmanship as a way to measure various historic districts? Many of the characteristics listed in this MPDF are also found in other MPDFs for other Architects body of work.
- ★ Where does Gist's work fit in the larger picture of post war housing?
- ★ What were the influences that combined to influence Gist's architecture?



- ★ Gist properties have been evaluated against other Gist properties.
- ★ **Garrison:** The SHPO (office) would have an overall Context Study on Post War Housing done, but due to many issues that cannot be done at this time. I will have to work with staff in order to address some of the issues we are bringing to you, if you are willing to assist in that effort.
- ★ Once we have enough of these types of MPDFs together is it possible to begin the process of developing an overall context study?
- ★ **Garrison:** Debbie Able looked at 87 subdivisions in Tucson and found only 5 or 6 that could be considered eligible. That would not be considered putting everything on the register. Does each city canvas their area and develop their own context study that in turn could be combined with other cities to create a master context for the state?
- ★ Why is the period of significance 1981?
- ★ Preparer chronicled phases of Gist’s life and there were clear character defining feature changes in his style up until 1981.
- ★ Those changes should discuss more clearly in the nomination.
- ★ **Chris Evans, Preparer:** On page 17 there is a reference to the “Eclectic Ranches” completed in 1981. It was the intent to include the entire scope of his life.
- ★ How will the less than 50-year-old properties be dealt with in the future?
- ★ **Evans:** Most of Gist’s work is already over 50 years old. Gist’s outstanding examples of the modern ranches or the high design custom houses might be eligible in less than 50 years and each would have to be addressed on a case by case basis if they are of exceptional importance.
- ★ Could use a table, better pictures, and graphics to illustrate the facts brought out in this nomination.
- ★ A chart was used as a basis for the periods of significance and character defining features. While the chart doesn’t need to be included, mention of it as a method used would be helpful.
- ★ Are the terms primary and secondary character defining features needed?
- ★ **Vondy:** Speaking as one of the persons in the office who works with the Tax Program, those terms are very helpful in determining which changes to the property are problematic or not.
- ★ **Frankeberger:** The major issue is significance. There is no discussion about what is significant about the property in any sort of depth. There is no discussion about why a feature is significance. This wasn’t discussed in the Joesler and it isn’t discussed in this one.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote  
 Ayes 8, Motion Carried  
 Unanimous



**b, c, d, e, f. Residences of Thomas Gist in Southern Arizona, 1947 – 1981, Tucson, Pima County**

Strang gave an overview each of the **Residences of Thomas Gist in Southern Arizona that have been nominated**

- b. Bell, Maynard and Evelyn Residence, Tucson, Pima County**
- c. Miller, Steve and Elizabeth Residence, Tucson, Pima County**
- d. Riecke Residence, Tucson, Pima County**
- e. Stevens Residence, Oro Valley, Pima County**
- f. Von Isser Residence, Tucson, Pima County**

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Bell, Maynard and Evelyn Residence, Miller, Steve and Elizabeth Residence, Riecke Residence, Stevens Residence, and Von Isser Residence** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion “**C**” at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that these nominations be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Jeffrey**.

**Discussion:**

- ★ Reicke Residence is already on the register in the Harold Bell Wright Historic District, but it may be also put forward as an individually listed property under the Thomas Gist Residences MPDF.



- ★ Von Isser residence nomination needs a photo of the carport conversion. If it is an issue of integrity that photo documentation is necessary.
- ★ **Evans:** A photo can be added. The carport is not attached to the residence therefore it is not an adverse affect to the property.
- ★ In Miller residence incompatible alteration (mended adobe brick) is mentioned, is there a photo of that?
- ★ **Evans:** Photo # 6 shows the repair to the wall and I don't think it affects the significance. The photo can be relabeled to indicate that this is the area that has been repaired.
- ★ **Garrison:** Clarification that the repair looks to have been using lime mortar. Over time this repair will age and cease to look as different from the remainder of the wall. You need to research the material used for the repair. If it is Portland cement – it may be a problem. If not you need to add the explanation about lime mortar and the aging process.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote  
 Ayes 8, Motion Carried  
 Unanimous



**g. Miracle Mile Historic District, Tucson, Pima County**

Strang gave an overview of Miracle Mile Historic District

Motion: **Jeffrey** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Miracle Mile Historic District on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion “**A**” 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:**

- ★ **Incorporate SHPO comments into the record.**
- ★ Nomination needs to be edited.
- ★ There's a typographical error on page 22, the first paragraph that goes out to the margin the “limited interstate exists” should be changed to “limited interstate exits”.
- ★ In the next paragraph the name of the building, “The Tucson House”, needs to be included section discussing “the construction of the 17 story building”.
- ★ A picture of Lake Elvira needs to be included with the photo of the Stone Avenue underpass.
- ★ What created the need for Auto Specific Architecture? Keep the discussion specific to the term.
- ★ **Demion Clinco, preparer:** It was an attempt to discuss and show how the road changed as usage of it changed and the development of Tucson. In a couple of paragraphs illustrating how you moved from trailblazer into more formalized roadways.
- ★ The map was confusing. It didn't show which properties were contributing or non-contributing.
- ★ Mabry provided the map at the meeting that clarified the issue.
- ★ Community Development and how the changes in transportation affected that development were discussed. Then there is the discussion of building types and styles in which the focus of the discussion is mid century. The period of significance goes back to the 20s. There needs to be more information given about the earlier periods.
- ★ Need more information if the warehouse typology is going to be used in the nomination.
- ★ Are signs a contributing structure of the alignment? If so it needs to be clear in the nomination.
- ★ **Clinco:** On page 4 under streetscapes signs are mentioned. They are character-defining features for the district. They are contributing characteristic for the individual property to which they are attached and in that respect protected.
- ★ If there is a redevelopment of the property and the sign is removed does that affect the integrity of the property?
- ★ Should the signs be added to the count of contributing elements? Signs as objects might be appropriate.
- ★ In Mesa, due to the Light Rail, there was a determination that signs should be considered objects and are of value. The signs could be moved as long as it was relative to the buildings. Also, there could be a sign that remained eligible even if the associated property was not saved. Need to plan for the future of the objects.



- ★ In Tucson statute, Historic Signs may be moved around the city and still retain their historic status allowing for adaptive reuse.
- ★ If these signs get listed on the National Register on their own and are moved from the original property how does that affect their National Register Status.
- ★ National Register Status would be lost.
- ★ How is the eligibility of the roadway being dealt with? Are there elements that may be moved? How will those work when development occurs in the area? Need to be specific.
- ★ Streetscape isn't listed as a structure and appears to have lost its integrity.
- ★ **Strang:** We just completed a Route 66 inventory. The original Route 66 is listed on the National Register. The 14,000 item inventory properties along Route 66 and they are either contributing or non-contributing components. That includes anything including signs, buildings, overpasses and other elements. As such they become part of the inventory of Route 66. The Miracle Mile street structure should be the backbone on which contributing and non-contributing elements are located.
- ★ This doesn't look like a district or a street because it is not well defined. The layout of the district has not been explained in the nomination. How the street is a thing needs to be discussed.
- ★ This appears to be a nomination about hotels and signs. I didn't read anything about gas or food. The most important things should be gas, food, and lodging. The connection wasn't there.
- ★ The street should be evaluated as a structure and determined non-contributing structure due to the alterations made to it over time. Very little of the original materials remain.
- ★ Is the name correct? Is this a site? The alignment is the important issue and on that alignment are the elements of transportation. It is part of the story of growth of transportation and commerce.
- ★ All this area within the boundaries is considered the Miracle Mile it was perceive that way and remains so today. Needs to be better defined in the nomination.
- ★ Alignment versus district.
- ★ Nominate the Miracle Mile and its character – you deal with the street as a corridor that is in-viable, not changed, immutable; so that in the past you can see where it has been, how it has evolved, changed into the present version of itself. Therefore opening the door for compatible change in the future. Giving you a continuing viable traveler's corridor that is allowed to evolve on its own.
- ★ Guidance to the preparer – road alignment would be a site with historic character defining features, road related things spawned by the corridor, and the significance of transportation as related to the site.
- ★ Preparer should work with the City of Tucson to work these issues out.
- ★ Need to see the nomination again because the changes being requested will change the nomination completely.
- ★ **Garrison:** Most of the non-contributors are at the edge of the district and as such should be left out of the district. There is only one contributor that is dependent on a non-contributor to get to the streetscape. Is this a Hotel Motel MPDF disguised as a district?
- ★ **Demion:** Businesses all along the corridor advertised being located on the Miracle Mile.
- ★ Needs new name.
- ★ Would like to see it again.
- ★ Would SHPO want to have a conversation with the Keeper Mabry and Demion regarding this nomination?

**Majewski:** Called for the vote  
Nays 8, Motion Failed  
Unanimous





**h. Tempe Double Butte Cemetery (Pioneer Section), Tempe, Maricopa County**

Strang gave an overview of **Tempe Double Butte Cemetery (Pioneer Section)**

Motion: **Henderson** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Tempe Double Butte Cemetery (Pioneer Section)**, on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion “**A**” 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:**

- ★ Cemeteries and individual graves are not normally eligible for the National Register unless they have some artistic or historic social significance.
- ★ The nomination seems more focused on the historic people interred and that should not be the focus. The focus should be community development.
- ★ Page 5 contributing elements are mentioned. Need clarification – what are they?
- ★ Period of significance is 1962. Is the more appropriate date 1958? 1958 is the date the Cemetery Association gave control to the City of Tempe.
- ★ **Billy Keiser, City of Tempe Historic Preservation Office, preparer:** The cutoff date of 1962 was chosen because of the 50-year rule. The remainder of the cemetery is not within the period of significance due to age. Burial plots for important individuals who were interred after 1962 were already in existence in the Pioneer portion of the cemetery prior to their death. That is why in the contributing sections there are non-contributing gravesites.
- ★ Keiser gave an explanation of contributing and non-contributing graves and portions of cemetery on the map.
- ★ **Keiser:** The basis for the nomination is community development. The nomination illustrates and mirrors the diversity of the City of Tempe.
- ★ **Joe Nucci, City of Tempe Historic Preservation Officer:** The story that is told under Criterion “A” is the diversity of Tempe in its earliest settlement. The diversity of type of markers used shows the diversity of wealth and the surnames give us the ethnic diversity of the Tempe through its early development. The fact that the wealthy individuals are buried next to the average citizens also reflects the diversity of the population of the city.
- ★ Move the paragraph stating these facts to earlier in the nomination.
- ★ More photos of the graves of average person’s graves would help illustrate the diversity of the cemetery.
- ★ Criterion “C” would tell the story of a local manifestation of the Nation’s change toward the park like cemeteries as opposed to churchyard standing headstone cemeteries. The entire cemetery could be nominated under planning and design by showing those changes that occurred in the mindset of the citizens of Tempe. Cemeteries as planning and art.
- ★ **Nucci:** This is the only existing example of that change in cemetery planning, design, and construction. There is the Pioneer Graveyard and the Modern Cemetery side by side. The plan was to show how the community at large used the cemetery and to raise the awareness of the diversity. The two styles of cemetery are noted and discussed in the nomination.
- ★ **Keiser:** I can scale back Criterion “B” Issues and keep within Criterion “A” with Criterion “C” undertones.
- ★ **Nucci:** If the entire cemetery is included in the nomination the element of diversity is lost, since the modern era does not show the same diversity.
- ★ The National Register has given guidance by stating the vast majority of graves in a still active cemetery must be over 50 years old. The National Register as built in guidelines that are specifically for a situation like this. Use the term “vast majority” instead of citing percentages.
- ★ By scaling back the period of significance to 1958 and changing the boundary to omit sections 16 and 18.
- ★ It is not a district, but rather it is a site.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote  
Ayes 8, Motion Carried  
Unanimous





**i. Kirkland-McKinney Ditch, Tempe, Maricopa County**

Strang gave an overview of **Kirkland-McKinney Ditch**

Motion: **Balsom** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Tempe Municipal Building** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion “**A**” 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:**

- ★ Bob Frankeberger’s comments were very relevant in terms of what could happen, in the future, with this ditch. What inappropriate constraints may be placed on the utility of this ditch? It is intended to convey water. By taking away the possible lining of the ditch or other changes.
- ★ As with the Welton Mohawk this is a working system. Necessary changes were considered and didn’t impact the integrity of the property.
- ★ **Garrison:** As long as it is nominated under Criterion “A” lining the ditch as well as other maintenance is acceptable. There was a time when the Salt River Project (SRP) acting on behalf of the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) did not want open ditches. There has been an assessment of laterals and open ditches and as long as they are historic, they are acceptable as open. If it is found that this ditch needs to be piped there would be documentation and then it would be de-listed.
- ★ **Nucci:** This portion of the canal is entirely east of city owned property, Ellias Rodriguez House, is on an easement that goes between the right-of-way of Old Main Street and private development and city owned property on BOR land. It is one of the pieces that they want to keep open for interpretation of the first modern era canal dug up on the south side of the Salt River Dam.
- ★ Where does this piece of this canal fit with other canals that SRP considers historic? More information needed, there have been surveys done that would be helpful.
- ★ On page 3 under overview of the canal the term “other high volume”. The term “other high volume” needs to be omitted as it gives the impression that this is high volume segment.
- ★ On page 4, paragraph in the middle section states “Borden Homes and another non-contributing residential subdivision implies that this subdivision is non-contributing to this ditch.
- ★ **Garrison:** In the nomination it talks about this being the first south side canal and its connection with the Hayden Mill, it is the first of a list. It doesn’t matter how long the list is still the oldest ditch in the system that is still in use in the Salt River Valley.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote  
Ayes 8, Motion Carried  
Unanimous



**j. Tempe Municipal Building, Tempe, Maricopa County**

Strang gave an overview of **Tempe Municipal Building**

Motion: **Henderson** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Tempe Municipal Building** 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:**

- ★ **Nucci:** There a plans to re-glaze the windows of this facility. Currently the windows are single pane and not considered energy efficient. A grant is to be applied for and if the building were deemed historic under Criterion “C” it would make the grant easier to obtain. With historic designation it would be possible to keep the existing glazing on the more sheltered sides of the building. It is being rushed forward in order to obtain the grant in a timely manor.
- ★ Equating Mid Century Modern with the word Style is not appropriate.
- ★ A statement about Criterion Consideration G needs to be included in the nomination.



- ★ There is no discussion of 50-year exception.
- ★ There should be a summary paragraph about its significance under Criterion "A".
- ★ Need to check repetition.
- ★ Cultural affiliation is a little odd.
- ★ Comparison with other upside-down buildings.
- ★ There needs to be a discussion of this building and how it fits into the modern movement.
- ★ The period of significance needs to be 1970.
- ★ Under architectural classification on the form name it Modern Movement and leave out Style and from the 20s.
- ★ Under associative theme of significance that it survived as a style that seems odd as a justification.
- ★ Was this upside-down pyramid really a passive solar strategy?
- ★ **Nucci:** The concept was that sun didn't strike major portions of the building.
- ★ Need better description of "new technologies that were being developed."
- ★ Is obtaining a grant for re-glazing is a reason to void the 50-year rule?
- ★ **Nucci:** Actually it is about public investment in the project. This building is intended to be the start of keeping downtown vital.
- ★ Map needs to be easier to read. Perhaps USGS map.
- ★ **Nucci:** Photos of this building are in the Library of Congress.
- ★ **Garrison:** There needs to be discussion of John I Yelliot, father of Passive Solar Design engineering in Arizona. John Yelliot was a consultant on all the solar projects in the state. Research into his involvement should be done.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote  
 Ayes 8, Motion Carried  
 Unanimous



**Doug Kupel recused himself from this nomination**

**k. C. P. Stephens DeSoto Six Motorcars, Phoenix, Maricopa County**

Strang gave an overview of **C. P. Stephens DeSoto Six Motorcars**

Motion: **Jeffrey** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **C. P. Stephens DeSoto Six Motorcars** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria "**A**" 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:**

- ★ This property is part of the Tax Act Program.
- ★ Are there any historic photos?
- ★ **Bob Graham, preparer:** No there are no historic photos. There is a rendering that was in the newspaper before the building was built. The style was determined by the rendering.
- ★ This is one of the few buildings left that is connected to the auto of the 20s and 30s.
- ★ As a building type it retains its form.
- ★ There are other auto related buildings in the area so it maintains its integrity of setting.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote  
 Ayes 7, Motion Carried  
 Unanimous





I. Halm, George House (resubmitted Coalter Country Place – name change), Phoenix, Maricopa County

Strang gave an overview of Halm, George House

Motion: Kupel moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Halm, George House 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:**

- ★ There has been significant work on this house, but there isn't an integrity section that discusses and justified them.
- ★ **Keiser:** In pages 3 -7 the integrity of the various facades and elevations are discussed. The rehabilitation work and other changes are discussed.
- ★ Although many changes have been made to this building, it still looks like it is the same house. Character is not changed.
- ★ The back of the house has been changed substantially, but it is not visible to the street.
- ★ No photo of carport that was added.
- ★ Have the preparers address the guidance given to them?
- ★ Is the expanded porch on the east side?
- ★ Yes, it on the east side.
- ★ Gave an overview of changes to house.
- ★ There is a breezeway between carport and house.
- ★ Spatial volumes on the inside of the house have been changed.
- ★ **Keiser:** The increase in square footage to the house didn't affect the footprint of the house. The basement and attic were made into usable spaces thus increasing the square footage of the living areas.
- ★ Needs better discussion of increased square footage.
- ★ The date of the building has been verified as requested.
- ★ City of Phoenix sent a letter opposing the nomination of this house, but it did not go as far as formally objecting to the house going forward, so the nomination can proceed.
- ★ Map needs clarification.
- ★ **Ryan Smith, resident of the neighborhood:** Spoke in favor of the house.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote  
7 Ayes 1 Nay, Motion Passed



2. MOUNTAIN VIEW BLACK OFFICERS CLUB

- ★ **Garrison:** SHPO received the report that was produced by the Army Corps of Engineers assessing the eligibility of this property. The conclusion of the report was that the building was significant, but not eligible due to loss of integrity. Would like a discussion of its integrity issues that are pertinent to its nomination and to give the committee an opportunity to delist the property. You have been given a summary of the report and a copy of the draft my response. The recommendation will be that the property retains its integrity and that they immediately seek a determination of eligibility from the Keeper. This would resolve any issues of integrity. My response will be sent to the Keeper and not to Fort Huachuca. While they are not under legal mandate to save the building I do not think they will move to demolish the building at this time, but there is no guarantee. In the previous meeting it was moved that the nomination be forwarded to the Army preservation officer for consideration of submittal to the Keeper. I have spoken with the Deputy Army Preservation Officer and she said on this issue of making this call, it wasn't their call for eligibility. The fort can submit directly to the keeper and skip the Army Preservation Officer. I am in favor of that direct connection to the Keeper to speed up the decision.
- ★ Is a 2<sup>nd</sup> motion needed to submit to the keeper or did our previous motion cover it.
- ★ **Garrison:** The last motion covered it. The Advisory Council will meet within the month and this issue will be brought before them.





**Kupel** moved that the Arizona Historic Sites Review Committee reaffirm its determination that the **Mountain View Black Officers Club** is a significant property at the **National** Level of Significance even considering the new information that we have received it still retains integrity, we continue to feel that it should remain on the Arizona State Historic Register of Historic Places. Seconded **Lacy**.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote  
Ayes 8, Motion Carried  
Unanimous

#### **D. OLD BUSINESS**

##### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES FORM THE JULY 27, 2012, SEPTEMBER 28, 2012 AND OCTOBER 12, 2012 HSRC MEETINGS**

Moved by Lacy and Seconded by Ryden

**Majewski:** Called for the vote  
Ayes 8, Motion Carried  
Unanimous

#### **E. STAFF REPORT SHPO REPORT**

- a. Vivia gave the new properties that are now on the National Register
- b. Ann Howard introduced Kris Dobschuetz as the new Archaeological Compliance Staff Person
- c. Ann Howard gave an overview of the damage to the Amity Pueblo Site

#### **F. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Jim Ayers: There is progress in bringing back the Heritage fund. I will be meeting with Director Martyn and a few Republicans to discuss the issue next week.

#### **G. AGENDA ITEMS**

None

#### **H. DATES FOR UPCOMMING 2013 HSRC MEETINGS**

- a. March 22, 2013 – 9:30 AM
- b. July 26, 2013 – 9:30 AM
- c. November 8, 2013 – 9:30 AM

Accepted by Consensus

