Tempe Historic Preservation Commission

AGENDA

Date: THURSDAY, May 9, 2013
Location: Hatton Hall, 34 E 7th Street, Tempe (parking in City Hall Garage)
6:00 PM Call to Order, sign in, introductions, (please mute cell phones)

1. Call to Audience: Persons wishing to address the commission on any matter may do so at the discretion of the Chair, however, Arizona Open Meeting Law limits commission discussion to matters listed on the posted agenda. Other topics may be placed on a future agenda for discussion.

2. Approval of HPC Minutes
04/11/13 Tempe HPC Monthly meeting

3. Public Hearing Historic Eligible Classification
Hold a Public Hearing for HE Classification of 1) Arcadia Jones House, located at 708 S Lindon Lane, 2) Clark House located at 923 S Maple Avenue, 3) Escalante House located at 949 S Maple Avenue, 4) Gilliland House located at 928 S Mill Avenue, 5) Goodwin House located at 930 S Mill Avenue, 6) Jones House located at 944 S Mill Avenue, 7) Monty House located at 821 S Maple Avenue, and 8) Nichols House located at 919 S Maple Avenue.

4. Discuss & Consider properties proposed for HE classification on June 13, 2013
Discuss and consider properties proposed for Historic Eligible classification

5. Discuss & Consider Tempe General Plan 2040 Update
Discuss and consider Historic Preservation issues in GP-2040
Discuss and consider Cultural Resource Area classification in GP-2040

6. Discuss and Consider Graduate Student Intern Program Projects
Alyssa) Cavalier Hills Historic District Request
Billy) Double Butte Cemetery National Register Nomination
Billy) Tempe Municipal Building National Register Nomination
Billy) 2013 Governor’s Heritage Preservation Honor Award Nomination
Nathan) Kirkland-McKinney Ditch National Register Nomination
Andrea/Joe) Historic Preservation Graduate Student Intern Program update

7. Discuss and Consider 2013 CLG Conference Attendance
Tempe HPO will request tuition scholarships for members able to attend

8. Discuss and Consider Chair / Staff Updates:
Tempe HPO Social Media Project n=2793 http://www.facebook.com/TempeHPO
Tempe HPF Social Media Project n=1271 http://www.facebook.com/TempeHPF

9. Current Events / Announcements / Future Agenda Items
- Member Announcements
- Staff Announcements
- Nancy Ryan presentation on GP2040 at next HPC meeting
05/29/2013 General Plan 2040 6:00 pm at Tempe Library TLC Classroom
06/12-14/2013 Arizona Historic Preservation Conference Mesa Hilton, 1011 West Holmes Avenue
June HPC Meeting Date: Thursday 06/13/2013 6:00 p.m. at Hatton Hall, 34 E 7th Street
July HPC Meeting Date: Thursday 07/11/2013 6:00 p.m. at Hatton Hall, 34 E 7th Street

Adjourn

To date in 2013 commission members report donating 188 volunteer hours to the City of Tempe

The City of Tempe endeavors to make all public meetings accessible to persons with disabilities. Within 48 hours notice, special assistance can be provided for sight and/or hearing impaired persons at public meetings. Please call (480) 350-8007 (voice) or 350-8400 (TDD) to request accommodation.
Pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.02, notice is hereby given to the members of the Tempe Historic Preservation Commission and to the general public that the Tempe Historic Preservation Commission will hold a meeting open to the public on Thursday, February 14, 2013, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., at Hatton Hall, located on the Governor B. B. Moeur Campus at 34 East 7th Street, Tempe, Arizona.

A copy of the agenda for the meeting will be available at Tempe City Hall, 31 East 5th Street, Garden Level East, Community Development Department, Historic Preservation Office at least twenty-four hours in advance of the meeting.

Dated this 7th day of March, 2013

Tempe Historic Preservation Commission

By [Signature]

Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting the Tempe City Clerk, 480-350-8007 (voice), or 480-350-8400 (TDD). Requests should be made as early as possible to arrange the accommodation.
RULES OF PROCEDURE

AS ADOPTED BY THE

TEMPE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

April 8, 2010

WHEREAS, the Commission recognizes the underlying principal of these rules to be decision-making by majority, and

WHEREAS, application of these rules provide every member of the voting body of this Commission with equal rights, and

WHEREAS, these rules afford Commissioners protection of the minority rights to be heard, to protest, to convince their peers, and to fully understand the issues discussed or voted, and

WHEREAS, the use of the rules offers a simple and direct procedure for conducting Commission business;

NOW THEREFORE, the Tempe Historic Preservation Commission does adopt for use and implement the rules of order as procedure for conducting the Commission’s business as set forth herein and as follows:

MOTIONS, shall follow correct order … considering only one question at a time, as such:

A Commission member addresses the Chair, the Chair acknowledges that member, another member seconds the motion, the Chair repeats the motion, the Chair calls for discussion of the motion, the Chair puts the motion to a vote, the Chair announces the results of the vote.

IMPARTIALITY, shall provide for and protect the rights of individual members, of minority opinions, of majority opinion, and of any member absent from a meeting, as such:

Members may communicate to the Commission when recognized by the Chair, the Chair maintains highest priority to direct the course of the meeting, the maker of a motion will take precedence over others, new speakers will take precedence over those who already spoke to a motion, the Chair should typically request speakers for an opposing view.

ORDER OF BUSINESS, shall proceed in consideration of interested public, invited guests, staff, and any having business with the commission, as such:

A consent agenda may be presented by the Chair at the beginning of a meeting.*
Call to order and approval of minutes shall be the Commission’s first business,
Members of the public and guests of the Commission shall next be invited to speak,
Public Hearing presentations or discussion shall be the Commission’s next business,
Public Meeting presentations or discussion shall be the Commission’s next business,
Presentations by City Staff shall be the Commission’s next business,
Presentations by Consultants shall be the Commission’s next business,
Presentations by Standing Committees of this Commission shall occur next,
Presentations by Special Committees of this Commission shall occur next,
General discussion and Commissioner’s Business shall then occur.

* A consent agenda may be presented by the Chair at the beginning of a meeting. Items may be removed from the consent agenda on the request of any one member. Items not removed may be adopted by general consent without debate. Removed items may be taken up either immediately after the consent agenda, be placed later on the agenda, or continued to another meeting at the discretion of the assembly.
The Tempe Historic Preservation Commission meets at 6:00 p.m. on the second Thursday of each month at Hatton Hall, 34 East 7th Street. The Tempe Historic Preservation Office prepares an agenda with supporting material for Historic Preservation Commission meetings. State law requires that commission agendas be publicly posted at least 24 hours prior to a meeting; however, Historic Preservation Commission agendas are usually available the Monday before the Thursday meeting. You can find Historic Preservation Commission agendas in the following locations: the City Clerk’s Office on the 2nd floor of City Hall, the Tempe Historic Preservation Office on the 2nd floor of the Orchid House, the bulletin board on the Garden Level outside of the City Council Chambers, and on the internet at http://www.tempe.gov/historicpres.

Historic Preservation Commission monthly meetings are always open to the public and are greatly enriched by community participation. The Commission welcomes the community perspective and schedules a “Call to the Audience” at the beginning of the meeting for the convenience of attendees who would like to have input but can not stay for the entire meeting. The Commission was created to advise Tempe City Council on matters concerning historic preservation and therefore providing citizens with opportunities to communicate comments and concerns is fundamental to the mission of the organization.

There are many ways to reach the Historic Preservation Commission during public meetings and at other times as well. Members of the public may come forward and talk with the Commission during the “Call to the Audience” at the beginning of each monthly meeting, however, Arizona Open Meeting Law limits commission discussion to matters listed on the posted agenda. Of course you can always request that an item be placed on the agenda for discussion at an upcoming Commission meeting.

If you know in advance that you want to address the Commission on a specific issue you can have the issue placed on the agenda for discussion and consideration as a Scheduled Public Appearance. Please contact the Historic Preservation Office no later than the Friday morning before the Thursday meeting.

Citizens can also contact the Historic Preservation Office to communicate with Commission members. The Tempe Preservation website is the Commission’s primary public outreach facility. From the site at http://www.tempe.gov/historicpres/ you will find up to date information on Tempe Preservation including: announcements of meetings and events, agendas and minutes, and additional contact information. Please feel free to contact the Tempe Historic Preservation Office at 480.350.8870 or by email sent to joe_nucci@tempe.gov, or find us on Facebook at http://www.facebook.com/TempeHPO.
Tempe Historic Preservation Commission [Tempe HPC]

MEETING MINUTES

Date: THURSDAY, April 11, 2013

Location: Hatton Hall  34 East Seventh Street

Commissioners Present: Ira Bennett, Andrea Gregory, Charlie Lee, Lauren Proper, Brenda Shears, Scott Solliday

Staff Present: Alyssa Gerszewski, Nathan Hallam, Billy Kiser, Joe Nucci, Mark Vinson


Call to Order: 6:04 P.M., Andrea Gregory, Chair

1. Call to Audience  NO REPLY

Mark Vinson introduces ASU HUD-402 Community Revitalization students


2. Approval of HPC Minutes 03/14/2013 Tempe HPC meeting

MOTION [BENNETT]: MOVE TO APPROVE TEMPE HPC MEETING MINUTES FROM 03/14/2013 AS AMENDED, SECOND [SOLLIDAY], APPROVED, 6-0

3. Public Hearing Historic Eligible Classification

• Gregory: Reads public hearing statement for historic eligible classification of the Harrington-Birchett House located at 202 E 7th Street, Terrell House located at 521 West 5th Street, Curry House located at 225 South Roosevelt Street, Blakely House located at 305 South Roosevelt Street, Marriott House located at 606 South Roosevelt Street, Arcadia Jones House located at 708 South Lindon Lane, and Patio Palms apartments located at 626 South Wilson Street.

• Nucci: Summarizes the request and discusses action to be taken.

• Proper: Expresses concerns about structural integrity of Blakely House.

• Solliday: Discusses integrity concerns for the Terrell House.

• Olson: Requests on behalf of Arizona State University that the THPC does not classify the Harrington-Birchett House as Historic Eligible.

• Nucci: Summarizes jurisdiction for the Harrington-Birchett House.
• Terrell House (Mac McGinn, property owner): Why should my property be classified Historic Eligible?
• Gregory & Nucci: Summarize historic eligible classification benefits and process.
• Arcadia Jones House (Gary G. Metoxen, property owner): Requests continuation for classification of the Arcadia Jones House as Historic Eligible.
• Nucci: Recommends the Arcadia Jones House be continued.
• Metoxen: Provides brief history and explains damage to property. Agrees to provide photographs of property.
• Vinson: Will talk to other city departments to gather info on Arcadia Jones House.
• Blakely House (Lori Wheeler, property owner): Is moving the structure considered if demolition permit is issued?
• Nucci: Explains that a property can be moved as last resort, but this changes the integrity of location.

**MOTION [PROPER]: MOVE TO CONTINUE THE ARCADIO JONES HOUSE UNTIL JUNE HPC MEETING, SECOND [SHEARS], APPROVED, 6-0**

• Gregory: Concerned about tracking changes proposed for the Harrington-Birchett House.
• Olson: Explains Harrington-Birchett House is subject to 30 day review by SHPO.

**CONSENSUS THAT HARRINGTON-BIRCHETT HOUSE IS UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF SHPO**

**MOTION [SOLLIDAY]: MOVE THAT THE HARRINGTON-BIRCHETT HOUSE NOT BE CLASSIFIED AS HISTORIC ELIGIBLE AT THIS TIME (DISMISSAL WITHOUT PREJUDICE), SECOND [BENNETT], APPROVED, 6-0**

• Bennett: Recommends more research on Terrell House.
• Nucci: Explains implications of continuation to property owner.

**MOTION [BENNETT]: MOVE TO CONTINUE THE TERRRELL HOUSE UNTIL THE MAY MEETING, SECOND [SHEARS], APPROVED, 6-0**

• Proper: Recommends HPC not classify the Blakely House as Historic Eligible.

**MOTION [PROPER]: MOVE THAT THE BLAKELY HOUSE WILL NOT BE CLASSIFIED AS HISTORIC ELIGIBLE [LEE], DENIED, 4-2**

• Vinson: Motion does not pass.

**MOTION [BENNETT]: MOVE TO CLASSIFY THE BLAKELY HOUSE, THE MARRIOT HOUSE, THE CURRY HOUSE, AND PATIO PALMS APARTMENTS AS HISTORIC ELIGIBLE [SOLLIDAY], APPROVED, 6-0**

4. Presentation Arizona State University Historic Preservation Update
• Olson: Discusses interior, exterior, and landscape rehabilitation of Harrington-Birchett House and its new use as dining facility. Shares information on rehabilitation of Piper Writers House, University Club, Social Science Building, and Manzanita Hall. Explains the archeological project taking place on Alpha Drive.

5. Discuss & Consider Properties Proposed for HE Classification on May 9, 2013
• Hallam: Summarizes new properties to classify historic eligible – 1) Monty House located at 821 S Maple Avenue, – 2) Nichols House located at 919 S Maple Avenue, – 3) Gilliland House located at 928 S Maple Avenue, – 4) Goodwin House located at 930 S Mill Avenue, – 5) Jones House located at 944 S Mill Avenue, – 6) Clark House located at 923 S Maple
Avenue, – 7) Escalante House located at 949 S Maple Avenue, will be discussed at April meeting. Staff noted several of these properties are owned by Steve Tseffos and could set important precedent.

- Lee: Expresses concern about new round columns at entry to Gilliland House.
- Solliday: Proposed properties are in 1981 Tempe Historic Property Survey. Photograph collection from the survey housed at Tempe History Museum.

6. **Discuss & Consider Tempe General Plan 2040**
- Hallam: Provides details on meeting with Nancy Ryan about determination of Cultural Resource Areas. THPC to be involved in consideration of new Cultural Resource Area selection.
- Hallam & Nucci: Conducted field survey and re-evaluated Cultural Resource Areas from GP2030.
- Nucci: Ryan invited the HPO and HPC to redefine Cultural Resource Area for GP2040.
- Gregory: Requests new Cultural Resource Areas to be discussed at May meeting.
- Vinson: Nancy Ryan requested to provide GP2040 update in June.
- Gregory: Will multi-family properties be included in new Cultural Resource Areas?
- Nucci & Hallam: Recommend multi-family properties with single ownership be classified Historic Eligible. Cultural Resource Area classification is for anticipated future Historic Districts and could include multi-family properties with multiple ownership, for example the Sunset Vista 1958–1960 subdivision classified as a CRA in GP2030.

7. **Discuss & Consider Graduate Student Intern Program Projects**
- Nucci: Provides Kiser update on NRN for Double Butte Cemetery, and Tempe Municipal Building. Kiser and Nucci are working on Arizona Governor Heritage Award for the Rio Salado Foundation.
- Gerszewski: NRN for Moeur Park passed in Historic Sites Review Committee meeting on March 22. Will revise and submit to the Keeper of the National Register when SHPO comments are received.
- Hallam: NRN for Kirkland-McKinney Ditch not submitted to Keeper of National Register yet.

8. **Discuss & Consider 2013 HPC Elections**
- Gregory: Recommends waiting to do elections until May, or vote electronically.
- Shears: Prefers to vote electronically.
- Nucci: Submit electronic votes to Nucci.

9. **Discuss & Consider Chair/Staff Updates**
- Nucci: June meeting may be postponed due to scheduling conflict with Arizona Historic Preservation Conference.

10. **Current Events / Announcements / Future Agenda Items**
Next HPC Meeting Date Thursday 05/09/2013 at 6:00 p.m. at Hatton Hall, 34 E 7th Street

*Meeting adjourned at 8:01 PM*

Andrea Gregory, Chair

*minutes scheduled for HPC approval on 05/09/2013*
FREQUENTLY USED ABBREVIATIONS OR ACRONYMS

- CDD – City of Tempe Community Development Department: Established February 15, 2005, by City Manager Will Manley, the CDD consists of six divisions: Economic Development, Housing Services, Redevelopment, Neighborhood Enhancement, Rio Salado/Town Lake, and Special Projects, as well as the Community Design Studio / City Architect. The Tempe Historic Preservation Office is an agency of the Special Projects Division.

- CLG – Certified Local Government: In 1980, Congress established a framework for local preservation programs through an amendment to the National Historic Preservation Act empowering Arizona cities and counties to become Certified Local Governments (CLGs). Once certified, these entities are eligible for specialized assistance and funds for developing their own local preservation programs and entitled to comment on NR and other SHPO activities within their boundaries. The City of Tempe became a CLG in 1995.

- DDA – Development & Disposition Agreement: a redevelopment contract between the City and one or more developers or redevelopers specifying terms and conditions for construction or reconstruction.

- DSD – City of Tempe Development Services Department: dealing with Building Safety, Land Use, Planning and Zoning


- GRIC – Gila River Indian Community: is an alliance of two tribes, the Akimel O'odham (Pima) and the Pee Posh (Maricopa). Established by Executive Order in 1859, the Community covers more than 600 square miles and is the largest indigenous community in the Phoenix metropolitan area. GRIC helps make the Tempe Preservation Graduate Student Intern Program possible through a generous grant of State-Shared Revenue funds.

- HPF – (see Tempe HPF) Tempe Historic Preservation Foundation

- HSRC – (Arizona) Historic Sites Review Committee: Arizona's official Arizona and National Register of Historic Places review board. The HSRC meets three times during the year to review National Register nominations and advise the State Historic Preservation Officer on nominations to the State and National Registers.

- IEBC – International Existing Building Code: adopted by Tempe City Council by Ordinance No. 2005.89 on December 1, 2005, as part of the code body promulgated by the International Code Council, provides means for preservation of existing Tempe building inventory through reasonable and feasible code processes.

- IRS – Issue Review Session: informal Mayor and Council public meeting where members of the public may come forward and talk with City Council during the “Call to the Audience” prior to regular Council meetings.

- NPS – National Park Service: the City of Tempe is a Certified Local Government through an inter-governmental agreement with the United States Department of the Interior National Park Service and the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office.

- NRN – National Register Nomination: An application to list a property on the National Register of Historic Places is reviewed by the SHPO and then by the Arizona Historic Sites Review Committee (Sites) before formal application is made to the Keeper of the National Register in Washington DC.

- PAD – Planned Area Development: site plan overlay to define development standards for a specific project.

- SHPO – State Historic Preservation Office: a division of Arizona State Parks, responsible for the identification, evaluation, and protection of Arizona's prehistoric and historic cultural resources; established by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.

- SRP-MIC – Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community: created by Executive Order on June 14, 1879 by President Rutherford B. Hayes, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRPMIC) is located in Maricopa County, aside the boundaries of Mesa, Tempe, Scottsdale, Fountain Hills and metropolitan Phoenix.

- Tempe HPC – Tempe Historic Preservation Commission: Created by Ordinance 95.35, adopted November 9, 1995. Members serve three year terms with the exception of the initial appointments; charged with administering the Tempe Historic Preservation Ordinance and Plan, as well as advising Mayor / Council on all matters related to historic preservation.


- Tempe HPO – Tempe Historic Preservation Office: Responsible for the identification and conservation of Tempe’s prehistoric and historic cultural resources, the Office uses Federal, state, and city funding for the historic preservation program and assists owners of historic properties with grant applications, property maintenance, and preservation activities; provides staff support to the Tempe HPC.

- THM – Tempe Historical Museum: Located at 809 E. Southern Avenue in Tempe, the Tempe Historical Museum is a center where the community comes together to celebrate Tempe's past and ponder the future. Permanent and changing exhibits, educational programs, and research projects generally focus on some aspect of Tempe's history within the context of state and national events.

- TOD – Tempe Transportation Overlay District: placed to encourage appropriate land development and redevelopment consistent with and complementary to the community’s focused investment in transit, bicycle, and pedestrian infrastructure in certain geographic areas of the City; typically in association with the light rail.

- ZDC – Zoning & Development Code: Adopted by Mayor and Council on January 20, 2005, effective February 22, 2005, the ZDC implements Tempe General Plan 2030 by encouraging creative development of the built environment in order to build a community that promotes the livability and uniqueness of Tempe; establishes zoning districts and development standards.
The Public Hearing must be acknowledged:


1) Direct Staff to summarize the application and proposed action:

“HPO please summarize this request and indicate the action before the Commission.”

2) HPO

“At their meeting on September 13, 2012, the Historic Preservation Commission reached consensus to resume classification of Historic Eligible properties in accordance with Section 14A-4 of the Tempe City Code: “Designation of landmarks, historic properties and historic districts”. Since that time, HPC has classified 27 properties as Historic Eligible. On April 11, 2013, HPC discussed classification of the Arcadia Jones House located at 708 S Lindon Lane. This property is believed to be built in 1899, and therefor appears eligible for local listing by virtue of its extreme age. HPC elected to continue classification of this property pending additional research into the history and integrity of this property. In addition, staff has identified 7 properties from Blocks 21 and 28 of the Gage Addition in the Maple Ash Neighborhood. The following properties are recommended for classification as Historic Eligible by HPO: – 1) Arcadia Jones House located at 708 S Lindon Lane, 2) Clark House located at 923 S Maple Avenue, – 3) Escalante House located at 949 S Maple Avenue, – 4) Gilliland House located at 928 S Mill Avenue, – 5) Goodwin House located at 930 S Mill Avenue, – 6) Jones House located at 944 S Mill Avenue, – 7) Monty House located at 821 S Maple Avenue, – and 8) Nichols House located at 919 S Maple Avenue Call for Commission discussion:

“Is there discussion from the Commission regarding the information from Staff prior to taking public comment?”

3) Public input must be taken:

“This is a Public Hearing. Any person wishing to address the Commission regarding these Historic Eligible classifications may do so at this time by first getting the attention of the Chair.”

4) Public input must be accurately attributed:

“Please state your name and address for recording in the meeting minutes.”

6) Discussion may take place prior to a vote at the option of the members:

“Is there discussion from the Commission regarding the information provided by public comment prior to closing the Public Hearing?”

7) Call the Question:

“MOVE THAT THE TEMPE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION CLASSIFY – the ARCADIA JONES HOUSE, the CLARK HOUSE, the ESCALANTE HOUSE, the GILLILLAND HOUSE, the GOODWIN HOUSE, the JONES HOUSE, the MONTY HOUSE, and the NICHOLS HOUSE – AS HISTORIC ELIGIBLE AND LIST THEM AS SUCH IN THE RECORDS OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT.”

8) Is there a second? – Please Vote.

9) Summarize what took place and what are the next steps:

“The Tempe Historic Preservation Commission has just concluded a Public Hearing for Historic Eligible classification of properties which are not designated Historic and not listed in the Tempe Historic Property Register. The single effect of Historic Eligible classification is notification of the Historic Preservation Office in the event that a permit or other consideration by the city is requested for these properties, including the potential for a stay of demolition for a period not to exceed 30 days.

9) The conclusion of the Public Hearing and resumption of the public meeting must be acknowledged.

“This concludes the Public Hearings for Historic Eligible classification of historic properties.”

Thank you for your interest in this important Tempe Preservation activity.
Please run once prior to Wednesday, April 24, 2013.
Thank you.

LEGAL ADVERTISEMENT

The City of Tempe will hold a public hearing for Historic Eligible classification of the following properties in Tempe.

1. Arcadia Jones House located at 708 S Lindon Lane
2. Clark House located at 923 S Maple Avenue
3. Escalante House located at 949 S Maple Avenue
4. Gilliland House located at 928 S Mill Avenue
5. Goodwin House located at 930 S Mill Avenue
6. Jones House located at 944 S Mill Avenue
7. Monty House located at 821 S Maple Avenue
8. Nichols House located at 919 S Maple Avenue

A public hearing will be held by the Tempe Historic Preservation Commission at Hatton Hall, 34 East Seventh Street at 6:00 p.m. on Thursday, May 9, 2013. For more information, contact the Tempe Historic Preservation Office at (480) 350-8028, (TTD: 350-8913), or visit us online at – www.tempe.gov/historicpres
Thank you for sharing Mr. Tseffos email. When his first property came before the Historic Preservation Commission, it was considered as a single property that was listed on the National Register. I understood that we were first taking the steps to review and recommend those Tempe properties that were already on the National Register. In his remarks to the Commission, Mr. Tseffos made it clear that he had begun inquiry into the process to have it de-listed from the National Register. Given that circumstance, I did not feel it appropriate at that time to have it listed as Historic Eligible for the City of Tempe with the possibility that it could lose its National Register listing; not solely because Mr. Tseffos did not want the Historic Eligible designation.

However, any other properties that he may own need to be considered in light of the circumstances of those properties with regard to an evaluation of whether each fits the criteria to receive the Commission’s recommendation for Historic Eligibility.

DO NOT REPLY TO ALL – This message pertains to issues to be discussed and considered by the Tempe Historic Preservation Commission in public meetings conforming to the requirements of Arizona Open Meeting Law – (ARS. §§ 38-431 through -431.09) Replies to this message should be directed only to the Tempe Historic Preservation Office and not broadcast to all recipients of this distribution list. Please avoid conflict with Arizona Open Meeting Law – DO NOT REPLY TO ALL.

Just to let you know that Mr Tseffos has received his mail regarding designation of properties on Mill Avenue. He may not have received notice of properties in the interior of Maple Ash as the Assessor’s Office provides a different address for those. In any case, he continues to be content to confuse HE classification with H designation and will no doubt cite the precedent of the Mullen Van Petton House from early in the classification process when the protection, or lack thereof, afforded by National Register listing was not so clearly understood. Please send comment or concerns to me for distribution to the membership and thank you for your continued courtesy and cooperation in this hard work.

DO NOT REPLY TO ALL – This message pertains to issues to be discussed and considered by the Tempe Historic Preservation Commission in public meetings conforming to the requirements of Arizona Open Meeting Law – (ARS. §§ 38-431 through -431.09) Replies to this message should be directed only to the Tempe Historic Preservation Office and not broadcast to all recipients of this distribution list. Please avoid conflict with Arizona Open Meeting Law – DO NOT REPLY TO ALL.

-----Original Message-----
From: Mill Properties [mailto:stevetseffos@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 24, 2013 4:57 PM
To: Nucci, Joseph
Subject: historic eligible properties from steven tseffos

dear mr. nucci

today i received your letter stating that three of my mill avenue properties are eligible for listing in the tempe historic properties register. as you know, i attended a meeting of the historic commission recently in which they agreed with me that if a building owner did not want or desire to have their property or properties classified, that the commission and thus the city would grant the owner's request. i am hereby putting you on notice that i do not want my properties added to the properties register and want you to treat this property exactly as my last property was treated and not included or considered for the register. in the past you have ignored many of my emails and requests and therefore i am sending this to other members of the city staff and councilmembers and mayor. i would appreciate your responding that you have received this correspondence and understand my position. please pass along an email for andrea gregory the commission chair so that i may remind her of my time testifying before her committee and the committees decision to not force historic designation or the register on property owners that do not want to be included.

steven a. tseffos
mill properties two
602.692.3900
April 28, 2013

City of Tempe
Tempe Historic Preservation Office
Community Development Dept.
31 East 5th St.
P.O. Box 5002
Tempe, Arizona 85280-5002

Re: Opposition to Maple/Ash Historic district

Dear Historic Representative:

I am an owner of property in the proposed Maple/Ash historic district. My property address is 821 South Maple, and the property is zoned R-3, Multi Family Residential Limited. We are opposed to the Tempe Historic District designation and any additional regulations regarding this property. I believe our property values will be damaged if this overlay is imposed. We are proud of our home and neighborhood. This neighborhood has done fine with the existing regulations. There have been significant improvements in the neighborhood, new investment and repairs that will only be mired by another layer of regulations. Any proposition that slows down or adds impediments to the approval of building plans within the existing regulations is not acceptable. We strongly oppose the historic designation of our property.

 Regards,

[Signature]

Kent Oertle
P.O. Box 50411
Phoenix, Arizona 85076-0411

Phone: 480.753.2295 (O)
       480.893.6027 (H)
Email: mandkhome@aol.com
Tempe Historic Preservation Commission (Tempe HPC)
Tempe Historic Preservation Office
Thursday, May 02, 2013

KENT OERTLE
P O BOX 50411
PHOENIX AZ, 85076-0411

Dear Mr Oertle,

We are in receipt of your letter dated April 28, 2013, expressing opposition to Maple/Ash Historic district and related to Historic Eligible classification of your property located at 821 South Maple Avenue (the 1922 Monty House).

This is sent to clarify your misunderstanding of the process scheduled to occur in a public hearing of the Tempe Historic Preservation Commission on Thursday, May 9, 2013. At that time, the commission will discuss and consider classifying Monty House as Historic Eligible. This is not Historic designation of the property or district. The sole effect of this Historic Eligible classification will be to add Monty House to the list of properties that appear to meet city code criteria for historic designation and listing in the Tempe Historic Property Register. The singular result of this Historic Eligible classification would be the potential to delay issuance of a demolition permit or other permit sought from the city to alter the property for a period not to exceed 30 days.

We understand from your letter that you are opposed to any action that could slow down or impede approval of building plans. Please note that the potential 30-day preservation review would run concurrent with the standard permit process and in many cases would not impact the project schedule at all.

Please be assured that we will include your letter dated April 28, 2013, in the information transmitted to Commissioners and in the documentation of the May 9, 2013, public hearing.

Yours Very Truly,

By Joseph G. Nucci, Historic Preservation Officer

Joseph G. Nucci, Historic Preservation Officer
www.tempe.gov/historicpres  joe_nucci@tempe.gov
At their meeting on September 13, 2012, the Historic Preservation Commission reached consensus to resume classification of Historic Eligible properties in accordance with Section 14A-4 of the Tempe City Code: “Designation of landmarks, historic properties and historic districts”. Since that time, HPC has classified 27 properties as Historic Eligible. On April 11, 2013, HPC discussed classification of the Arcadia Jones House located at 708 S Lindon Lane. This property is believed to be built in 1899, and therefore appears eligible for local listing by virtue of its extreme age. HPC elected to continue classification of this property pending additional research into the history and integrity of this property. In addition, staff has identified 7 properties from Blocks 21 and 28 of the Gage Addition in the Maple Ash Neighborhood. The following properties are recommended for classification as Historic Eligible by HPO:

Arcadia Jones House located at 708 S Lindon Lane,
Clark House located at 923 S Maple Avenue,
Escalante House located at 949 S Maple Avenue,
Gililland House located at 928 S Mill Avenue,
Goodwin House located at 930 S Mill Avenue,
Jones House located at 944 S Mill Avenue,
Monty House located at 821 S Maple Avenue, – and
Nichols House located at 919 S Maple Avenue
SIGNIFICANCE - The 1899 Arcadia Jones House is significant for its association with Tempe agricultural history as a onetime rural farmhouse. It is also significant as a local variant of National Folk-style residential architecture.

A. EVENT/HISTORY - During the first half of the twentieth century, the Tempe area east of Rural Road, south of Apache Boulevard, and west of Farmer Avenue was an agricultural landscape of orchards and field crops, tree-lined canals, and rural farmhouses built along unpaved section line roads. Tempe farms produced agricultural commodities—grain, alfalfa, cotton, citrus, dairy, livestock, and an array of fruits and vegetables—that formed the basis of the region’s economy until the post-World War II residential and commercial boom.

B. PERSON - Arcadia Jones, the widow of Dr. Wilson Walker Jones, a pioneer Salt River valley physician, acquired the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of Section 17 in 1899. She purchased the forty-acre property from its original homesteaders, Jose and Felicita Gonzales. In a family history, Arcadia’s granddaughter indicated that Mrs. Jones built the house soon after acquiring the property. The 1900 U.S. census indicates Jones and five of her seven children, age 9 through 22, lived at the house, along with two field hands who helped manage the farm. Arcadia mortgaged the property to Farmers and Merchants Bank in 1921 but passed away in 1923; her daughter Laura Curry inherited the property but lost it in a 1924 judgment, whereby the Maricopa County Sheriff sold the property at auction to A.T. Hammons, the State Superintendent of Banks, who in turn sold to Andrew Martin. The farm was redeveloped as a college campus by Cook Christian Training School after 1965.

C. DESIGN/CONSTRUCTION - The 1899 Arcadia Jones House is a one-story adobe house. Irregular in plan, the house sits on a crawlspace foundation with plastered walls topped by a low-pitched, hipped roof with overhanging eaves and exposed rafter ends. Windows are wood casement and aluminum sliding; some windows are boarded up. The building may have undergone remodeling after initial construction, but aerial photographs indicate that the house’s overall massing retains integrity from 1930.
SIGNIFICANCE - The 1899 Arcadia Jones House is significant for its association with Tempe agricultural history as a onetime rural farmhouse. It is also significant as a local variant of National Folk-style residential architecture.

A. EVENT/HISTORY - During the first half of the twentieth century, the Tempe area east of Rural Road, south of Apache Boulevard, and west of Farmer Avenue was an agricultural landscape of orchards and field crops, tree-lined canals, and rural farmhouses built along unpaved section line roads. Tempe farms produced agricultural commodities—grain, alfalfa, cotton, citrus, dairy, livestock, and an array of fruits and vegetables—that formed the basis of the region’s economy until the post-World War II residential and commercial boom.

B. PERSON - Arcadia Jones, the widow of Dr. Wilson Walker Jones, a pioneer Salt River valley physician, acquired the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of Section 17 in 1899. She purchased the forty-acre property from its original homesteaders, Jose and Felicita Gonzales. In a family history, Arcadia’s granddaughter indicated that Mrs. Jones built the house soon after acquiring the property. The 1900 U.S. census indicates Jones and five of her seven children, age 9 through 22, lived at the house, along with two field hands who helped manage the farm. Arcadia mortgaged the property to Farmers and Merchants Bank in 1921 but passed away in 1923; her daughter Laura Curry inherited the property but lost it in a 1924 judgment, whereby the Maricopa County Sheriff sold the property at auction to A.T. Hammons, the State Superintendent of Banks, who in turn sold to Andrew Martin. The farm was redeveloped as a college campus by Cook Christian Training School after 1965.

C. DESIGN/CONSTRUCTION - The 1899 Arcadia Jones House is a one-story adobe house. Irregular in plan, the house sits on a crawlspace foundation with plastered walls topped by a low-pitched, hipped roof with overhanging eaves and exposed rafter ends. Windows are wood casement and aluminum sliding; some windows are boarded up. The building may have undergone remodeling after initial construction, but aerial photographs indicate that the house’s overall massing retains integrity from 1930.
SIGNIFICANCE - The 1899 Arcadia Jones House is significant for its association with Tempe agricultural history as a onetime rural farmhouse. It is also significant as a local variant of National Folk-style residential architecture.

A. EVENT/HISTORY - During the first half of the twentieth century, the Tempe area east of Rural Road, south of Apache Boulevard, and west of Farmer Avenue was an agricultural landscape of orchards and field crops, tree-lined canals, and rural farmhouses built along unpaved section line roads. Tempe farms produced agricultural commodities—grain, alfalfa, cotton, citrus, dairy, livestock, and an array of fruits and vegetables—that formed the basis of the region's economy until the post-World War II residential and commercial boom.

B. PERSON - Arcadia Jones, the widow of Dr. Wilson Walker Jones, a pioneer Salt River valley physician, acquired the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of Section 17 in 1899. She purchased the forty-acre property from its original homesteaders, Jose and Felicita Gonzales. In a family history, Arcadia’s granddaughter indicated that Mrs. Jones built the house soon after acquiring the property. The 1900 U.S. census indicates Jones and five of her seven children, age 9 through 22, lived at the house, along with two field hands who helped manage the farm. Arcadia mortgaged the property to Farmers and Merchants Bank in 1921 but passed away in 1923; her daughter Laura Curry inherited the property but lost it in a 1924 judgment, whereby the Maricopa County Sheriff sold the property at auction to A.T. Hammons, the State Superintendent of Banks, who in turn sold to Andrew Martin. The farm was redeveloped as a college campus by Cook Christian Training School after 1965.

C. DESIGN/CONSTRUCTION - The 1899 Arcadia Jones House is a one-story adobe house. Irregular in plan, the house sits on a crawlspace foundation with plastered walls topped by a low-pitched, hipped roof with overhanging eaves and exposed rafter ends. Windows are wood casement and aluminum sliding; some windows are boarded up. The building may have undergone remodeling after initial construction, but aerial photographs indicate that the house’s overall massing retains integrity from 1930.
SIGNIFICANCE - The 1899 Arcadia Jones House is significant for its association with Tempe agricultural history as a onetime rural farmhouse. It is also significant as a local variant of National Folk-style residential architecture.

A. EVENT/HISTORY - During the first half of the twentieth century, the Tempe area east of Rural Road, south of Apache Boulevard, and west of Farmer Avenue was an agricultural landscape of orchards and field crops, tree-lined canals, and rural farmhouses built along unpaved section line roads. Tempe farms produced agricultural commodities—grain, alfalfa, cotton, citrus, dairy, livestock, and an array of fruits and vegetables—that formed the basis of the region’s economy until the post-World War II residential and commercial boom.

B. PERSON - Arcadia Jones, the widow of Dr. Wilson Walker Jones, a pioneer Salt River valley physician, acquired the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of Section 17 in 1899. She purchased the forty-acre property from its original homesteaders, Jose and Felicita Gonzales. In a family history, Arcadia’s granddaughter indicated that Mrs. Jones built the house soon after acquiring the property. The 1900 U.S. census indicates Jones and five of her seven children, age 9 through 22, lived at the house, along with two field hands who helped manage the farm. Arcadia mortgaged the property to Farmers and Merchants Bank in 1921 but passed away in 1923; her daughter Laura Curry inherited the property but lost it in a 1924 judgment, whereby the Maricopa County Sheriff sold the property at auction to A.T. Hammons, the State Superintendent of Banks, who in turn sold to Andrew Martin. The farm was redeveloped as a college campus by Cook Christian Training School after 1965.

C. DESIGN/CONSTRUCTION - The 1899 Arcadia Jones House is a one-story adobe house. Irregular in plan, the house sits on a crawlspace foundation with plastered walls topped by a low-pitched, hipped roof with overhanging eaves and exposed rafter ends. Windows are wood casement and aluminum sliding; some windows are boarded up. The building may have undergone remodeling after initial construction, but aerial photographs indicate that the house’s overall massing retains integrity from 1930.
SIGNIFICANCE - The 1899 Arcadia Jones House is significant for its association with Tempe agricultural history as a onetime rural farmhouse. It is also significant as a local variant of National Folk-style residential architecture.

A. EVENT/HISTORY - During the first half of the twentieth century, the Tempe area east of Rural Road, south of Apache Boulevard, and west of Farmer Avenue was an agricultural landscape of orchards and field crops, tree-lined canals, and rural farmhouses built along unpaved section line roads. Tempe farms produced agricultural commodities—grain, alfalfa, cotton, citrus, dairy, livestock, and an array of fruits and vegetables—that formed the basis of the region’s economy until the post-World War II residential and commercial boom.

B. PERSON - Arcadia Jones, the widow of Dr. Wilson Walker Jones, a pioneer Salt River valley physician, acquired the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of Section 17 in 1899. She purchased the forty-acre property from its original homesteaders, Jose and Felicita Gonzales. In a family history, Arcadia’s granddaughter indicated that Mrs. Jones built the house soon after acquiring the property. The 1900 U.S. census indicates Jones and five of her seven children, age 9 through 22, lived at the house, along with two field hands who helped manage the farm. Arcadia mortgaged the property to Farmers and Merchants Bank in 1921 but passed away in 1923; her daughter Laura Curry inherited the property but lost it in a 1924 judgment, whereby the Maricopa County Sheriff sold the property at auction to A.T. Hammons, the State Superintendent of Banks, who in turn sold to Andrew Martin. The farm was redeveloped as a college campus by Cook Christian Training School after 1965.

C. DESIGN/CONSTRUCTION - The 1899 Arcadia Jones House is a one-story adobe house. Irregular in plan, the house sits on a crawlspace foundation with plastered walls topped by a low-pitched, hipped roof with overhanging eaves and exposed rafter ends. Windows are wood casement and aluminum sliding; some windows are boarded up. The building may have undergone remodeling after initial construction, but aerial photographs indicate that the house’s overall massing retains integrity from 1930.
SIGNIFICANCE - The 1899 Arcadia Jones House is significant for its association with Tempe agricultural history as a onetime rural farmhouse. It is also significant as a local variant of National Folk-style residential architecture.

A. EVENT/HISTORY - During the first half of the twentieth century, the Tempe area east of Rural Road, south of Apache Boulevard, and west of Farmer Avenue was an agricultural landscape of orchards and field crops, tree-lined canals, and rural farmhouses built along unpaved section line roads. Tempe farms produced agricultural commodities—grain, alfalfa, cotton, citrus, dairy, livestock, and an array of fruits and vegetables—that formed the basis of the region’s economy until the post-World War II residential and commercial boom.

B. PERSON - Arcadia Jones, the widow of Dr. Wilson Walker Jones, a pioneer Salt River valley physician, acquired the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of Section 17 in 1899. She purchased the forty-acre property from its original homesteaders, Jose and Felicita Gonzales. In a family history, Arcadia’s granddaughter indicated that Mrs. Jones built the house soon after acquiring the property. The 1900 U.S. census indicates Jones and five of her seven children, age 9 through 22, lived at the house, along with two field hands who helped manage the farm. Arcadia mortgaged the property to Farmers and Merchants Bank in 1921 but passed away in 1923; her daughter Laura Curry inherited the property but lost it in a 1924 judgment, whereby the Maricopa County Sheriff sold the property at auction to A.T. Hammons, the State Superintendent of Banks, who in turn sold to Andrew Martin. The farm was redeveloped as a college campus by Cook Christian Training School after 1965.

C. DESIGN/CONSTRUCTION - The 1899 Arcadia Jones House is a one-story adobe house. Irregular in plan, the house sits on a crawlspace foundation with plastered walls topped by a low-pitched, hipped roof with overhanging eaves and exposed rafter ends. Windows are wood casement and aluminum sliding; some windows are boarded up. The building may have undergone remodeling after initial construction, but aerial photographs indicate that the house’s overall massing retains integrity from 1930.
SIGNIFICANCE - The 1899 Arcadia Jones House is significant for its association with Tempe agricultural history as a onetime rural farmhouse. It is also significant as a local variant of National Folk-style residential architecture.

A. EVENT/HISTORY - During the first half of the twentieth century, the Tempe area east of Rural Road, south of Apache Boulevard, and west of Farmer Avenue was an agricultural landscape of orchards and field crops, tree-lined canals, and rural farmhouses built along unpaved section line roads. Tempe farms produced agricultural commodities—grain, alfalfa, cotton, citrus, dairy, livestock, and an array of fruits and vegetables—that formed the basis of the region’s economy until the post-World War II residential and commercial boom.

B. PERSON - Arcadia Jones, the widow of Dr. Wilson Walker Jones, a pioneer Salt River valley physician, acquired the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of Section 17 in 1899. She purchased the forty-acre property from its original homesteaders, Jose and Felicita Gonzales. In a family history, Arcadia’s granddaughter indicated that Mrs. Jones built the house soon after acquiring the property. The 1900 U.S. census indicates Jones and five of her seven children, age 9 through 22, lived at the house, along with two field hands who helped manage the farm. Arcadia mortgaged the property to Farmers and Merchants Bank in 1921 but passed away in 1923; her daughter Laura Curry inherited the property but lost it in a 1924 judgment, whereby the Maricopa County Sheriff sold the property at auction to A.T. Hammons, the State Superintendent of Banks, who in turn sold to Andrew Martin. The farm was redeveloped as a college campus by Cook Christian Training School after 1965.

C. DESIGN/CONSTRUCTION - The 1899 Arcadia Jones House is a one-story adobe house. Irregular in plan, the house sits on a crawlspace foundation with plastered walls topped by a low-pitched, hipped roof with overhanging eaves and exposed rafter ends. Windows are wood casement and aluminum sliding; some windows are boarded up. The building may have undergone remodeling after initial construction, but aerial photographs indicate that the house’s overall massing retains integrity from 1930.
SIGNIFICANCE - Constructed in 1930, Clark House, located at 923 S Maple Avenue, is significant as the 128th oldest building in Tempe, that is to say only 127 buildings are believed to predate the Clark House. It is in the upper 99th percentile of all Tempe buildings in terms of age (p%=0.997). The Clark House is significant for its association with Tempe’s historic Gage Addition; it is also significant as a local variant of Bungalow-style residential architecture.

A. EVENT/HISTORY - The Gage Addition, just west of the ASU campus, forms the northernmost part of Tempe’s Maple-Ash neighborhood. Platted in 1909, the Gage Addition contains homes built primarily during the first half of the twentieth century, and could qualify as an historic district.

B. PERSON - Adolph Clark acquired undeveloped Lot 8, Block 28 of the Gage Addition in April 1929. Clark mortgaged the property in November 1929 and built the house at 923 South Maple Avenue soon thereafter. Clark worked as a clerk for the Salt River Valley Water Users’ Association. Charles Mullen purchased the house in 1942, and in 1949 his children deeded the property to their mother, the Flora Mullen, who lived there until her death in 1969.

C. DESIGN/CONSTRUCTION - The Clark House is a one-story, brick, Bungalow-style house. Rectangular in plan, the house sits on a crawlspace foundation with brick walls topped by a medium-pitched, front-gabled roof with open eaves, jerkinhead, and stucco gable siding. An inset front porch supported by a brick pillar shades the house’s single-leaf entryway. Windows are double-hung with brick sills.
SIGNIFICANCE - Constructed in 1926, Escalante House, located at 949 S Maple Avenue, is significant as the 114th oldest building in Tempe, that is to say only 113 buildings are believed to predate the Escalante House. It is in the upper 99th percentile of all Tempe buildings in terms of age (p%=0.998). The Escalante House is significant for its association with Tempe’s historic Gage Addition; it is also significant as a local variant of Bungalow-style residential architecture.

A. EVENT/HISTORY - The Gage Addition, just west of the ASU campus, forms the northernmost part of Tempe’s Maple-Ash neighborhood. Platted in 1909, the Gage Addition contains homes built primarily during the first half of the twentieth century, and could qualify as an historic district.

B. PERSON - Ynes and Maria Escalante, sisters, built the house at 949 South Maple Avenue in 1926. Maria graduated from the Arizona State Teachers College in 1921 and taught at the grammar school on 10th Street; in 1930 Ynes worked as a cook. Clara Urbano, the sisters’ great niece, recalled that Maria “built a house on Tenth Street...west of Mill. On Tenth Street on the corner.” The sisters’ father, Manuel Escalante, worked for many years as a gardener at Arizona State Teachers College. The Escalante sisters are not to be confused with the Escalante family on East 8th Street for which Escalante Park is named.

C. DESIGN/CONSTRUCTION - The Escalante House is a one-story, stucco, Bungalow-style house. Square in plan, the house sits on a crawlspace foundation with stuccoed walls topped by a medium-pitched, intersecting-gabled roof with open eaves and gable vents. An inset front porch supported by square wood pillars shades the house’s single-leaf entryway. Windows are casement.
SIGNIFICANCE - Constructed in 1926, Gililland House, located at 928 S Mill Avenue, is significant as the 115th oldest building in Tempe, that is to say only 114 buildings are believed to predate the Gililland House. It is in the upper 99th percentile of all Tempe buildings in terms of age (p%=0.998). The Gililland House is significant for its association with Tempe’s historic Gage Addition; it is also significant as a local variant of Bungalow-style residential architecture, and for its association with Clyde Gililland, a local business leader and longtime public servant who served as Tempe mayor from 1960 to 1961.

A. EVENT/HISTORY - The Gage Addition, just west of the ASU campus, forms the northernmost part of Tempe’s Maple-Ash neighborhood. Platted in 1909, the Gage Addition contains homes built primarily during the first half of the twentieth century, and could qualify as an historic district.

B. PERSON - Clyde and Gladys Gililland acquired undeveloped Lot 14, Block 28 of the Gage Addition in 1925. In February 1926 they mortgaged the property and build the house at 928 South Mill Avenue soon thereafter. Clyde Gililland owned and managed the Gililland Motor Company. He served as a member of the Tempe City Council from 1930 to 1961, served as mayor from 1960 to 1961, and served as a member and president of the Tempe Elementary School District 3 Board of Education.

C. DESIGN/CONSTRUCTION - The Gililland House is a one-story, masonry, Bungalow-style house. Square in plan, the house sits on a crawlspace foundation with stuccoed walls topped by a medium-pitched, side-gabled roof with open eaves. A front porch supported by four round pillars shades the length of the house’s east façade; a jerkinhead roof covers the house’s single-leaf entryway. Windows are wood, double-hung.
SIGNIFICANCE - Constructed in 1930, Goodwin House, located at 930 S Mill Avenue, is significant as the 129th oldest building in Tempe, that is to say only 128 buildings are believed to predate the Goodwin House. It is in the upper 99th percentile of all Tempe buildings in terms of age (p%=0.998). The Goodwin House is significant for its association with Tempe’s historic Gage Addition; it is also significant as a local variant of Spanish Colonial Revival-style residential architecture, and for its association with Garfield Goodwin, a local business leader and longtime public servant who served as Tempe mayor from 1924 to 1926.

A. EVENT/HISTORY - The Gage Addition, just west of the ASU campus, forms the northernmost part of Tempe’s Maple-Ash neighborhood. Platted in 1909, the Gage Addition contains homes built primarily during the first half of the twentieth century, and could qualify as an historic district.

B. PERSON - Garfield and Charlotte Goodwin acquired undeveloped Lot 12, Block 28 of the Gage Addition in June 1929 and built the house at 930 South Mill Avenue soon thereafter. Garfield Goodwin operated the Goodwin Curio Store, which retailed Indian crafts and artifacts. He later sold much of his inventory to Mae Heard. Goodwin sat on Tempe City Council during the 1920s and served a term as mayor from 1924-1926. He married Charlotte Josephine Mullen in 1913 and the couple raised three children, including Kemper Goodwin, a prominent Tempe architect.

C. DESIGN/CONSTRUCTION - The Goodwin House is a one-story, masonry, Spanish Colonial Revival-style house. Rectangular in plan, the house sits on a crawlspace foundation with stuccoed walls topped by a medium-pitched, intersecting-gabled roof with exposed rafter tails and clay tile roofing. A front porch supported by two arched pillars shades the house’s single-leaf entryway. Windows are casement.
SIGNIFICANCE - Constructed in 1935, Jones House, located at 944 S Mill Avenue, is significant as the 130th oldest building in Tempe, that is to say only 129 buildings are believed to predate the Jones House. It is in the upper 99th percentile of all Tempe buildings in terms of age (p%=0.998). The Jones House is significant for its association with Tempe’s historic Gage Addition; it is also significant as a local variant of Southwest-style residential architecture.

A. EVENT/HISTORY - The Gage Addition, just west of the ASU campus, forms the northernmost part of Tempe’s Maple-Ash neighborhood. Platted in 1909, the Gage Addition contains homes built primarily during the first half of the twentieth century, and could qualify as an historic district.

B. PERSON - Maurice and Alice Jones acquired undeveloped Lot 12, Block 28 of the Gage Addition in February 1930 but did not build the house at 944 South Mill Avenue until 1935. Maurice Jones served as Secretary of the Tempe Irrigating Canal Company. He also managed a farm and worked as a district manager for a local auto insurance provider. The house served as a rental property through much of the late twentieth century; ASU history professor Dr. Noel J. Stowe, founder of the ASU Public History Program, rented the house with his wife, Gwen, from 1968 through 1971.

C. DESIGN/CONSTRUCTION - The Jones House is a one-story, masonry, Southwestern-style house. Rectangular in plan, the house sits on a crawlspace foundation with stuccoed walls topped by a flat roof with parapet. A front porch supported by two square stuccoed pillars and topped by a front-sloping roof covered in Spanish tile shades the house’s single-leaf entryway. Windows are wood, double-hung and picture.
SIGNIFICANCE - Constructed in 1918, Monty House, located at 821 S Maple Avenue, is significant as the 84th oldest building in Tempe, that is to say only 83 buildings are believed to predate the Monty House. It is in the upper 99th percentile of all Tempe buildings in terms of age (p%=0.998). The Monty House is significant for its association with Tempe’s historic Gage Addition; it is also significant as a local variant of Southwest-style residential architecture.

A. EVENT/HISTORY - The Gage Addition, just west of the ASU campus, forms the northernmost part of Tempe’s Maple-Ash neighborhood. Platted in 1909, the Gage Addition contains homes built primarily during the first half of the twentieth century, and could qualify as an historic district.

B. PERSON - Euphemia Monty acquired undeveloped Lot 1, Block 21 of the Gage Addition in June 1914; this lot was adjacent to the unsubdivided property where Monty lived at 809 South Maple Avenue. In July 1918 Monty purchased a new “Phoenicia” house in Phoenix with the intention of assembling it on Lot 1; in December 1918 she mortgaged the lot and assembled the house at 821 S Maple Avenue, which she occupied until her death in 1922. A native of Canada, Monty immigrated to the United States in 1908 at the age of 43; she worked as a dressmaker. In 1922, before her death, Monty sold the property to her niece, Jeanette Dupuis, who taught at Tempe Union High School. Dupuis rented out the house through the 1930s before selling to William and Lillian Colcord in October 1939. The Colcord couple in turn sold the property to Hazel Boyd in May 1940. Boyd remained at the address through the early 1960s.

C. DESIGN/CONSTRUCTION - The Monty House is a one-story, masonry, Southwestern-style house. Rectangular in plan, the house sits on a crawlspace foundation with stuccoed walls topped by a flat roof. A corner front porch supported by an arched, stuccoed pillar shades the house’s single-leaf entryway and features a sloped roof covered in Spanish tile. Windows are replacement sliders.
Cultural Resources Areas and Solliday 2001

In Tempe General Plan 2030, the list of Cultural Resources Areas (CRAs) was drawn from the roster of eligible historic districts recommended by Scott Solliday in his 2001 Post World War II Subdivision study.

From the beginning, however, preservationists and planners understood CRAs differently. From a preservation perspective, CRAs anticipated historic districts—these were subdivisions “set aside” for future historic district designation. From a planning perspective, CRAs were tools for discouraging multifamily development in single-family neighborhoods. For planners the fact that CRAs were drawn from Solliday’s roster of eligible districts made little difference; more important to them was the availability of an “objective” third-party analysis, as they did not want to appear partial in their selection of CRAs.

Consider the case of Victory Acres. In the course of formulating General Plan 2030, Victory Acres, a neighborhood with high historical and cultural significance but low architectural integrity, petitioned the City of Tempe to become a CRA, which the City granted. With its low historic integrity, however, Victory Acres has little chance of becoming an historic district. Yet planners have used its status as a CRA to discourage multifamily development pressure in the neighborhood.

For planners, therefore, CRAs are effective tools for discouraging speculative multifamily development in single-family neighborhoods. Such development, in practice, violates the existing density allowed by zoning and therefore requires a general plan amendment. This is typically enough to discourage developers or redirect these projects to more suitable sites.

For preservationists, on the other hand, CRAs do little to protect the historical integrity of contributing properties within eligible historic districts, and therefore do not anticipate historic district designation. From a planning perspective this was never the intention: CRAs involved density considerations exclusively, with no consideration made for the suite of original development standards (height, setback, lot size), and no consideration made for building materials or landscape, which the city does not regulate in single-family neighborhoods.

This begs the question: why use preservation considerations—significance and integrity—to locate CRAs when CRAs have no teeth for preserving historic integrity in the first place?

Cultural Resource Areas and Prop 207

Solliday’s 2001 study did give the Tempe Historic Preservation Office tremendous capacity for identifying and classifying neighborhoods with significance and historic integrity to warrant historic district designation. Yet passage of Arizona Prop 207 in 2006 undermined that capacity.

Before Prop 207, historic district designation was a “top-down” process, initiated by a property owner or a group of property owners, and authorized by City Council. Those opposed to designation had the burden of documenting objection, and formal objection required signatures
from at least twenty percent of effected property owners. Even then, City Council could authorize the designation with a favorable three-fourths vote.

Prop 207, however, turned the process on its head. Those in favor of historic district designation now have the burden of documenting support for designation, and City Council prefers seeing a high percentage of zoning waivers before authorizing an historic district. This makes designation a “bottom-up” process, one that must begin with grassroots interest among a broad base of property owners in an eligible district. And nobody knows where such interest might emerge—residents in an historically significant neighborhood with outstanding integrity may never support designation, whereas residents in a less significant neighborhood with lower historic integrity may suddenly show interest.

Consider the case of Hudson Manor, a late-1940s neighborhood with a high degree of significance and historic integrity, yet where efforts to generate support for an historic district failed in 2010 due to lack of support. Most property owners in Hudson Manor neither supported nor opposed the designation, but were indifferent and failed to either provide a waiver or opt-out of designation. The Historic Preservation Office has learned that in extensively developed neighborhoods with a high percentage of absentee ownership such as Hudson Manor, it becomes difficult to drum up enough interest or support among property owners to effect historic district designation.

This begs the same question: why use preservation considerations—significance and integrity—to locate CRAs when nobody at City of Tempe has any real capacity for targeting and designating historic districts in the first place?

Summary and Recommendations

From a planning perspective, CRAs work—they discourage multifamily development in single-family neighborhoods. Current CRAs should be rolled over into General Plan 2040, and new CRAs should be established wherever single-family neighborhoods face multifamily development pressure—near the university, along the light rail corridor, and elsewhere.

From a preservation perspective CRAs do not work—they do not anticipate historic districts. Therefore preservation considerations—significance and integrity—should have no role in the determining which neighborhoods become CRAs; truthfully they never had that role the first place. Instead, CRAs should be drawn from neighborhoods facing multifamily development pressure; furthermore the logic of selecting CRAs should involve identifying unifying themes such as flood irrigation or other prominent developments, building, landscape, or cultural features—urban lakes, golf courses, etc.

Hypothetically, CRAs could help protect the historic integrity of contributing properties within eligible historic districts if given wider considerations—not just density, but development intensity, a loose term that captures a range of development standards such as building height, setback, etc. If CRAs consider intensity along with density, they could better serve preservation interests. Staff should make efforts to build intensity considerations into the definition of CRAs in General Plan 2040.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td>123 Main St, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>415-555-1234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Doe</td>
<td>456 Oak Ave, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>415-555-5678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Johnson</td>
<td>789 Pine Rd, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>415-555-9081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Williams</td>
<td>101 Elm St, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>415-555-3456</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Brown</td>
<td>222 Walnut Ave, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>415-555-6789</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TO ESTABLISH CAVALIER HOMES A HISTORIC NEIGHBORHOOD

IT WILL BE GIVEN TO THE CITY OF TEMPE FOR CONSIDERATION

THIS PETITION IS FOR THE RESIDENCES OF CAVALIER HOMES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>PHONE NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

TO ESTABLISH CAVALLER HOMES A HISTORIC NEIGHBORHOOD

IT WILL BE GIVEN TO THE CITY OR TEMPE FOR CONSIDERATION

THIS PETITION IS FOR THE RESIDENTS OF CAVALLER HOMES

Date: 9/2013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. N. McKenzie</td>
<td>1711 N. Hawthorne Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Smith</td>
<td>1823 N. McKinley Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Johnson</td>
<td>1789 N. Main St. Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Williams</td>
<td>1764 N. Alabama Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Brown</td>
<td>1749 N. Franklin Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Davis</td>
<td>1725 N. Madison Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Thompson</td>
<td>1700 N. Maine Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Cooper</td>
<td>1675 N. Michigan Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Anderson</td>
<td>1650 N. Michigan Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Perez</td>
<td>1625 N. Madison Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Garcia</td>
<td>1600 N. Main St. Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Martinez</td>
<td>1575 N. Main St. Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Rodriguez</td>
<td>1550 N. Main St. Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Sullivan</td>
<td>1525 N. Main St. Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Martinez</td>
<td>1500 N. Main St. Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Garcia</td>
<td>1475 N. Main St. Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Rodriguez</td>
<td>1450 N. Main St. Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Sullivan</td>
<td>1425 N. Main St. Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Martinez</td>
<td>1400 N. Main St. Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Garcia</td>
<td>1375 N. Main St. Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Rodriguez</td>
<td>1350 N. Main St. Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Sullivan</td>
<td>1325 N. Main St. Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Martinez</td>
<td>1300 N. Main St. Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Garcia</td>
<td>1275 N. Main St. Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Rodriguez</td>
<td>1250 N. Main St. Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Sullivan</td>
<td>1225 N. Main St. Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Martinez</td>
<td>1200 N. Main St. Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Garcia</td>
<td>1175 N. Main St. Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Rodriguez</td>
<td>1150 N. Main St. Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Sullivan</td>
<td>1125 N. Main St. Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Martinez</td>
<td>1100 N. Main St. Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Garcia</td>
<td>1075 N. Main St. Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Rodriguez</td>
<td>1050 N. Main St. Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Sullivan</td>
<td>1025 N. Main St. Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Martinez</td>
<td>1000 N. Main St. Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Name of Property
   Historic name: __Tempe Double Butte Cemetery (Pioneer Section)____
   Other names/site number: ______N/A____________________________
   Name of related multiple property listing:
   N/A
   (Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing

2. Location
   Street & number: _2505 W. Broadway Rd._______________________
   City or town: _Tempe___ State: ____AZ______ County: _Maricopa___
   Not For Publication:   Vicinity: [ ]

3. State/Federal Agency Certification
   As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, I hereby certify that this _x_ nomination ___ request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60.
   In my opinion, the property ___ meets ___ does not meet the National Register Criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant at the following level(s) of significance:
   ___national   ___statewide   _x_ local
   Applicable National Register Criteria:
   _x_A   ___B   ___C   ___D

   ________________________________
   Signature of certifying official/Title:                               Date

   State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government

   ________________________________
   In my opinion, the property ___ meets ___ does not meet the National Register criteria.

   ________________________________
   Signature of commenting official:                                  Date

   ________________________________
   Title : State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government
4. National Park Service Certification

I hereby certify that this property is:

___ entered in the National Register
___ determined eligible for the National Register
___ determined not eligible for the National Register
___ removed from the National Register
___ other (explain:) _____________________

Signature of the Keeper   Date of Action
____________________________________________________________________________

5. Classification

Ownership of Property

(Check as many boxes as apply.)
Private:  
Public – Local  x
Public – State  
Public – Federal  

Category of Property

(Check only one box.)
Building(s)  
District  x
Site  
Structure  
Object  

Sections 1-6 page 2
### Number of Resources within Property

(Do not include previously listed resources in the count)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Noncontributing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register ________

---

**6. Function or Use**

**Historic Functions**

(Enter categories from instructions.)

- Funerary / Cemetery
  - ________________
  - ________________
  - ________________
  - ________________
  - ________________

**Current Functions**

(Enter categories from instructions.)

- Funerary / Cemetery
  - ________________
  - ________________
  - ________________
  - ________________
  - ________________
7. Description

Architectural Classification
(Enter categories from instructions.)

N/A

Materials: (enter categories from instructions.)
Principal exterior materials of the property: _Stone (Granite and Marble monuments)_

Narrative Description
(Describe the historic and current physical appearance and condition of the property. Describe contributing and noncontributing resources if applicable. Begin with a summary paragraph that briefly describes the general characteristics of the property, such as its location, type, style, method of construction, setting, size, and significant features. Indicate whether the property has historic integrity.)

Summary Paragraph

Double Butte Cemetery is located on the westernmost fringe of the City of Tempe and sits just east of that municipality’s boundary with neighboring Phoenix. It is located immediately south of Broadway Road, from which thoroughfare public access is gained. Interstate-10 flanks the eastern periphery of the property; there is a considerable distance of undeveloped land and vegetation separating the interstate from the burial grounds, providing a veritable buffer zone that eliminates excessive noise and unsightly features of mass-transportation that might otherwise detract from the serenity commonly associated with cemeteries. To the south, the main entrance to the Marriott hotel and resort at Double Buttes marks the cemetery’s boundary but is separated by fencing and mature vegetation. The cemetery is prominently situated at the western base of two large rock outcroppings known locally as the Double Buttes and Bell Butte. These geographic features have played a prominent role in the cemetery’s history since its founding in the late 1880s and have provided the omnipresent visual backdrop from whence the cemetery’s name is derived. As an active graveyard, the grounds continue to expand outward as necessity dictates and therefore this nomination pertains only to the oldest, or “Pioneer Section” of the property. Owned and operated by the City of Tempe since 1958 (and overseen by a volunteer advisory committee which has expressed strong support for listing on the national register), Double Butte Cemetery is comprised of 41.4 acres, although 13.7 of that remains undeveloped at this time and, as will be seen, only a portion of the remaining 27.7 acres is being nominated to the national register. The historic section of the cemetery exudes its original
Tempe Double Butte Cemetery

Maricopa, Arizona

Name of Property

County and State

desert, bare-dirt appearance and contains only minimal plantings; the more modern (non-contributing) sections are grass-covered and lined with large trees. Numerous narrow paths—some paved, some not—wind their way throughout the cemetery and allow vehicular access to each respective section; significantly, these access trails have not been straightened or otherwise altered from their original configuration; that is to say, they remain positioned in the same manner as they were during the historic period of significance, and other than the addition of asphalt pavement no other alterations have been made. (See photos 1-4 for geographic setting and context).

Narrative Description

DESCRIPTION OF PHYSICAL FEATURES

Location – This property exists in its originally developed location at the western base of the Double Buttes. The first burial plots were set in an undeveloped, Sonoran desert environment and the cemetery has been maintained in a manner that has preserved this original desert appearance. Niels Petersen, a prominent Tempe entrepreneur and landowner, donated this site in the late 1890s for use as a cemetery.1 The original burials remain within the confines of Tempe Double Butte Cemetery, which has expanded outward many times over the years to accommodate community needs. This outward growth, however, has served only to enhance the integrity of setting and has had no detrimental impacts.

Setting - Double Butte Cemetery retains its full integrity of setting with regard to the historic period of significance (1888-1958). Visiting the site, one immediately gains a sense of the original layout and it is easy to envision the cemetery as it existed in its earliest days. Visitors can readily deduce the manner in which the cemetery strategically expanded at various intervals over a period of many decades, radiating outward in different directions to accommodate the continuing need for additional burial space. The two mountainous outcroppings—Bell Butte and Double Buttes—rise prominently to the east and southeast, providing a sense of visual orientation that has remained constant since the first interments occurred some 120 years ago.

Feeling - The sheer size and dominance of the buttes underscores the natural setting and deepens the sense of spiritual connection that visitors experience when traversing the cemetery grounds. Despite being situated in a sprawling urban and suburban area with more than 4 million residents, one feels as though they have stepped backwards in time and cannot help but become oblivious to the city around them. The Sonoran Desert atmosphere adds tremendously to this sense of feeling, as no alterations have been made to the historic portions of the cemetery; the indigenous vegetation that sporadically surrounds the individual graves and trails harkens back to the earliest years of the site’s use as a burial ground and exudes a high level of environmental feeling and integrity.

1 Fox, A History of Tempe’s Double Butte Cemetery, p. 3.
Association - As Tempe’s earliest cemetery, Double Butte portrays the unique diversity of the community across time. Members of various ethnic groups can be found buried alongside one another, a lasting vestige to the remarkable range of cultural associations that defined people’s daily lives in Tempe through the ages. No other place in Tempe so vividly portrays this cultural diversity and developmental associations in such a powerful and original setting. The cemetery also bears close associations with broader historical themes, including economic development and politics (at the local, state, and national levels), which will be discussed in greater detail in a subsequent section of this nomination.

Materials - Tempe Double Butte Cemetery is unique in that it is the only cemetery in the Salt River Valley that includes both a Victorian-era pioneer graveyard alongside a Post WWII-era cemetery. The property contains graves and markers of pioneer families evidencing the early diversity of the community and providing a good representation of the historic Tempe community’s continuously developing self-image. The juxtaposition of both aforementioned sections demonstrates the evolution of a simple town graveyard into a modern community cemetery. From the natural desert in the Pioneer Section to the tree-lined irrigated lawn areas, both sections coexist with good integrity and together they help us interpret Tempe’s growth and development from a rural 19th century farming community to a modern 21st century urban center. This transcendence of design and development provides a significant array of gravemarkers and monuments that collectively represent the artistic values of several historical periods while simultaneously offering insights into the evolution of landscape architecture.

The gravemarkers in the Pioneer Section consist primarily of stone tablets and obelisks, with the more elaborate obelisks predating the 1920s and being representative of the Victorian-style preferences more common to that earlier time period. Among the newer burials, many of the markers lay flat on the surface of the ground and are composed of copper or brass, whereas older burials contain predominantly free-standing tablets of granite or marble.

A number of larger family plots dot the cemetery grounds, many of which date back to the early 1900s and some of which are still in use in those instances where living family descendants continue to reside in Tempe. These family plots are almost invariably distinguished by historic fencing of various sorts, in many cases wrought-iron (see photos 5-6). Furthermore, many family burial plots (particularly those that are not fenced) have small, approximately six-inch wide and four-inch tall concrete curbing denoting the rectangular boundaries (see photos 7-8). These concrete curbs are an important character-defining feature of the cemetery and no such infrastructure has been installed in the modern era; all concrete curbing shows certain unmistakable signs of old age, such as significant cracking; lightening in coloration; wear to the surface finish; shifting in position (making them unlevel); and minor damage of various sorts including chipping and weathering. Damaged portions of these concrete curbs have not been replaced with new materials and thus the historic integrity remains fully intact.

Condition - For many years, primary caretaking responsibilities at the cemetery fell to the individual families whose relatives were buried there. Oftentimes families would erect fencing around their burial plots and would, to the best of their abilities, care for the grounds in the
immediate vicinity to prevent overgrowth and other unsightly features. As a result, in its earliest years Double Butte Cemetery appeared only sporadically cared-for because some families had access to caretaking resources while others did not. In early years the Tempe Cemetery Company did its utmost to ensure upkeep, but ultimately the more minute details were the responsibility of the families who owned burial plots. Of course, this early method of landscaping and grounds upkeep is no longer the case at Double Butte. The cemetery is now administered and maintained by the City of Tempe Parks and Recreation Department. This city department first acquired ownership of the property in 1958 from the Tempe Cemetery Association, which dissolved its interest in the property at that time. After a brief period of private operation from 1998 to early 2000, the City of Tempe resumed its former role and continues to operate the cemetery through a cooperative arrangement between the Community Services and Public Works Departments, with administrative oversight provided by the Double Butte Cemetery Advisory Commission.

Although gravestones and burial plots at Tempe Double Butte Cemetery generally remain in good condition, many of the older burial-markers show signs of age and some are in critical need of conservation. Additionally, some of the oldest markers have suffered either from vandalism or natural deterioration and are now cracked, chipped, or in a few egregious instances, lying prostrate upon the ground (see photos 9-10). There are also a number of graves at the cemetery that have never had identifying markers (130 according to burial database records). All burial plots are maintained with care, however, and the cemetery continues to portray its wide diversity of interments through careful, diligent caretaking by the City of Tempe Parks and Recreation Department.

CONTRIBUTING/NON-CONTRIBUTING ELEMENTS

Contributing Features

The desert-landscaping in the Pioneer Section of the cemetery (sections A-G and 1-14 on the site plan) is considered contributing, as all of these portions contain predominantly pre-1958 burials, with some post-1958 interments spread sporadically throughout. The desert landscaping is indicative of the cemetery’s historic environment and remains unchanged across time, making it both a contributing element as well as a significant character defining feature. Although sections 16 through 23 (the grass-covered area of the grounds) are not considered contributing due to age, they are significant for the fact that they represent an evolving burial trend in suburban Arizona, one which saw a mid-century shift at many cemeteries from natural Sonoran desert environs to a more lush vegetative environment featuring large trees and grass in lieu of desert flora. Significantly, however, the Pioneer Section was never altered to conform with this new trend and thus we see these two customary styles—one representing the historic method of burial and the other a more modern preference—located side-by-side at Double Butte Cemetery.

2 Cheryl Fox, A History of Tempe’s Double Butte Cemetery, p. 9.
3 Double Butte Cemetery Burial Database.
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Additional contributing features include wrought-iron fencing surrounding family burial plots, concrete curbing surrounding family burial plots, walkways separating individual cemetery sections, and the gravestones writ large. All of these features are bountiful throughout the historic section of Double Butte Cemetery and are thus contributing elements of the historic district.

Non-Contributing Features

The more modern lawn sections (Sections 16-23), which comprise the western portion of Double Butte Cemetery, are considered non-contributing because they were appended after the cemetery grounds were acquired by the City of Tempe in 1958. Additionally, the Memorial Gardens, Sunset Section, and Sunrise Sections (the latter two making up the southeastern fringe of the property and the former comprising a small component of the northern periphery) are also considered non-contributing due to modernity. The cemetery contains only one built structure, a small maintenance building, which is of modern construction and is considered non-contributing.

SUMMARY

Although there has been some damage and vandalism to a small number of the oldest gravestones, Tempe Double Butte Cemetery nevertheless retains a remarkably high level of integrity, as evidenced through the retention of desert-landscaping in the older Pioneer Section, the continuing existence of historic burial plot fencing and concrete curbing, and the presence of a very high percentage of burials dating to the period of significance (1888-1958). The location, setting, burial juxtaposition, and retention of historic infrastructure all contribute to a remarkably high level of integrity at Double Butte Cemetery. The sections of the cemetery being nominated contain only one non-contributing structure which, considered in the grander scheme, is no detraction at all from the setting and feeling one experiences when visiting the site.
8. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria
(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

☐ A. Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

☐ B. Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

☐ C. Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.

☐ D. Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Criteria Considerations
(Mark “x” in all the boxes that apply.)

☐ A. Owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes

☐ B. Removed from its original location

☐ C. A birthplace or grave

☒ D. A cemetery

☐ E. A reconstructed building, object, or structure

☐ F. A commemorative property

☐ G. Less than 50 years old or achieving significance within the past 50 years

Areas of Significance
(Enter categories from instructions.)

Community Planning / Development

________________________
________________________
________________________
Tempe Double Butte Cemetery

Period of Significance

1888-1958

Significant Dates

1888 (first verifiable burial)

Significant Person

(Complete only if Criterion B is marked above.)

N/A

Cultural Affiliation

N/A

Architect/Builder

N/A

Statement of Significance Summary Paragraph (Provide a summary paragraph that includes level of significance, applicable criteria, justification for the period of significance, and any applicable criteria considerations.)

Double Butte Cemetery is being nominated for the National Register of Historic Places under criteria A, with the stipulations of criteria consideration D as supporting evidence of eligibility inasmuch as the cemetery transcends mere personal/familial significance and many of those buried there maintained a direct association with the development of both the Tempe community as well as the State of Arizona. Under criteria A, Double Butte Cemetery is eligible for its strong association with the early development of Tempe in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century. The period of significance begins in 1888 with the first known burial and extends to 1958, the time at which the cemetery reverted to City of Tempe ownership. It is the only remaining pre-1900 burial ground in the City of Tempe and served as the community’s first officially-recognized cemetery beginning in 1888. As such, it contains the graves of early pioneers who contributed in various ways to the economic, political, social, and cultural development of the burgeoning town beginning in the 1880s, a mere decade after Tempe’s founding on the southern bank of the Salt River at the base of Tempe/Hayden Butte. So too does the cemetery contain the graves of persons who played prominent roles in the political
development of the Territory (and later State) of Arizona, exuding the many contributions of Tempe residents to the broader realm of Arizona history writ large. Tempe Double Butte Cemetery provides an understanding and appreciation of the city’s highly diversified past with unparalleled transparency. As the primary place of burial for community residents beginning in the late 1880s and extending into the modern era, the cemetery reflects, through its array of burial plots and headstones, the cultural and social diversity of Tempe over a period spanning generations and dating back to the community’s earliest years.

Narrative Statement of Significance (Provide at least one paragraph for each area of significance.)

Double Butte Cemetery is the town’s first cemetery; it is significant for being contemporaneous with the founding of Tempe, for evidencing the diversity of community pioneers, and as an exemplary representation of the self-image of the community during its first century in existence. The creation and continuity of Tempe’s first cemetery reflects a broad spectrum of the community’s history and culture. As a district eligible under Criteria A, Double Butte not only meets, but exceeds, the requirements for the continued presence of integrity of location, setting, feeling, and association. Significantly, the site goes far beyond mere individual and family associations; it reflects the establishment, development, and growth of Tempe through the presence of many early pioneers’ gravesites.

Increasingly, scholarship and public perception have come to demonstrate a growing appreciation for the important historical themes that graves, cemeteries, and burial places represent. Owing to a growing emphasis on the history of ordinary individuals, grass roots movements, and various cultural groups, the importance of burial places to the interpretation of community history is taking on new significance. Unfortunately, the maintenance and preservation of burial places is threatened by neglect and vandalism, even as the qualities that render these places important representatives of our history make them worthy of preservation. Historic designation and listing is an important step in preserving Double Butte, because such recognition can help to initiate and sustain community interest in the overall importance of this site in conveying the story of its past. Designation also lends increased credibility to localized efforts seeking to preserve this resource for its continuing contribution to the community's identity.

The advent of the western base of the Double Buttes as a burial place can be traced to the continued expansion of Tempe in the late nineteenth century and the increasing need for a pre-determined cemetery far-removed from the town’s residential and commercial core. Prior to the establishment of

Double Butte Cemetery, many persons were buried in a haphazard manner at locations near the settlement. Double Butte therefore became the first successful attempt to mitigate this shortcoming and, within ten years of its founding, had become the primary place of burial for deceased Tempe residents. Although the first verifiable burials date to the 1880s, Double Butte Cemetery was not officially established until September 13, 1897 during a meeting of the Tempe
Tempe is, and always has been, a place of tremendous diversity. Located as it is, directly between the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservation (SRP-MIC) and the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), Tempe is a place that has long been defined by its relationship with Native American communities. In that same regard, Arizona’s proximity to the border with Mexico has also played a critical role in cultural development. Since its earliest days Tempe has attracted a wide range of Hispanic- and Mexican-American residents who served in a variety of capacities at the local level. So too did Japanese-American migrant farmers contribute to this dynamic of diversity, occupying portions of the eastern Salt River Valley beginning in the early 1900s and adding another layer of cultural complexity. The arrival of Anglo-American businessmen and entrepreneurs beginning in the 1870s and continuing for many decades thereafter provided yet another important cultural and ethnic linkage, one that at times bonded, and occasionally abraded, these groups during the course of everyday.\(^5\)

As Tempe’s earliest cemetery, dating to 1888, Double Butte prominently portrays this remarkable diversity through its broad range of burials. Walking down the rows of gravestones, it is not unusual to find members of various ethnic groups buried side by side, a lasting tribute to those whose daily lives found them working and living near one another. No other place in Tempe so vividly portrays this cultural diversity in such a powerful and original setting.

A 1940s scrapbook of the Tempe Old Settlers Association named 91 early city pioneers; 82 of those named are buried at Double Butte. Indeed, the cemetery is the gravesite of Tempe founder Charles T. Hayden, his son U.S. Senator Carl Hayden, and numerous other Tempe pioneers and persons of transcendent importance in the history of the community, including the families of Fogal, Gilliland, Goodwin, Gregg, Laird, Miller, Moeur, and O’Conner. While Hayden, Laird

---


\(^5\) Scott Solliday, “Historical Overview,” in Scott Kwiatkowski and Thomas Wright, *Tempe (Hayden) Butte & Environs Archaeological and Cultural Resource Study*, pp. 3-4. Although the Tempe community bears a close historical relationship with neighboring tribes, there is not a specific correlation between these tribes and Double Butte Cemetery, and this National Register nomination should not be construed as suggesting that such a correlation exists. See Logan Simpson Design, Inc. and Ryden Architects, *City of Tempe: Tempe Double Butte Cemetery Master Plan*, p. 27.
and Moeur are memorialized in our built environment by buildings and structures directly associated with their productive lives, Fogal, Gregg, Miller, and many other pioneer families are commemorated only at Double Butte and their graves are the only physical remnant of their lives in Tempe. (See photos 24-28).

**Developmental history/additional historic context information (if appropriate)**

**Development of Double Butte Cemetery, 1888 to 1958**

Tempe Double Butte Cemetery traces its roots back as far as 1888, the date of the first recorded graves in the cemetery register (six total interments are known to date from that year). For the next decade, Double Butte grew to become Tempe’s primary burial place. Accordingly, on September 13, 1897, the Tempe Cemetery Company was formed, becoming the first entity to administer the property. Officers included: Thomas Morrow (president); Jonathan L. Richard (vice president); Gabriel Cosner (secretary); and M.S. Johnston (treasurer). The articles of incorporation granted operating rights for twenty-five years, until September 1922. Upon executive board approval, the company made available one thousand shares of stock in Double Butte Cemetery, valued at ten dollars per share.6

Among the first sections to be professionally developed by the Tempe Cemetery Company, what has come to be known as the “Pioneer Section” offered family plats and was located adjacent to earlier, pre-1897 burials. Of the five original company executives named above, four of them are buried in the Pioneer Section. It is also in this, the oldest organized portion of the cemetery, that the graves of Tempe pioneers Charles Trumbull Hayden, Carl T. Hayden, and Benjamin B. Moeur are found. Alongside them are buried members of their immediate families, including Carl Hayden’s wife Nan, who sewed the first Arizona state flag in 1912. Governor Moeur’s wife, Honor Andersen Moeur, who served for many years as secretary of the Tempe Cemetery Association, is also buried next to her husband.7

As noted, the incorporation charter for the Tempe Cemetery Company expired in September 1922. Two years later a stockholder meeting convened to elect a new board of directors and to determine the future directional aspirations of the company. New directors were elected at a January 31, 1924 meeting, including: Joseph T. Birchett (president); D.G. Buck (vice president); Mrs. B.B. Moeur (secretary); Hugh Laird (treasurer); and Price Wickliff (sexton).8

Events in the 1920s had left the company in dire financial straits, and the cemetery itself suffered immensely as a result, with “many of the graves . . . badly sunken and the trees beginning to die from lack of water and care.” Recent banking failures at the local level had devastated the Tempe Cemetery Company’s pecuniary assets and the new board of directors was faced with the primary task of raising additional funds. By the end of 1926, after only a few months of effort, a

---

8 Fox, *A History of Tempe’s Double Butte Cemetery*, p. 5.
fundraising committee had secured nearly $1,500 to be expended towards cemetery upkeep as well as the purchase of five additional acres of land from original donor Niels Petersen.9

By the time Joseph Birchett retired as president in 1929, the Tempe Cemetery Association had fully recovered from its earlier financial woes and had begun to envision greater expansion (ironically, the cemetery achieved fiscal prosperity just as the Great Depression struck and catapulted the nation into financial catastrophe). Some concern was expressed with the frequent practice of non-Tempe residents being buried in the cemetery, especially because of limited space. However, this important element is characteristic of the twentieth century population expansion of the Salt River Valley, with thousands of persons migrating from other portions of the U.S. and contributing in their own unique ways to the ever-evolving cultural milieu of the region.

Prior to his departure, Birchett recommended that the cemetery expand to include both of the buttes and all land adjoining them, noting that he was “convinced that at some future time they will be valuable assets.” An imaginative Birchett foresaw the placement of permanent reservoirs and ponds “on some of the higher ground” as being conducive to the future construction of mausoleums and proclaimed that Double Butte Cemetery, if properly expanded and administered, “could unquestionably be made into one of the most beautiful and unique cemeteries in the whole country.”10

Birchett’s vision of lavish ponds and fountains on the slopes of the Double Buttes never came to fruition (perhaps due more to issues of geographic impracticality rather than financial concerns), but the cemetery did nevertheless continue to expand in other, more practical, directions. In 1938 Tempe Cemetery Association President Garfield A. Goodwin asked the board of directors to approve a motion for the purchase of twenty-five acres of land abutting the western fringe of the existing grounds for the price of $3,200. In upcoming years burial plots would continue to fill these newly acquired lands: Sections F and G were filled between 1927 and 1936; Sections 1-7 reached capacity between 1926 and 1939; and Sections 8-12 had been bought out by 1958.11

By the 1950s, the cemetery had grown to a size and scale that severely taxed the administrative abilities of a volunteer organization like the Tempe Cemetery Association. At a board of directors meeting on April 17, 1958, the three remaining members (E.P. Carr, Jr., Hugh E. Laird, and Clyde Gilliland) announced that a deal had been struck to “convey to the City of Tempe all of its right, title and interest in and to the property . . . on the condition that the City of Tempe assume its obligations to operate the same as a cemetery.”12 Thus, after sixty years of private,

---

9 Joseph T. Birchett, President’s Report, March 30, 1926, quoted in ibid, p. 6.
10 Ibid., p. 8.
11 Ibid., pp. 8-9.
12 Tempe Cemetery Association Minute Book, April 17, 1958, quoted in ibid., p. 9.
Cultural, Social, and Historical Development in Tempe, Arizona, 1888 to 1958

Because of Tempe’s location in the heart of the fertile Salt River Valley, the town was initially defined by the presence of farms spreading outward in all directions from the community’s core. Tempe’s future role as a transportation center became apparent with the arrival of the railroad (1887), a role reemphasized with the completion of the Ash Avenue Bridge (1913), allowing traffic—at that time mostly wagons—all-weather access to the north bank of the Salt River and, by extension, to Phoenix. Add to this Tempe’s fortuitous adjacency to the educational institution that would one day become Arizona State University, and one can gain a realization of the reasons for which the community so prominently exudes a wide range of cultural diversity.

The arrival of the railroad in 1887 sparked a significant economic fluorescence in Tempe, which now enjoyed a vital commercial link not only to nearby Arizona communities but to the entire outside world as well. Anglo-American opportunists flocked to Tempe, recognizing the inevitable expansion that would occur now that the railroad linked the community to peripheral business centers. This sparked widespread infrastructural expansion in the town’s core while simultaneously encouraging real estate investors to purchase farmlands skirting the town’s immediate fringe in anticipation of additional expansion. This resulted in continuing residential development, beginning especially in 1910 with the advent of the Gage Addition and perpetuated in 1924 with the platting of Park Tract south of 8th Street and west of Mill Avenue, neighborhoods that would cater predominantly to the Anglo-American middle-class contingent of the community’s population. Thus, the arrival of major transportation infrastructure in the 1880s initiated the economic ascendency that would ultimately bring countless persons to Tempe as permanent residents.

Surrounded by farms in its earliest days, many migrants arrived to serve as laborers in the fields, giving rise to a considerably large Hispanic/Mexican population as early as 1900 (many of these persons lived in the area known as San Pablo, near the present site of Sun Devil Stadium and slightly removed from the community’s commercial hub along Mill Avenue). Later, beginning in the 1910s and 1920s, the Sotelo Addition further to the east (near the present site of Four Peaks Brewery, once Borden Creamery) represented an even greater expansion of the local Hispanic/Mexican community. Today, this type of racial segregation is not so readily apparent, with the entire Tempe community bearing a semblance of cultural diversity throughout.

---

13 For Tempe’s most current strategic approach to administering Double Butte Cemetery, as outlined in 2002, see Logan Simpson Design, Inc. and Ryden Architects, City of Tempe: Tempe Double Butte Cemetery Master Plan (May 31, 2002). For historic preservation initiatives and design guidelines in particular, see ibid., Appendix D.
The preeminence of large-scale farming operations in the Salt River Valley also gave rise to an increasing migrant population beginning in the early twentieth century. Persons of Asian descent began arriving in greater numbers in the 1920s and early 1930s, when unfavorable conditions in the farming areas of southern California induced many such immigrants to move further east into Arizona. In the 1930s, under the gubernatorial term of longtime Tempe resident Benjamin B. Moeur, cultural tensions reached a climax when local Anglo-Americans began threatening and even carrying out acts of violence against migrant farm workers. An international incident with Japan seemed imminent, and an ambassador from that country visited Phoenix to speak personally with Governor Moeur in 1934 in hopes of easing tensions and devising a peaceful solution. Eventually the matter fizzled out, but not before many Asian-Americans found themselves terrorized by profound racial intolerance. All of this exemplifies the rapidly evolving nature of cultural and social diversity in the Salt River Valley.16

February 1885 saw the ceremonial opening day of the Tempe Normal School, whose board was headed by Tempe’s founding pioneer Charles T. Hayden. A mere 31 students were on hand to mark the occasion (a stark contrast to the approximately 72,000 attendees enumerated in the school’s 2011 student body).17 Any community boasting a major collegiate institution necessarily attracts a wide array of persons, both teachers and students. As the school expanded and its student body/work force grew, so too did Tempe witness a corollary expansion in its own population’s cultural and social diversity. In more modern times, students from nations all around the globe come to Arizona State University in pursuit of a higher educational degree, thus perpetuating the college’s role in the continuing evolution of Tempe as a cultural community.18

What role does Tempe Double Butte Cemetery play in all of this? All three of the above-named developmental themes (farming, transportation, education) brought—and continue to bring—an ever-increasing array of culturally and ethnically diverse inhabitants to Tempe. These seemingly disparate evolutionary phenomena are drawn together in a powerful and spiritual manner at Double Butte Cemetery. Persons of all ethnic backgrounds—regardless of previous neighborhood segregation in the local community or racial backlash that occurred between different ethnic groups—are here found in one and the same place, a lasting vestige of the fact that all were, during their lifetimes, a pivotal component of the community and assisted, through their daily activities, in creating the Tempe that exists today. As such, Double Butte Cemetery holds a unique distinction as the location that perhaps best exhibits the cultural and social evolution of the local community.

A fitting summarization comes from Ben Furlong, a longtime resident of Tempe, who wrote in 1997 that, “As communities grow, the important qualities of human interaction are often difficult

16 See National Register Nomination for the Governor B.B. Moeur House (May 2012), esp. pp. 9-10. See also various articles in the Los Angeles Times between August and December 1934, cited in ibid.
18 For the evolution of the Arizona Territorial Normal School, see Smith, Tempe: Arizona Crossroads, pp. 39-41; 98-101. Out of the 2011 student body population, 33.9%–or 19,780 persons—were listed as being of a minority ethnic group.
to retain. Indeed, the effort to keep them requires constant and deliberate attention.” Perhaps nowhere else in Tempe is this better exemplified than at Double Butte Cemetery, the site that most profoundly portrays the community’s evolution. The cemetery is now commemorated biannually with the “Tales from Double Butte” walking tours, which offers the public an opportunity to visit the grounds and learn about Tempe history, as told by numerous tour guides well-versed in local history. Thus, Double Butte Cemetery has become an important venue for the dissemination of historic knowledge and serves as an important link between the past and present.

Prominent Burials at Double Butte Cemetery

Some of the more prominent Arizonans who are buried within the confines of Double Butte Cemetery include: Charles Trumbull Hayden (founder of Tempe); Carl T. Hayden (longtime Arizona senator); Benjamin B. Moeur (Arizona Governor, 1932-1936); and Howard J. Pyle (Arizona Governor, 1950-1954).

The site contains an array of headstones of resonant importance, including those of military veterans from every major American conflict since the Civil War. Below is an assorted example of some of the significant epitaphs found at Double Butte Cemetery:

- Sergeant John E. Campbell (1866-1910): “Charged San Juan Hill. In charge of platoon and mentioned by Col Roosevelt for gallant conduct.” (See also Crantz Cartledge, below). (See photo 15).

- Crantz Cartledge (no date): “Co. C. – 1 U.S.V. Cav.” The First U.S. Volunteer Cavalry was Theodore Roosevelt’s famed Rough Rider regiment during the Spanish American War. Cartledge is at least the second Rough Rider veteran buried at Double Butte Cemetery, along with Sergeant John E. Campbell (mentioned above). (See photo 16).


- William Fellows (May 5, 1856-January 2, 1911): “Pvt Co D 197 Ohio Infantry. Civil War.” It is interesting to note the date of birth (1856) which would have made this individual no more than 9 years old while serving as a private in the Civil War. Unless he was a drummer-boy then this birthdate is almost certainly erroneous. (See photo 18).
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- John Knight (October 5, 1851-September 6, 1904): (Woodmen of the World insignia). There are numerous headstones bearing the emblems of fraternal organizations, of which this specimen serves as an example. (See photo 20).


- James Waterhouse (1823-1909): “Veteran of Civil War” (See photo 23).
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10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property __ 41.4_____

Use either the UTM system or latitude/longitude coordinates

**Latitude/Longitude Coordinates**

Datum if other than WGS84: _N/A_____

(enter coordinates to 6 decimal places)

1. Latitude: ___________________ Longitude: ___________________
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Tempe Double Butte Cemetery

Verbal Boundary Description (Describe the boundaries of the property.)

Tempe Double Butte Cemetery is located at 2505 W. Broadway Road and occupies a prominent position at the base of two mountainous outcroppings, known locally as Bell Butte and the Double Buttes. The cemetery lies on the westernmost periphery of the city and is bounded by Broadway Road on the north, Interstate-10 on the east, Westcourt Way on the south, and 48th Street on the west. Within these boundaries, the historic portion of the cemetery lies east of the main entry road, which bisects the entire property from north to south (please see attached site map for visual boundary description).

Boundary Justification (Explain why the boundaries were selected.)

The nominated boundaries circumscribe all extant contributing historic resources within Tempe Double Butte Cemetery.
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Additional Documentation

Submit the following items with the completed form:

- **Maps:** A USGS map or equivalent (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property's location.

- **Sketch map** for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources. Key all photographs to this map.

- **Additional items:** (Check with the SHPO, TPO, or FPO for any additional items.)

Photographs

Submit clear and descriptive photographs. The size of each image must be 1600x1200 pixels (minimum), 3000x2000 preferred, at 300 ppi (pixels per inch) or larger. Key all photographs to the sketch map. Each photograph must be numbered and that number must correspond to the photograph number on the photo log. For simplicity, the name of the photographer, photo date, etc. may be listed once on the photograph log and doesn’t need to be labeled on every photograph.

Photo Log

Name of Property: Tempe Double Butte Cemetery

City or Vicinity: Tempe

County: Maricopa

State: Arizona

Photographer: William S. Kiser

Date Photographed: 2012

Description of Photograph(s) and number, include description of view indicating direction of camera:

1 of 24. The Double Buttes, looking southeast (viewed from cemetery section D).

2 of 24. Bell Butte, looking east (viewed from cemetery section D).

3 of 24. Main entrance, looking south, with the Double Buttes visible at left. Note the desert gravel sections to the left and the tree-lined lawn sections to the right.

4 of 24. Close-up of Double Buttes, looking southeast from the main entry road.
5 of 24. Historic wrought-iron fencing surrounds a family burial plot, looking southeast, with Double Buttes in the background. This type of infrastructure is common throughout the historic section of the cemetery to denote family plots. (Located in cemetery section D).

6 of 24. A second example of historic iron fencing around a burial plot. This example exhibits some damage from unknown causes. (Located in cemetery section B).

7 of 24. This type of concrete curbing is common throughout the Pioneer Section of Double Butte Cemetery and is used to denote burial plots. Typically, burial plots with fencing do not have such curbing (and vice versa). Note the chipping and cracking to the concrete, indicative of its antiquity. (Located in cemetery section D).

8 of 24. This plot—which contains no known burials—is circumscribed by an historic brick curb that was originally covered in cement. (Located in cemetery section D).

9 of 24. This photo shows an extreme example of damage to an historic headstone. Only a portion of the original remains intact, and what does remain is almost entirely illegible. Although it was obviously once a free-standing marker, it now lies almost flat on the ground. (Located in cemetery section C).

10 of 24. A second damaged gravemarker; note the bottom portion (original made of cement reinforced with three strands of rebar) is entirely missing, although it continues to survive as a free-standing object. (Located in cemetery section G).

11 of 24. John E. Campbell (Section E).

12 of 24. Crantz Cartledge (Section A).

13 of 24. William E. Carver (Section D).

14 of 24. William Fellows (Section E).

15 of 24. James Gililland (Section C).

16 of 24. John Knight (Section B).

17 of 24. William S. McMannon (Section F).

18 of 24. Elizabeth Steele (Section C).

19 of 24. James Waterhouse (Section D).
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20 of 24. Garfield Goodwin (Section C).

21 of 24. Fogal Family Plot (Section D).

22 of 24. Hugh Laird (Section 2).

23 of 24. Winchester Miller (Section B).

24 of 24. Dr. John L. Gregg (Section B).

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement: This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C.460 et seq.).

Estimated Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 100 hours per response including time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Office of Planning and Performance Management. U.S. Dept. of the Interior, 1849 C. Street, NW, Washington, DC.
National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations for individual properties and districts. See instructions in National Register Bulletin, How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form. If any item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, architectural classification, materials, and areas of significance, enter only categories and subcategories from the instructions.

1. Name of Property
   Historic name: __Tempe Municipal Building__
   Other names/site number: _______N/A_____________________________
   Name of related multiple property listing: _______________________
   (Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing)

2. Location
   Street & number: ____31 E. Fifth Street____________________________
   City or town: _Tempe_ State: ___AZ____ County: _Maricopa_
   Not For Publication: _____________________________________________
   Vicinity: _____________________________________________________

3. State/Federal Agency Certification
   As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended,
   I hereby certify that this ___x_ nomination ___ request for determination of eligibility meets
   the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic
   Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60.

   In my opinion, the property ___x_ meets ___ does not meet the National Register Criteria. I
   recommend that this property be considered significant at the following
   level(s) of significance:
   ___national ___statewide ___local
   Applicable National Register Criteria:
   ___x_A ___B ___C ___D

______________________________________________  Date
Signature of certifying official/Title: ______________________________________________________
______________________________________________
State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government

In my opinion, the property ___ meets ___ does not meet the National Register criteria.

______________________________________________  Date
Signature of commenting official: _______________________________________________________
______________________________________________
Title: __________________________________________ State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government
4. National Park Service Certification

I hereby certify that this property is:

___ entered in the National Register
___ determined eligible for the National Register
___ determined not eligible for the National Register
___ removed from the National Register
___ other (explain:) _____________________


5. Classification

Ownership of Property

(Check as many boxes as apply.)

Private: □

Public – Local  □

Public – State □

Public – Federal □

Category of Property

(Check only one box.)

Building(s) □

District □

Site □

Structure □

Object □
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Number of Resources within Property
(Do not include previously listed resources in the count)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Noncontributing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register 0

6. Function or Use

Historic Functions
(Enter categories from instructions.)

Government: City Hall
Government: Government Office

Current Functions
(Enter categories from instructions.)

Government: City Hall
Government: Government Office
7. Description

Architectural Classification
(Enter categories from instructions.)
Modern Movement
Mid-Century Modern
___________________
___________________
___________________
___________________
___________________

Materials: (enter categories from instructions.)
Principal exterior materials of the property: Concrete; Steel; Glass

Narrative Description
(Describe the historic and current physical appearance and condition of the property. Describe contributing and noncontributing resources if applicable. Begin with a summary paragraph that briefly describes the general characteristics of the property, such as its location, type, style, method of construction, setting, size, and significant features. Indicate whether the property has historic integrity.)

Summary Paragraph
Located on 5th street just east of Mill Avenue, Tempe Municipal Building was completed in 1970. Its structure incorporated the latest techniques of steel construction. The building is surrounded by pedestrian bridges and promenade decks to achieve a “center-of-the-city” effect. The site also contains a sunken courtyard known as the “Garden Level,” where additional office space is located. One of the significant features of the Tempe Municipal Building is the intentional inversion of the glass pyramid to keep the building cool in the summer months and allow for significant public space on a small site. Additionally, the building was turned forty-five degrees to the street grid to minimize glass exposure to direct sunlight. Finally, the use and expression of structural steel as the main building material in an effort to explore this new technology is a significant feature. Having never been materially altered, Tempe Municipal Building retains strong integrity of location, setting, and feeling.
Narrative Description

The Tempe Municipal Building is located in the heart of downtown Tempe at 31 East Fifth Street, between Mill and College Avenues, just north of the Arizona State University campus, and is the centerpiece of the Harry E. Mitchell Government Complex. The Tempe Municipal Building has become the symbolic center, not only of the downtown, but of the entire community. Adjacent to the hustle and bustle of Mill Avenue, citizens of Tempe know this building as the “upside-down pyramid.” Its unique form has made it an iconic part of the downtown atmosphere. Although not yet 50 years old, its historical impact on the city qualifies the Tempe Municipal Building to be recognized as a local landmark.¹

The Tempe Municipal Building sits on the former site of the 1914 Tempe City Hall. When construction of a new city hall building was first discussed, city officials were strongly considering moving to a new, more geographically central, location on Rural Road and Southern Avenue to escape the deteriorating conditions of the downtown district. Architect Michael Goodwin thought otherwise, envisioning this as a challenge to begin anew the revitalization of downtown Tempe. Goodwin convinced officials to keep the location and designed a new building that sparked the beginning of downtown Tempe’s widely acclaimed revitalization.

Over the past 140 years, Tempe has held national, state, and local significance for its important role in the development of the Salt River Valley as a center of commerce and education, as a critical link in transportation networks during the settlement of the territory, and for its associations with important political figures. Tempe’s unique heritage is exemplified in its significant cultural architecture and infrastructure. These qualities exist today in the Tempe Municipal Building, as well as the rest of the downtown area.

The property retains connections to the physical environment of its surroundings evident in the walkways and bridges that radiate outward in order to connect visually and symbolically to the city’s center. The decision to keep city hall functions in the historic commercial core of the community overshadows temporal changes in the built surroundings and lies at the heart of the concept of setting. A hotel, the Police/Courts building, Tempe Transit Center, a parking garage, Brickyard, and the 525 Building all came later, along with a wide variety of new commercial and office buildings in and around city hall. All of these are, in many ways, the result of the continued existence of city hall at the very heart of downtown Tempe. A practical definition of setting in the context of the Tempe Municipal Building is simply “at the heart of the community in the middle of the downtown commercial district that it helped preserve and perpetuate”.²

Tempe Municipal Building opened its doors to the public in 1970 and is a prime example of Mid-Century Modern architecture in Tempe. The building has been well-maintained over the last forty-three years. Despite several expansions and alterations; virtually all of its original

² Ibid., p. 29.
materials have been preserved. Mature landscaping around the site is well maintained. With additions of other buildings in and around the complex, the only deviations from the original site have been within the complex itself, where pathways and pedestrian bridges have either been changed or removed.
8. **Statement of Significance**

**Applicable National Register Criteria**
(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

- [x] A. Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- [ ] B. Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
- [ ] C. Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.
- [ ] D. Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

**Criteria Considerations**
(Mark “x” in all the boxes that apply.)

- [ ] A. Owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes
- [ ] B. Removed from its original location
- [ ] C. A birthplace or grave
- [ ] D. A cemetery
- [ ] E. A reconstructed building, object, or structure
- [ ] F. A commemorative property
- [x] G. Less than 50 years old or achieving significance within the past 50 years
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Areas of Significance
(Enter categories from instructions.)

Community Planning & Development


Period of Significance

1970

Significant Dates

1970

Significant Person
(Complete only if Criterion B is marked above.)


Cultural Affiliation


Architect/Builder

Michael & Kemper Goodwin, Ltd.
Statement of Significance Summary Paragraph (Provide a summary paragraph that includes level of significance, applicable criteria, justification for the period of significance, and any applicable criteria considerations.)

The Tempe Municipal Building achieves significance under National Register Criteria A, for its association with the broad patterns of community development. Planning and construction of a new Tempe Municipal Building, which began in 1968 and concluded in 1970, was one component of a comprehensive campaign to renovate and modernize the city’s facilities infrastructure, financed through the sale of municipal bonds. Construction of the new city hall occurred simultaneously with development of a new cultural center campus on city land at Rural Road and Southern Avenue. Development of the more geographically-centered cultural center introduced an alternative to locate the new city hall away from the downtown.³

Criteria Consideration G discussion

Constructed in 1970, the Tempe Municipal Building has achieved significance within the past fifty years for its paramount role in recentralizing the downtown core of the City of Tempe at a time when peripheral development threatened to relocate government offices several miles further south of the historic commercial and legislative hub. The decision to retain City Hall in downtown Tempe sparked a concomitant revitalization of surrounding business, in the process reassuring town residents that the historic urban center would remain such for generations to come. The downtown Tempe/Mill Avenue District has flourished since the moment the new Tempe Municipal Building opened its doors in 1970, with hundreds of businesses enjoying the benefit of a pedestrian, metropolitan atmosphere that otherwise would have been lost had City Hall been relocated. Thus, this property is highly significance for its impact on Tempe commercial and legislative development over the preceding forty-three years and will doubtless continue to exert this beneficial effect in years to come.

Narrative Statement of Significance (Provide at least one paragraph for each area of significance.)

Location

Tempe Municipal Building exists on the former site of the 1914 City Hall building. When construction of a new city hall was first being discussed, city officials were strongly considering moving it to a new, more geographically central, location at Rural Road and Southern Avenue to escape the deteriorating conditions of the downtown district. Architect Michael Goodwin thought otherwise and saw this as a challenge, as well as a beginning for revitalization of downtown Tempe. Goodwin convinced officials to keep the location, and his subsequent design did indeed spark the beginning of the revitalization project for downtown Tempe.

Tempe Municipal Building Maricopa; Arizona
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Tempe architect Michael Goodwin designed the building as an upside-down pyramid for two reasons. First, he wanted this building to become an icon for the city: Goodwin’s intent was for this property to be the “center-of-the-city,” with the original construction plans incorporating pathways radiating outward in all directions. Programs within the building have been organized in a way that is convenient for the public to access, with the most public necessities towards the bottom of the pyramid and the more private spaces near the top. Second, the building functions as a passive solar building because of the self-shading character of the inverted pyramid form. With the walls slanted at a forty-five degree angle, the roof becomes a shading structure for the entire building. In winter, the building is engineered to trap the heat in order to warm interior spaces. In 2010, the Tempe Municipal Building received the 25 Year Award from the Arizona Society of the American Institute of Architects, in part for its innovations in sustainable design. In addition, it was identified as one of the 25 most important buildings in the area by the Phoenix Metro chapter of the American Institute of Architects. These design aesthetics could not have been achieved without the influence of the Mid-Century Modern architecture that arrived in the Salt River Valley in the mid-1960s. This movement brought with it new ideas and technologies that made the design of the Tempe Municipal Building possible.4

Community Planning & Development in Tempe, Arizona 1968-1970

Tempe was a small agricultural community through most of its history. After World War II, Tempe began growing at a rapid rate and soon the last of the farms disappeared. By 1970, Tempe had grown into a modern city and along with it, the teachers college had evolved into Arizona State University. Through annexation, Tempe’s corporate limits were rapidly expanding to the south, east and west until, the city’s ultimate boundaries were established in the 1970’s. During this period of rapid areal expansion the traditional downtown commercial core of the community lapsed into disinvestment and deterioration. As downtown businesses followed their customers into the suburbs; the central business district, which had existed along Mill Avenue for almost 100 years, began to transform itself into an automobile-oriented commercial strip, compromising both the historic integrity and pedestrian character of the traditional downtown.5

Municipal services struggled to keep pace with the rapid growth of the community until, by 1968, the Tempe City Council faced a momentous decision. Prior to redevelopment, the 300-foot by 300-foot city hall site housed the city jail, firehouse, library and court, all in one 1920s building, with numerous eclectic additions. Additional City offices were located in various nearby residences and converted commercial properties. The need for expanded City facilities was obvious, but debate centered on the location for a new city hall.6

---

Sentiments were divided between redevelopment of the tight downtown site or removal to a more geographically-central location at the southwest corner of Rural Road and Southern Avenue, at the site of the planned new cultural complex on an expansive 22 acres. Centrally-located and with ample parking provided in a park-like suburban setting, programming the new cultural complex soon sparked interest in relocating city hall out of the downtown. When the Mayor and Council considered options for a new municipal complex in 1968, some Council members, as well as several citizens, favored the Rural and Southern site, reasoning that the site was bigger and more conveniently located.7

Tempe’s traditional downtown commercial center along Mill Avenue had been declining during the 1950s and 1960s. What began as a disorderly adaptation of the Territorial-era downtown to automobile-based commerce during the post-World War II decade continued apace as the street increasingly dominated the sidewalk. Visual clutter was further compounded in 1959, when the Arizona Highway Department upgraded the status of Federal Highways US 60, US 70, US 80, US 89 and State Route 93, all of which crossed the Salt River on the Mill Avenue Bridge and were then routed through downtown Tempe. The associated program of right-of-way improvements and widening drastically altered the character of the central business district streetscape and building facades along Mill Avenue. Although targeted for redevelopment, opinions varied as to the appropriate method of redevelopment for downtown Tempe. Many community leaders touted the wholesale demolition and replacement tactics of "urban renewal" employed by many cities in the 1950s and 60s. Others favored a more hands-off approach to downtown redevelopment and Mill Avenue revitalization.8

In a Tempe Oral History Project interview, U.S. Representative Harry E. Mitchell, who was on the Tempe City Council at the time, observed, “It had gotten so bad and so low, people were embarrassed about downtown, even though it was an entry-way to the city, entry to the university. Most people tried to AVOID downtown, felt that it gave a very negative impact on the city - so most people just didn’t care. Anything was better. In fact, the first, I would say probably the first redevelopment between Second Street and Third Street, where America West is now, that whole area, probably all the way over to Ash Avenue, was just bulldozed, and there was a sign put up, “Will build to suit.” That was our first effort at urban renewal.”9

By the end of the 1960s, urban renewal had suffered widespread criticism for its adverse effects on economic intensification, social vivification, and preservation of community cultural resources in urban areas across the country. Even as planning for a new municipal building began, the wholesale demolition practices of urban renewal were changing into what would become a more place-based redevelopment strategy under the Community Development Block Grant program. For the time being, however, several more downtown historic buildings would

7 Ibid.
be lost to demolition despite preservation efforts strengthened by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.10

The downtown site was selected to remain the location of city hall by the narrowest of margins. By a 4-3 vote, the decision was made to redevelop the original location, thus setting in motion what was to become decades of reinvestment and focused redevelopment along Mill Avenue and throughout the downtown. Newly-elected Mayor Elmer Bradley favored a downtown location and by June 1968 the city had entered negotiations with Bauer’s Auto Parts to acquire a parcel of property at Myrtle and Fifth Avenue—adjacent to the Tempe Police Department—for construction of the new office complex.11 On August 1, the city officially acquired ownership of the property.12

Originally, construction was planned for a two-story, 45,000 square foot structure.13 While the council did consider hiring out-of-town architectural experts for the project, they ultimately decided that “Tempe has several fine architectural firms and that we should use them when possible.” With that in mind, on July 25, 1968 the City Council selected Michael and Kemper Goodwin as architects for the project. From that point forward, all prior plans changed and a much more innovative approach was adopted. Mayor Bradley estimated that construction costs could be limited to about twenty dollars per square foot, bringing the total cost to just over $1 million based on preliminary plans.14

Completion of the strikingly modern Municipal Building in 1970 symbolized a commitment by the City Council to the revitalization of downtown Tempe and a desire to be seen as a progressive community. Tempe would go on to become a world-class showcase of downtown revitalization best-practices, even as the Valley of the Sun would become the model for Modern style architecture in the midcentury era from 1945 to 1975. The design of the Tempe Municipal Building continues to reflect a progressive architectural identity which once helped send a message to the community about the city’s commitment to the future of downtown.15

Spurred on by Tempe’s centennial in 1971, Downtown Tempe, the Mill Avenue District and later, Tempe Town Lake continued to be revitalized as an entertainment and shopping venue that attracts people from throughout the Valley and beyond. The commitment to downtown that began with the Tempe Municipal Building in 1970 was further bolstered in 1973 with the creation of the University-Hayden Butte Redevelopment Area and again in 1974 with participation in the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development's Community Development Block Grant Program. The center-city location of municipal government, selected

12 Ibid., August 2, 1968.
14 Ibid., July 26, 1968.
by the City Council as a demonstration of confidence in the future of the downtown area, has come to represent the cornerstone of these downtown redevelopment efforts.\footnote{Library of Congress, “American Memory, Historic American Building Survey number HABS AZ-142”, \url{http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/D?hb3:/temp/~ammem_08HM} (accessed October 13, 2011).}

Now the centerpiece of the Harry E. Mitchell Government Complex, the Tempe Municipal Building is a unique pyramid of solar-bronzed glass and steel inverted in a sunken garden courtyard. Since its opening, the Tempe Municipal Building has continued to provide a focal point for downtown redevelopment and a landmark for community building, while supplying space for the growing community's city government. Aesthetics, accessibility, energy conservation and expandability were the major components of its architectural concepts. The building provides maximum space without overpowering the available site in Tempe's compact central business district. The landmark building continues to exemplify progress in government and promote a timeless beauty compatible with ongoing redevelopment and the reinvention of downtown Tempe. Certainly, the Tempe Municipal Building meets the popular definition of a landmark, which is a property that expresses a distinctive character worthy of preservation.

**Developmental history/additional historic context information** (if appropriate)

**Michael Goodwin, Architect 1939-2011**

Born in 1939, Michael Goodwin was the son of prominent local architect Kemper Goodwin, grandson of early Tempe businessman Garfield Goodwin. Kemper Goodwin was born in Tempe, Arizona on April 28, 1906 and received his architectural training at the University of Southern California. Although he received his architecture license in 1931, Kemper did not establish his own firm until 1945. Kemper’s firm ultimately employed more than forty individuals and became one of the most prosperous in Arizona. He specialized in educational facilities and designed more than 200 such structures over a period spanning several decades. Their designs included several buildings on the Arizona State University campus: the Memorial Union, Wilson Hall, and the Mathematics Building, among several others. Kemper Goodwin retired in 1975 after passing ownership of the firm along to his son, Michael. Kemper died December 24, 1997.

Following in his father’s footsteps, Michael left Tempe for a time in the early 1960s to attend USC, graduating from there with a degree in architecture in 1963. Following his graduation, Michael returned to his Arizona hometown and, with his father in 1967, formed the architectural firm of Michael and Kemper Goodwin, Ltd. In addition to his work in architecture, Goodwin also became politically active, serving two terms in the Arizona House of Representatives in the 1970s (the first and only architect to serve in that capacity in the State of Arizona). As his work began to garner considerable attention among colleagues in his field he won the Arizona Architects’ Medal in 1975 and, three years later, became the youngest person ever to be awarded
the distinction of Fellow in the American Institute of Architects. The firm designed relatively few homes, concentrating instead on projects such as schools and government buildings.\textsuperscript{17}

In Tempe, Michael Goodwin designed several middle and high schools, including Marcos de Niza High School (1971) and Corona del Sol High School (1976). The former was considered to be revolutionary in design of an open-space campus, while the latter incorporated one of his earliest solar-based technological designs. Indeed many modern architects—and historians too, for that matter—acknowledge that Michael Goodwin’s designs exuded a profound consciousness of the need to incorporate environmentally friendly, or “green,” components into buildings to make them both more practical for their surroundings and more sustainable in the long-term. Goodwin, according to one historian, “was doing all that before it was a movement. And what he was doing was simply being a responsible architect who didn’t put his ego ahead of the building’s intended function.”\textsuperscript{18}

Michael Goodwin passed away May 9, 2011 at the age of 72. Along with his father Kemper, he left an indelible imprint upon the City of Tempe and the surrounding communities through his innovative architectural designs. Tempe’s iconic upside-down pyramid represents Goodwin’s greatest architectural achievement and provides a lasting vestige to the memory of a highly influential Tempe family. “He created stunning, striking works that were groundbreaking but practical for their environment,” Tempe Mayor Hugh Hallman explained following Goodwin’s recent death. Robert Pela, a writer for the \textit{Phoenix New Times}, similarly commented that, “he was a visual artist whose structures weren't simply attractive and functional, but also a celebration of the land that surrounded them.”\textsuperscript{19}

\textbf{Mid-Century Modern Architecture in the Salt River Valley, 1945 – 1975}

The Mid-Century Modern movement flourished for 30 years, between 1945 and 1975. During this time there were many local architects who created noteworthy works. Some of these include Al Beadle’s IBEW Union Hall, built in 1967, and James Flynn’s 1974 Vlassis Ruzow and Associates Office, both located in the Metro Phoenix area. These works were prominent examples of the incorporation of steel and glass construction. Another example with great impact on the valley, even more so on the City of Tempe, was Michael Goodwin’s design for the Tempe Municipal Building.\textsuperscript{20}

Located on 5th street just east of Mill Avenue, Tempe Municipal Building was completed in 1970. The construction of this building incorporated the latest techniques of steel construction. Goodwin used the structural properties of steel to design an inverted pyramid structure. The building is centered on 2½ acres of land that combines the building with plazas, gardens,

\textsuperscript{17} City of Tempe Historic Property Register, Selleh House Listing. \url{http://www.tempe.gov/historicpres/SellehHouse.html}.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{20} City of Phoenix Historic Preservation Office and Ryden Architects, Inc., pp. 3-119.
pedestrian bridges and promenade decks to achieve a “center-of-the-city” effect. The site also contains a sunken courtyard space known as the “Garden Level” where additional office space is located. This sunken courtyard was designed to create an intimate feeling for its occupants when they walked into the space. The intention of inverting the glass pyramid was to keep the building cool in the summer months and allow for significant public space on a small site. The design strategy of passive solar cooling and heating was achieved by trapping heat in areas of the walls so it would radiate into the building in the winter months. In the summer months, the affect is slightly different. The building was turned forty-five degrees to the street grid to minimize glass exposure to direct sunlight. The glass is tinted with a sun-bronze tint and, in combination with the shade provided by the angled walls. City officials desired the extensive amount of glass so they could always have visual access to their surroundings and connect with the community.

Goodwin designed the building as an upside-down pyramid for two reasons. First, he wanted this building to become an icon for the city, which it certainly has. Programs within the building have been organized in a way that is convenient for the public to access, with the most public necessities towards the bottom of the pyramid and the more private spaces near the top. Second, the building functions as a passive solar building because of the self-shading character of the inverted pyramid form. With the walls slanted at a forty-five degree angle, the roof becomes a shading structure for the entire building. In winter, the building is engineered to trap the heat in order to warm interior spaces. In 2010, the Tempe Municipal Building received the 25 Year Award from the Arizona Society of the American Institute of Architects, in part for its innovations in sustainable design. In addition, it was identified as one of the 25 most important buildings in the area by the Phoenix Metro chapter of the American Institute of Architects. These design aesthetics could not have been achieved without the influence of the Mid-Century Modern style that arrived in the Salt River Valley in the mid-1960s. This movement brought with it new ideas and technologies that made the design of the Tempe Municipal Building possible.21
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Verbal Boundary Description (Describe the boundaries of the property.)

Tempe Municipal Building is located at 31 E. 5th Street in the heart of the downtown. The building is bounded by 5th Street to the North, Forest Avenue on the East, 7th Street to the South, and Mill Avenue to the West.

Boundary Justification (Explain why the boundaries were selected.)

These four streets surround Tempe Municipal Building and therefore these are the most accurate definitions for a verbal boundary description.

11. Form Prepared By

name/title: __Billy Kiser________________________________________________
organization: _City of Tempe______________________________________________
street & number: __31 E. 5th St.____________________________________________
city or town: _Tempe________________ state: ____AZ_____ zip code:__85281_____ 
e-mail ___joe_nucci@tempe.gov___________________________________________
telephone: ___480-350-8870_____________________________________________
date:____February 2013__________________________________________________

Additional Documentation

Submit the following items with the completed form:

- **Maps:** A USGS map or equivalent (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property's location.

- **Sketch map** for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources. Key all photographs to this map.

- **Additional items:** (Check with the SHPO, TPO, or FPO for any additional items.)
Photographs

Submit clear and descriptive photographs. The size of each image must be 1600x1200 pixels (minimum), 3000x2000 preferred, at 300 ppi (pixels per inch) or larger. Key all photographs to the sketch map. Each photograph must be numbered and that number must correspond to the photograph number on the photo log. For simplicity, the name of the photographer, photo date, etc. may be listed once on the photograph log and doesn’t need to be labeled on every photograph.

Photo Log

Name of Property: Tempe Municipal Building
City or Vicinity: Tempe
County: Maricopa  State: Arizona
Photographer: Alyssa Matter
Date Photographed: August 2012

Description of Photograph(s) and number, include description of view indicating direction of camera:

1 of 13.  Tempe Municipal Building, looking north west.
2 of 13.  Tempe Municipal Building, looking north.
4 of 13.  Tempe Municipal Building, looking north east.
5 of 13.  Tempe Municipal Building, looking east.
6 of 13.  Main Entrance Stairs to the “upside-down” pyramid, looking south.
7 of 13.  Main Entrance Sign of the Tempe Municipal Building.
8 of 13.  Main Entrance to the lower Garden Level of the building, looking south.
9 of 13.  Tempe Municipal Building and City Hall Plaza, looking south west.
10 of 13.  Tempe Municipal Building floor plan, lower garden level.
11 of 13.  Tempe Municipal Building floor plan, lobby level.
Tempe Municipal Building  Maricopa, Arizona

Name of Property                   County and State

12 of 13.  Tempe Municipal Building floor plan, 2nd floor.
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Rio Salado Foundation
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Kristin Patrick
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P.O. Box 1737
Tempe, AZ 85280

Phone (work): (480) 473-0245 (home): N/A

E-Mail Address:
riosaladofoundation@gmail.com

Person Submitting Nomination:
Lisa Roach

Organization/Affiliation (if applicable):
Tempe Historic Preservation Foundation

Street Address/City/State/Zip:
P.O. Box 1894
Tempe, AZ 85280

Phone (work): (480) 346-8352 (home): (480) 220-6643

Names, Addresses, and Phone Numbers of Two References or Project Partners:

1. Diane Enos
   SRP-MIC
   10005 East Osborn Road
   Scottsdale, Arizona 85256
   (480) 362-7740

2. Rosemary Gannon
   Salt River Project
   P. O. Box 52025
   Phoenix, AZ 85072-2025
   (602) 236-5900
The Rio Salado Foundation

Formed in 2001, the Rio Salado Foundation is principally dedicated to supporting community enhancement projects—through public-private partnerships—in the vicinity of Tempe Town Lake and Papago Park, where the oft-tranquil waters of the former and the red rock buttes of the latter form a serene landscape that has become one of the most popular destinations in the Salt River Valley. Since its opening more than a decade ago, Tempe Town Lake and its surrounding attractions, which include the four historic properties detailed in this nomination, have hosted approximately 2.7 million visitors annually. Since its inception, the Rio Salado Foundation has been a forceful advocate for regional beautification, and, through its efforts, the area now boasts an array of natural, cultural, historic, and recreational resources.

The Rio Salado Foundation has developed a master plan for the focus area, one that meshes historic preservation of local landmarks with numerous recreational activities, providing a public destination that effectively conveys Tempe’s rich heritage in both its historic and modern eras. With this in mind, the organization’s board of directors—along with dozens of generous donors—coalesced in a capital procurement campaign entitled “Water Was Just the Beginning.” A decade later, these efforts have led to the creation of “a vibrant destination, ensuring educational, recreational, and cultural programs to support our Valley’s youth, families, and visitors.”

The preservation of four Tempe landmarks has proven pivotal to the fulfillment of the Foundation’s overall mission. These historic icons include the Sandra Day O’Connor House, the Rose Eisendrath House, the Hayden Flour Mill and Silos, and the Ash Avenue Bridge Abutment. Collectively, these four properties convey the diverse and rich history of early Tempe and the Salt River Valley, emphasizing such historical themes as: politics/government; tourism/leisure; local commerce; and transportation.

The public response to these preservation initiatives has been overwhelmingly positive. Community events at each of these sites have collectively attracted thousands of visitors; many of the younger participants at such events are enjoying these historic venues for the first time in their publically-accessible state. Media coverage has abounded, with local newspapers and periodicals frequently featuring updates on the Rio Salado Foundation’s progress in its respective preservation projects and providing increased publicity for events at all four properties. Numerous fundraising initiatives have opened these sites to the public in their preliminary stages of rehabilitation while simultaneously securing additional pledges from donors. To date, the Rio Salado Foundation has raised approximately $6.4 million dollars for these four historic preservation projects.
Local residents have been invited to volunteer in certain phases of these projects and have thus personally contributed to the perpetuation of Tempe’s cultural and historic heritage. Through the Rio Salado Foundation’s unparalleled efforts, historic preservation and community involvement have become inextricably linked, and the future of Tempe’s past is thus ensured for the enjoyment and education of generations to come.

The pages that follow detail each of the four Tempe historic preservation projects for which the Rio Salado Foundation is being nominated for the 2013 Governor’s Heritage Preservation Award, with an emphasis on community involvement, economic development, and sustainability. Each respective project represents a firm commitment to Arizona preservation on the part of the Foundation and its many generous donors, without whom these historic and cultural resources might have already been lost.

**Sandra Day O’Connor House**

The historic Sandra Day O’Connor House, originally constructed in Paradise Valley and moved to its current Papago Park location through the preservation efforts of the Rio Salado Foundation, represents a milestone in local sustainability. It is a testament to the rich history and unique southwestern architecture of the region and is representative of modern restoration and preservation techniques.

The O’Connor House, a 501(c)(3) non-profit charity, is now located within the boundaries of Tempe’s “Carl Hayden Campus for Sustainability,” which connects elements of the Papago Park landscape in a “carefully crafted and unobtrusive setting that reflects the nature of its surroundings.” With the O’Connor House as its centerpiece, the campus incorporates both natural and built components into its dedication to sustainability. It will play an important role in future development and preservation efforts at both the Green Line Riparian Area as well as the Carl Hayden Campus for Sustainability. The Green Line is an intermittent stream flowing through the campus, providing a living ecosystem within the natural Sonoran Desert surroundings. As the location of both the O’Connor House and the Eisendrath House, the Carl Hayden Campus has become, according to one individual, a means of celebrating the legacy of “strong, intelligent women.”

Brick by brick, the entire adobe house was deconstructed, transported to Tempe, and then meticulously reconstructed in Papago Park at a site overlooking downtown Tempe and Town Lake to the south. In a testament to the multicultural collaboration that characterizes the Rio Salado Foundation’s preservation efforts, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community blessed the new site prior to the house being relocated.

Renamed “The O’Connor House and Center for Civic Discourse,” the repurposed home of the first woman to serve as a United States Supreme Court justice is now a venue “for people and organizations to come together and resolve conflicts or disagreements peacefully.” In this, the O’Connor House continues to act in the same capacity that it did decades ago, when the
burgeoning lawmaker and future Supreme Court justice hosted bipartisan events at her home to foster mutual goodwill and collaboration among Arizona’s political leaders.

Eisendrath House

The Eisendrath House is a Pueblo-Revival Style dwelling built in Papago Park in 1930 by prominent architect Robert Evans. The house boasts a rich historical legacy as the one-time residence of Rose Eisendrath, a wealthy widow from Chicago who discovered that, when vacationing in Phoenix, her Jewish heritage precluded her from patronizing many of the Valley’s leisurely resorts. In defiance of ethnic persecution, Eisendrath constructed her own home as a “haven for tolerance.” The house was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in April 2011.

The Eisendrath House occupies a nine-acre indigenous Sonoran Desert site north of Tempe Town Lake. The Rio Salado Foundation launched its effort to preserve this well-known historic landmark in view of allowing the location “to serve the public, not only as a reminder of Tempe’s past, but as a touchstone for its future as a sustainable, diverse community.” In October 2010, the Rio Salado Foundation hosted “A Night to Preserve” at the Eisendrath House, an event that attracted hundreds of Valley residents who participated in a collaborative effort to raise public awareness for the rehabilitation project. In a further testament to the Rio Salado Foundation’s dedication to community involvement, a local Boy Scout troop was recently enlisted to participate in a beautification campaign that involved the planting of 250 Saguaro cacti on the nine-acre site.

The Tempe City Council has approved an agreement between the municipality and two outside entities—the Rio Salado Foundation and Salt River Project (SRP)—to provide educational programs at the Eisendrath House once the rehabilitation project has been completed. Salt River Project will work directly with the City of Tempe’s Water Conservation Team, which will have its offices at the completed Eisendrath House. The goal of this partnership is to create public education programs and classes, to be hosted at the Eisendrath House Meeting Building. This will eliminate the multiple city-wide locations where such classes are currently being held, providing instead a single convenient location for all such educational services. Additionally, the Tempe Historic Preservation Foundation will have an office on-site, will plan and organize tours of both the house and its Papago Park surroundings, and will train docents to lead those public tours. Thus, the project will be completed and sustained through the collaborative efforts of four organizations: the Rio Salado Foundation, Salt River Project, the City of Tempe, and the Tempe Historic Preservation Foundation.

Hayden Flour Mill and Silos

The Hayden Flour Mill and Silos, which for many decades served as Tempe’s economic anchor, is an irreplaceable vestige to the town’s agricultural past. Constructed in 1918, the Mill holds the distinction of being the oldest cast-in-place, reinforced concrete building in Tempe. The grain elevator and silos, directly to the east of the mill, were built in 1951 and remained the tallest structures in Tempe until 2007. The Mill and Silos have been determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.
Adaptive reuse of the iconic Hayden Flour Mill and Silos has allowed the site to become a public attraction once more, with its renovated landscaping and interpretive signing beckoning passersby at one of Tempe’s busiest pedestrian corridors.

Landscaping at the Mill and Silos brought together more than 80 volunteer residents on a June 2012 morning—in the heat of the summer—to fill “gabion baskets” with river rock. Volunteers represented several local corporations and organizations, including: Intel; Tempe High Key Club; the Faithful City Church; the Tempe Neighborhood Advisory Board; and a number of good samaritans partaking in the restoration of the town’s most revered historic landmark.

The Hayden Flour Mill and surrounding environs have been made available to the public, and “the once-shuttered property now boasts a grassy lawn lit by twinkly lights, an amphitheater, signage detailing the mill’s history, and a shady grove in which to sit or picnic.” The first-floor windows have been opened, allowing a view inside the building that includes the original iron safe.

On October 5, 2012, the Rio Salado Foundation held a grand opening ceremony for the Hayden Flour Mill and Silos. The Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community provided a traditional blessing of the site and President Diane Enos spoke about the spirit of collaboration that is the hallmark of the Foundation. The Tempe Historic Preservation Foundation and the Tempe Historic Preservation Office supplied volunteer tour guides for the event. Public interest not only met, but in fact far exceeded expectations, with each tour being filled to capacity and hundreds of additional citizens signing a waiting list for future tour dates. A subsequent tour was arranged one month later in order to accommodate those who were unable to see the repurposed Mill during the grand opening. Future tours are in the planning stage and it is hoped that, through the efforts of local volunteers, these will become multiannual events.

**Ash Avenue Bridge Abutment**

Built between 1911 and 1913, the Tempe Concrete Arch Highway Bridge was an 11-span reinforced concrete bridge—the first such structure to be built across the Salt River—that provided a vital and reliable transportation link between Tempe on the south side of the river and Phoenix on the north side. In 1928 the Arizona Highway Department recommended the construction of a new river crossing; in 1931, once the new structure had been completed, the 1911 bridge was permanently decommissioned. Listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1984, the 1911 bridge was found to be a public safety concern in the construction of Tempe Town Lake and was demolished in 1990. The south abutment was salvaged in-place, but remained fenced-off and unused until now.

The Ash Avenue Bridge Abutment rehabilitation comprises one stage of a larger Rio Salado Foundation Project, that of the Veterans Memorial at Tempe Town Lake. Veterans Day 2011 witnessed the groundbreaking ceremony of Phase I, which included restoration of the historic bridge abutment, lighting, circular stairs, and grading of surrounding land.
Through its integration into this larger Rio Salado Foundation project, the landmark Ash Avenue Bridge Abutment will serve as a viewing platform from which visitors can overlook the Veteran’s Memorial below, a function that epitomizes both the City of Tempe’s and the Rio Salado Foundation’s commitment to community development through the preservation of historic resources.
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Photo Key

Sandra Day O’Connor House
1. Post-project completion, looking northwest at sunset
2. Post-project completion, looking southwest at sunset
3. Post-project completion, looking southwest
4. Post-project completion, looking southeast at front door
5. During relocation process, looking west
6. Post-project completion, interior living room
7. Justice Sandra Day O’Connor assisting in the reconstruction of her home

Eisendrath House
1. “A Night to Preserve” event, October 2010
2. After rehabilitation, looking northwest from interior courtyard
3. After rehabilitation, east-facing façade
4. After rehabilitation, interior courtyard, looking northeast
5. Before rehabilitation, east-facing façade
6. Before rehabilitation, east-facing façade
7. Before rehabilitation, north-facing façade

Hayden Flour Mill and Silos
1. Post-project completion, looking south
2. Post-project completion, looking southeast
3. Post-project completion, looking north
4. Before project completion, looking northeast
5. Public event (outside of the mill) May 2012
6. Public event (inside of the mill), May 2012

Ash Avenue Bridge Abutment
1. Post-project completion, looking west
2. Post-project completion, looking south
3. Post-project completion, looking north over the viewing platform
4. Before project completion, looking west
5. Before project completion, looking east
6. Before project completion, looking south
7. Dedication ceremony, November 11, 2012

Sandra Day O’Connor House: 10-minute video
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/04/13</td>
<td>Tempe Historical Society Annual Luncheon</td>
<td>11:30 am</td>
<td>History Museum, 809 E Southern Av</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- THS Annual Meeting &amp; Luncheon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/09/13</td>
<td>Historic Preservation Commission</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Hatton Hall, 34 E 7 St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Public Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/22/13</td>
<td>Tempe General Plan 2040</td>
<td>5:30 pm</td>
<td>Tempe Library, TLC Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Citizen Work Group Review of Draft Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/13/13</td>
<td>Historic Preservation Commission</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Hatton Hall, 34 E 7 St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Public Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/27/13</td>
<td>Tempe General Plan 2040</td>
<td>5:30 pm</td>
<td>Tempe Library, TLC Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Citizen Work Group Review Draft Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/11/13</td>
<td>Historic Preservation Commission</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Hatton Hall, 34 E 7 St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Public Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/26/13</td>
<td>AZ Historic Sites Review Comm</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Arizona State Parks, 1300 W Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/08/13</td>
<td>Historic Preservation Commission</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Hatton Hall, 34 E 7 St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Public Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/12/13</td>
<td>Historic Preservation Commission</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Hatton Hall, 34 E 7 St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Public Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/13</td>
<td>Historic Preservation Commission</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Hatton Hall, 34 E 7 St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Public Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>Historic Preservation Commission</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Hatton Hall, 34 E 7 St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Public Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td>AZ Historic Sites Review Comm</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Arizona State Parks, 1300 W Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/12/13</td>
<td>Historic Preservation Commission</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Hatton Hall, 34 E 7 St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Public Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>