PUBLIC MEETING AGENDA

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
November 12th, 2015
Hatton Hall
34 East 7th Street, Tempe, AZ  85281
6:00 PM

Call to Order

Roll Call

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. CONSIDERATION OF MEETING MINUTES: 10/08/15

3. Update on One Hundred Mill (Charles T. Hayden House / Monti’s La Casa Vieja) project

4. Discuss and consider draft Apache and Alameda Character Areas documents

5. Update on Kirkland-McKinney Ditch lining proposal

6. Updates on Eisendrath House and Hayden Flour Mill

7. HPO Intern Program Updates
   - Billy Kiser Work Update – Kiser
   - Cerelia Torres Work Update – Torres

8. Chair / Staff Updates

Current Events / Announcements / Future Agenda Items
- Member Announcements
- Staff Announcements

Adjourn

For further information on the above agenda items, contact Community Development, Planning Division (480) 350-8331. Agenda items may not be heard in the order listed. The City of Tempe endeavors to make all public meetings accessible to persons with disabilities. With 48 hours advance notice, special assistance is available at public meetings for sight and/or hearing-impaired persons. Please call 350-8331 (voice) or 350-8400 (TDD) to request an accommodation to participate in a public meeting.
Agenda Item 2
Chair Gregory called the meeting to order at 6:06 pm

1. Call to Audience:
   - No Reply

2. CONSIDERATION OF MEETING MINUTES: 09/10/2015

Commissioner Turner moved the Commission to approve the September 10, 2015 minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Buss and passed with a vote of 5-0.

3. Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness approving proposed alterations to Tempe (Hayden) Butte for Steel Tank Reservoir Rehabilitation – Hayden Butte East, located at 222 East 5th Street.

   - Andrew Romance of Dibble Engineering gave a presentation on the proposed rehabilitation work
   - Overview of paint color and selection process
   - Overview of excavation and trenching locations and methods
   - Overview of rockfall protection and draping material to be proposed as phase two work
   - Existing rock spoils to remain in place
   - Trenching to take about one week; native plant re-vegetation planned for disturbed ground
   - No petroglyphs to be affected by trenching
   - Phase 1 involves only the East tank
   - Discussion of consultation process with both SRP-MIC and GRIC
   - Archaeological monitoring to be conducted during trenching, and workers to undergo SRP-MIC Cultural Sensitivity Training
   - Tribes prefer that coating material for tanks match the Butte in color
   - Staff recommendation to approve certificate of appropriateness with four conditions
   - Commissioner Shears moved the Commission to approve the certificate of appropriateness with staff-recommended conditions. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Solliday and passed with a vote of 5-0.

- Eisendrath House – Funding received for landscaping; grand opening events scheduled for November 20th, 21st, and 22nd, 2015
- Hayden House - Overview of conditions required by City Council per May 7th, 2015 PAD approval; demolition plan by Bob Graham is mostly complete; protection plan still being drafted; November 1st groundbreaking has been pushed back to December 1st; Historic American Building Survey documentation almost complete; AZTEC Engineering to conduct archaeological monitoring and trenching; overview of HPO discussions with development team
- Hayden Flour Mill – No development agreement has been finalized
- Tomlinson Estates / Date Palm Manor - Revisions to National Register nominations in progress and will be submitted to the Keeper soon; 8-10 Tomlinson Estates residents met regarding design guidelines and will adapt Borden Homes design guidelines to fit Tomlinson Estates

5. HPO Intern Program Updates

- Kiser working on award nominations for Eisendrath House and assisting Public Works with an architectural designation for the Mill Avenue Bridge.
- Daniel Vinson’s internship is on hold due to school obligations

6. Chair / Staff Updates

- Owner of the Casa Loma building spoke with HPO to discuss local designation
- Update on recent legal proceedings involving Gonzales-Martinez House
- Re-roofing of St. Mary’s church completed
- SRP to begin re-lining Kirkland-McKinney Ditch in January 2016

Chair Gregory adjourned the meeting at 7:23 p.m.

Prepared by: Billy Kiser, HPO Intern
Reviewed by: John Larsen Southard, Senior Planner / Historic Preservation Officer

Andrea Gregory, Chair
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INTRODUCTION

Using private funds, the Hayden House Tempe LLC is planning to construct a new facility on a 2.51-acre parcel bounded by Mill Avenue, Rio Salado Parkway, Maple Avenue, and Second Street in Tempe. This privately owned parcel is situated in Township 1 North, Range 4 East, Section 16 (SE4), Gila and Salt River Base Line and Meridian. The project will involve the demolition of a parking lot and portions of the Monti’s La Casa Vieja restaurant building, relocation of underground utilities, and the construction of a building with a basement, parking lot, and associated infrastructure. An agreement with the City of Tempe requires the presence of an archaeologist on-site during the demolition. The following work plan provides background information about previous investigations in the area, a cultural context, and methodology for the monitoring as well as recovery of burials, if discovered. It also addresses how the historic archaeological remains will be treated when discovered.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project area lies within the Phoenix Basin, an area of south-central Arizona characterized by fault-block mountains and intervening sediment-filled basins. This Salt River is approximately 500 ft north of the parcel; the Tempe Butte is approximately 200 ft to the east. No natural vegetation remains, but where present is part of the Lower Colorado Desertscrub vegetation community. Creosotebush and bursage would have dominated the landscape. Trees such as paloverde, ironwood, and mesquite would have bordered the larger drainages, and riparian vegetation would have grown along the Salt River.

BACKGROUND RESEARCH

Multiple projects have occurred near the Hayden House parcel (Figure 1; Table 1). The most relevant is ACS’s excavations across the street at the Hayden Mill site. They found both prehistoric and historic features (Stokes and Vargas 2008). Only a few prehistoric irrigation-related features were discovered. This suggests few if any prehistoric remains should be present in the current project area.

Both prehistoric and historic archaeological have been documented nearby (Figure 2; Table 2). The prehistoric site AZ U:9:115(ASM), the Terraced Butte Site, is located east of the parcel. The parcel was the site of the early 1870s Charles T. Hayden house, which is incorporated into the restaurant and will be preserved. This building is situated within AZ U:9:309(ASM), the Tempe Historic Townsite. Numerous historic buildings have been documented in Tempe, many considered individually eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (Figure 3).

CULTURAL CONTEXT

Evidence of human occupation in Arizona began approximately 10,000 B.C. The cultural development of the region is characterized by five main periods representing distinctly different lifeways: the Paleoindian period (10,000–8500 B.C.), the Archaic period (8500 B.C.–A.D. 100), the Formative period (A.D. 100–1450), the Protohistoric period (A.D. 1450–1694), and the Historic period (A.D. 1694–mid-1900s) (Table 3). The prehistoric developmental periods are further subdivided by archaeologists into chronological periods and phases based on differentiating patterns of behavior and material culture evident in the archaeological record. The following overview will focus on the Formative period, since this is when the nearby Terraced Butte site was occupied (Stokes and Vargas 2008).

Formative Period

Early Formative and Pioneer Periods

The Early Formative period (ca. A.D. 100–650) constitutes a time of transition with expansion of agricultural efforts, increase in sedentism, construction of more substantial pit structures, and incipient production of plain ware ceramics (Doyel 1993; Neily et al. 1999; Wallace et al. 1995). Evidence suggests a shared cultural pattern existed across southern Arizona during the initial phase (ca. A.D. 100–450/550) (Cable and Doyel 1987; Doyel 1993; LeBlanc 1982; Whittlesey 1995). This cultural pattern was characterized by semi-sedentary settlements with pit houses, large communal houses, plain ware pottery, large projectile points, basin and slab metates, flexed and seated inhumations, primary cremations, and floodwater agriculture. Small irrigation canals appeared in the lower Salt River Valley at this time.
Table 1. Summary of Previous Projects in or near the Project Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>In APE?</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994-166.ASM</td>
<td>Rio Salado Survey</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Foster and Turner 1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-226.ASM</td>
<td>Rio Salado Parkway</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Kwiatkowski 1997c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-227.ASM</td>
<td>Hayden's Ferry</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Kwiatkowski 1997b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-228.ASM</td>
<td>City of Tempe/Rio Salado</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
<td>Kwiatkowski 1997a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-87.ASM</td>
<td>Mill to Myrtle</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Wright 1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-536.ASM</td>
<td>Hayden Prehistory/General</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Kwiatkowski 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-587.ASM</td>
<td>PBNS Level 3 Fiber Optic Line</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Doak 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-36.ASM</td>
<td>Ash Avenue Fire Station No. 6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Kaldahl &amp; Dart 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-106.ASM</td>
<td>Tempe Performing Arts Center</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Kaldahl &amp; Dart 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-997.ASM</td>
<td>528 W. 1st Street</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Davis &amp; Hohmann 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-260.ASM</td>
<td>Downtown Tempe Transit Center</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Rogge et al. 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-785.ASM</td>
<td>Hayden Flour Mill</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Vargas et. al 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-50.ASM</td>
<td>1St Street and Roosevelt Street Survey</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Stahman 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-593.ASM</td>
<td>GEC Mill Avenue and 3rd Street Survey</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
<td>Breternitz &amp; Robinson 2007a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-607.ASM</td>
<td>Parcels 3A &amp; 3B, Marina Heights</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Breternitz &amp; Robinson 2007b,c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Summary of Previously Identified Cultural Resources in or near the Project Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AZ Site No.</th>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>In APE?</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FF:9:17(ASM)</td>
<td>Historic highway(SR 80)</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
<td>AZSITE 7437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T:10:84(ASM)</td>
<td>Historic railroad (SFPP)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>AZSITE 15311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U:9:6(ASM)</td>
<td>Historic ferry crossing (Hayden's Ferry)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>AZSITE 71409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U:9:49(ASM)</td>
<td>Historic buildings (Roy Hackett House and Hilge House/Bakery)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>AZSITE 71467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U:9:57(ASM)</td>
<td>Historic building (Petersen Building)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>AZSITE 78116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U:9:58(ASM)</td>
<td>Historic building (Andre Building)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>AZSITE 78117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U:9:60(ASM)</td>
<td>Historic building (Frankenberg House)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>AZSITE 78118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U:9:62(ASM)</td>
<td>Historic building (Our Lady of Mt. Carmel Catholic Church)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>AZSITE 78120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U:9:114(ASM)</td>
<td>Prehistoric petroglyphs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Stokes &amp; Vargas 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U:9:115(ASM)</td>
<td>Mesa 1:9(GP) Prehistoric village site (Terraced Butte Site)</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
<td>Kwiatkowski 1997b; Vargas et al. 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U:9:165(ASM)</td>
<td>Prehistoric village site (La Plaza Tempe)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Wright 2005a, b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U:9:3(ASU)</td>
<td>Historic foundation and other features</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>AZSITE 94127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U:9:73(ASU)</td>
<td>Historic canal (San Francisco Canal)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Kwiatkowski 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U:9:188(ASM)</td>
<td>Historic park (Tempe Beach Park)</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
<td>Kwiatkowski 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U:9:190(ASM)</td>
<td>Historic foundation (Hayden blacksmith shop)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Kwiatkowski 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U:9:216(ASM)</td>
<td>Historic residential and commercial foundations and prehistoric canal and pit</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Kwiatkowski 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U:9:278(ASM)</td>
<td>Historic flour mill (Hayden Flour Mill)</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
<td>Vargas et al. 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U:9:309(ASM)</td>
<td>Historic district (Tempe Historic Townsite)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Fangmeier 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U:9:94(ASU)</td>
<td>Historic railroad (Mesa-Winkelman spur)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Vargas et al. 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hayden House
Burial Monitoring and Discovery Plan
AZTEC Project No. AZG1523
Figure 3. Portion of the USGS 7.5' Tempe topographic quadrangle showing the project area documented historic buildings and structures in downtown Tempe.
Table 3. Cultural Chronology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Main Developmental Stages</th>
<th>Chronological Periods</th>
<th>Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 1900</td>
<td>HISTORIC</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 1800</td>
<td>PROTOHISTORIC</td>
<td>Protohistoric</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 1700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 1600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 1500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 1400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 1300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 1200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 1100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 900</td>
<td>FORMATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7000 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9000 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Vahki, Estrella, and Sweetwater phases—which, along with the Snaketown phase, traditionally comprised the Pioneer period in the Hohokam cultural chronology (Gladwin et al. 1937; Haury 1976)—can best be conceptualized as a continuation of the broad, regional cultural development of the Early Formative period. For this reason, the transition between the Early Formative and Pioneer periods is ambiguous. During the Vahki phase (ca. A.D. 450/550–650), both micaceous-tempered plain ware and red ware ceramics were produced and a figurine complex developed. Other characteristics include settlements with plaza-oriented layouts, the construction of large square houses, and a mortuary pattern incorporating both cremations in pits or trenches and flexed and semi-flexed inhumations (Doyel 1991). The hallmark of the following Estrella and Sweetwater phases (ca. A.D. 550/650–700) is the production of grooved and decorated red-on-gray ceramics. Although the large square houses continued to be constructed, they are smaller than those built during the Vahki phase and occur with smaller structures.
The presence of some intrusive elements, including macaws, shell, and turquoise, suggests the initiation of regional interaction and long-distance trade.

The Hohokam cultural pattern appears, at the earliest, during the Snaketown phase (ca. A.D. 700–750) of the Pioneer period or perhaps the subsequent Gila Butte phase (ca. A.D. 750–850) of the Colonial period (Wallace 1997; Wallace et al. 1995; Wilcox 1979; Wilcox and Sternberg 1983). As an integrated, regional belief and ritual system, the Hohokam cultural pattern initially appeared in the lower Salt River Valley and was characterized by the development of large-scale irrigation agriculture, red-on-buff pottery, a distinctive iconography, exotic ornaments and artifacts, a cremation mortuary complex, trash mounds, the adoption of public architecture such as ballcourts, and larger, more complex settlements.

Throughout the Hohokam Preclassic period (Snaketown through Sacaton phases), extending from A.D. 700 to around A.D. 1150 or 1200, the lower Salt River Valley can be considered the primary focus of Hohokam regional development. The Snaketown phase witnessed the first documented construction of canals on a large scale (Wilcox and Shenk 1977), trash mounds, and urn cremation burials (Haury 1976). There is evidence of Hohokam occupation outside the lower Salt River Valley during the Snaketown phase in river valleys, such as in the lower Verde River Valley and along the Santa Cruz in the Tucson Basin. This expansion continued in the subsequent Colonial period (ca. A.D. 750–950). By the end of the Sedentary period (ca. A.D. 1150/1200), a multitude of sites were occupied in the Salt and Gila river valleys and canal networks had attained their greatest levels of complexity.

**Colonial Period**

The Colonial period (ca. A.D. 750–950) is divided into the Gila Butte (ca. A.D. 750–850) and Santa Cruz (ca. A.D. 850–950) phases in the lower Salt River Valley. It is characterized by the establishment of numerous and widespread settlements throughout the area, the adoption of ballcourts as a public architectural component, the expansion of canal systems, and the spread of new material culture and an elaborate mortuary complex (Ciolek-Torrello and Wilcox 1988; Crown 1991; Czaplicki 1984; Doyel 1991; Gasser et al. 1990; Haury 1976; Howard 1993; Marmaduke and Henderson 1995; Neily et al. 1999; Wilcox and Sternberg 1983). Settlement patterns reveal increasing differentiation in site size and function (Gregory 1991); settlement hierarchies developed along irrigation systems in river valleys (Doyel 1991). Within sites, spatial patterning in groups of structures becomes apparent (Howard 1985). Ballcourts appeared as integrative structures at some villages by the early Gila Butte phase, which then increased in number and spatial extent throughout the remainder of the Colonial period. The number and size of ballcourts varied from village to village, suggesting a hierarchical structure within the regional system (Doyel 1991; Wilcox and Sternberg 1983).

**Sedentary Period**

The Sedentary period (ca. A.D. 950–1150), as represented by the Sacaton phase in the lower Salt River Valley, witnessed continued growth of the number, size, and extent of Hohokam settlements, ballcourts, and canal networks (Crown 1991; Debowksi et al. 1976; Doyel 1991; Doyel and Elson 1985; Haury 1976; Howard 1993; Wilcox and Sternberg 1983). Many large sites reached their maximum size and complexity at this time (Crown 1991). In peripheral drainage areas, the number of villages, hamlets, and farmsteads also increased. By the early Sedentary period, ballcourts were represented not only in the lower Salt River Valley but outside the valley as well. Hohokam influence and the ballcourt system had expanded to its greatest size (Doyel 1980; Wilcox and Sternberg 1983). It is also during this time that Hohokam exchange and interaction networks reached their greatest extent, and the amount of exotic materials at large sites may indicate that some social differentiation had developed (Doyel 1991; Nelson 1986). The intensive use of agricultural rock piles for cultivation of agave and possibly cholla, and non-irrigation agricultural intensification appears to stem from the late Sedentary and early Classic periods (Cantley 1991; Doyel 1993b; Fish et al. 1992a, 1992b; Masse 1991).

By the end of the Sedentary period, however, the Hohokam regional system appears to have weakened as ballcourts and many sites outside the lower Salt River Valley were abandoned and Hohokam populations were concentrated along major drainages (Ciolek-Torrello and Wilcox 1988; Craig 1999; Crown 1991; Doyel 1991; Gasser et al. 1990; Haury 1976; Wilcox and Sternberg 1983). Incipient platform mounds
were constructed in the lower Salt River Valley at this time, signaling the beginning of a change in public architecture (Gregory 1987; Haury 1976). Some ancestral villages such as Snaketown and Grewe were depopulated, and the populations shifted to nearby locations (Craig 1999; Crown 1991; Doyel 1980). Other changes included “…an increase in the production of red ware pottery, a decrease in the production of red-on-buff, an emphasis on urn cremation burial, and a decrease in the frequency of ornate artifacts” (Doyel 1991:253). These changes were concomitant with the downcutting and widening of the Gila and Salt rivers between A.D. 1020 and 1160 (Waters and Ravesloot 2000, 2001), which may have been caused by several clusters of major flooding events during this interval (Graybill et al. 1999).

**Classic Period**

During the Classic period (ca. A.D. 1150–1450)—divided into the Soho and Civano phases in the lower Salt River Valley—change in the structure of Hohokam communities was indicated by several factors. Changes culminating during the Soho phase included a shift in burial practices from primarily cremations to inhumations and urn cremations; the development of new domestic architectural forms, including post-reinforced and adobe-walled structures and walled compounds; a further reduction in red-on-buff pottery and an increase in red ware pottery production; and a change in regional networks reflected in a shift in the production and distribution of ceramic types and exotic materials (Crown 1991; Doyel 1980, 1991). The Soho phase also saw the decline and eventual collapse of the ballcourt system in the lower Salt River Valley and the florescence of another monumental architectural component, the platform mound (Gregory 1987). With roots in the Sedentary period (Gregory 1991), the platform mound reflected a change in Hohokam community organization that was manifested in settlement systems not only in the lower Salt River Valley, but over a much wider region. Although the rapid transformation during the Classic period appears dramatic, many of the developments were initiated in the Sedentary period.

A hierarchy of settlement types also emerged during the Classic period, including villages with only one or a few walled residential compounds and settlements with one or more platform mound compounds as well as other compounds (Doyel 1980, 1991). By the Civano phase, several large settlements contained one or more platform mounds, numerous compounds, a ballcourt, and a tower or great house. These various types of Classic period settlements have been postulated to form distinct irrigation communities—sociopolitical organizations consisting of a series of integrated villages that included one or more platform mound villages serving as administrative centers distributed along a single canal or canal system (Gregory 1991; Howard 1987). A shift in the use of platform mounds appears to have occurred during this phase, but the nature of that shift remains ambiguous. Researchers have pointed out that while some individuals may have resided in structures on or around platform mounds, these site features continued to contain artifacts and architectural elements different from assemblages found elsewhere (Bostwick and Downum 1994). Salado polychrome pottery, most of which was imported from outside the lower Salt River Valley, appears in ceramic assemblages at this time (Abbott and Schaller 1992; Crown 1991). Such developments may reflect increasing social differentiation, and possibly the existence of elite groups controlling and coordinating ritual and agricultural knowledge, interregional interaction, and access to resources (e.g., Doyel 1991; Wilcox 1991; Wilcox and Shenk 1977).

The end of the Classic period was marked by the collapse of the platform mound communities and the depopulation of the lower Salt and Gila river valleys. The abandonment of these late Classic period communities has been suggested to coincide with a period of drought and flood conditions that substantially reduced or destroyed the irrigation systems on which these communities relied (Nials et al. 1989). However, recent geoarchaeological testing in the adjacent middle Gila River Valley found no indication that the late Classic period collapse was preceded by major changes in the fluvial landscape. Given the close association of the Gila and Salt drainages, a similar conclusion was posited for the Salt River (Waters and Ravesloot 2001). Nevertheless, abrupt changes in community organization and integration were marked by the appearance of dispersed rancheria settlements with shallow pit structures, “degenerate” red ware ceramics, and indications of a mixed subsistence strategy; however, some Civano phase compounds possibly were reoccupied (Doyel 1991, 1995; Sires 1983; Teague and Crown 1984).
Protohistoric Period

The Protohistoric period (ca. A.D. 1450–1690) represents the time between the end of the Classic period and sustained Spanish contact. The archaeology of the period is poorly understood throughout southern Arizona, largely due to the small sample of excavated material, poor chronometric control, and lack of a cohesive interpretive framework (Whittlesey et al. 1998; Wilson 1999). As a result, the principal sources of information are Spanish ethnohistorical accounts that are relevant primarily to the late Protohistoric period.

In the 1690s, the Spanish identified two main subgroups of Upper Pimans occupying southern Arizona: the Akimel O’odham in the middle Gila River Valley (Bolton 1948; Doelle 1981; Ezell 1983; Gasser et al. 1990), and the Sobaipuri in the middle Santa Cruz and San Pedro river valleys (Bolton 1948; Doelle 1984; Masse 1981; Wallace and Doelle 1997). These accounts provide an outline of the Sobaipuri and O’odham settlement-subsistence systems in the 1690s. Most settlements were located in riverine settings and consisted of small, loosely clustered, brush-covered houses. Each village was self-sufficient, politically autonomous, and focused on agriculture (both floodwater and irrigation). While Piman villages were noted as far west as the confluence of the Salt and Gila rivers, hostilities with Yavapai to the north may have kept the Pima out of portions of the Salt River Valley in the late seventeenth century (Doyel 1989; Henderson and Hackbarth 1995). At present, few Protohistoric Akimel O’odham sites have been found in the Gila River Valley (Doelle 1981, 1984; Gasser et al. 1990; Ravesloot and Whittlesey 1987).

Historic Period

The Historic period (ca. A.D. 1690–1970) began with sustained Spanish contact and comprises the time for which written records of the region exist. It is divided into the Hispanic Era, encompassing the time of Spanish and Mexican occupation of what became Arizona, and the American Era, starting in 1848, when the area came under American control, to present. Since the likely historic resources to be found on this project would address the early history of Tempe, the following discussion will focus on the American Era and Tempe history.

The American Era (A.D. 1853–Present)

After gold was discovered in California in 1848, thousands of emigrants began to cross Arizona, heading west. Most of the travelers followed the Gila River to its confluence with the Colorado River, where fording was possible with the assistance of friendly Quechans. When California’s easy placer mining days were over, miners began to work their way eastward over the Sierra Nevadas and into Arizona. The first gold strike was in 1857 on the Gila River, a few miles east of the Gila-Colorado junction. Other ore discoveries were made in Mohave and Yavapai counties in the early 1860s. As mining communities flourished, new military posts were established to protect citizens from Indian depredations, especially those by the Yavapais and Western Apaches. This often resulted in permanent settlements near military installations.

The Territory of Arizona was created by President Abraham Lincoln in 1863 in response to politics of the Civil War, with a total of 72 million acres, the bulk of which was public domain. To accommodate private land ownership, a survey was necessary. The General Land Office began the first survey in 1867 with the initial point set at the confluence of the Gila and Salt rivers (today’s 115th Avenue/Avondale Boulevard and Baseline Road). The 36 sections (each a mile square) of a township (a six-mile-square grid) became the basis for homesteading in the Salt River Valley. A legal patent could be obtained in one of three ways: 1) by residing on the land for five years and claiming up to 160 acres; 2) by residing on the land for 14 months with commutation at $1.25 per acre; or 3) by an outright purchase of land.

Salt River Valley and Tempe

Euroamerican settlement of the Salt River Valley dates to 1865 with the building of a military post, Camp Verde (later known as Fort McDowell), near the confluence of the Verde and Salt rivers. Modern irrigation started almost by accident. In 1867, the Fort McDowell post sutler, John Y.T. Smith, expanded his forage supply by establishing a hay station on the Salt River to cut the wild grasses on the river bottom. Needing help, he hired Jack Swilling, a miner from Wickenburg, as his wagon master. Swilling
was intrigued with the weed-covered banks of earth that traversed the area (Peplow 1970). As Swilling, Smith, and others began to realize these were remnants of a prehistoric irrigation system, the idea was conceived for rebuilding the structures. That first canal, called the Swilling Ditch, was successful and was soon followed by other ditches on both sides of the river, often allegedly following the alignment of prehistoric canals. Economic prosperity seemed assured as Salt River water was made available to farms where settlers grew alfalfa, barley, corn, beans, sweet potatoes, and pumpkins for sale to the nearby military post of Fort McDowell, as well as to miners at the rich Vulture Mine, the village of Wickenburg, and other mining communities to the northwest. Over the next few decades, as the Army launched campaigns to suppress the Yavapais and Apaches, the door was opened for non-native settlement of the Salt River Valley.

Soon after the first canal was established, there were enough people in scattered settlements to establish an election precinct. In 1869, the first post office was opened with Jack Swilling as postmaster. By the end of 1870, an official townsite had been established.

The first settlers in Tempe were Mexican farmers from southern Arizona and northern Sonora who established fields around Tempe Butte. They helped excavate the first two irrigation canals, the Kirkland-McKinney Ditch and the San Francisco Canal. In 1872 some of these farmers founded the town of San Pablo east of the butte. In 1870 Charles T. Hayden cofounded the Hayden Milling and Farm Ditch Company and filed a claim for water rights, and in 1871 Hayden established a permanent ferry crossing west of the butte. In the following years they constructed the Hayden Ditch and a flour mill. Hayden also built a store, warehouses, blacksmith shops, a house, and other outbuildings. Once most of the building was completed he closed his Tucson establishment and moved to Tempe in 1873. In time both communities combined, and the town of Tempe was founded in 1879.

Expansion in land under cultivation and the consolidation of south side irrigation companies into the Tempe Irrigating Canal Company lead to an increase in raising alfalfa and other livestock feed as well as wheat, barley, and oats, which were milled into flour by the Hayden Mill. By the 1890s some farmers started growing dates and citrus (City of Tempe 2015; Vargas et al. 2008).

**RESEARCH ORIENTATION**

Since the archaeological investigations for this project would focus on human remains, the research potential would be directed towards basic information about the number, age, and sex of the individuals found during monitoring. Potentially, chronological and trade information also could be identified.

In addition to removing burials, basic information will be gathered on the archaeological features discovered during monitoring. Historic-period features with abundant artifacts could provide information relating to the early history of Tempe as well as information about Hayden's business. Although the potential is low, prehistoric features and artifacts would likely be associated with the nearby village Terrace Butte site and could provide information about activities that occurred on the site's periphery.

**FIELD METHODS AND APPROACH**

**Pre-Field Mobilization**

Since the project is on privately owned land and is using private funds, no archaeological permit is required. A burial agreement will be obtained. It is assumed that the contractor will handle contacting Bluestake and obtaining the appropriate permits. All work will be conducted in accordance with Occupational Safety and Health Administration safety requirements.

**Monitoring**

The construction contractor and client will notify AZTEC at least 48 hours before ground-disturbing activities are to occur. Utility relocations on the edge of the parcel and removal of the parking lots and building foundations will be monitored for archaeological resources. The parking lot and foundation removals could expose footings or foundations of earlier structures or the tops of excavated historic features such as privies and trash pits. The utility trenches could expose historic buried utilities or features that were near the edge of the parcel.
Since the majority of the parcel will be deeply excavated for a parking garage, a series of systematically placed trenches will be dug with a backhoe. These trenches, which will be space approximately 30 ft apart and run in a north-south alignment, will be monitored (Figure 4). It is anticipated the trench depth will be approximately 4.5 ft, to stay within the Occupational Safety and Health Administration guidelines. If deeper trenches are required proper safety procedures, such as stepping back, will be followed. In addition to exposing archaeological features, the trenches will provide information about the stratigraphy and identify the depth of the culturally sterile layer. Monitoring of the mass excavation will be limited to the sediments found above this layer.

General Field Methods

All trenches will be examined for prehistoric and historic archaeological resources. If human remains are found, all construction activities within 15 m (50 ft) should be halted, and the City of Tempe historic preservation officer will be notified immediately. The location of all features will be mapped and photographed.

Once the trenching is completed, an in-field meeting will be held with the City of Tempe historic preservation officer, the client, and AZTEC to determine which features, if any, require additional investigation and/or if additional trenching is needed.

Current archaeological recording techniques will be employed to document the field investigations. The selected features will be sampled, the fill will be screened, and artifacts will be collected or documented in the field.

Human Remains

For the burials, horizontal and vertical provenience, and collection of artifacts will be completed. Descriptive forms and logs will be completed for the investigations. Standardized field forms will be completed for each excavation unit and all discovered features. A 5-m (16 ft) area surrounding the burial will be investigated to determine if additional burials are present. All work will be confined to the project parcel; no archaeological investigations outside the parcel will occur.

Human remains will be excavated in their entirety by a qualified archaeologist. All associated feature fill will be screened through 1/8-inch wire mesh. Unless natural stratigraphy is encountered, burial features will be excavated in arbitrary 10-cm levels. Analysis will involve only non-invasive techniques. Scaled drawing will be prepared of each burial. Photography of mortuary features and/or their contents will be prohibited. Data collection will involve a general inventory of the number of bones and minimum number of individuals represented, measurements and written notation used to establish the age, sex, and any taxonomic or pathological changes or anomalies. All remains and associated objects will be wrapped in cotton batting and placed in paper bags and cardboard boxes for transport. Repatriation of the remains will follow the conditions of a burial agreement.

ARTIFACT ANALYSES

Grave goods discovered in association with human remains will be collected and kept in proximity to the remains. Artifacts observed in the trench walls may be collected if associated with a feature. All recovered artifacts will be processed and analyzed.

DISCOVERY

Should human remains be discovered by the contractor when an archaeologist is not present, all work within 50 ft of the discovery should be halted, and AZTEC should be contacted immediately. The contact will be Barbara Macnider (602-448-2954).

CURATION

The investigations involve privately owned land. A curation agreement has been obtained from the Tempe History Museum. All paperwork and the report will be submitted to the museum at the end of the project. In addition, if human remains are found a copy of the report will be sent to the ASM for review and, once approved, will be included in the repatriation files.
Figure 4. Schematic showing systematic trenches.

Sources: ADOT ATIS (2013); ESRI World Imagery (2013); NAD 83, UTM Zone 12

Map Disclaimer: This map is for general siting purposes only.
References Cited

Abbott, David R., and David M. Schaller

Bolton, Herbert E.

Bostwick, Todd W., and Christian E. Downum

Breternitz, Cory Dale, and Christine K. Robinson

Cable, John S., and David E. Doyel

Ciolek-Torrello, Richard, and David R. Wilcox (editors)

City of Tempe

Craig, Douglas B.
Crown, Patricia L.

Czaplicki, Jon S. (compiler)

Davis, Margaret "Peg," and John W. Hohmann

Doak, David P.

Doelle, William H.

Doyel, David E.

Ezell, Paul H.
Fangmeier, Kristin L.

Foster, Michael S., and Korri D. Turner

Gasser, Robert E., Christine K. Robinson, and Cory D. Breternitz (compilers)

Gladwin, Harold S., Emil W. Haury, Edwin B. Sayles, and Nora Gladwin

Graybill, Donald A., David A. Gregory, Gary S. Funkhouser, and Fred L. Nials

Gregory, David A.

Gregory, Michael M.

Haury, Emil W.

Henderson, T. Kathleen, and Mark R. Hackbarth
Howard, Jerry B.


Kaldahl, Eric J., and Allen Dart

Kwiatkowski, Scott M.
1997a *A Cultural Resources Survey of Portions of Second Avenue, First Street, Fifth Street, University Drive, Farmer Avenue, Roosevelt Street, Hardy Drive, Beck Avenue, and Priest Drive, Tempe, Maricopa County, Arizona*. Project Report No. 97:88, Archaeological Research Services, Inc., Tempe.


LeBlanc, Steven A.

Marmaduke, William S., and T. Kathleen Henderson

Masse, W. Bruce

Neily, Robert B., Richard Ciolek-Torrello, and Matthew A. Sterner

Nials, Fred L., David A. Gregory, and Donald A. Graybill

Peplow, Edward H., Jr. (editor)

Ravesloot, John C., and Stephanie M. Whittlesey

Rogge, A.E. (Gene), Kirsten Erickson, and Chad Kirvan

Sires, Earl W.

Stahman, Andrea

Stokes, Robert J., and Victoria D. Vargas

Teague, Lynn S., and Patricia L. Crown (editors)
Vargas, Victoria D., Thomas E. Jones, Scott Solliday, and Don W. Ryden

Wallace, Henry D.

Wallace, Henry D., and William H. Doelle

Wallace, Henry D., James D. Heidke, and William H. Doelle

Waters, Michael R., and John C. Ravesloot
2000 Late Quaternary Geology of the Middle Gila River, Gila River Indian Reservation, Arizona. *Quaternary Research* 54:49–57.

Whittlesey, Stephanie M.

Whittlesey, Stephanie M., William L. Deaver, and J. Jefferson Reid

Wilcox, David R.

Wilcox, David R., and Lynn O. Shenk
Wilcox, David R., and Charles Sternberg

Wilson, John P.

Wright, Thomas E.


CHARLES TRUMBALL HAYDEN HOUSE
(La Case Vieja)
(Monti's La Casa Vieja)
100 South Mill Avenue
Tempe
Maricopa
Arizona

HABS No. AZ-228

PHOTOGRAPHS

WRITTEN HISTORICAL AND DESCRIPTIVE DATA

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY
Intermountain Support Office – Denver
National Park Service
P.O. Box 25287
Denver, Colorado 80225-0287
HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDING SURVEY

CHARLES TRUMBULL HAYDEN HOUSE
(La Casa Vieja)
(Monti's La Casa Vieja)

HABS No. AZ-228

Location: The Charles Trumbull Hayden House is located at 100 South Mill Avenue, at the Southwest corner of Mill Road and Rio Salado Parkway

Present Owner And Occupant: Hayden House Tempe LLC/Not Currently Occupied

Significance: Built by Charles Trumbull Hayden in 1873, the house is one of the oldest extant Anglo-American buildings on the Salt River valley. Hayden and his family, including his son Senator Carl Hayden, lived at this residence through Senator Hayden's early childhood. The building is the oldest continually-occupied adobe structure in the city of Tempe. It is also a very good, increasingly-rare example of Sonoran-style adobe vernacular architecture, and Arizona's first example of preservation of an historic building, launching the career of prominent architect Robert T. Evans.

Historians: Robert G. Graham, Historical Architect, Motley Design Group LLC
Scott Solliday, Senior Architectural Historian, AZTEC Engineering Group, Inc.

Project Information: This HABS report was prepared for the owners of the structure, Hayden House Tempe LLC, to fulfill zoning ordinance requirements of a Planned Area Development (PAD) prior to redevelopment of the property. The PAD requires that: "Applicant shall contract with a qualified firm for preparation of an outline format Historic American Buildings Survey ("HABS") report documenting the entirety of the Historic Property, which is to be completed prior to commencement of any excavation construction, etc., on the overall development site. A duplicate copy of all HABS material submitted to the National Park Service shall be deposited with the Community Development Department." Motley Design Group LLC was the primary contractor, and was responsible for all photography, final document preparation and architectural description. AZTEC Engineering Group, Inc. provided consulting historian services, and was responsible for all historical information.
Part I. HISTORICAL INFORMATION

A. Physical History


2. **Architect:** Architect is not known for the original construction of the building: the vernacular design was presumably supervised by one of Charles T. Hayden’s Hispanic employees. Robert T. Evans was architect for the 1924 restoration of the building. Evans was an engineer, architect, and builder who gained local prominence for his exclusive use of adobe construction in central Arizona, 1924–1945.

3. **Original and subsequent owners, occupants, uses:** Charles T. Hayden was the original owner of the building. It was his primary residence between 1873 and 1889. The Hayden family moved to a new house in 1889, and the building was used as a board house between ca. 1889 and 1911. During this time the Hayden family retained ownership, except for brief intervals in the 1890s when creditors temporarily held title to the property. The building was vacant between ca. 1911 and 1921. Ownership was transferred to Hayden’s daughters, Sallie D. Hayden and Mary McEllherren, in 1921. It was converted into apartments in 1921, but in 1924 Hayden and McEllherren hired Robert T. Evans to restore the building to its original appearance. They operated the property as a tea house and restaurant known as La Casa Vieja between 1924 and 1932. Nellie P. Covert took title through foreclosure in 1935 and leased the building to various restaurateurs who continued to use the name La Casa Vieja. Leonard F. Monti bought the property in 1954, and the restaurant was known as Monti’s La Casa Vieja between 1954 and 2014.

4. **Builder, contractor, suppliers:** Original construction of the building was by C.T. Hayden Company. Contractor for the 1924 restoration is not documented, but was likely the (Robert T.) Evans Construction Company.

5. **Original plans and construction:** The first wing of the house was a north-south row of four interconnected rooms built of adobe block. Between 1876 and 1883 a second block of rooms extended west from the northernmost room, forming an L-shaped structure with an enclosed courtyard to the south. The building was flat roofed with vigas protruding from the exterior walls. A second floor room
was added above the northeast corner of the house around the time that the north wing was built.

Sources: Old Settlers Photograph Collection (Tempe History Museum); Janus Associates, Tempe Historic Property Survey, File HPS-146 (Tempe History Museum).

6. Alterations and additions:
   a. Several additions and alterations were made to the house in the 1880s and 1890s, including the addition or removal of individual rooms, and construction of a second-story wood-frame addition across the full length of the north wing, ca. 1893.

   b. In 1924 the building was restored back to its 1880s appearance. Robert T. Evans supervised the removal of all second story additions and other incompatible additions as well as repairs to all exterior and interior finishes.

   c. Later changes to convert the building into a large restaurant included covering the courtyard to create additional indoor dining space in ca. 1954; construction of a 5,000-square foot addition on the south end of the building in 1968; and construction of a 6,000-square foot addition on the south end of the building in 1979.

Sources: Old Settlers Photograph Collection (Tempe History Museum); Janus Associates, Tempe Historic Property Survey, File HPS-146 (Tempe History Museum).

B. Historical Context

Charles Trumbull Hayden

Charles Trumbull Hayden was a notable Arizona pioneer. Born on April 4, 1825, in Windsor, Connecticut, he moved west and became a prominent trader on the Santa Fe Trail, and one of the first Anglo-American merchants to open a business in Tucson. He is generally credited as being the founder of Tempe. As a young man, Hayden began his career as a teacher. He taught in New Jersey, Kentucky, Indiana, and Missouri, but when he arrived in Independence, Missouri, in the late 1840s he took a job as a clerk in a mercantile business. In 1848 Hayden bought a wagon and went to Santa Fe with a load of goods. His first independent business venture was quite profitable. Hayden decided to stay and open a store in Santa Fe. With a partner in Missouri providing a stock of trade goods, Hayden established one of the most successful freighting businesses operating on the Santa Fe Trail in the 1850s. The Gadsden Purchase was negotiated with
the Mexican government in 1853, and in 1856 the United States took possession of what are now the southernmost portions of Arizona and New Mexico. Seeing a new opportunity, Hayden immediately went to Tubac, a small isolated village south of Tucson that had become the headquarters for the Santa Rita Silver Mining Company. There was clearly a market for tools, manufactured goods, and other provisions in this western part of New Mexico, which would later become the Arizona Territory; Hayden planned to be one of the first to serve it. When an overland mail route from St. Louis to San Francisco was established in 1858, Hayden was a passenger on the first regularly scheduled stage coach to arrive in Tucson. He opened a store in Tucson, which would become the new base of operations for his mercantile company. Hayden was among the first non-native settlers in the old Mexican village, which had a population of about 500. His freighting business quickly grew to become one of the largest commercial enterprises in the Arizona Territory. Hayden’s wagons were loaded with goods at the ports of San Diego, San Francisco, and Guaymas, Sonora; at Fort Yuma, where supplies were brought up the Colorado River by steamboat; and at supply points on the old trade routes to Missouri and Arkansas. Within five years, the Tucson-based C.T. Hayden Company was supplying food, livestock feed, lumber, and all types of goods to dozens of mining camps and army forts throughout the Arizona Territory.¹

Hayden’s Ferry

In 1866 the United States Army’s Military Department of Arizona moved its headquarters from Tucson to Whipple Barracks near Prescott. Hayden had frequently bid on contracts to supply military posts, so he made his first trip to the northern part of Arizona Territory. Stopping at Florence, he was advised that the best crossing on the Salt River was at a point where a large butte and a small butte rose above the south bank of the channel. When he reached the Salt River Valley, the river was at flood stage, and he had to camp at the crossing site for two days before the water receded enough that he could safely cross with his wagons. During this time he climbed to the top of the larger butte and surveyed the valley. He noted the fertile floodplains, an abundance of water, and the potential for agricultural development of the unsettled valley. Also, a site at the base of the butte was ideal for the construction of a water-powered flour mill, and there was a natural bedrock ford there for crossing the river, which would make the area an important link in a north-south trail across the territory. A few years later, hundreds of

farmers had settled in the Salt River Valley, and Hayden made plans to once again be among the first to establish trade in a rapidly growing new community.\textsuperscript{2}

Charles Hayden returned to the Salt River Valley in the fall of 1870, purchased 50,000 pounds of wheat and barley, much of it the first harvest by local farmers, and delivered the grain to Prescott. On the return trip he again stopped at Salt River to talk to John W. Swilling, who had directed most of the canal building in the area. Construction of Swilling’s first canal on the north side of the river in 1867 led to the formation of the Phoenix townsite. In 1869 Hispanic settlers from Tucson and northern Sonora started excavating two small canals on the south side of the river: the McKinney and Kirkland Ditch, which irrigated a few quarter-sections east of the butte Hayden had climbed years earlier, and the San Francisco Ditch, which ran west of the butte. Both canals ran along the narrow terrace just above the riverbed. By late 1870 Swilling was organizing another large-scale irrigation system on the south side. He joined with B.W. Hardy, James L. Mercer, J. O. Sherman, John Olvaney, and J. E. Ingersoll to form the Hardy Irrigating Canal Company to extend a new canal far to the south. The group filed a claim to take 20,000 miner’s inches of water from the Salt River. Charles Hayden had just filed his own claim for 10,000 miner’s inches and formed the Hayden Milling and Farm Ditch Company with four associates to excavate another canal and build a water-powered flour mill. In January 1871 Swilling and Hardy abandoned their effort, and the company was reorganized as the Tempe Irrigating Canal Company to combine the Hardy and Hayden efforts as well as the McKinney and Kirkland canals into a single irrigation system with one head on the river.\textsuperscript{3}

The founding partners for the Tempe Irrigating Canal Company were able to buy two shares of stock for $200 and a contribution of tools and provisions, with an option to buy additional shares. Those with no money could obtain a $200 share in the company through their labor, credited at three dollars per day of work, plus four dollars per day for each team of draft animals provided. One share of stock entitled the holder to enough water to irrigate a quarter-section (160 acres). Hayden acquired 17 shares in the Tempe Canal and 17 shares in the McKinney and Kirkland Ditch, which would provide a flow of up to 2,000 miner’s inches. He planned to build a flour mill, and that was the volume of water that would be needed to turn the heavy milling stones. By 1872 a trunk


\textsuperscript{3} Christine Lewis, “The Early History of the Tempe Canal Company,” Arizona and the West 7 (Autumn 1965):229–230; Fred Andersen, Tempe Canal: Photographs, Written Historical and Descriptive Data (Historic American Engineering Record No. AZ-16, 1989), 2–6; Tempe Irrigating Canal Company, Minutes, 1870-1879 (Salt River Project Archives, Tempe); Maricopa County Recorder [MCR], Canals Book 1, page 43; Weekly Arizona Miner, December 17, 31, 1870.
ditch ran a half mile from the headgate on the river, and water was then diverted into several branch canals. The McKinney and Kirkland Ditch was enlarged to deliver water to the Hayden Ditch, which brought water around the south edge of the butte to the mill site. By September 1875, 109 shares in the company had been sold, and the canal system was essentially completed with a total carrying capacity of 11,000 miner's inches. Shares in the Tempe Irrigating Canal Company were very valuable and were often sold, divided, or rented. With a reliable supply of irrigations water, farmers were soon producing large harvests of wheat, barley, and oats, and providing a steady supply of grain that Hayden needed for his and freighting business and the flour mill he was building.4

Charles Hayden spent considerable time in the Salt River Valley during the canal planning and negotiations in early 1871. Before he returned to Tucson he selected a site on the west side of the butte and directed his employee, John J. Hill, to construct a store and a ferry on the river. The first store was a simple structure made of willow poles and adobe covered with brush and mud. Hill sold tools, shoes, food, and household goods to the nearby settlers. The ferry was a heavy wooden boat tethered to a cable stretched across the river. It was large enough to carry a wagon and team. The ferry was only put in operation when the river was too high to ford. Hayden understood the importance of the site where he planned to establish his new commercial operations. The ideal location for his flour mill would be at the base of the butte because water to turn a turbine or water wheel could be delivered through the Hayden Ditch. With the only reliable crossing on the Salt River regardless of fluctuating water levels, Hayden's wagons could freely travel north or south, and a multitude of travelers would patronize his store and ferry. Hayden called the settlement Hayden's Ferry. The Hayden's Ferry Post Office was established on April 25, 1872, with Hill as postmaster.5

Workers started laying the foundation for a three-story flour mill in fall 1872. In mid-1873 a permanent building for the store was built about 200 feet west of the mill, and a row of four rooms extending north from the store was the beginning of the Hayden house. All structures were of adobe construction, using a minimal amount of lumber, which had to be hauled from Prescott by Hayden's teamsters. An underground pipeline

4 Lewis, "Early History of the Tempe Canal Company," 229–230; Andersen, Tempe Canal, 7-10; Tempe Irrigating Canal Company, Minutes; Earl Zarbin, Two Sides of the River: Salt River Valley Canals, 1867-1902 (Tempe: Salt River Project, 1997), 25, 36; Salt River Herald, January 26, 1878.

running from the Hayden Canal provided water for the house. In December 1873 Hayden sold his Tucson store and moved his residence and all of his business operations to his new headquarters in the Salt River Valley.⁶

As the mill was being completed in 1874, Hayden filed Preemption Entry No. 50 with the General Land Office. The Pre-Emption Act of 1841 granted a settler the first right to purchase up to 160 acres of public land at $1.25 per acre if improvements had been made, such as building a house. Unlike the Homestead Act, no clearing and cultivation of fields was required.⁷ Hayden filed a declaratory statement and paid $200, and on October 20, 1875, was granted a patent for the south half of the northwest quarter and the north half of the southwest quarter of Section 15, Township 1 North, Range 4 East, a 160-acre tract roughly bounded by what is now the north bank of the Salt River, 5th Street, the top of Tempe Butte, and the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks.⁸

In 1875 Hayden’s Ferry consisted of the four-room Hayden House, the C.T. Hayden Company store, the Hayden Flour Mill, and the ferry. The Hayden Flour Mill was powered by water flowing through the Hayden Canal and over a 25-foot waterfall to turn a 30½-inch turbine water wheel. It began operation in 1874 with two sets of grinding stones; by about 1880 it was operating with four sets of stones and processing more than 2,000 pounds of wheat per day.⁹ Construction of an additional wing on the Hayden House during this time more than doubled the size of the structure. The new block of rooms extended from the northernmost room of the original building westward to form the north part of the house. An adobe wall running from the northwest corner of the house to the store on the south created an enclosed courtyard. An entry on the north façade opened to a broad zaguan that led into the courtyard. In 1876 Charles Hayden brought in enough lumber to install what was reportedly the first wooden floor in the Salt River Valley. A second story adobe addition was built on the northeast corner of the house sometime between 1876 and 1883. With these additions, as well as other

⁶ Hayden, Charles Trumbull Hayden, Pioneer, 38–39; Fireman, “Charles Trumbull Hayden.”


⁹ “Salt River Valley – It’s Ditches and Mills,” Arizona Illustrated Quarterly, April 1881; Phoenix Herald, September 29, 1882.
alterations made in the 1890s, the design of the Hayden House was frequently adapted to the changing needs of Charles Hayden and his family.\(^{10}\)

The Hayden House was located near the center of Hayden’s Ferry; by 1880 it was surrounded by dozens of structures housing many interrelated businesses that were a part of the C.T. Hayden Company. The flour mill and the butte dominated the east half of the property. A large adobe building, built north of the mill ca. 1878, housed a blacksmith shop with three forges and a wagonmaker’s shop, operations that were vital to Hayden’s freighting business but also served other teamsters and travelers. A second floor addition on the building was briefly occupied by the short-lived Salt River Valley News; other rooms provided storage for sacks of grain. Several adobe rowhouses were also built north of the mill, facing the river, to house Hayden’s employees. A sugar mill was installed inside the flour mill structure ca. 1878 to process sugar cane that the Gonzales family, one of the largest groups of settlers in the area, had brought from Sonora and planted along the river bed. Hayden later planted amber sorghum for producing molasses as well. By 1881 annual production of panocha (sugar cake) and syrup was more than 10,000 pounds. Bran and other waste products from the flour milling process were fed to hogs that were held in pens just northeast of the mill. By the 1880s, up to 1,000 hogs were being slaughtered each year. Hayden had a steady supply of bacon, ham, and lard for his customers. There was also a soap factory near the mill, which used rendered fat.\(^{11}\) All of the mules and horses for Hayden’s freighting business were kept in stalls and corrals to the west of the house and store, where there also were a large adobe barn, carriage room, harness room, and a pen for dairy cows. Orchards were planted in the northwest corner of Hayden’s property, between his home and the river, and along the western boundary of the parcel. In 1879, 300 orange trees were planted; 400 more trees were planted in 1880, including figs, lemons, pomegranates, apples, pears, peaches, apricots, nectarines, cherries, and plums. By 1880 Hayden had bought another 400 acres to the south of Hayden’s Ferry from earlier settlers who chose to leave. These fields were planted in alfalfa, wheat, and sorghum. Within just 10 years,

---


Hayden’s Ferry was producing a broad range of food and feed to be sold locally or delivered to towns throughout the territory.\(^{12}\)

Charles Hayden’s businesses flourished at Hayden’s Ferry. Through the 1870s his teamsters made regular deliveries to Date Creek, Wickenburg, Prescott, McDowell, Tucson, Florence, Silver King, and Yuma. Because bands of Apaches and Yavapais often attacked any travelers on the well-traveled trails, several wagons made the trip together. A train of wagons often carried up to 50,000 pounds of wheat and barley. He opened small trading posts in Prescott, Wickenburg, Gillette, Tip Top, Sacaton, and Casa Blanca. When the teamsters went to Prescott they returned with lumber. At Sacaton and Casa Blanca, on the Gila River Indian Reservation, he traded manufactured goods for sacks of wheat.\(^{13}\) When the Southern Pacific Railroad was completed through the southern part of the Arizona Territory in 1880, Hayden lost the very profitable work of long-distance freight hauling. However, this meant he had access to a much greater volume of goods. Hayden’s wagons regularly made the journey to the railhead at Maricopa, bringing back 2,000–10,000 pounds of goods every week, more than anyone else in Maricopa County in early 1880s. His store was large enough to accommodate his ever-expanding stock, which now included wagons, farm machinery, dry goods, stationary, canned goods, nails, silk, clocks, boots, shoes, playing cards, and Spanish-English dictionaries. The mill was producing 1.4 million pounds of flour each year, as well as processed barley for feed for livestock.\(^{14}\)

Charles T. Hayden’s diverse but interconnected business ventures brought him prosperity; they also greatly benefitted settlers under the Tempe Canal. He provided a market for all locally produced grain and was the first to bring manufactured goods to the isolated area. Hayden also employed 50 men by 1880 as his teamsters, blacksmiths carpenters, mill workers, and clerks.\(^{15}\) He played a critical role in promoting the rapid development of the first community on the south side of the Salt River. Most histories and biographies written in the 20\(^{th}\) century proclaim Hayden as the founder of Tempe,\(^{16}\)

\(^{12}\) Hayden, Charles Trumbull Hayden, Pioneer, 38-39, 48–49; Fireman, “Charles Trumbull Hayden;” Salt River Herald, April 20, 1878; Phoenix Herald, December 10, 1880; Arizona Citizen, September 25, 1881; Arizona Gazette, June 12, 1882, June 20, 1883.

\(^{13}\) Hayden, Charles Trumbull Hayden, Pioneer, 14–18; Weekly Arizona Miner, March 8, 22, 29, April 5, 12, 1873.

\(^{14}\) Hayden, Charles Trumbull Hayden, Pioneer, 40, 45–47; Phoenix Herald, July 29, August 3, September 6, 1880; “Salt River Valley – It’s Ditches and Mills;” Arizona Republican, December 25, 1901

\(^{15}\) “Salt River Valley – It’s Ditches and Mills.”

\(^{16}\) Portrait and Biographical Record of Arizona (Chicago: Chapman Publishing Co., 1901), 871; Farish, History of Arizona, vol. 6, 104-109; Robinson and Bonham, “A History of Early Tempe;”
however, this is an overstated and Anglo-centric interpretation, based on the claim the Hayden’s Ferry was renamed Tempe, as the name of the post office was changed from Hayden’s Ferry to Tempe in 1879. The broader region surrounding Hayden’s Ferry was known as Tempe since 1871. It included dozens of Hispanic families from Tucson and northern Sonora who had settled in the area in 1869 and completed excavation of the McKinney and Kirkland Ditch and the San Francisco Ditch in 1870. By the time Hayden built his house, store, and mill, there was already a sizeable town just to the east, initially known as San Pablo and platted as Tempe, but later referred to as Old Tempe, East Tempe, or Mexican Town.\(^\text{17}\)

**The Hayden Family in Tempe**

Charles T. Hayden married Sallie Calvert Davis in Nevada City, California, on October 4, 1876. After the wedding they traveled to San Bernardino by railroad, and continued the journey to Hayden’s Ferry on one of Hayden’s wagons. On October 2, 1877, the Haydens' first child, Carl, was born. Three daughters—Sara, Mary, and Annie—soon followed. Charles Hayden went to great lengths to provide a comfortable life for his family, and the Hayden House featured the first wood floor and the first Bermuda grass lawn in the Salt River Valley. However, things were rapidly changing in the rustic frontier settlement. With the completion of the Maricopa and Phoenix Railroad, a spur line from Southern Pacific station at Maricopa, there was direct rail service to Tempe and Phoenix. With the arrival of the first train in 1887, investors who had financed the railroad formed the Tempe Land and Improvement Company to develop and promote a modern townsite at Tempe. They bought 305 acres from Charles Hayden and another 400 acres of lands to the south from others. The Tempe townsite was surveyed, and blocks, lots, and streets were laid out. This immediately started a construction boom. New homes and businesses were being built within a month, and property values started rising.\(^\text{18}\)


opening of new mercantile firms. From late 1883 to early 1885 at least 21 lawsuits were filed against Hayden, mostly by California firms that had provided a large volume of manufactured goods on credit.\(^{19}\) Wealthy local farmers Michael Wormser and Neils Petersen offered Hayden financial assistance and took over some of his business operations until they were repaid. Hayden also consolidated debts with mortgages on his large landholdings. In 1887 he was able to make a payment of $20,000 to Alexander Davis of St. Louis, Missouri, for a partial release of mortgage so that he could sell some properties without restriction and raise enough money to settle his remaining debt. Five years later he paid Davis the balance of $30,000.\(^{20}\)

In 1891 the *Arizona Daily Star* estimated Charles Hayden's net assets to be $150,000; however, many disastrous events outside his control continued to plague his business for another decade. In the late 1880s the Arizona Canal Company built a massive new canal to consolidate all irrigation systems on the north side of the river and open new farmland farther north. This caused a considerable drop in the flow of the Salt River downstream, and due to the decreasing amount of water flowing into the Tempe Canal, Hayden was required to cut mill operations down to just two days per week. In 1888 Hayden filed suit against the operators of the Arizona Canal, claiming that he was entitled to use enough water to operate his mill but the upstream appropriation denied his prior right to the river water. Hayden's action was one of many demanding clarification of vaguely defined water rights in the Salt River Valley. Judge Joseph H. Kibbey, of the U.S. District Court's 2nd Judicial District, consolidated Hayden's case with others and the case was renamed *Charles T. Hayden vs. Arizona Canal Company, et al* with *Wormser, et al vs. Salt River Valley Canal Company, et al*. Hayden was assured some relief in 1890, and in 1892 Kibbey decided the case in favor of the earliest water users, concluding that Hayden, the Tempe farmers, and the others had priority rights to the Salt River.\(^{21}\)

This case was followed by very destructive floods hit the Salt River Valley in 1890 and 1891, washing away farmlands and homes. This was followed by the Panic of 1893, which precipitated a devastating national depression through the mid-1890s. Apparently Hayden was too quick to forgive debts owed to him by local farmers, contributing to his losses. Joseph A. Ford of the San Francisco firm of Murphy, Grant & Company took over management of Hayden's store on two different occasions but

\(^{19}\) Maricopa County Civil Cases, Register of Actions.

\(^{20}\) Fireman, "Charles Trumbull Hayden;" Vargas et al., *Hayden Flour Mill*, 179–180; MCR, Mortgage Release, Document #18870001437, recorded May 2, 1887; MCR, Mortgage Release, Document #18920001246, recorded February 19, 1892.

Hayden always managed to repay his debts and hold on to his most important properties.\textsuperscript{22}

The Hayden family lived in the house on Mill Avenue through the 1870s and 1880s, but the Tempe Land and Improvement Company’s aggressive promotion of the townsite brought new residents and the construction of new homes and stores started crowding the house and grounds. In 1889 the Haydens moved to a spacious 80-acre ranch two miles east of town. Sallie Hayden acquired a cash entry patent for the north half of the northwest quarter of Section 24, Township 1 North, Range 4 East, in 1894.\textsuperscript{23} After the family moved out of the old Hayden House it was used as a boarding house, with most of the tenants being employees of the C.T. Hayden Company. Initially, the family planned to turn the building into a hotel known as Hayden’s Lodging House or Hotel Hayden. In ca. 1893 a second story addition was built across the full length of the north wing. As late as 1897 there was still optimism that the building would be a successful hotel:

Mrs. E.N. Durley, late of Wichita, Kansas, has taken charge of Hayden House, which is undergoing many improvements. The location and arrangements of Hayden House make it particularly desirable place for people coming here to spend the winter and for Normal School students. It is quiet and homelike and is altogether the most desirable place in town.\textsuperscript{24}

However, Hotel Hayden never had more than a handful of boarders, and the physical condition of the structure declined until it was closed in 1911.\textsuperscript{25}

Charles Trumbull Hayden died on February 5, 1900, just before his 75th birthday. He was mourned as one of the last true pioneers of Arizona. He had a reputation as an honest and generous businessman, and was greatly respected for his contributions to Tempe and Arizona. Hayden was the primary employer for Tempe’s Mexican-American community, where he was known as "Don Carlos." He extended credit and support to the first Mormon settlers who founded Mesa, and he was an outspoken defender of the Pimas and Maricopas at a time when there was bitter hostility toward any Native

\textsuperscript{22} Fireman, “Charles Trumbull Hayden;” Vargas et al., Hayden Flour Mill, 49, 83, 86–90, 179–180; MCR, Deed, Document #18890000108, recorded March 27, 1889; Tempe News, April 20, 1895.

\textsuperscript{23} Janus Associates, File HPS-146; U.S. Bureau of Land Management, General Land Office Records Database.

\textsuperscript{24} Tempe News, September 4, 1897.

\textsuperscript{25} Fireman, “Charles Trumbull Hayden;” Vargas et al., Hayden Flour Mill, 45; Tempe News, March 11, 1894; Arizona Gazette, April 4, 1895.
Americans in the valley. He had served as Probate Judge during his time in Tucson and as a County Supervisor for Maricopa County in the 1880s. Hayden also worked successfully for the establishment of the Territorial Normal School in Tempe, which has grown to become Arizona State University. At the time of his passing, Tempe was entering a new era at the turn of the century.26

His son Carl Hayden had served as secretary of the C.T. Hayden Company, and though his father had discussed future plans for the company with him, Carl’s ambitions were not as a merchant. After his father’s death he returned to Tempe from Stanford University and reluctantly took charge of the family business. As one of his first significant changes, Carl Hayden had the first electric lights installed in the flour mill, store, and hotel.27 However, his primary concern was to begin liquidating the company assets. Carl Hayden joined John S. Armstrong’s Arizona Mercantile Company as secretary. He transferred his father’s inventory to the partnership in 1901 and closed the C.T. Hayden Store. The Hayden Flour Mill was leased to Alfred J. Peters, who had helped manage his father’s businesses for more than 20 years. The Hayden House, which was occupied by employees of both the mill and the Arizona Mercantile Company, was managed by Mrs. E.A. Hackett.28

Charles Hayden’s widow, Sallie D. Hayden, died in 1907. The distribution of the estate to her three surviving children in 1910 gave Carl, Sara, and Mary each a one-third interest in the remaining properties. The Hayden siblings initially did nothing with these properties. Carl was busy pursuing a career in government; Sara (who now went by the name Sallie) was a student at the Tempe Normal School and later at Stanford University; and Mary married Larry McElherren and devoted her time to raising a family. They sold the family ranch east of Tempe, but the old Hayden House on Mill Avenue sat vacant for 10 years.29

**Carl Hayden**


27 *Tempe News*, September 21, 1900.


29 Janus Associates, File HPS-146; MCR, Decree of Distribution of Estate, Document #19100008566, recorded October 19, 1910; MCR, Quit Claim Deed, Document #19190002805, recorded June 20, 1919.
Charles and Sallie Hayden’s son, Carl Trumbull Hayden, also was a very prominent figure in Arizona history. He was born in the Charles Hayden House on October 2, 1877, and lived there until the family moved to their ranch east of town in 1889. Carl Hayden graduated from the Territorial Normal School in Tempe in 1896 and attended Stanford University, 1896–1900. He returned home when his father died in 1900 and became president and general manager of the C. T. Hayden Company, but he sold or leased all remaining business interests by 1904. Carl Hayden’s primary ambition was in politics. He was elected to the Tempe Town Council in 1902 and was a delegate from Arizona to the Democrat National Convention in 1904. He served as Maricopa County treasurer, 1905–06, and Maricopa County sheriff, 1907–12. There was one particular incident during his tenure as sheriff that he became widely known in Arizona. On May 21, 1910 armed men robbed a train in Tempe and fled on horseback. Hayden borrowed one of the few automobiles in town, chased the robbers down, and arrested them. He married Nan Downing in 1908 and moved from the Hayden ranch near Tempe to Phoenix. When Arizona was granted statehood in 1912, Carl Hayden was elected as Arizona’s first representative in the U.S. House of Representatives. He served in the House for 14 years and was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1926, where he served until 1969. During his long congressional career he was a strong advocate for federal funding for highways and reclamation projects, two areas that were of great importance for the development of Arizona. He served 56 years in Congress, which at the time of his retirement was the longest that anyone had ever served. He died on January 25, 1972. As his birthplace and childhood home, the Hayden House is the one site most closely associated with the life of Senator Carl Hayden.\(^{30}\)

**Robert T. Evans**

After 1910, the C.T. Hayden Company consisted of Carl Hayden, president; Sallie D. (Sara) Hayden, vice president; and Mary H. McElltherren, secretary. In 1921 the Haydens divided the last remaining property, the old Hayden House at First Street and Mill Avenue. Sallie and Mary received joint title to the east half of Block 66, which included the Hayden House and the C.T. Hayden Company store, and Carl took ownership of the largely undeveloped west half of Block 66.\(^{31}\) Sallie Hayden had returned to Tempe to teach at the Tempe Normal School, and the Hayden sisters decided to do something with the decrepit old adobe complex. The flour mill had been destroyed by fire in 1917, and a modern concrete building had been built to replace it. The Hayden House and the store, across the street from the new Hayden Flour Mill, were the only remaining
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\(^{31}\) MCR, Warranty Deed, Document #19210003781, recorded 14 Sept 1921; MCR, Warranty Deed, Document #19210003782, recorded September 14, 1921.
reminders of their father’s sprawling estate at Hayden’s Ferry, but they had sat empty and deteriorating for the past 10 years. The Hayden sisters announced their plans for repairing the house and converting it into apartments. The old Hayden store at the south end of the house was razed, and a new store was to be built on the northwest corner of the block, at First Street and Maple Avenue.\textsuperscript{32} However, three years later, the Hayden Apartments, also known as the Hayden House, was not a successful venture. In 1924 the Hayden sisters planned a complete restoration of the old house to take it back to its original Sonoran style adobe design. They hired Robert T. Evans to manage the project, and Sallie, Mary, and Mary’s husband, Larry McEllherren, mortgaged the property for a $5,000 loan from Fidelity Building and Loan Association to cover the cost of remodeling the Hayden House.\textsuperscript{33}

Robert T. Evans, an engineer and architect, came to Arizona in 1923 to visit his mother, renowned landscape artist Jessie Benton Evans. He had received an engineering degree from Armour Institute of Technology in Chicago and studied architecture at the University of Freiberg in Germany. His mother owned a large tract of desert land on the south slope of Camelback Mountain and offered a 12-acre parcel to her son if he chose to stay. Robert Evans decided to stay and went on to establish a notable career in central Arizona, where he became known for his design and construction of modern homes using adobe as the primary building material. His first project in Arizona was in 1924, when the Hayden sisters hired him to restore the Charles Hayden House.\textsuperscript{34}

The old adobe building had never had an apparent final design; it had been constantly built onto and altered over a period of 20 years, with its evolution based more on the pragmatic needs of the Hayden family. There are no known accounts of the work done in 1924 as it progressed, but it appears to have been completed fairly quickly. Evans removed the upper story and numerous incompatible additions, leaving a smaller L-shaped structure consisting of the earliest adobe walls. Exterior walls were refinished with plaster. The original courtyard was preserved, with adobe walls on the south and west that were either restored or rebuilt. There is no documentation of what features were preserved or what elements might have been reconstructed or designed by Evans, but the old house was presumably restored back to its 1880s form and appearance.

\textsuperscript{32} Tempe News, May 18, August 10, 31, 1921.

\textsuperscript{33} Woodward, et al., Tempe Historic Property Survey; Janus Associates, File HPS-146; MCR, Mortgage, Document #19240006224, recorded October 11, 1924.

However, James H. McClintock, a Phoenix pioneer and official state historian, had visited Charles Hayden during that period, and after completion of the work he commented that the elegantly finished structure exhibited “Spanish and Mexican touches the old house never knew.” 35 The Hayden House was more than 50 years old at the time, and this was the first restoration of a historic building in Arizona.

It appears that this particular project inspired Robert T. Evans and influenced his later career. He established the Evans Construction Company, which worked strictly with adobe construction. He designed and built the Jokake Tea House near Scottsdale in 1926, and over the following years added guest rooms and the distinctive bell towers that created the iconic entrance of the Jokake Inn. He designed and built several impressive adobe homes in the Pueblo Revival style in the Arcadia area near Camelback Mountain in the 1920s and 1930s. Most of his houses were large high-style residences, but in 1935 he built modest adobe homes in the Subsistence Homesteads tract in Phoenix for the Federal Resettlement Administration. These Pueblo Revival-style houses were built at cost of only $2,000 each and now make up a large part of the Phoenix Homesteads Historic District. 36

La Casa Vieja

On November 7, 1924, the Hayden sisters had the formal opening of their tea house and restaurant in the rehabilitated landmark. It was called La Casa Vieja, or "the old house." The long list of guests in attendance on that evening included Robert T. Evans, former state historian James McClintock, and what appeared to be a majority of the business owners and civic leaders of Tempe. La Casa Vieja was an immediate success. With seating for up to 70 guests, it was filled to capacity each evening. The restaurant offered Spanish [Mexican] dinners, luncheons, and teas. 37 Some finishing touches were still being added to the building through 1925. Ornate shutters were installed on the windows, and a cobblestone fountain was built in the courtyard. La Casa Vieja was closed during the hot summer months. The formal opening for the second season was on October 2, 1925, and featured an elegant dinner and a musical program. 38

Soon after opening the business the Hayden sisters formed a partnership with Louise B. Lynd, another teacher at the Tempe Normal School (which was renamed Arizona State Teachers College in 1925). La Casa Vieja was incorporated in 1926, with Louise B. Lynd as president, Sallie D. Hayden as vice president, and Mary H. McEllherren, as secretary-
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35 Arizona Republic, November 6, 1924.
37 Arizona Republic, November 6, 1924; Tempe News, November 8, 19, 1924.
38 Tempe News, April 18, October 3, 1925.
treasurer. Both Hayden and Lynd lived on the property.\textsuperscript{39} The costs of operating an elegant formal dining room were undoubtedly high, and revenues were perhaps not as high as anticipated, for the Hayden sisters had problems managing their debt for several years. They paid off the original 1924 mortgage from Fidelity Building and Loan Association in March 1926, and a second loan from Tempe National Bank for $2,500 in 1928, but then mortgaged the property to Christy and Culver for a loan of $8,000.\textsuperscript{40} As the economic slowdown of the Great Depression set in, they fell behind in their mortgage payments. By this time Christy and Culver had sold the note on the property to Nellie P. Covert, who brought suit against the Hayden family and Christy and Culver. (MCR, Notice of Pending Foreclosure, Document #19320014553, recorded July 2, 1932) The restaurant was closed in 1932, and the Hayden sisters lost La Casa Vieja to foreclosure. Covert took ownership of the property.\textsuperscript{41}

The restaurant was closed for three years. La Casa Vieja reopened in November 1935 under the management of Mrs. Mae Taylor. The building was again renovated and a large Indian mural was painted in one of the dining rooms. As before, the restaurant served Mexican food and featured a cocktail bar, dancing, and entertainment. A Mexican stringed band with vocalist Amos Terrell would become the regularly featured entertainment at La Casa Vieja.\textsuperscript{42}

Covert retained ownership of the property and leased the restaurant to various managers over a 20-year period. It continued to be a Mexican restaurant and cocktail bar through the 1940s and 1950s, but apparently not with the formal elegance of La Casa Vieja’s earlier years. Other restaurateurs who leased the property included Eugene and Lucille Payne (ca. 1943–47), E.A. Rascoe (ca. 1951–52), and Fred and Ruth Brechan

\textsuperscript{39} MCR, Articles of Incorporation, Document #19260012563, recorded July 2, 1926; MCR, Warranty Deed, Document #19280007100, recorded September 19, 1928; Arizona Directory Company, Phoenix City and Salt River Valley Directory (Los Angeles:1925, 1926, 1928, 1930, 1931).

\textsuperscript{40} MCR, Mortgage, Document #19260008347, recorded June 24, 1926; MCR, Mortgage, Document #192800010608, recorded April 5, 1928; MCR, Mortgage Release, Document #19280014520, recorded April 5, 1928; MCR, Mortgage Release, Document #19280014524, recorded April 5, 1928.

\textsuperscript{41} Arizona Directory Company (1932); MCR, Judgment, Document #19350005754, recorded October 14, 1935; MCR, Sheriff’s Certificate of Sale, Document #19360010812, recorded February 27, 1936.

\textsuperscript{42} Arizona Republic, November 10, 16, December 14, 1935.
(ca. 1952–54). In 1954 the property was sold to Leonard F. Monti. It was under his ownership that La Casa Vieja would have its greatest success as a restaurant. 43

Leonard Monti was a World War II veteran from Minnesota. After the war he was treated at the Veterans Administration hospital in Phoenix and decided to stay in the area. He opened Monti’s Western Tavern Grill in downtown Chandler in 1947. When he took over La Casa Vieja, he planned a steakhouse menu rather than the Mexican-style restaurant it had been since 1924. Monti’s La Casa Vieja quickly became a very popular restaurant, and changes were made to the building to accommodate the growing clientele. The courtyard was covered in the early 1950s to create the “fountain room” for more indoor dining space. In 1968 a 5,000-square foot addition was built on the south end of the building, which included a modern kitchen. With the construction of another addition to the south in 1979 the restaurant grew to 17,000 square feet, with an occupancy limit of nearly 1,000 people. In 1991 Monti’s La Casa Vieja served more than 450,000 people, making it one of the largest independent restaurants in the country. The landmark restaurant served its last meals on November 17, 2014, and closed after operating for 60 years as Monti’s La Casa Vieja and 90 years as the best known restaurant in Tempe. 44

Part II. ARCHITECTURAL INFORMATION

A. General Statement

1. Architectural character: The Hayden House is a presently a one-story adobe rectangular building with a rectangular footprint. The original core of the building is an L-shaped adobe structure with open courtyard, exemplary of the vernacular Sonoran architectural style. Nine contiguous rooms link along two streets, east and north of the property. Several rooms fill in on the interior of the L-shape, with a once-open courtyard at the interior that was later roofed, creating the current rectangular footprint. The otherwise organic interior is interrupted by the zaguan that created a primary entry and passage to the courtyard.

Thick adobe walls compose most of the vertical load bearing structure of the building. The roof structure of the historic core is reinforced and supported on


newer wooden posts and beams. Other than the historic adobe walls, there are wood columns and beams and later some steel columns and beams added to span the courtyard.

The approximately 2-foot thick adobe walls are punctured by single windows and doors. All original doors and windows have been replaced, but the majority of the current openings are original opening locations. The street sides of the building typically would have one door and one window opening into each room. While the Mill Avenue sections on the east side of the property were the first to be constructed, it is suggested from the placement on the zaguan on the north elevation that it is the dominant face of the building. The large arched opening of the zaguan is currently infilled with a wood plank wall and 3-foot by 7-foot wood door.

Most walls are plaster and stucco-covered adobe, typical of the Sonoran style architecture. All exterior walls appear to have several coats of plaster and stucco. The interior side of of the adobe walls are largely covered by plaster or by later wood frame construction. A low-slope roof covers the rectangular footprint. The original roof structure is still visible in the Mill Avenue rooms. The cottonwood vigas and sahuaro rib latillas are exposed to the room interior, as is thatch above of straw, twigs etc. The cottonwood log vigas rest on the adobe walls, but do not extend beyond the building face.

There is little ornamentation to the Sonoran style architecture: this building is no exception. False “viga ends” were attached to the exterior, probably in the 1924 Evans restoration. Additionally, there is a projecting band along just below the roofline, indicating the original wall height.

2. Condition of fabric: Despite numerous alterations, the condition of the historic core of the building is good. Walls show no obvious signs of compromise, though the original adobe brick walls are encased in several layers of cement plaster/stucco and/or are covered by wood-frame walls. Original cottonwood vigas logs are bowing significantly, but they are no longer the primary roofing structure for the building (as a modern roof was suspended above them) and they have additional support from added wood columns and beams. Windows and doors have been replaced (recently) and are still in good condition.

B. Description of Exterior

1. Overall Dimensions: The remains of the historic adobe structure measure 131’-9” in the east-west direction and 76’-11” north to south. The arms of the L-shaped original adobe are approximately 18 feet wide on the exterior.
2. Foundations: The historic adobe core of the building likely rests on a fieldstone foundation. No excavation was performed for this evaluation. Nor is the foundation visible from any vantage point on the property. Older plan sets of the building show a fieldstone foundation, but this is not confirmed.

3. Walls: Exterior: The main core adobe brick walls are mostly 1'–10” thick with an added 1” of original lime plaster on the interior side, making the total wall thickness approximately two feet, although this thickness varies considerably throughout the building. In most cases, all walls have at least one an additional layer of cement stucco over original plaster on the exterior side.

4. Structural system, framing: The nearly 2-foot thick adobe brick exterior walls provided the primary structure upon which the cottonwood viga roofing structure bore. The original roofing structure is typical of adobe structures of the late 19th century: wood vigas support a network of saguaro rib latillas laid perpendicular to the vigas. Straw thatch of was placed over the latillas, supporting a thick roof of earth and clay. The failure of the original cottonwood logs necessitated the construction of a new modern roof above the original, and the removal of most of the earth fill; only enough remains to ballast the straw in place. In addition to the posts supporting the modern roof structure, a post and beam system was installed to provide additional support to the failed vigas.

5. Porches, stoops, balconies, bulkheads - None

6. Chimneys: No chimneys for the interior fireplaces and early interior wood stoves exist at this time. There are two interior fireplaces in the historic core of the building.

7. Openings:
   a. Doorways and doors: The building has eleven (11) external doorways – all of which appear to be original door locations. It is likely that a few doors openings may be partly infilled to create windows. Only one door on the west elevation appears infilled completely. The doors are mostly unadorned, lacking casings on the exterior, except for the two doors that served as main entrances for the restaurant. On the north elevation an early oversized arched opening is infilled with horizontal wood planks and a centered main door. A simple profile wood casing surrounds the main door. The main door on the east elevation has a low arched opening and wood door.
   b. Windows and shutters – Most window openings found on the north and east elevations are original window openings, the exception being the door openings that have been partially infilled to make them into windows. All windows are new, 2-over-2 pattern fixed wood windows in
imitation of double hung windows. No original windows remain. There are no shutters on any windows at this time, and there were no shutters originally according to historic photographs.

8. Roof:

a. Shape, covering: There are several roofs covering the entire building. Predominantly there is a flat roof over the majority of the building and another covering the historic core along Mill Avenue. Both roofs are flat with slight sloping for drainage, and composed of polyurethane roofing over wood framing. A low parapet runs the entire perimeter of the building.

b. Cornice, eaves: None.

c. Dormers, cupolas towers: None.

C. Description of Interior

1. Floor plans: The Hayden House was constructed as a series of Sonoran-style contiguous single pen structures assembled in an L-shape. Adobe additions were made to the interior side of the L, as additional flat-roofed pens or sheds. The courtyard was completed by the construction of adjacent buildings to the south and utility outbuildings on the west, linked by freestanding fence walls. Remnants of the adobe courtyard walls are extant along the south boundary of the building. Typical of adobe construction in this time and region, in most instances each room was provided with doorways to each adjacent room, creating continuous flow between the interior spaces.

2. Stairways: None.

3. Flooring: There are three types of flooring used throughout the building: most common is carpet over concrete. Some room floors are covered with saltillo tile and the floor in the once-courtyard area is scored concrete. The zaguan floor was paved with river cobbles set in concrete. This still remains in part of the hall. All of these floors date to the 1924 restoration or later.

4. Walls and ceiling finish: Walls throughout the building have many different finishes, ranging from painted plaster to a variety of wood finishes (plank board, plywood board, paneling). A few walls have a wood wainscot—simple plank board with no profile cap. In some cases there are wood frame walls abutting the adobe. Some walls were originally exterior but are now within building additions. Many of the interior adobe walls have been hidden by later finishes or
other walls. Other walls are wood frame construction with plaster or gypsum board, mostly finished with modern faux-historic wood paneling.

Ceilings, like the walls, have a variety of finishes. Part of the adobe core house still exhibits original vigas, latillas and some areas of exposed thatch. Other ceilings are from later eras. The historic zaguan has a plank wood ceiling and small king trusses from unhewn small logs – as decoration for the modern restaurant use. The remaining historic core has finished ceilings – beadboard, pressed tin, or gypsum board. A few rooms in later restaurant utility areas have dropped acoustical tile ceilings.

5. Openings:

a. Doorways and doors: Rooms have up to four openings to allow movement through each wall. In the historic core of the building, some original openings between the original rooms have been widened: in some, wood frame walls or screens are infilled into the wider openings. One opening between two of the east rooms is an angled arched opening, nearly full-height and room wide. One early door opening remains in the building, featuring original casings and transom, presently infilled.

No original doors remain. Interior doors were wooden panel doors with transoms as evidenced in photographs. Some original wood frames were located to confirm original opening locations, but otherwise most historic frames have been removed, covered, or replaced. One door on the interior of the building shows original frame and a transom, which has been infilled with a solid panel. All door openings are rectangular except for the two exterior main entrance doors.

b. Windows: Existing window openings are original openings. Due to the thickness of the walls, the windows have deep wells on the interior side, with frames sitting almost flush with the exterior walls. The current windows are 2/2 fixed wood windows. All windows were replaced in a recent renovation. A few openings have remnants of the original wood frames or casings remaining.

6. Decorative features and trim: For the most part, the interior of the building has upheld the restraint of the Sonoran vernacular style. Two small arched niches flank a north-facing window in the northeast corner room. The two fireplaces are decorated with river cobbles or tile, finishes possibly dating to the 1924 Evans restoration. The exposed roof structure in the eastern row of rooms also
contributes importantly to the original historic character of this part of the building.

Later details added prior to World War II date to the Evans restoration in 1924 and to the years soon after. Most notable is the fountain constructed of concrete and river cobbles, originally in the open courtyard but now within the enclosed space of the building. The fountain suffered a few later additions including a central statue and Mexican ceramic tile finishes on the interior and concrete cap. A mural from the 1930s fills one entire room wall; this mural is protected by later plastic glazing.

Details dating to post-WWII remodels generally reinforced an old-West theme by adding rustic elements. An example is the use of unhewn half-logs for door or window opening trim, and in a few places as a wainscot.

7. Hardware: Few if any pieces of historic hardware remain. All nails found were modern wire nails.

8. Mechanical equipment:

   a. Heating, air conditioning, ventilation: Other than non-functional fireplaces, all climate control equipment is modern. Systems in use prior to vacancy were rooftop heat pump units.

   b. Lighting: Electrical systems were completely modernized within the last 50 years. Lighting consists of a variety of types typical of modern restaurant uses, and operated via lighting control panels.

   c. Plumbing: Plumbing systems were completely modernized within the last 50 years. Bathrooms and systems typical of modern restaurants (such as wait staff service stations) are located throughout the building.

D. Site:

1. Historic landscape design: The building sits on the southwest corner of two major streets in Tempe, Arizona. There is little landscaping around the building: occasional palms and low shrubs. The building is bounded by parking lots on the south and the west.

2. Outbuildings: Several different configurations of adobe outbuildings have occurred over the years, bordering the west side of the central courtyard. Specific uses of these buildings have not been established.
Part III. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

A. Architectural drawings:


B. Early Views: None.

C. Interviews: None.

D. Selected Sources:

Archival research was conducted at the following repositories:
- Tempe History Museum, Tempe
- Hayden Library, Arizona State University, Tempe
- Arizona Historical Society, Tempe
- Salt River Project, Tempe
- Maricopa County Recorder, Phoenix

The key sources for compiling the historical information include numerous books and articles on Charles Trumbull Hayden, historic property studies conducted in Tempe, newspapers, and the Hayden Family Papers at Arizona State University Department of Archives and Manuscripts. Copies of most materials cited in this study are on file in the Tempe History Museum Archives. Research was thorough, and no additional sources of information have been identified.

Manuscript Collections

Tempe, Arizona. Arizona State University Department of Archives and Manuscripts.

The Hayden Family Papers are the most complete assemblage of unpublished documents relating to Charles T. Hayden and the Hayden family. Fireman, "Charles Trumbull Hayden" and Vargas, et al., Hayden Flour Mill are based on a comprehensive survey of this collection, so those sources are cited often for information from the Hayden Family Papers.

Tempe, Arizona. Salt River Project Archives.

Holds unpublished documents relating to the early history of irrigation in the Salt River Valley.

Tempe, Arizona. Tempe History Museum Archives.
Holds unpublished documents and photograph collections, as well as many published sources relating to Charles T. Hayden, the Hayden family, and Tempe history. An important collection is the research files compiled during production of Woodward, et al., *Tempe Historic Property Survey*.

**Government Documents**

Maricopa County Recorder. Various documents.  

Maricopa County Superior Court. Register of Actions, Civil Cases.

U.S. Bureau of Land Management. General Land Office Records Database.  

**Books and Articles**


Arizona Women’s Hall of Fame. “Jessie Benton Evans (1866–1954).”  


One of the earliest comprehensive multi-volume histories of Arizona, which is based in part on oral accounts of individuals who were involved in significant events and activities.

The first detailed biography of Charles T. Hayden, based largely on the Hayden Family Papers at Arizona State University Department of Archives and Manuscripts.


A very detailed and intimate biography of Charles T. Hayden written by his son, based on the Hayden Family Papers and his personal remembrances.


A brief biographical article on Charles T. Hayden written by his daughter, but of limited value and with some factual errors.


A comprehensive study of early Tempe history with emphasis on the development of irrigation systems.


Includes a biographical chapter on Charles T. Hayden, but of limited value and with some factual errors.


Includes a biographical sketch of Senator Carl Hayden, with some information on his father, Charles T. Hayden.


Includes a contemporary biographical sketch of Charles T. Hayden.


A brief early history of Tempe with some factual errors.


**Reports and Unpublished Materials**


A very broad comprehensive study on the life of Charles T. Hayden and the history of Tempe as they relate to the Hayden Flour Mill.


Biographical context for Robert T. Evans.


A comprehensive history of Tempe. The supporting research files include materials specific to the Charles Hayden House, including transcribed newspaper articles and reference to all known photographs and sources of information.


**Newspapers**

*Arizona Citizen* [Tucson].

*Arizona Gazette* [Phoenix].

*Arizona Republic* [Phoenix].

*Arizona Republican* [Phoenix].

*Phoenix Herald* [Phoenix].

*Salt River Herald* [Phoenix].

*Weekly Arizona Miner* [Prescott].

E. Likely Sources Not Yet Investigated: Site monitoring of new foundation excavation at parking lots immediately adjacent to the building may reveal additional information.
F. Supplemental Material: None.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photograph No.</th>
<th>View Direction</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-1</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>General View of North Side and intersection of Mill Avenue and East Rio Salado Parkway. Historic Hayden Flour Mill beyond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-2</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>General View of North Side and setting on Rio Salado Parkway. Historic Hayden Flour Mill beyond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-3</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>General West Back and adjacent parking lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-4</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>General East Front and Mill Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-5</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>North Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-6</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>North Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-7</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>East Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-8</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>North Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-9</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>East Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-10</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>East Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-11</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>East Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-12</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Detail of North Side Main Door. Likely the original opening of the historic zaguan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-13</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Interior. Main parlor room – Room East 1 - including detail of adobe wall cut.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-14</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>Interior. Main parlor room – Room East 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-15</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Interior. View of Room East 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-16</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Interior. View of Room East 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-17</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Interior. View of Room East 3 through Rooms East 2 and East 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-18</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Interior. Room Northeast Corner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-19</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>Interior. Room Northeast Corner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-20</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Interior. Room North 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-21</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Interior. Room North 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-22</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>Interior. Room North 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-23</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Interior. Room North 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-25</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Interior. Room North 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-26</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Historic Adobe Gate/Wall Remnant at South Elevation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-27</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>Detail. Historic Adobe Gate/Wall Remnant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-28</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Detail. Historic Adobe Gate/Wall Remnant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-29</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Detail. Historic Adobe Wall cut at Room East 1 showing two adjacent adobe walls: the adobe warehouse wall adjacent to the Room East 1 wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-30</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>Detail. Ceiling Room East 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-31</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Detail. Ceiling. East 3 Room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-33</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>Detail. Fireplace. Room East 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-34</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Detail. North Side, Main Entrance from interior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-35</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Detail. Cobblestone and concrete path from zaguan entrance to courtyard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-36</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Detail. Cobblestone and concrete path from zaguan entrance to courtyard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-37</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>Detail. Fountain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-38</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>Remnant walls of historic adobe west wing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-39</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>Detail. Interior door opening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-40</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Detail. Historic Mural in Room North 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-41</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Detail. Historic Mural in Room North 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-42</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>East Side with Scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-44</td>
<td></td>
<td>Floor Plan. Produced by Motley Design Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ-228-45</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Historical Marker for Hayden’s Ferry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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