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Executive Summary

Project Title:
The Tucson Convention Center (TCC) Landscape: Strategies for Stewardship

Project Partners:
College of Architecture, Planning, and Landscape Architecture (CAPLA), the Drachman Institute, the City of Tucson, Tucson Pima County Historical Commission, the Tucson Historic Preservation Foundation, TCC Today, Pima Community College, and SMG (Worldwide Entertainment and Convention Venue Management)

Project Description/Scope:
The interaction of various publics in conjunction with a proposed rehabilitation project which would affect infrastructure and amenities at the Tucson Convention Center Landscape is the focus of this research. In support of revitalizing the landscape—thus creating a vibrant community center and cultural space within Tucson’s urban core—this document has identified associated stakeholders and explores several themes concerning the activation of this space. Themes investigated use case studies to posit best practices influencing positive stewardship in perpetuity, given the successes or failures of similar landscapes and offer suggestions for engaging the public during and after rehabilitation.

Themes considered in this research include:

- What is the design/historical significance of the TCC landscape and other open, public spaces like the TCC?
- What intended uses (e.g. events, community public space, and tourism destinations) are associated with activation of the TCC landscape and similar landscapes?
- What unintended uses (e.g. homeless presence and unintended recreation like skateboarding) are associated with activation of the TCC landscape and similar landscapes?
- What is the structure of ownership/management/stewardship organization at similar landscapes? What would this structure look like at the TCC landscape?
- What are operations and maintenance policies/guidelines at similar landscapes—especially for art work, water features, vegetation, and unintended users?
- How are sustainability standards (i.e. energy and water) devised at similar landscapes?
- How are risk management policies/guidelines, especially for water features, devised at similar landscapes?
- What does the preservation advisory and review process for rehabilitation and maintenance projects look like at similar landscapes? What about the TCC landscape?
- Who are the community stakeholders and what is their level of participatory involvement during the planning process at the TCC landscape?
- How should public outreach and education programs be administered at the TCC landscape so that a culture of stewardship is fostered for all stakeholders, general and end users, and maintenance administrators?
- How are similar landscapes funded? What would funding models at the TCC landscape look like?
Location of the Project Area:
The project area is located within Pima County (Districts 2 and 5) and within the City of Tucson (Ward 6). It is bounded by Congress St. to the north, Cushing Street to the south, Church Ave to the east, and Granada Ave. to the west (Figure: Project Overview Map 1).

Regulatory Framework:
The following organizational chart conceptualizes the hierarchical schema of regulators, administrators, managers, and publics that will be involved in overseeing stewardship efforts at the Tucson Convention Center Landscape (Figure: Regulatory Diagram).
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INTRODUCTION
1 INTRODUCTION

The Tucson Convention Center (TCC) Landscape otherwise known as the Tucson Community Center Landscape, was designed by American landscape architect Garrett Eckbo during a period in American history that is commonly known as urban renewal (Figure: Fountain, Tucson Pima Arts Council 2012). In sum, urban renewal was a land redevelopment program; its proponents felt that by developing urban centers into areas of moderate to high density use, city cores would be economically strengthened and necessary civic spaces might be built and cultivated. While this era is oftentimes marred by feelings of dissension concerning the removal of traditionally associated communities and their vernacular spaces from urban centers, it is important to underscore the vitality of their collective memory (Otero 2010) and to understand the context within which the landscape was conceptualized (Erickson 2012a; Erickson 2012b). Today, conserving and investing in urban infrastructure and public, open spaces that cultivate a sense of place, like the Tucson Convention Center Landscape, is necessary for the enjoyment, health and well being of future generations.

In brief, Garrett Eckbo was one of the twentieth century’s foremost Modernist landscape architects and the Tucson Community Center Landscape was created at the height of Eckbo’s career between the years of 1971 and 1973. Known for designing “people places” and for introducing arid land and native plants into his designs, Eckbo understood the significant role water holds for those who dwell in the desert. Building upon the rich cultural and ecological heritage of Tucson, the Eckbo landscape was meant to bring communities together in a social, civic space that offered cultural experiences through entertainment venues like the Arena, the Leo Rich Theater, and The Music Hall while providing outdoor urban recreation and artistic expression manifest in its fountain features and design layout (Erickson 2012b). Through the years this space has undergone a series of transformations and sustained continued neglect; in part due to its character as a modernist designed public landscape in a contested cultural space (Yetman 2010:12; Otero 2010). Today, the Tucson Convention Center is considered one of Tucson’s endangered resources and is listed as a “threatened landscape” by the Cultural Landscape Foundation (Figure: Arizona Daily Star 2013 ).
As time passes and the landscape ages it becomes a larger part of a significant national and local narrative. Educating and engaging the public as to this story and the space’s intent is now paramount for the activation and successful stewardship of the TCC Landscape. With current and continued development trends representing cultural and economic revitalization of this general area, the landscape stands poised to serve its original purpose—a vibrant center offering Tucson’s diverse communities and visitors experiences in cultural education and social events in an interactive space. By investing in existing infrastructure and rehabilitating the landscape through capital improvement projects the City of Tucson also seeks to involve the public—building a constituency of users that might enjoy all the features of this unique landscape for time immemorial. Inasmuch, a recent (Yetman 2010:11-12) study reports that:

“Most of the problems associated with the Eckbo landscape [i.e. the TCC Landscape] are related to insufficient and/or inappropriate programming within the space, challenges with maintenance, and a general lack of awareness of the value of the fountains on behalf of the public.”
This report was suggested by City of Tucson administrators and advocates for the conservation, use, and management of the Tucson Convention Center Landscape, Garrett Eckbo fountain features, and those structures and objects (historic and modern) incorporated into the aesthetic and functional design of the project area. Findings and recommendations detailed here are meant to accompany ongoing dialogue concerning the current site condition and future stewardship of the landscape so that various publics benefit (socially and economically) and are included in uses of the space. This report includes 1) a brief culture or use history highlighting important historical events and groups associated with the project area in the past and into modernity; 2) an outline for future stewardship at the landscape as understood through parallel case studies; and 3) prioritized strategies associated with engaging various publics in stewardship and proposed activities at the landscape. Also included is the identification of governmental, public, and private stakeholders (i.e. property owners and managerial public administrators) and those additional communities with vested interests in revitalizing the landscape for one reason or another. These stakeholders are spatially illustrated by a series of aerial, jurisdictional maps and/or accompanying tables and figures.

A companion document is being created by University of Arizona students, CAPLA, and the Drachman Institute.

-2015 Documentation and Condition Assessment of Landscape Features (ARC 497J/597J)

The University of Arizona and The Drachman Institute are currently conducting a condition assessment of several character defining features at the Tucson Convention Center Landscape. As part of class curriculum offered at the University of Arizona through the Heritage Conservation Certificate Program, the Documentation and Interpretation of the Built Environment class is completing a comprehensive inventory and physical assessment of varied landscape features including the Eckbo Fountainscapes-The Walkway, Fountain Plaza, and Upper Plaza, lighting, planters, signage, public artworks, and seating or benches.

Further, the Drachman Institute with assistance from Pima Community College students, is developing spatial methodologies such as a three dimensional model for the condition assessment and rehabilitation plan. The TCC Landscape will be scanned using LiDAR (Light Detection And Ranging) technology to create a geo-referenced point cloud of data that can then be translated into a three dimensional Revit model. The LiDAR scan will be conducted by local firm, Darling Geomatics. The study is expected to be completed in May of 2015.
1.1 THE HISTORIC CONTEXT

Developing strategies that promote public participation and stewardship at The Tucson Convention Center Landscape is a multifaceted process that should first consider, and define, the types of publics that will ultimately be involved in the landscape’s use and stewardship. To understand the history of site and land use at the Tucson Convention Center Landscape as well as those publics associated with this history, an abridged culture history is provided below. This culture history is meant to orient variable audiences that might use this document, bringing awareness as to the complexities of the landscape’s use over time. In doing so, culture or use histories should note all publics and communities (i.e. stakeholders) that might retain a vested interest in this particular space so that their perspectives are included in long term planning. Lastly, this section situates our understandings of several investigative themes that will later be introduced:

- What is the design/historical significance of the TCC landscape?
- Who are the community stakeholders and what does this imply concerning their level of participation during planning processes at the TCC landscape?
- How should public outreach and education programs be administered at the TCC landscape so that a culture of stewardship is fostered for all stakeholders, general and end users, and maintenance administrators?
1.1.1 A BRIEF HISTORY OF TUCSON

Prehistoric Settlement

The Tucson Basin and surrounding areas contain evidence of human occupation beginning nearly 12,000 years ago and perhaps even earlier (McKoy 2002). The first arrivals are marked by those ancestral Native American groups that came to gather wild plants and hunt megafauna, migrating in and out of the region in a climate that was cooler and wetter than today (PCOCRHP 2001). Aside from following herd animals, what brought these “Paleo-Indian” and later peoples to the Sonoran Desert was water—whether felling mastodons in the swampy cienegas of Southern Arizona or gathering mesquite from the banks of the Santa Cruz River near what is now Downtown Tucson, ancestral Native Americans made the desert their home. It is important now to note that the focus of community and infrastructure in Tucson has always shared a common thread involving the incorporation of water in everyday life, ritualistic practices, and many aesthetic urban and rural designs.

Centuries subsequent to Paleo-Indian arrivals are referred to as the Archaic period (8,000 B.C.-A.D. 200). During this time groups continued seasonal hunting and gathering but diversified their strategies for resource exploitation which saw the colonization of river floodplains. Research by Desert Archaeology, Inc., along the Lower and Middle Santa Cruz River at Los Pozos and Las Capas (Mabry and Davis 2008; Gregory and Adams 1999) has revealed patterns of increased sedentism associated with the introduction and intensification of agriculture (Figure: Las Capas Fields and Figure: Hohokam Farmers). What resulted were concentrated riverine settlements and the fluorescence of Sonoran Desert farmers, commonly called the Hohokam culture. Subsurface evidence of Hohokam pit houses from this period and periods thereafter are known in the vicinity of the Tucson Convention Center Landscape.

Irrigation Canals and Fields -3,000 years old near Downtown Tucson

Ceramic vessels found near Tucson
From A.D. 200-A.D. 1150 the Hohokam peoples of the Santa Cruz River Valley grew increasingly complex as their villages punctuated the river terraces. Ceramic technologies emerged and pit house settlements became economically focused on agriculture (squash, beans, maize, and possibly cotton) which included the construction and maintenance of large-scale irrigation canals and dry-land or flood-water farming (Fish et al. 1992:4). Public facilities at Hohokam pit house villages included courtyards, platform mounds, ballcourts, and reservoirs (PCOCRHP 2001:3; Fish and Fish 2008). Next, the Classic period (A.D. 1150-A.D. 1450) marks a time of settlement aggregation, architectural, social, ideological and demographic change for the Hohokam. The building of platform mound sites increased, long distance trade intensified, and above-ground adobe structures were built along major watercourses (Fish and Fish 2008). The Marana Mound site (Fish et al. 1992) and University Indian Ruin (Milliken et al. 2012) are examples of aggregated Classic period mound sites near the Tucson Convention Center Landscape.

Sometime after A.D. 1450 Hohokam centers were depopulated for reasons that are still debated today. Following this depopulation, O’odham cultures developed (Doelle and Wallace 1991) concomitant with the arrival of Athabaskan-speaking Apache and shortly thereafter, the Spaniards. O’odham groups in the Tucson Basin also practiced desert irrigative farming, organizing themselves in small settlements often referred to as rancherias. Living in brush structures (“ki”s), the O’odham farmed seasonally, gathered seeds, nuts, and wild fruits, and hunted as they occupied areas around upland springs in the winter, and alluvial valleys in the summer (Figure: Tohono O’odham ki; PCOCRHP 2001:5; McGuire et al. 1993). When Spaniards did arrive to the Santa Cruz Valley around the late 17th century with Father Eusebio Francisco Kino, they noted the O’odham village “Chuk-son” along the river bank. “Chuk-son” would later be called Tucson (McKoy 2002).
**Historic Settlement**

The Spanish Crown established many far-flung missions and presidios in the Americas during the Spanish Colonial period in order to Christianize local populations while using these groups for labor and exploitation of rich environmental resources such as copper and silver. They continued agricultural practices using canal irrigation (acequias) and further used the rivers for terrestrial navigation. Spaniards also brought to the area new technologies, non-native foodstuffs, cattle, horses, sheep, and architectural construction methods using earthen materials like adobe bricks as well as ideas about urban planning and vernacular spaces (Figure: Tucson Convento; PCOCRHP 2001:6). These introductions would drastically alter the appearance of Tucson and impact the lives of those traditional, indigenous societies that had long lived in the region. During this time and some time afterwards, homes for Spanish soldiers and their families were built in the presidio of Tucson and years later, displaced Hispanic families (as a result of Anglo encroachment) continued building homes in the vicinity and south of the presidio (Otero 2010:13-14). Homes were constructed as contiguous row houses (Sonoran row houses) with zaguan breezeways and shared interior courtyards—row house designs that were transported from northern Mexico during the Spanish and Mexican periods and were the typical urban form in Downtown Tucson until the arrival of Anglos and the railroad in the late 19th century (Nequette and Jeffery 2002). Sonoran row houses were constructed with no street setbacks, promoting communal interaction, and were arranged on a grid. These architectural styles are still observable in areas of Downtown Tucson known as El Presidio and The Barrio. They represent the historical urban fabric of communities that existed in the Tucson Convention Center Landscape prior to its construction between 1971 and 1973.
The year 1821 denotes the Mexican period in Arizona with Spanish colonists winning independence from Spain. Other notable dates are 1848, the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, and 1854, the Gadsden Purchase. The former ceded a large portion of the American West from Mexico to the United States and although Tucson was excluded from this treaty, the latter purchase saw Mexican rule end in Tucson. Further, the Gadsden Purchase decreed Tucson and surrounding areas were now under the territorial jurisdiction of the United States (McKoy 2002). Demographically, most of Downtown Tucson was Hispanic during this time. However, with the railroad in 1880 came emigrating and enterprising Anglos and immigrants such as the Chinese. The territorialization and 1912 statehood of Arizona were thus marked by a diversification of ethnic groups and a geographically observable divisioning of urban and rural spaces—the continued settlement and occupation of The Barrio by Mexican-Americans and other minorities was no different in Downtown Tucson (Figure: South Meyer Looking toward Cushing and Figure: Barrio Libre). Euroamerican ranchers, trappers, and wildemen and women, Chinese railroad workers miners, and farmers, African Americans, and many different religious groups came west in search of freedom and fortune and ended up congregating in what is now Downtown Tucson and the site of the Tucson Convention Center Landscape. As these groups settled amongst Native Americans (Tohono O’odham and Yaqui) in the area and Mexican-American families, Tucson at the turn of the twentieth century was a vibrant and culturally diverse desert town, affectionately known today as The Old Pueblo, and geographically partitioned into interconnected ethnic enclaves (Figure: Meyer Looking S bt Jackson and Ochoa and Figure: Women Barrio Viejo 1920s jpg).
During the late nineteenth and into the early-to-mid-twentieth centuries, the advent of the automobile and tourism boasting the allure of the desert’s warm, dry climate (Sunshine Club ca. 1922), subsequently shaped Tucson so that by the 1940s the town was a quickly-expanding metropolis (Figure: Tucson Sunshine Center Ad). Additionally, wartime industries brought new jobs to the area, namely in the aviation and defense industry. With the creation of these jobs, people also came.

“World War II ushered in an era of growth... for Arizona and its metropolitan areas [and by] 1950 the metropolitan area had 122,764 residents. However, two-thirds of this population did not actually live within Tucson but settled in subdivisions which sprang up around its corporate limits,” (Akros 2007:7).

Nevertheless, population numbers rose from 45,454 in 1950 to 212,892 by 1960 (Sonnichsen 1982:280; Akros 2007:7).
As Tucson grew and certain areas of the city aged, the perceived need for centrally located, monumental entertainment venues and civic and administrative spaces took form in the policies of urban renewal. The Barrio with its hundred-year-old adobe mud-brick homes, unassuming facades, and mostly marginalized minority communities (mainly Mexican) was at this time described as urban blight. Following years of opposition, a bond election in 1966 gave the city necessary funds to build a civic center and this same year, property acquisition and community dislocation in The Barrio began (Otero 2010:117). Although considered “slums” by many outsiders, the loss of The Barrio muffled the figurative heartbeat of the Mexican American community and many suffered (Figure: Plaza Theater 1950). In Lydia Otero’s book La Calle (2010), she describes a very different scene concerning life in communities of The Barrio and recounts the determined story of Olga Otero Litel. In 1966 Litel, pregnant and with her children present, climbed atop a bulldozer set to destroy her great-grandfather’s home located in The Barrio (Otero 2010:166). Otero (2010:36-37) continues with the remarks of Anna Don who recalls her father visiting “Chinatown” in The Barrio. Don relayed, “What was then Chinatown is in the middle of the [Tucson Convention] Center today.”

Nevertheless, nearly half of The Barrio was razed during the urban renewal program in Tucson—its original streets reconfigured with few vestiges of its layout left in place (Figure: TCC Barrio Scheme; see Otero 2010:127-152 for the story of Alva Torres). Heartbreaking stories such as these are the histories that should be remembered and those residents associated with The Barrio should be celebrated today.
1.1.2 HISTORY OF THE TUCSON CONVENTION CENTER LANDSCAPE

The following section of this document is taken from the 2012 National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form for the Tucson Community Center Landscape (Erickson 2012a) and the Conservation Master Plan: Tucson Community Center Landscape (Erickson 2012b). The National Register nomination is pending approval through the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) although the landscape is considered eligible for inclusion on the register under Criterion C and G (Erickson 2012a:16-17). The master conservation plan (Erickson 2012b) is also awaiting adoption by Mayor and Council.
Urban Renewal in Tucson: The Pueblo Center Redevelopment Project (Erickson 2012a:23)

Between the end of World War II and the mid 1970s, efforts were made throughout the United States to revitalize what were perceived as decaying city centers. In the process, many cities, including Tucson, demolished large sections of old downtown areas. Tucson began planning for revitalization in 1942, with a ten-year plan by Ladislas Segoe and Andre M. Faure entitled “Tucson Regional Plan, Incorporated”. Lacking financial resources, however, the idea did not gain momentum until passage of the 1949 Housing Act offered substantial financial aid to urban communities. This was expanded in 1954, when a second Housing Act adopted a preventive stance towards slums and blight (Gragg 1969:2).

The Housing Act then required localities to develop a comprehensive plan, analyzing blighted neighborhoods and providing a framework for renewal. While the initial 1949 Act focused largely on housing, the 1953 Act opened the possibility for non-residential projects. (Gragg 1969:57).

It was not until 1965, however, that the Tucson City Council adopted a substantive plan for proceeding with The Pueblo Center Redevelopment Project (Lung et al. 1965). It was this plan that opened the way for the joint venture of Cain Nelson Wares and Friedman & Jobusch that led to the creation of the Tucson Community Center (Figure: Eckbo Fountains 1972-1973). Although the TCC Landscape came into existence through urban renewal, it is important to recognize that its visionary Eckbo, perhaps due to his work with the Farm Administration during World War II, was not convinced that the results of indiscriminate urban renewal were always positive. He himself argued for urban development as opposed to urban redevelopment with its focus on slums and blighted areas (Eckbo 1964:5). Eckbo was strongly opposed to the arbitrary construction of freeways through neighborhoods, speaking publicly against Tucson’s plans to “hack up the city” at the same time that he was developing the design for the TCC Landscape (Tucson Daily Citizen 1968).
Garrett Eckbo and Modern Landscape Architecture (Erickson 2012a:18)

One of the finest landscape architects of the twentieth century (Birnbaum and Foell 2009:85-87), Eckbo led the rebellion against the formal and decorative Beaux Arts tradition that dominated landscape practice at the beginning of the twentieth century. While studying at Harvard, he and fellow landscape architecture students Dan Kiley and James Rose fell under the influence of Walter Gropius, a leading educator in Modern architecture at Harvard, and soon published three articles in Pencil Points, a leading publication in progressive architecture. Eckbo went on to become the acknowledged educator and spokesperson for the Modern landscape movement, writing seven major books and over fifty articles outlining the principles of his work. His book Landscape for Living (1950) is considered to be the single most influential treatise on Modern landscape design (Birnbaum and Foell 2009:87). Instead of following the accepted practice of adapting historic models to contemporary needs, Modernism chose as its point of departure the site, the client, the program, the materials, the architecture, the technology, and geographic character. Forms and arrangements drew from characteristics of site, climate, materials and cultural needs. People were recognized not only as cultural individuals and groups, but as members of local, national and world societies. Design should be imaginative, yet socially and environmentally responsible. The role of tradition should be to provide inspiration and a benchmark for achievement (Eckbo 1950; Pregill and Volkman 1999). The work of visual artists of the same period, especially Vassily Kandinsky and Joan Miró, had a significant effect on the formal aspects of Modern design, helping to mitigate the regularity of the axial Beaux Arts plans (Rainey 1989).

Modern landscape architecture also stressed three-dimensional form, working with space from the inside out rather than from the outside in. Indoor and outdoor spaces were seen as continuous rather than discontinuous. addition to the general principles of Modernism that sprang from the “Harvard Revolution”, Eckbo believed that experiential factors – sight, sound, smell, touch, overall feeling, psychological reaction – are as important as economic, technical, and functional factors (Eckbo 1984:7). He further believed that continuous and substantial contact with nature is essential to a healthy design. He stressed that every designed landscape should respond to the needs of people who are to use the space, taking into account the surrounding neighborhood, the region and beyond. He felt a strong affinity for the developing ecological sensitivity of the twentieth century, and his name is frequently linked with that of ecologist and fellow University of California at Berkeley faculty member Ian McHarg, who wrote Design with Nature in 1967. The layout of the Tucson Convention Center Landscape does not depart from Eckbo’s design philosophy and similarly, strategies for engaging the public in the revitalization and future management of the landscape today should continue to focus on adapting the use of the space to meet the needs of Tucson’s modern communities.
The Tucson Convention Center Landscape Design Theory

As plans for urban renewal gained speed in the 1960s, Tucson envisioned the creation of a new, exciting downtown and in doing so, the cultural center of the Mexican-American community (The Barrio) was in large part destroyed. When constructed ended in 1973, 17.6 million dollars had been expended to create the new “pueblo center” and amenities included the Eckbo fountains, the Arena, Music Hall, and Leo Rich Theater (Figure: Eckbo Dean Austin Williams Design). As noted by Erickson’s research (2012a:18-19) construction was undertaken by two local architectural firms Cain Nelson Wares and Friedman & Jobusch (Figure: City of Tucson Design).
Edward ‘Ned’ Nelson headed the project. M.M. Sundt, a local contractor, did the construction. Nelson, Barnard Friedman and Donald Laidlaw (The City of Tucson Planning Department Director) interviewed a number of the most prominent landscape architects in the country in an effort to complete the team, among them Lawrence Halprin, Dan Kiley and Garrett Eckbo. It was a visit to the Fulton Mall in Fresno, CA, that convinced them that Eckbo was the right person for Tucson’s needs. A contemporary account in the Tucson Daily Citizen recounts,

“We went to Fresno, Nelson recalls. And we watched the people – winos, housewives, oldsters, kids – walking, talking, arguing, laughing. The children played in the pools. These were just great spaces, . . . and we asked ourselves, “Why can’t we combine the ideas of an open-air mall with a community center?” (Pavillard 1971)
Erickson (2012a:19) continues: Eckbo, whose foundational treatise Landscape for Living was published in 1950, focused on designing “people places.” More specifically, this meant creating landscapes that welcomed “all human beings: . . . men, women, babies, children, adolescents, old folks, Negroes, Mexicans, Orientals, ‘white Caucasians,’ Jews, etc.” (Eckbo 1950: 29). He argued that landscape design was not exterior decoration – the role it had played in the Beaux Arts design tradition - but rather the organization of outdoor space for the use of people (Eckbo 1946:11). As a result of this emphasis, the Tucson Convention Center Landscape is a flexible choreographic space which serves multiple populations and functions. As a leisure landscape for strolling and picnicking, it provides areas for children to enjoy the water and run about while families and friends sit together and chat. As a lunchscape for busy office workers, it provides a much needed mid-day break. As a formal entrance foyer for the Arena, Leo Rich Theater and Music Hall, it offers an elegant transition to cultural activities and evening performances. As a place for street artists and special events, it serves as a congenial outdoor performance and exhibit space. As green space in the city, it serves all of the functions and populations listed above. Beyond this, the Tucson Convention Center Landscape is an outstanding example of how Eckbo’s design principles were translated into material form (Figure: TCC Design Scheme).
The Tucson Convention Center Landscape in Use

Between 1971 and 1974 the arena, music hall, theater, fountains, and a 10.2 million dollar retail complex called La Placita Village were completed and opened to the public (Figure: Walkway Plan). La Placita Village was meant to serve communities and visitors using the civic amenities of the Tucson Convention Center Landscape acting as a place for outdoor dining, informal performances, and casual shopping. Features of the Tucson Convention Center Landscape that are the focus of revitalization and continued use today are not only those physical structures that exist (the Eckbo Fountainscapes—the Fountain Plaza, the Walkway, the Upper Plaza, and Veinte de Agosto Park, the Arena, the Leo Rich Theater, the Music Hall, and for the purpose of understanding the landscape holistically, La Placita Village) but those characteristic defining features that also include objects such as railings, benches, public art, vegetation and shade, planters, lighting, signage, kiosks, water fountains, and circulatory paths—all contributing to a sensory experience one might feel when using the landscape. Also of significance are those remaining historic structures and objects that were retained or partially retained during the construction of the Tucson Convention Center Landscape. These include the old La Placita—historically called La Plaza de la Mesilla—with its gazebo feature, the Sosa-Carrillo-Fremont House, the Samaniego House, and the original El Charro storefront that is now the visitor’s center in La Placita Village (Figure: TCC Landscape Map with Labeled Features). When La Placita Village opened in 1974 it was reportedly 200,000 square feet of new offices, shops, retail, cinema, and restaurant space. Mariachis, jazz musicians, barbershop quartets, and clowns performed in the space which was designed originally in an “authentic Southwest style” (Otero 2010:150).
1.1.3 THE TUCSON CONVENTION CENTER LANDSCAPE TODAY

Although this space has historically underserved Tucson’s communities and visitors, it has the potential to be revitalized. Following plans to deaccession the underused and neglected landscape in 2010 (Erickson 2012b:40), a number of projects aimed at raising awareness as to the historical significance of the landscape were undertaken. Some offered strategies for stewardship and engaging the public.
Preserving Modernist Designed Public Landscapes: The Case of Garrett Eckbo at the Tucson Convention Center (Yetman 2010)

Summary:
Erickson (2012b:40) states: During the fall of 2010, Emily Yetman, MLA, then a Landscape Architect in Residency at the Museum of Contemporary Art (MOCA) in Tucson, raised concerns about the lack of knowledge and the deteriorating condition of the Tucson Community Center Landscape. At the time it was facing condemnation by the City of Tucson, and few people remembered that it had been designed by Garrett Eckbo. As a result of her initial research, which included locating plans that firmly linked the Landscape to the work of the master landscape architect, a description and photographs of the Landscape were placed on the website of the Cultural Landscape Foundation, where it was officially listed as a “threatened landscape” (Figure Yetman Preservation, Challenges, Strategies, Application).

Yetman’s paper further focused on the Modernist movement of the mid 20th century and investigated the common challenges specific to the preservation of Modernist landscape architecture—like the TCC Landscape. In her work she developed cursory strategies for bringing new life to the Eckbo portion of the TCC Landscape. Challenges in preserving the landscape are listed as 1) it is a forgotten landscape, 2) it needs to be maintained, 3) there is a lack of appreciation for the design/designer and/or a conflicted history associated with the landscape, 4) it has been neglected; 5) there is a lack of documentation at the landscape, 6) the landscape is threatened by municipality, 7) it is considered a liability, and 8) there needs to a maintenance of original design integrity if it is to be preserved. Many of her strategies to address the challenges of preservation have been applied over the last five years.
The National Register of Historic Places Registration Nomination Form: Tucson Community Center Landscape (Erickson 2012a)

Summary:
The National Register of Historic Places is the official federal list of the nation's historic places (districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects) worthy of preservation due to their historical, architectural, archeological, and cultural significance (NPS, 1997). The National Register is accredited by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and is administered by the National Park Service as part of a national program to support public and private efforts in identifying, evaluating, and protecting America’s historic and archaeological resources (NPS, 1997).

The National Register Program considers three key concepts in understanding eligibility recommendations for nominated properties. These include a property’s historic significance, historic integrity, and its historic context. Nominated properties must meet at least one of the four themes of significance recognized by the National Register Criteria:

- Association with events, activities, or patterns
- Association with important persons
- Distinctive physical characteristics of design, construction, or form
- Potential to yield important information.

The property in general should also be fifty years of age or more to be considered historic, although there are exceptions (NPS, 1997).

The initiation process and the preparation of the necessary documentation usually come from private individuals and organizations, local governments, and American Indian tribes (NPS, 1997). A professional review board in each state then considers the properties suggested for listing and makes a recommendation to the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) as to its eligibility. Certified Local Governments (CLGs), which are communities having a certified local historic preservation program also make recommendations on the eligibility of properties within their community (NPS, 1997). Finally, determining the eligibility for listing the historic property is at the request of the State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs) as well as the Federal Preservation Officers (FPOs) for properties owned or controlled by the United States Government (NPS, 1997).

In 2012, a National Register of Historic Places Registration Form was prepared by Helen Erickson from the Tucson Historic Preservation Foundation to formally record and nominate the Tucson Community Center Landscape (Tucson Convention Center Landscape) to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

The information in the form identified and located the Tucson Community Center Landscape, made the case for historic significance and integrity, and explained how the property meets the National Register criteria, as it significant “under Criterion C, as an outstanding example and significant work of a master: landscape architect Garrett Eckbo (1910-2000).” The property is also recommended eligible under Criterion G. Criterion G considers those properties having achieved significance in the past fifty years as potentially eligible and exceptions to the historic age clause.

While the National Register documentation supports in preserving historic properties by recording their significance and assessing their present condition as well as recognizing the historic characteristics that give the property historic significance and integrity (NPS, 1997), it does not secure their preservation against demolition and development nor does it offer recommendations for its rehabilitation.

The National Registration Form does not offer strategies for engaging the public nor does it provide a framework for future stewardship. However, the information provided in the document can be utilized in educating the public about the historic significance of property. This nomination has been submitted but is pending state level (SHPO) approval.
**Master Conservation Plan: Tucson Community Center Landscape (Erickson 2012b)**

**Summary:**
In 2012, Helen Erickson in consultation with William Patrick O’Brien from the National Park Service prepared *The Master Conservation Plan for the Tucson Community Center Landscape*. The plan was designed to promote and consider the conservation of the Garrett Eckbo Landscape at the Tucson Community Center through describing and recognizing the historic significance and integrity of the landscape and its features. It included a recourse inventory, an Interpretation and assessment of the significant resources and their condition, an assessment of the vulnerability of these resources, and a group of recommendations for retaining the significance and protecting the site.

The plan concluded with the necessity of rehabilitating and protecting the Eckbo Landscape as a significant component to the revitalization of the downtown area as well as the importance of developing a creative program to draw more people into the landscape which should go hand-in-hand with long term planning (Erickson, 2012b). The plan has yet to be adopted by Mayor and Council. Adoption should be prioritized at this time.

The plan acknowledged the importance of public participation and the significance of making the general public aware of the value of the resource, which can be achieved through the development of initiatives to encourage the use of the landscape by Tucsonans and visitors (Erickson 2012:Appendix 2: Bringing People into the Landscape).

After consulting with community groups and downtown business groups, it was agreed that a program for the use of the revitalized space must be developed where such activities should be coordinated by a selected organization or individual (Erickson, 2012b).

---

**The plan’s recommendations for engaging the public are as follow:**

- Inform the public of the significance of the landscape through TV, newspapers, radio, websites, and social media outlets such as Facebook.
- Engage visitors with the site through interpretive signage, walking tours (i.e. insertion of the landscape into the “Turquoise Trail” itinerary), descriptive fliers at the Tucson Visitors Center, and other interactive web-based media.
- Invite surrounding communities to visit the landscape through individual communication, discussion at neighborhood associations and service clubs, and connecting with downtown business groups.
- Involve the academic community (University of Arizona and Pima Community College) through joint projects, developing an exhibition of Eckbo Landscape, providing guest speakers in classes, and offering walking or bike tours of downtown to new students.
- Involve historic preservation organizations.
- Provide the public (including heritage communities) with opportunities to return to the landscape through seasonal celebrations; school trips; music, dance or street theater performances; social or folk dance activities; art shows; food trucks; and by offering wireless internet connection at the site.
TCC Today (TCC Today 2015) (http://www.tcctoday.org/)

Summary:
TCC Today is a volunteer community group interested in the renewal of the Tucson Convention Center Landscape. Its mission is to advocate for the collaborative use of philanthropic gifts, government funds and revenues, and corporate support to renew and maintain the TCC Landscape (features include Tucson Music Hall, Leo Rich Theater, the Arena, and the Eckbo landscape).

TCC Today recognizes the beneficial economic impacts the revitalization of the TCC Landscape will have for Downtown Tucson, heritage and local communities, and visitors alike. Their vision for stewardship aligns with the recommendations made in the DTP (2010) and ULI (2013) publications. The website states (TCC Today 2015):

“The vision, design, concept, and architecture of the TCC performing arts complex hold great potential for Tucson-based artists as well as for touring performers. Before their true capacity can be realized, however, the venues and the landscape need restoration and leading-edge technology. To understand the full measure of need, the City of Tucson is beginning to evaluate systems and user needs [at the TCC Landscape]. Complementing this, in 2012 the Tucson Historic Preservation Foundation commissioned a Conservation Plan for the Eckbo-designed landscape. This plan was adopted by the TCC Commission, the Tucson Pima Arts Council, and the Tucson Pima County Historical Commission. The Plan’s first recommendation is a Fountain/Water Study. TCC Today is now seeking underwriting for this essential step towards revitalization.”

With a matching grant from Rio Nuevo Multipurpose Facilities District (a TIF district), community advocates from TCC Today and other organizations and partners also began some rehabilitation efforts; implementing recommendations from the conservation plan. In what is referred to as the “Demonstration Area”, a portion of the Fountain Plaza just west of the Leo Rich theater was restored using twenty-first century technological solutions like arid region, compatible vegetation and silva-cell subsurface planting boxes for replaced flora (Figure: Eckbo and Silva Cell Signage and Figure: Rehabilitated Area). Additionally, seating and lighting was replaced and planters were reconstructed from molds made from the originals. This “Demonstration Area” was meant to represent what the rehabilitated landscape could be and it has been successful in drawing people to the area as evidenced in its increased use. More demonstration areas are planned by TCC Today.

Enhancing and restoring this valuable asset is lastly cited as a community priority and the mission of TCC Today is further described as moving this consensus toward action. A list of donors and partners of TCC today is provided, this list could be mined to identify and engage additional stakeholders in stewardship strategies at the landscape (See Supplemental Tables).
2015 Bond Project Proposal: City of Tucson Downtown Community Theaters and Historic Cultural Landscape

Summary:
In April of 2015 the Pima County Board of Supervisors approved a county bond package totalling 850 million dollars. The City of Tucson Downtown Community Theaters and Historic Cultural Landscape bond proposal is included in the current package which will be up for community vote in November of 2015. Should the bond be approved by Pima County voters the county will receive 23.5 million dollars for rehabilitation of the TCC Landscape (Figure: SOW Bond Project; See Supplemental Tables).
1.2 PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, PUBLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE TCC LANDSCAPE

Rio Nuevo Downtown Multipurpose Facilities /Redevelopment and Revitalization District
(http://www.tucsonaz.gov/integrated-planning/plan-tucson)

Summary:
Rio Nuevo Multipurpose Facilities District (District) was voted on and approved by Tucson voters in 1999. The District was set up as Tax Incremental Financing district to collect a portion of sales tax revenues for use in redevelopment and revitalization of infrastructure and community projects – especially in depressed areas.

The District has a long history of successes and failures. It was reincarnated as a State Municipal District when the State of Arizona took over management in 2013 (rionuevo.org, 2015).

MISSION:
To facilitate and participate in the development of a vibrant downtown Tucson.

The Rio Nuevo District owns the TCC and is a partner with the City of Tucson. Activities and plans for the TCC- Eckbo Landscape were initiated through this partnership and with other interested stakeholders.
Tucson Planning:

Summary:
Selected past planning efforts in and around the Central Business District and potentially affecting Downtown and TCC – Eckbo Landscape. Many are expired or have been superseded by subsequent plans.

- Urban Renewal Plan - (expired)
- Pueblo Center Redevelopment Project (1965) - (expired)
- Rio Nuevo Redevelopment Project Redevelopment Plan (1979)
- RioNuevo Redevelopment Plan (1982)
- Rio Nuevo Redevelopment Plan/Planned Area Development (1987)
- Tucson Community Center Planned Area Development (1987)
- Rio Nuevo Master Plan, 10-Year Development and Long-Range Vision 2001
- Rio Nuevo District (RND)—October 14, 2002

City of Tucson Parks & Recreation Ten-Year Strategic Service Plan October 31, 2006:

Summary:
In 2000, the City began a process for creating a city parks and recreation plan. The Plan was completed in 2006. Potential rehabilitation activities relating to the TCC/Eckbo Landscape are consistent with the Mission, Vision, and Community Core Values of the Parks & Recreation Ten-Year Strategic Service Plan.

Mission: To provide a park system offering high quality facilities, programs and services for Tucsonans of all ages and abilities.

Vision: “The City of Tucson Parks and Recreation Department will provide a variety of parks, recreation facilities and program experiences equitably throughout the community. Existing facilities will be aggressively maintained and additional facilities added as growth and demand dictate. Programs will be developed and maintained to the highest quality, ensuring a safe environment with exceptional service while developing a lifetime customer. Services will demonstrate a positive economic investment through partnerships with other service providers, both public and private, contributing to a high quality of life for Tucsonans.”

Community Core Values:

- Park accessibility
- Customer service
- Youth
- Seniors and Disabled Population
- Inclusion
- Equity
- Safety
- Family
- Recreation
- Health and Wellness
- Resource Management
- Environmental Stewards
Plan Tucson
(http://www.tucsonaz.gov/integrated-planning/plan-tucson)

Summary:
Plan Tucson is the voter approved General and Sustainability Plan for the City of Tucson. The City’s Office of Integrated Planning was created in November of 2013 as part of the Plan to oversee its administration and implementation. The Plan is a holistic and integrated approach to achieving preliminary and extended goals for the City in:

1. The Social Environment
2. The Economic Environment
3. The Natural Environment
4. The Built Environment

Each of these Focus Areas addresses cultural resources as vital components in meeting the Plan goals. Additionally, The Plan outlines specific policy recommendations through its subchapters. Plans for the TCC are consistent with many of the goals and policies of Plan Tucson. Selected applicable policy elements are highlighted in the following sections.
1. **The Social Environment:**

**Public Health:** Multipurpose paths and public open space development.

**Public Safety:** Strengthen the role of social networks in public safety through increasing lawful activity in public spaces. Pursue design for public spaces and encourage design that incorporates principles of defensible space.

**Parks & Recreation:** Prioritize repairing, maintaining, and upgrading existing recreational facilities. Support the integration of environmentally and historically sensitive building materials and methods in public recreational facility development and operation. Expand outreach and partnerships with neighborhoods to facilitate the adoption and care of existing neighborhood parks.

**Education:** Work collaboratively with schools regarding planning and community development in the built environment to address community needs.

**Arts & Culture:** Promote heritage destinations and annual heritage events regionally, nationally, and internationally. Implement site specific and neighborhood-scaled development strategies that incorporate cultural heritage and the arts. Increase the capacity of and access to buildings and open spaces to expand arts-related activities and public programming throughout the community. Support the installation and maintenance of public art throughout the community. Target public investment to leverage additional capital for heritage, arts, and cultural activities.

**Governance & Participation:** Emphasize interactive participation methods that solicit input from the public and provide feedback to the public on input received and how it was used. Increase participation of the traditionally underrepresented populations in policy, program, and project planning and decision-making. Facilitate opportunities for neighborhood representatives, business organizations, not-for-profit organizations and agencies, and other stakeholders to meet regularly with and obtain information from City staff on City initiatives and activities.

2. **The Economic Environment:**

**Jobs & Workforce Development:** Collaborate with local institutions, including but not limited to the University of Arizona, Pima Community College, Pima County, and public and private training and technical organizations to support a well-educated, well-trained workforce with skills matched to local job opportunities and employer needs.

**Business Climate:** Enhance the community attributes that are mutually beneficial to the business climate and quality of life for residents, including a safe environment, recreational opportunities, multi-modal transportation, a vibrant downtown, distinctive neighborhoods, excellent education, primary and secondary employment opportunities, and arts and entertainment venues.

**Tourism & Quality of Life:** Promote and preserve Tucson’s cultural heritage and historic resources, including archaeology, architecture, performance, art, landmarks, and events. Enhance civic and convention facilities, outdoor spaces, and venues making them reflective of Tucson’s cultural heritage and desert environment, in order to draw visitors to the area and serve the local community with year-round indoor and outdoor arts, culture, and sports programming.
3. **The Natural Environment:**

**Energy & Climate Readiness:** Reduce the urban heat island effect by minimizing heat generation and retention from the built environment using a range of strategies.

**Green Infrastructure:** Expand and maintain a healthy, drought-tolerant, low-water use tree canopy and urban forest to provide ecosystem services, mitigate the urban heat island, and improve the attractiveness of neighborhoods and the city as a whole.

**Water Resources:** Expand the use of alternative sources of water for potable and non-potable uses, including rainwater, gray water, reclaimed water, effluent, and storm water.

**Environmental Quality:** Develop practices to reduce utility, fuel, and procurement costs and to improve environmental performance through process, technological, and behavioral changes to demonstrate City leadership in sustainable practices and improve operational efficiencies.

4. **The Built Environment:**

**Historic Preservation:** Maintain, retrofit, rehabilitate, and adaptively reuse City-owned historic buildings. Identify historic streetscapes and preserve their most significant character-defining features. Follow national and local historic preservation standards when rehabilitating or adding facilities and landscaping in historic urban parks. Mitigate impacts on historic, cultural, and archaeological resources caused by construction or excavation in City rights-of-way. Evaluate the benefits of new development relative to historic preservation in land use decisions. Integrate historic, archaeological, and cultural resources in project planning, and design when development occurs in historic districts.

**Public Infrastructure, Facilities, and Cost of Development:** Coordinate with utility companies and other public service providers for the planning of infrastructure, facilities, and services, making sure infrastructure and facility construction is sensitive in design and location to environmental and historic resources.

**Redevelopment and Revitalization:** Redevelop and revitalize in areas with the greatest potential for long-term economic development by focusing public resources, tools, and incentives to catalyze private investment. Build from existing assets of areas identified for redevelopment and revitalization. Prioritize neighborhood revitalization efforts to focus on those geographic areas with the greatest need. Undertake an inclusive community participation process in redevelopment and revitalization efforts.

**Land Use, Transportation, and Urban Design:** Integrate land use, transportation, and urban design to achieve an urban form that supports more effective use of resources, mobility options, more aesthetically-pleasing and active public spaces, and sensitivity to historic and natural resources and neighborhood character. Create pedestrian and bicycle networks that are continuous and provide safe and convenient alternatives within neighborhoods and for getting to school, work, parks, shopping, services, and other destinations on a regular basis. Support the provision of secure storage and of showers and lockers for bicyclists and pedestrians. Using existing neighborhood, area, and other specific plans as the starting point, undertake an inclusive public process to explore the concept of developing and implementing planning and service areas to coordinate and enhance land use planning, infrastructure improvements, and public service delivery.
Revitalizing Downtown Tucson: Building the New Pueblo (DTP 2010)

Summary:
In 2010 the Downtown Tucson Partnership (DTP) published findings concerning the need for an urban renaissance in Tucson’s downtown areas. Their report offers strategies for engaging and encouraging private and non-profit sector investment in Downtown Tucson. Tucson’s attributes—those characteristics making it a choice location for redevelopment through public involvement—are observed in its strong arts and cultural community, sizable government employer center, low violent crime rate, comparatively large amounts of parking spaces for the public, and its rich history and large collection of heritage buildings that remain intact. These characteristics reportedly make Downtown Tucson an economically viable location for revitalization. Investing in urban, public infrastructure is thus seen as a means to involve the community or citizens in the management and redevelopment of Downtown Tucson.

The report concludes that the involvement of public and non-profit organizations in reinvestment, accompanied by Tax Incentive Finance (TIF) Funding Plans (DTP 2010:24), among other capital funding projects, will provide the following benefits to downtown; tourism, economic revitalization, tax revenue increase, increase in job opportunities, livable downtown areas, and increases in the number of patrons using downtown.

The report further describes the Tucson Convention Center as an area that should function both as a park with a public plaza and as open space, among other uses (e.g. tourism destination). The report cites the site’s size (10,640 square feet of meeting space and 113,940 square feet of exhibit space) and lists the seating capacity of the Arena (9,962 seats) positing the ways in which this landscape can further contribute to the economic health and well being of downtown patrons if properly rehabilitated and creatively used. DTP (2010:65) also offers that the sale of City lands to be commercially developed could be used to fund rehabilitation. A large part of revitalizing the TCC Landscape, according to the DTP study, should be focused on the construction of a public plaza with a major fountain and performance area as well as the addition of a newly constructed convention center hotel. A new hotel might accommodate both business and leisure travelers and was also proposed by the Rio Nuevo Multifacilities Development District (TIF District). It was posited that the development of a proposed 525 room hotel will more than double downtown’s Tucson’s room capacity and an expanded and improved convention center will be better able to attract conventions and meetings to the downtown area.
Imagine Greater Tucson
(http://www.imaginegreatertucson.org/)

Summary
Imagine Greater Tucson is dedicated to creating a vibrant region for generations to come, using a carefully designed visioning process. This process, involving more than 10,000 residents, created The Vision for a Greater Tucson Region that unifies our strengths through 60 Shared Regional Values, categorized into 9 Principles:

- Accessibility
- Educational Excellence
- Environmental Integrity
- Good Governance
- Healthy Communities
- Higher Education
- Prosperity
- Quality Neighborhoods
- Regional Identity

Plans for the TCC are consistent with the goals of Imagine Greater Tucson and contribute to at least two of their principles through the vision for neighborhood and downtown centers.
Downtown Tucson Arizona: Working Together to Revitalize Downtown (ULI 2013)

Summary:
The Urban Land Institute advisory services panel report was geared towards the Downtown Tucson revitalization efforts and was embarked upon to 1) bring together leaders from across the fields of real estate and land use policy to exchange best practices and serve community needs; 2) foster collaboration within and beyond the Urban Land Institute’s membership through mentoring, dialogue and problem solving; 3) explore issues of urbanization, conservation, regeneration, land use, capital formation and sustainable development; 4) advance land use policies and design practices that respect the uniqueness of both the built and natural environments; and 5) share knowledge through education, applied research, publishing and sustaining a diverse global network of local practice and advisory efforts that address current and future challenges.

The Urban Land Institute report concludes that Downtown revitalization will only occur if the city leads a diverse group of stakeholders, unites various ward interests, and works with the county and Rio Nuevo to move forward as one community, brought together by a shared love of place. It was also suggested that the City should demonstrate a renewed sense of service to its citizens and foster bipartisan action between the city and the county.

Based on this the ULI panel suggested the following recommendations for the revitalization of the Tucson Convention Center:

• Tax Increment Financing (TIFs) could be used as a tools or means of funding the Tucson Convention Center. This tool is very appropriate because the state receives so much of it fiscal benefits from tourism.
• Creating a new cultural plaza at the top of the steps, incorporating theaters and museum. Developing a new plaza in connection with Eckbo elements where appropriate, abandoning those elements that are in conflict with desired topography and landscape.
• Creating a new crescent walkway from the cultural plaza to the entrance axis rather than a 90-degree connection adjacent to the convention center mechanical plant.
• Retain private management for the TCC.
• Use Pima County bond funding, which is the largest and only pool of public funding for significant infrastructure investments (for projects such as the proposed Convention Center improvements, the creation of a visitors center, the redevelopment of La Placita, and stravenue investments), as much and as appropriately as possible in addition to the extension of Rio Nuevo.
• Revisit the incentives policy for site-specific TIFs for hotel and retail use, making them contingent on proven need with clear black-and-white criteria.
• Purchase or contract with an operator to provide flooring and other equipment and management for court and ice sporting events.
Stewardship
2 STEWARDSHIP

Based on the findings and recommendations presented in these aforementioned publications and projects the need for education and recognition, documentation, rehabilitation, public-private partnership development, and continued capital improvement and maintenance projects at the Tucson Convention Center Landscape should continuously be prioritized by the City of Tucson and other TCC project partners and advocates. As of April 21, 2015 the Pima County Board of Supervisors approved a 2015 bond project package which will be voted on in November of 2015 by the public. If the bond passes, the Tucson Convention Center Landscape rehabilitation project will become a reality.

Inasmuch, what is now necessary is the development of a comprehensive stewardship plan that builds upon the recommendations of past publications and projects and ongoing discourse. Concomitant with this plan should be considerations for public participation at the landscape with focus shifted on appropriate programming that responsibly uses the landscape—understanding both the landscape’s physical features and ensuring the cultivation and preservation of a sense of place. Maintaining the integrity and original design intent as well as capitalizing on the inherent functionality of the space will thus be prioritized—giving the space a cultural heartbeat while entertaining and celebrating those associated with, and interested in, its history and use, past and present. The following sections offer guidelines for successful stewardship at the Tucson Convention Center Landscape based on known practices involving a series of parallel case studies. Sections also detail suggested programmatic strategies for stewardship and public participation at the TCC Landscape and provide a framework for implementation.
Thematic Issues

Stewardship practices involve balancing the physical needs of a cultural resource and the expectations of use for vested publics while mitigating risks to, and enhancing experiences for, both the cultural resource and the public. Stewardship might also address various managerial concerns associated with the activation and projected vitality of historic and cultural landscapes and resources like the Tucson Convention Center. There is overlap between the themes considering stewardship and public participation and engagement, as the two are inextricably linked. Themes investigated, or to be understood, using parallel case studies in order to extract principles for best stewardship practices at the TCC Landscape include:

- What is the design/historical significance of other open, public spaces like the TCC?
- What intended uses (e.g. events, community public space, and tourism destinations) are associated with activation of landscapes similar to TCC?
- What unintended uses (e.g. homeless presence and unintended recreation like skateboarding) are associated with activation of landscapes similar to TCC?
- What is the structure of ownership/management/stewardship organization at similar landscapes? What would this structure look like at the TCC Landscape?
- What are operations and maintenance policies/guidelines at landscapes similar to TCC—especially for artwork, water features, vegetation, and unintended users?
- How are sustainability standards (i.e. energy and water) devised at similar landscapes?
- How are risk management policies/guidelines, especially for water features, devised at similar landscapes?
- What does the preservation advisory and review process for rehabilitation and maintenance projects look like at similar landscapes? What about the TCC Landscape?
- Who are the community stakeholders and what is their level of participatory involvement during the planning process at similar landscapes?
- How are public outreach and education programs administered at the landscapes similar to TCC so that that a culture of stewardship is fostered for all stakeholders, general and end users, and maintenance administrators?
- How are similar landscapes funded?

Public participation and engagement is a large part of stewardship. Public participation and engagement should be viewed as a collaborative process that involves multiple, diverse publics. Public participation activities should first, be accessible to varied constituencies so that anticipated outcomes might reflect equitable representations concerning the views of stakeholders and the public at large. As a process, public participation should provide multivocal perspectives that holistically express the values and needs of all communities with a vested interest in specific cultural and historic landscapes. Themes that will be explored in the public participation portions of this stewardship plan include:

- What intended uses (e.g. events, community public space, and tourism destinations) are associated with activation of the TCC Landscape?
- Who are the community stakeholders and what is their level of participatory involvement during the planning process at the TCC Landscape?
- How should public outreach and education programs be administered at the TCC Landscape so that a culture of stewardship is fostered for all stakeholders, general and end users, and maintenance administrators?
- How would funding models at the TCC Landscape look?
2.1 OUR METHODOLOGY

In sum the goals of this document are to provide the City of Tucson and other administrative managers at the Tucson Convention Center Landscape, suggestions that will bring people back into the landscape and ensure its, and their, health over time. The aforementioned themes were used to provide an outline towards future stewardship plans at the Tucson Convention Center Landscape as well as explore methods for building a constituency of users through public participation and engagement.

The methodology employed to accomplish this consisted of the following steps:

1) Understand the context associated with the site’s land use history.
2) Identify previous publications and projects that consider the significance of the TCC Landscape and offer recommendations regarding its future preservation and activation.
3) Spatially identify the project area and its physical features.
4) Compile a comprehensive list of stakeholders and generalize their overall involvement/vested interests in the landscape.
5) Consider the multiple publics (stakeholders) that are involved in the current use and future stewardship of the landscape to devise strategies towards its successful activation.
3 STAKEHOLDERS

In the 2012 plan for the conservation of the Tucson Convention Center Landscape Erickson (2012b:32) notes the various jurisdictions (i.e. stakeholders) involved at the landscape:

The Tucson Community Center Landscape is owned by the City of Tucson, but the adjacent space-defining properties are owned by a variety of public and private entities. The Walkway runs between the Arizona Hotel Property (owned by the Pueblo Cente Redevelopment Project) and La Placita Village (owned by Pueblo Center Partners Ltd. Partnership). The historic Sosa-Carrillo-Fremont house, and the property immediately west of it, are owned by the State of Arizona. The Arena was sold to the Rio Nuevo Multipurpose Facilities District in 1989, but the City of Tucson holds a lease on it and retains responsibility for the surrounding landscape.

The definitions of stakeholders vary. Stakeholders can be property owners, businesses, neighbors, the general public, and institutional, governmental, or cultural entities. For all intents and purposes, stakeholders are attached to the use of a landscape and the politics of its space or cultivated sense of place—whether this is an economic use, physical use, or their use is intangible and tied to memory.

The complexities of ownership at this space and the diversity of those that manage and use the space accompanied by the contested nature of the space preclude quick, simple identifications of stakeholders that would result in a complete list. Therefore, the list of stakeholders provided in this document is cursory and should be continuously updated and reconfigured. Nevertheless, broad “types” of stakeholders have been identified through two different methods. The first being, a geopolitical, spatial search of all property owners at and near the landscape (Section 3.1). The second method involves qualitatively understanding the history of use and ongoing use and interest in the landscape by specific groups. These stakeholders are general and end users or the public at large—those communities of interested and affected parties associated with the TCC Landscape for various social, economic, or political reasons (Section 3.2). Overlap may exist between all categories of stakeholders.
3.1 JURISDICTIONAL MAPS AND STAKEHOLDER TABLES: GOVERNMENT, PUBLIC, AND PRIVATE OWNERSHIP (½ MILE BUFFER)

The Pima County Mapguide GIS database was used to conduct a spatial search of the project area (Figure: TCC Landscape Neighboring Stakeholders 1 and 2 (source in the map). A central point (centroid) was chosen near the fountain plaza and a half mile radial search criteria was used to buffer the centroid. Attribute information gleaned from this spatial search included 1,163 property listings, their addresses and owners, parcel numbers, latitude and longitude, and an acreage total of each parcel. The nature of these attributes proved rather rudimentary, especially in understanding the owner listings. Most of these “owners” were simply an address followed by a general classification of ownership type. For example, parcel 117141580 is “owned” by 136 W SIMPSON LLC. This property is more than likely a rental property that is privately owned. Additional research investigating what types of ownership this information implies is suggested.
In order to produce a useful jurisdictional map of associated stakeholders from this information—one that did not simply show 1,163 individual points or polygons within and surrounding the TCC Landscape—coarse groupings or categories were assigned (Table; See Supplemental Tables). Sub-categorical groupings further divide these public and private entities so a breakdown in ownership types is visually apparent. Property owners are considered key stakeholders. For locational reference, the owners have been categorized as Government, Business, Private and Social-Cultural.
3.2 PUBLIC STAKEHOLDERS: COMMUNITIES AND INDIVIDUALS

The following publics (See Supplemental Tables) do not represent a complete list of public stakeholders and should be amended often as support for the rehabilitation and activation of the TCC Landscape continues. These stakeholders were qualitatively identified based on known holdings, partnerships, or use, and levels of interest or monetary donations associated with the landscape. Some are considered key stakeholders.

As stated, stakeholders are users of the landscape. In identifying additional stakeholders, the types of users might further be understood categorically. General and end users at the TCC Landscape consist of variable public and commercial users. A scheme of user types is provided below.

- **Public Users:**
  - Transient User
  - Event User
  - Daily User

- **Commercial Users (Renters):**
  - Annual Users
  - Daily Users
  - Seasonal Users
  - Special Event Users
  - Community Users
Stewardship of Landscapes Similar to the TCC
The scope of the previous section of this document has been focused on identifying stakeholders (i.e. the various publics and vested communities associated with the Tucson Convention Center Landscape). However, to ensure the future success and long-range viability of the landscape as a civic space, a plan for stewardship should also be considered. As administrative bodies assume control and responsibility over the physical features of the landscape (Figure: Regulatory Framework/Managerial Administrators: City of Tucson)—guaranteeing multiple publics might benefit from rehabilitation efforts at the space—it is necessary for managers and the greater public alike to address the issues of long term maintenance and safety to promote appropriate landscape use. Several case studies with similar landscape features were investigated in order to provide some precedence in addressing constraints and issues in the activation of the Tucson Convention Center Landscape. It is the hope of many involved in the potential rehabilitation of the Tucson Convention Center Landscape, that a vibrant and living space fostering a sense of place for many constituencies might be cultivated while considering and weighing the twenty-first century risks posed by retaining the original design intent of the landscape. The following sections introduce ideas for maintaining the landscape and managing inherent risks to the public while balancing appropriate use of the space for both capital gains and community building activities by focusing on thematic issues at similar landscapes.
1. Klyde Warren Park

**Location:** Dallas, Texas  
**Date of Construction:** 2012  
**Architect/s:** The Office of James Burnett  
**Space:** 5.2 acres

**Design/Historical Significance:**
Klyde Warren Park was designed by award-winning landscape architect Jim Burnett, principal of The Office of James Burnett. His design is meant to create a sense of discovery as you move to the different “rooms” throughout the 5 acre park. The sustainable landscaping includes 37 native plant species and 322 trees, transforming a former freeway to a beautiful urban oasis.

The park is a feat of engineering and design. It is even with the street-level and preserves clearance for the highway below. The deck is made of more than 300 concrete beams arranged in groups with spacing in between the groups. Concrete slabs span the spaces connecting to the bottoms of the beams and forming trenches. The trenches act like planter boxes, allowing the trees to grow to the desired size. A combination of Geofoam and specially-designed soil helps keep the deck from being too heavy.

The design and construction of the park was managed by Bjerke Management Solutions and the design was led by two nationally-recognized design firms, The Office of James Burnett and Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. The Texas Department of Transportation selected Archer Western as the contractor for construction of the deck plaza. McCarthy Building Companies, Inc. served as the contractor to construct all of the amenities and complete the park.
Features and their Description:
The park is a feat of engineering and design. It is even with the street-level and preserves clearance for the highway below. The deck is made of more than 300 concrete beams arranged in groups with spacing in between the groups. Concrete slabs span the spaces connecting to the bottoms of the beams and forming trenches. The trenches act like planter boxes, allowing the trees to grow to the desired size. A combination of Geofoam and specially-designed soil helps keep the deck from being too heavy.

Intended Uses:
Sporting events like yoga classes, music and stories with Kidworks, zumba classes, food trucks, lunchtime musical features, and story time with Barefoot Books.

Unintended Uses:
Skateboarders and Homeless

Structure of Ownership, Management, and Stewardship:
Public, private partnership: The $110 million project was funded through a public-private partnership. Public support included $20 million in bond funds from the City of Dallas, $20 million in highway funds from the state and $16.7 million in stimulus funds. The balance of funding is through individual donors directly to the Woodall Rodgers Park Foundation.

Klyde Warren Park is owned by the City of Dallas and privately operated and managed by the private Woodall Rodgers Park Foundation. The Foundation studied great public parks across the country and plans to bring best practices to the park’s operations, programming and maintenance.

Sustainability Standards: N/A
Risk Management: N/A

Funding models:
The concept of building a deck park over Woodall Rodgers Freeway may have originated in the 1960s when Dallas Mayor J. Erik Jonsson decided to recess the freeway. Many years later in 2002, the idea resurfaced in the real estate community and John Zogg began to rally support for the project. In 2004, The Real Estate Council provided $1 million grant to fund feasibility studies and provide staff support during the incubator stage. Texas Capital Bank Founder Jody Grant heard about the project and joined the cause with a $1 million personal donation and a $1 million donation from the bank. In 2004, Grant, Zogg and Linda Owen formed The Woodall Rodgers Park Foundation, the organization that led the project from design to completion. Many city and civic leaders contributed to the park throughout the process. Construction on the deck began in October 2009 and the park opened in October 2012.
2. Falls Park on the Reedy

Location: Greenville, South Carolina
Date of Construction: 2002
Space: 20 acres
**Design/Historical Significance:**

Most of modern day Greenville was hunting land used by the Cherokee Indians, whose main villages were located in what is now Oconee County. A part of the Iroquois Nation, the Cherokees may have set up temporary summer camps along the banks of the Reedy River. In the 19th and early 20th centuries, Indian artifacts were found along the north bank of the river. European settlers were forbidden to live here until 1777, when the Cherokee were forced to cede their land to the new state. Referred to as “the cradle of Greenville,” it was the magnificent, life-giving falls of the Reedy River that led the first settlers to this region.

In 1768, Richard Pearis, who was married to a Cherokee Indian, established a trading post and grist mill at the base of the falls. In 1774, Pearis bought 50,000 acres – including the falls - from his son, who was considered a member of the Cherokee Nation. At the time, it was unlawful for a white man to purchase land from the Indians, so this allowed Pearis to get around the system. Pearis eventually sided with the British during the American Revolution. When he returned to Greenville, his business and family were gone. Following Pearis, Lemuel Alston built a small tub mill on the site of Pearis’ mill.
In 1815, Vardry McBee bought more than 11,000 acres from Alston, including most of present-day Greenville, and built two flour mills – one in 1817 and one in 1829. McBee was a philanthropist and gave the land for the town’s first schools, colleges and churches. In the 19th century, a variety of industries eventually clustered along the Reedy River. Those industries included an ironworks, the Gower, Cox, and Markley Coach Factory, a sawmill, a paper factory, an armory, as well as grist and corn mills. In 1876, McBee’s heirs worked with three Massachusetts mill owners to open the water-powered Camperdown Mill, which produced yarn and gingham until 1956. The falls provided a power source for industry in the early 19th century.

A variety of industries eventually clustered along the Reedy River, including an ironworks; the Gower, Cox and Markley Coach Factory; a sawmill; a paper factory and an armory, as well as grist and corn mills. A 27-acre mill village grew up on the hills surrounding the falls, complete with churches, mill store and recreation grounds. Whole families, often including children as young as 9 or 10, worked at the mills. They rented the mill houses for 50 cents a week per room; water and lights were supplied by the mill. The extension of Church Street in the late 1950s destroyed much of the once-extensive mill village.

In 1852, Furman Institution (now Furman University) bought the land. Three textile mills and a cotton warehouse operated in the early 1900s, all contributing to the pollution of the Reedy River. In 1967, the Carolina Foothills Garden Club reclaimed 26 acres for the current park, with the support of the City of Greenville, Furman University and the Planning Commission. Over the next 40 years, the Garden Club and the City of Greenville have worked with individuals, corporations and state and federal agencies to further develop the park, clean up the river and restore the historic Falls Cottage. In 1990, landscape architect Andrea Mains introduced the concept of transforming the park into a regional attraction, with beautiful public gardens and a pedestrian bridge.
Features and their Description:
In the mid-1980s, the Carolina Foothills Garden Club and the City of Greenville adopted a master plan for the park that was designed to restore the beauty of the area and provide a safe and welcoming gathering spot for individuals and groups. The vision for a dramatic public garden was finally realized when the Camperdown Bridge was removed in 2002. Using funds generated through a local hospitality tax, and building on the master plan designed in 1999 by landscape architect Andrea Mains, Falls Park was developed to include 20 acres of gardens showcasing Reedy River Falls. In August 2002, Mayor Knox White announced “In Full Bloom in 2003,” a $13 million initiative to transform the park into a public garden and oasis. Included in the project was construction of a 355-foot-long, 12-foot-wide, curved suspension bridge that was designed by world-renowned architect Miguel Rosales to provide dramatic views of the upper falls and the gardens below. Additional designs called for a new park building with two levels of plazas, a private restaurant, public restrooms and the garden’s maintenance facility to be located on the South Main Street end of the bridge.

Intended Uses:
Reedy River Duck Derby, Upstate Heart walk, Fidelity Investments Moonlight Movies, Shakespeare Performance and Marriage venues (River Lodge/Old Mill Garden and Rock Quarry Garden.

Unintended Uses:
Loitering, Skateboarding, Biking and homeless people’s hide out.

Structure of Ownership, Management, and Stewardship:
Falls Park on the Reedy is owned and operated by the City of Greenville, South Carolina.

Sustainability Standards:
Reducing storm drain pollution and improving water quality.

Risk Management: N/A

Outreach and Education:
Residents of the City of Greenville are involved in the decision making process of how the park is been managed and improved upon. For example they were involved in providing input that would be used to develop recommendations for the Bicycle Master Plan in a variety of methods. Public are involved through workshops and by online survey.

Community Stakeholder Involvement and Participatory Process:
City of Greenville. Furman University. Carolina Foothills Garden Club, and Paul Ellis.

Funding Models:
Funding was mainly from the City of Greenville’s Hospitality Tax which was spent on tourism related facilities and from Falls Park endowment fund.
3. Freeway Park

Location: Seattle, WA
Date of Construction: July 4th, 1976
Architect/s: Freeway Park was carried out by the firm of Lawrence Halprin & Associates, under the design direction of Angela Danadjieva (PPS, 2005: 7; Hirsch, 2005: 75; Maryman, Birkholz, 2006).
Space: 5.2-acres

Design/Historical Significance:
The award-winning park was grown out of a social and environmental vision for Seattle that came from a group of public-spirited individuals who wanted to “heal the scar” of Interstate 5 that was built in 1965, and to physically connect the area of First Hill to the east with Seattle’s financial center to the west (PPS, 2005: 7). However, Jim R. Ellis. Who has led the efforts in making Freeway Park a reality, had the concerns that Seattle didn’t have any main downtown passive accessible space (PPS, 2005: 7, Seattle Government).

In 1968, a group of events accrued which helped in transforming the Freeway Park into reality (PPS, 2005: 7):

- A $334 million Forward Thrust bond to fund parks was approved by the supporters of Kings County, where an amount of $65 million was used in parks and park facilities in Seattle (PPS, 2005: 7, Seattle Government).
- Federal and state funds were secured by the city of Seattle for constructing a lid over a portion of the freeway (PPS, 2005: 7, Seattle Government).
- The city was looking for a site near the freeway to seize drivers before going to the city core by implementing its municipal garage (PPS, 2005: 7).

On 1969, along with the state, federal, and private monies, local funds were approved which supported in allowing the park plan to move forward (Maryman, Birkholz, 2006).

On December 1st, 1970, the city of Seattle signed an agreement with Halprin firm, as it was impressed with the successes it accomplished in the Portland Fountain sequence (Hirsch, 2005: 75). The plan was that Freeway Park would be a downtown “park for all people” and a solution for the problems of the freeway (PPS, 2005: 7).
The park was innovative structurally and architecturally, where Halprin pushed the ideas and proposed “an extensive landscape that scaled down the impact of the freeway for both driver and pedestrian by building right over it.” (PPS, 2005: 12). “Halprin created the park not by converting its urban environment into a natural environment, but by blending the two into a new landscape, a new nature.” according to the local journalist Charles Mudede (PPS, 2005: 8).

On July 4th 1976, Freeway Park was open to the public as part of Seattle’s bicentennial celebrations (PPS, 2005: 8, Hirsch, 2005: 93). For the first few years of Freeway Park’s existence, it was considered success and had a positive history (PPS, 2005: 8). It was filled with children and parents around the fountains, employees and residents came to relax, and the well-known “Out to Lunch” concerts and evening performances occurred in the park (Hirsch, 2005).

Landscape architects from around the world came to see the park, as it was architecturally and structurally innovative and represented a powerful symbolic movement to repair damage caused by the freeway (PPS, 2005: 8, Hirsch, 2005: 102). It is considered one of the most fascinating survived post-War landscape architecture treatises (Maryman, Birkholz, 2006). The Freeway Park “stimulated people about what could be done.” according to former Seattle Council member Phyllis Lamphere (PPS, 2005: 8).
Since the early 1980’s, the park has been constantly updated which make the park a rich cultural document reflecting the evolution of attitudes and needs through time (PPS, 2005: 8).

The positive reputation of the park reduced through the years as it became to Seattle’s population of drug dealers, drug users, and homeless because of the overgrown vegetation and the low visibility of the park, which made the park dark and difficult to navigate (PPS, 2005: 8) in 2002, a murder of a blind and deaf homeless woman accrued in the park. This incident drove citywide efforts and the Project for Public Spaces, Inc., (PPS) was hired by Seattle Parks and Recreation to work with local stakeholders to assess and evaluate the park in order to revitalize the park through a vision and activation plan (PPS, 2005: 9, Hirsch, 2005: 96).

The park has won many awards since its creation (Hirsch, 2005: 100). The Background of the award winning Park illustrates and symbolizes the inspiring possibilities of the collaboration between diverse groups: the city, county, state, federal government, and public-spired individuals to create a large scale project and turn it into reality and to improve the quality of life in a developing city (PPS, 2005: 7; Hirsch, 2005: 75, 100). The park also reflects the collaboration between governmental agencies and locals to funds a public facility (Hirsch, 2005: 75).
Features and their Description:

enclosing a series of three linked plazas (Maryman, Birkholz, 2006). These three plazas are known as the Central Plaza, the East Plaza, and the West Plaza (Maryman, Birkholz, 2006). They are similar in the concrete material, broadleaf evergreen plantings, and the site furnishing. While different in the vitality of water occupying the space and the associated mood variations (Maryman, Birkholz, 2006).

The water features were placed over the canyon of the freeway in order to treat the artificial roaring sound from the traffic below with the natural sound of the water (Maryman, Birkholz, 2006).

The vegetation was chosen based on its tolerance for pollution and buffering sound coming from the freeway as its role was protecting visitors from wind, noise, and pollution (Hirsch, 2005; Maryman, Birkholz, 2006). It was placed strategically, as lower levels were dense with specific types and the higher levels with others, and the plantings were dense along the park’s edges (Hirsch, 2005; Maryman, Birkholz, 2006).

The lighting in the park was featured in the fountains, paths and the park’s other features, which provided the night visitors with dramatic experience (Hirsch, 2005: 85).

Maryman and Birkholz quoted Danadjieva reflecting on the park as she said “the elements of the park are designed to show contrast between the geometric architectural forms and the softness and lushness of the plant material”. (PPS, 2005: 8)
Intended Uses:
The intended use of Freeway Park was that it would be a downtown “park for all people”. (PPS, 2005: 7). As it “was supposed to give city-dwellers a little piece of the woods.” (Murakami, 2004) Halprin’s philosophy in designing parks was to plan and design “common spaces where human beings can meditate or move about, privately or together” (PPS, 2005: 12).

Unintended Uses:
Home for Seattle’s population of drug-dealers, drug-users, and homeless.

Structure of Ownership, Management, and Stewardship:
The Freeway Park is owned by the city of Seattle and funded by county, state and federal governments as well as the Freeway Park Neighborhood Association (FPNA), which consists of locals and leading business owners from the surrounding area who work to revitalize the park.

Users:
The potential users of the Freeway park are workers from Park Place and nearby office buildings, residents from Horizon House and the First Hill neighborhood, visitors from nearby hotels, and Convention Center attendees and the there is a diversity of the type of users including families, school groups, elderly couples, tourists, as well as policemen on horseback and bikes (PPS, 2005: 10; Hirsch, 2005: 94).

Operations and Maintenance:
In order maintain the park, several recommendations have been provided:
• The original dramatic lighting scheme in the fountains should be restored (Hirsch, 2005: 107).
• The incompatible planters with the park’s design should be removed (Hirsch, 2005: 107).
• Trimming guidelines for compact vegetation should be established (Hirsch, 2005: 107).
**Sustainability Standards:**
Due to the conditions of the site, with its harsh winds and high pollution levels, the plant list chosen was based on pollution tolerance (Hirsch, 2005: 84). The plantings, which were dense along the park’s edges as well as the structural elements and landforms, were used in a way that provided the visitor with protection from the wind, noise and pollution (Hirsch, 2005: 85).

As Danadjieva says on the creative process “To help reduce pollution I designed walls and berms to block the penetration of fumes from the Freeway. These elements are composed to allow the fresh breeze from the waterfront to enter the park... To buffer the noise of the traffic the walls on the edge of the park are configured [sic] to form a multiplane sound barrier.” (Hirsch, 2005: 85)

The action plan by PPS in 2005 also offers a suggestion to carry out the plantings in a sustainable way by recycling the plants when they are removed from the park (PPS, 2005: 12).

**Risk Management:**
Over the years, the park’s positive reputation reduced (PPS, 2005: 8). The park became dark and difficult to navigate due to its grown vegetation, which cut visual connections (PPS, 2005: 8). It also became home for Seattle’s drug-users, drug-sellers, and homeless population (PPS, 2005: 8). In 2002, a murder of a blind and deaf homeless woman accrued in broad daylight (PPS, 2005: 8). This incident drove the efforts to revitalize and reactivate Freeway Park city wide (PPS, 2005: 8).

- To connect the park visually to the buildings around it and the dark impression, concrete walls have been reduced in some areas and the trees have been trimmed (PPS, 2005: 8).
- Parks personnel to prevent people from sleeping in the park have installed bars across the surface of the benches (Hirsch, 2005: 98).
- Emergency alarm buttons were installed in the park during the development of the Convention Center (Hirsch, 2005: 96).
- A security camera was installed to watch the restroom, which was the location where the murder in 2002 occurred (Hirsch, 2005: 96).
- There has been an increase in the park’s security patrols (PPS, 2005: 8).
CASE STUDIES

Outreach and Education:
Because of the hidden entrances to the park and the high concrete walls and overgrown trees, which block the view of the park from the adjacent surroundings, few people realize the existence of the park and its location (Murakami, 2004; PPS, 2005: 14, Hirsch, 2005: 103). Also, the signage system in the park is inadequate which makes the orientation confusing and therefore generates an unsafe and lost feeling especially for first time visitors (PPS, 2005, 14).

In order to increase awareness of the park and identify the location, the following suggestions have been addressed:

- Improve access and entrances, as access is the main priority for the park (PPS, 2005: 18, Hirsch, 2005: 103). The entrances could be improved and reinforced visually by reducing the concrete wall levels, landscaping, adding art, extending sightlines, and using lighting and signage (PPS, 2005: 13, 18). A competition could be established between local designers to rework the entrances (Hirsch, 2005: 104).
- Include adequate signage at every entrance and every intersection (PPS, 2005: 18, Hirsch, 2005: 104). The signs could be standardized with a signage scheme with consideration for the parks concepts, intended use and themes (Hirsch, 2005: 104). It could include a brief history of the park’s development, concept of design, and a map of the interior of the park or directional posts (PPS, 2005: 18, Hirsch, 2005: 104). The same information included within the signs could be included in tourist brochures.
- Insert maps at points of potential directional confusion (Hirsch, 2005: 104, 105). The maps should include the different parts of the park, what might be discovered within the park’s areas, and the exists (Hirsch, 2005: 104, 105).
- Use lighting system to locate and highlight different features and parts of the park. For example, use the pedestrian lights along major pathways, at entrances, and to give a dramatic feeling to some fountains, trees, and corridors (PPS, 2005: 18).

Preservation Advisory and Review Process:
In January 2005, an activation plan prepared for the vision of Freeway Park was prepared by the Project for Public Spaces (PPS). The New York City based nonprofit organization was hired by the City of Seattle to work with neighborhood interest groups to assess and evaluate the park in order to revitalize it and make it more safe and habitable (PPS, 2005: 9; Hirsch, 2005: 99; Maryman, Birkholz, 2006). A number of meetings were held with area residents, property owners, building managers, employees, and park staff in order to understand what people think of the park and how they wanted it to be (PPS, 2005: 9). The report included a several short and long term programming recommendations that could help improve the park (PPS, 2005: 9; Hirsch, 2005: 99; Maryman, Birkholz, 2006).
Community Stakeholder Involvement and Participatory Process:

In order to revitalize the park and engage the public to use it, the PPS Study has provided several short, medium, and long term recommendations, which can be implemented:

• Establishing a regular “Walk around the Park” on a designated route, which was an idea proposed by the Horizon House residents who were willing to organize for health exercise purposes and to increase “people presence” in the park. And in order to enhance the route, temporary or permanent art or horticultural displays could be used (PPS, 2005: 10, 17; Hirsch, 2005: 106).

• Revitalizing the “Out to Lunch” popular concert program that was held in summer as well as other concerts and events in order to activate the park and encourage future park regulars who might discover the park through one of these events (PPS, 2005: 11, 17; Hirsch, 2005: 106).

• Providing the physical facilities that are essential in attracting and increasing activity in the park (PPS, 2005: 11, 17). For example, providing pedestrian-scale lighting, places for outdoor dining, colorful benches, comfortable and movable chairs, seasonal horticultural displays at strategic points, play areas for children, and interactive games such as horseshoes, bocce, and chess (PPS, 2005: 11, 17).

• Making “the park more active more often.” (PPS, 2005: 13). Several activities need to be programmed in several places through the park within various times of the day, week, and year (PPS, 2005: 13). As the “park needs to be thought of as a series of smaller “places” that are designed and managed to draw people into the park in key “anchor locations” throughout the park.” (PPS, 2005: 13).

• Enhancing the relationship and making the park more welcoming to residents, workers and visitors by creating connections between the park and the adjacent neighborhoods (PPS, 2005: 13).

• Providing removable vending carts that may enliven the park to test the practicality of creating permanent café structures before committing to building a large one (PPS, 2005: 18, Hirsch, 2005: 105).

Funding Models:

The funding sources that were used to make the Freeway Park a reality were:

• Forward Thrust bond money (PPS, 2005: 7; Seattle Government).

• County, State, and Federal highway funds (PPS, 2005: 7; Seattle Government).

Also the Freeway Park Neighborhood Association (FPNA), consisting of a neighborhood group and surrounding businesses leading members (Hirsch, 2005: 96; Maryman, Birkholz, 2006), raised funds to:


• Pay water to be restored in the fountains after tuning the fountains off in the early 1990 to reduce utility costs (Hirsch, 2005: 96).

• Spend on security patrols $30,000-40,000 yearly (Hirsch, 2005: 97).
4. Fort Worth Water Gardens

Location: Fort Worth, TX.
Date of Construction: 1974
Architect/s: Designed by Philip Johnson and John Burgee, and constructed by General Contractors of Thos. S. Byrne in Fort Worth (Roberts, 1997, City of Fort Worth, 2012).
Space: 4.3 acre
Design/Historical Significance:
On October 19th, 1974, the Amon Carter Foundation dedicated the 4.3-acre Water Gardens as a gift to the City of Fort Worth (The Cultural Landscape Foundation (tclf), 2001, City of Fort Worth, 2012, Hanna, 2014). “Motivated by Lady Bird Johnson’s civic beautification movement” (tclf, 2001), the New York architect, Philip Johnson who recently designed the Amon Carter Museum was chosen by Ruth Carter Stevenson, the president of the foundation, to design the Water Gardens (tclf, 2001, Hirsch, 2005: 11, City of Fort Worth, 2012). The park was designed to steer in a new era and enrich the abandoned properties on the southern end of downtown Fort Worth (tclf, 2001, Hanna, 2014).

Philip Johnson designed the asymmetrical space occupying several levels with the dynamic geometry forms of concrete filled with water and shift of vegetation (Hanna, 2014). The park seemed like “cooling oasis in a concrete jungle” in downtown Fort Worth, where the temperature breaks down to 100 degrees in the summer and became a reprieve for visitors and downtown Fort Worth locals. (Dutton, 2011: 41, City of Fort Worth, 2012). The park featured three main pools with different water characteristics, the Active Pool, The Quite Pool, and the Aerating Pool (tclf, 2001, City of Fort Worth, 2012, Hanna, 2014). Johnson managed to create diverse spaces that were open, closed, lowered, raised, private, and public within the series of spaces, of walkways, pools, and central plaza (Hanna, 2014). In 1975, the active pool was featured in part of the film “Logan’s Run”. In 1979, the active pool was also briefly featured at the end of “The Lathe of Heaven” TV adaptation (City of Fort Worth, 2012).

When the Fort Worth Convention Center expanded, the original plan of the park was altered to allow direct access from the center (Roberts, 1997, City of Fort Worth, 2012). The alteration included a new north entrance to the park, which therefore provided more access and restoration of the multiple sprays in the aerating pool (Roberts, 1997, City of Fort Worth, 2012).

In 2004, the Fort Worth Water Gardens was closed after a tragedy that happened in the summer where four people drowned in the active pool, three children and one adult (Hanna, 2014). The water was unusually deep due to high rains and maintenance issues. The park was reopened in 2007 after undergoing extreme renovations and applying several changes to make it safer for the public (Roberts, 1997, Hanna, 2014).

Based on Andy Taft who is the Downtown Fort Worth Inc. president, there are signs that Fort Worth Gardens “could be poised for a higher profile in its next 40 years.” And he expects more people to discover Fort Worth especially because the surrounding area of the park, southern end of downtown, keeps developing (Hanna, 2014).
Features and their Description:

The Active Pool is considered the main highlight and most famous in the park (tclf, 2001, Dutton, 2011: 65). The pool reflects a “man-made canyon”, where the water rushes down a series of steep stone steps into a rolling small pit falling 38 feet below the ground level (tclf, 2001, Roberts, 1997, Dutton, 2011: 65). The visitor’s walkway towards the bottom depends on disconnected elevated concrete steps with water rushing under their feet with the power and sound of the water (tclf, 2001, Dutton, 2011: 65).

The Quiet Pool is a surrounded with cypress trees and 20-foot concrete walls that are covered a sheet of water that gently rolls down into the sunken 16 feet from ground level still-water pool (tclf, 2001, Dutton, 2011: 65).

The Aerating Pool is considered the least successful pool (Dutton, 2011: 66). It featured forty spray fountains that were illuminated and seating areas covered with shade trees surrounding the pool (Dutton, 2011: 65, 66).

Intended Uses:
“The park was designed to usher in a new era on the southern end of downtown” (Hanna, 2014). It was planned to be a place where locals and tourists gather and the idea of the water was “to create something that would keep people coming back and back,” (Hanna, 2014 Quoting Johnson in the 1984 documentary Water Garden).

Sustainability Standards:
N/A
Structure of Ownership, Management, and Stewardship:
The Fort Worth Water Gardens is owned by the city of Fort Worth, as it was a gift from the Amon Carter Foundation in 1974.

Risk Management:
In the summer of 2004, a tragedy occurred where four people, three children and one adult, drowned in the active pool of the Fort Worth Water Gardens (Hirsch, 2005: 9; Hanna, 2014). The issue was that the water was unusually deep due to failure in pump circulation and heavy rains as well as the absence of handrails for safety (Dutton, 2011: 65).

After the tragedy, the Water Gardens were closed in order to reduce the problem and make the active pool safer (Hanna, 2014). In 2007, the park was fully reopened after applying several changes to the pool (Hanna, 2014):

- New railings to prevent people from falling were added
- Warning signs against swimming or splashing in the waters were provided
- The depth of the water in the active pool was reduced

Outreach and Education:
Most People seen to be aware of the Fort Worth Water Gardens because it was featured in the 1975 film “Logan’s Run” (Hanna, 2014).

Community Stakeholder Involvement and Participatory Process:
The Fort Worth Water Gardens is not used enough by locals, it is mainly used by tourists. (Hirsch, 2005: 21, Hanna, 2014 citing Mayor Betsy Price).

Mayor Betsy Price suggested that the Water Gardens need events in order to revitalize it and bring more people to it (Hanna, 2014). An event like Oct. 30 “Spooky Bike & Ball” ride was recommended which would include food trucks and live music (Hanna, 2014).

Funding Models:
The funding of the Fort Worth Gardens is by the City of Fort Worth.
5. Portland Open-Space Sequence

**Common Name:** Portland Open-Space Sequence.

**Historic Name:** Halprin Open-Space Sequence. Individually known as the Source Fountain Plaza, Lovejoy Fountain Park, Pettygrove Park and Ira Keller Fountain Park. With the exception of the Source, each of the parks are named after past city leaders.

**Location:** Portland, Oregon

**Date of Construction:** 1966, 1968, 1970

**Architect/s:** Lawrence Halprin
**Design/Historical Significance:**

The *Halprin Open-Space Sequence* was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in March of 2013 under Criteria:

A – Community development - Urban Renewal  
C – Landscape architecture – Modern Movement  
G – Significant collection of work by master landscape architect Lawrence Halprin achieved in the last fifty years (National Register Nomination (NRN), 2013).

Lawrence Halprin was a prolific and inventive modernist landscape architect for over 60 years (Martin, 2009). Though slightly younger, Halprin was a contemporary of Garrett Eckbo and their paths seemed to parallel. Both attended Harvard University’s Graduate School of Design and set up shops in or near San Francisco (NRN, 2013). Both Halprin and Eckbow are considered to have completed their most artistically significant works during the post-World War II urban renewal period (TCLF, 2015).

Halprin is best-known for designing the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial in Washington, D.C. However, he is probably best-regarded for the Portland Open-Space Sequence. Charles Birnbaum, of the Cultural Landscape Foundation, described Halprin: “He was the single most influential landscape architect of the postwar years.” (Martin, 2009). A few of his more famous projects in the city of San Francisco include Ghirardelli Square (1968), Embarcadero Center public areas (1972) and Levi’s Plaza (1982) (NRN, 2013).

Halprin was married to dancer and choreographer Anna Schuman. She was distinguished in the field of modern dance and her work fundamentally influenced Halprin’s aesthetic. His designs were conceived using basic elements of sound, movement and abstractions of the natural environment (HLC, 2015). For the plaza fountains, Halprin used the Sierra Cascades for inspiration (TCLF, 2015), (Figure: Sierras sketch).
From the south to the north, in a flowing sequence of fountains, paths, and plazas, the experience of the Halprin parks in Portland begins at the “Source Fountain”, which leads to the Lovejoy Fountain, with forms derived from the high desert, on to Pettygrove Park, with forms derived from meandering valley streams and meadows, and finally to the Forecourt Fountain, which recalls the mountains with its dramatic falls and alpine plantings. They embody Halprin’s philosophy that sculptural and landscape forms recognize nature and natural processes as a “driving force” but that the design does not “imitate nature.”

In a book of his sketches, Halprin wrote:

“In Portland I attempted to do 2 things: The first of these was to develop a long eight block sequence of open spaces. promenades, nodes of plazas & parks with a mix of public space & private space interwoven. Along this progression are a diversity of uses - housing, apartments, shops, restaurants, offices, auditorium. The space is choreographed for movement with nodes for quiet & contemplation, action & inaction, hard & soft, YIN & Yang.

The second basic approach was to bring into the heart of downtown activities which related in a very real way to the environment of the Portland area-the Columbia river, the Cascade mountains, the streams, rivers & mountain meadows. These symbolic elements are very much a part of Portlanders' psyche-they glory in their natural environment & escape to it as often as possible. But it seemed important to acknowledge the urban character of these places as well as their origins-so the designs deal with the origins of form: the process by which natural form is created. The fountains & plazas are formed to link up with nature's process not copy her.

Finally these places were for the first time designed to be used to be participatory NOT just to look at - - they say COME IN not stay off.” (TCLF, 2015).

(Figures: Lovejoy Drawing 2, Pettygrove Drawing, Keller)

Lawrence Halprin passed away in 2009 at the age of 93 (Martin, 2009).
Community Development - Urban Renewal

At the end of World War II, Portland was in the same situation as many cities facing deteriorating downtowns. With a combination of newly conceived “tax-increment financing” and $12 million in federal funds the City set about redeveloping downtown Portland (HLC, 2015). In the process the Portland Development Commission (PDC) was born. The PDC targeted 11 areas deemed to be blighted.

The South Auditorium District was still a lively multi-ethnic downtown neighborhood at the time. Determined to be part of the redevelopment plan, residents were moved and some 385 buildings were demolished. Leaders in the PDC hired Lawrence Halprin to reinvent the space. (HLC, 2015) The South Auditorium District was intended to be Portland’s cornerstone urban renewal project (Hottman, 2013).

Halprin’s design of the parks, plazas and fountains integrated into the urban environment were a radical departure from typical central business districts usually confined to basic uses for employment and shopping (HLC, 2015).

New York Times Architectural critic, Ada Louise Huxtable famously claimed the sequence as, “one of the most important urban spaces since the Renaissance.” (NRN, 2013)

Halprin’s work became an international model and set the stage for Portland’s future downtown public spaces (Johnson, 2008).
Features and their description:
The Portland Open-Space Sequence is a district consisting of four interconnected, but non-contiguous parks each of which are approximately one acre in size. The parks are linked by eight contributing and intentionally designed pedestrian malls/paths covering approximately eight blocks (NRN, 2013), (Figure: Map). The sequence has been described as, “…linked garden rooms forming a connected realm of public space…” (TCLF, 2009). Each park has a fountain or a pool. Pettygrove Park has an individual sculpture entitled, “The Dreamer.” Lovejoy Fountain Park has separate modernist structure/pavilion.
• **Pettygrove Park:**

Pettygrove Park is similar in size and dimension to Lovejoy. It is approximately an acre and is rectangular shape. It is parallel to the Third Avenue Pedestrian Mall and two blocks directly north of Lovejoy Park. The park consists of hillocks and meandering asphalt paths with a dense tree canopy throughout. Curved walls and steps surround a small paved stage. In the southeast of the park is a circular pool with a large, modern sculpture entitled the “Dreamer”. Pathways contain benches and globe lighting. (Figure: Pettygrove Park)

• **Source Fountain Plaza:**

The Source Fountain Plaza is a small park is 2,200 square-foot space at the southernmost end of the Sequence. It is about two blocks south of Lovejoy Fountain Park off of the Second Avenue Pedestrian Mall. The main element is a square, low-rise bubbler fountain made of brick and set in the center plaza. The plaza is also made of brick and concrete. A tiered concrete wall offers seating on the southern edge. (Figure: Source Fountain Plaza)

• **Lovejoy Fountain Park:**

Lovejoy Fountain Park is a rectangular space of nearly an acre. It is at located on the southern edge of the sequence near the Third Avenue Pedestrian Mall. The park includes a plaza and is surrounded by office, government and apartment buildings of the same era. The curb pedestals, and globe lights are located along the north. One of the primary elements in the park at the south end is an open, shelter pavilion made of concrete and a wooded slats with a wooden and copper roof. The other features are a set of three double benches and the main feature – the Lovejoy Fountain. The fountain itself is made of terraced, tiered precast concrete with pools at the base. The water cascades from the top, through paths and down to the pools. Steps and concrete pedestals serve as stepping stones and access to other levels. (Figure: Lovejoy Fountain Park)

• **Ira Keller Fountain Park:**

Ira Keller Fountain Park is set on a full city block. It is located at the far end of the Sequence off Market Street approximately two blocks from Pettygrove Park. The open space slopes to north to south with a large tree canopy and hilly berms. The main element of the park is the large, tiered, interactive, concrete fountain with rises inset with sunken pools. Waterfalls disperse 13,000 gallons of water per minute. (Figure: Ira Keller Fountain Park 1, Ira Keller Fountain Park 2)
CASE STUDIES

Pettygrove Park 2

Ira Keller Fountain Park 1

Ira Keller Fountain Park 2
**Intended Uses:**
Public spaces - parks, plazas, interactive water fountains, pedestrian paths community events.

**Unintended Uses:**
Swimming, bathing

**Structure of Ownership, Management, and Stewardship:**
The Portland Open-Space Sequence is currently operated and maintained by two city departments; the City Water Bureau and Portland Parks and Recreation Bureau. In July of this year, the management will be handed over completely to the PP&R.

In 2001, the City of Portland realized that their park systems were at a crossroads. In a proactive move, the City, Portland Parks and Recreation and Portland citizens came together to create the Parks 2020 Vision Plan. The vision included the following guiding principles.

- Essential Element
- Connected System
- Inclusive and Accessible
- Stewardship
- Intrinsic Value

The visioning process required a recognition that City park funding was undercapitalized. One of the goals for the Plan included the creation of a private, non-profit parks foundation (Parks 2020 Vision Plan, 2001). The Portland Parks Foundation (PPF) was created to involve the community in supporting the parks, and assisting with fund raising, land acquisition and special projects. Since 2002, the PPF has raised over $10 million for direct Portland Parks and Recreation investment.

The Halprin Landscape Conservancy was established in 2001 with the sole intent of the restoration and stewardship of the Portland Sequence. The conservancy is engaged in public-private partnerships with the City of Portland, citizens and private corporations. Recent projects include tree-thinning and new lighting at Lovejoy Fountain. The Conservancy engaged local homeowners to devise a scheme that was compatible with Halprin’s original design and improved the lighting of the area paths and plazas. The iconic Lovejoy shelter underwent a $200 thousand restoration in 2014 which was made possible through the effort of the HLC and corporate donations (Koffman, 2014).

Additionally, the HLC initiated the National Register nomination process in 2012 (NRN, 2013).
Operations and maintenance:
- The fountains are turned off during the cold weather months to prevent water from blowing or freezing on surfaces. This “down time” also provides an opportunity for maintenance and repair projects.
- All of the fountains are cleaned regularly, and the interactive fountains are chlorinated to the level of a swimming pool.
- PP&R works with the Regional Arts & Culture Council to maintain aesthetics at each fountain. Sculptures undergo restoration when needed, in order to present the art as originally intended.

Operations and maintenance:
- Most of Portland’s decorative fountains recirculate/recycle water to minimize water use and run-off. Meters have been installed to gauge water use and electrical consumption.

Risk management:
The Portland Open-Space sequence parks and fountains present many opportunities for risk. However, Portland has had very few troubles over the years. There has been one death in the recent past. A young man who had been drinking died after attempting to navigate the flow channels and became stuck in Keller fountain (Stairiker, 2015). Occasional “stubbed toe” claims are filed with the City from tripping and uneven cement. The uneven steps in the design of parts of the fountains prompted the City to create “visuals” or markings to make visitors aware of the landings and prevent mishaps. Some of the fountain pressure was too powerful for children, so the pressure was adjusted. Lawrence Halprin did take some safety measures in his designs. The Keller Fountain appears to have precarious ledges, but the pillars actually have three-foot deep pools that that act as barriers round the perimeter (HLC, 2015) (Figure: Keller_barriers). Keller Fountain now has signs stating “Swim at your own risk”. The City Council denied requests to put up the signs until recently (Stairiker, 2015). Other concerns are related to bacteria and hygiene. To counteract potential exposure, the fountains are chlorinated to swimming pool standards.

The following, “Rules to Follow When Visiting the Fountains” is from the Portland Parks and Recreation Department:
- Look, but don’t drink! The water flowing in decorative fountains is not for drinking. To conserve water, most of these fountains recycle water.
- Be safe! Although people enjoy splashing around in the interactive fountains, there are potential dangers for unattended children.
- Please use caution at all fountains. Slippery surfaces, rapidly moving water, and pools of water require careful attention.
• **Security:**

Portland Parks and Recreation has a Park Ranger Program that offers a wide range of services and safeguards. Rangers are considered the eyes and ears for the parks. They patrol and enforce park rules, while acting as park goodwill ambassadors. The Ranger program has close ties to law enforcement, neighborhood associations, and social service agencies. Rangers are trained, but are unarmed. The program was expanded in 2012 to provide service and security to the central business district and 16 downtown parks.

The City of Portland takes as many precautions as possible in trying to mitigate risk, but acknowledge that the park users must accept some of the risk. The Portland Open-Space Sequence parks were designed to echo nature and be interactive. Some risks are inherent and everyone takes a somewhat “cross your fingers” approach (Stairiker, 2015).

• **Homelessness:**

Portland has had some successes in battling homelessness that other cities have not (Pixley, 2015). Started over ten years ago and now accepted and supported by the City, Dignity Village is an example of a homeless transition site that offers camping and small dwellings (Figure: tentcity). The system works as a non-profit, membership based community where members are allowed to “check in” for up to two years while they are getting back on their feet. The concept became successful in large part because of donated private and City land (Heben, 2014). The City has also installed a day storage locker program in a downtown area hotel.

• **Skateboarders and bicyclists:**

According to Steve Pixley (2015) with Portland Parks and Recreation, skateboarders and bicyclists riding urban infrastructure stopped being a problem approximately ten years ago when the City instituted a skatepark program. Portland built four skateparks and six smaller neighborhood skate “spots” (Figure: HollyFarmsskate). There are currently several self-funded neighborhood skate spot projects endorsed by the PP&R. PP&R offers clinics and instruction classes as part of the program. The skate/bike outlets are used regularly and apparently filled a need to the extent that damage to benches, railings and walls from urban skateboarders and bicyclists is low.
Outreach and education:
The Halprin Landscape Conservancy was established in 2001 with the sole intent of the restoration and stewardship of the Portland Open-Space Sequence.

Their mission:
- Activate: Increase awareness of the parks as a cultural resource on par with the city’s and the nation’s greatest cultural resources.
- Improve: Make needed changes according to the original vision of Lawrence Halprin
- Maintain: Keep parks at the level of a residential garden

Preservation advisory and review process:
The Halprin Open-Space Sequence District was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in March of 2013. Preservation activities related to the space are under the purview of the Portland Planning Bureau (Certified Local Government), Oregon State Historic Preservation Office (State Historic Preservation Office) and the Halprin Landscape Conservancy.

Community stakeholder involvement and participatory process:
The Halprin Landscape Conservancy engages the neighbors in the vicinity of the Portland Open-Space Sequence for their input regarding rehabilitation efforts.

With the combined efforts Portland Parks and Recreation and the Portland Parks Foundation, the City has over 100 partner groups and somewhere near ten-thousand regular volunteers who contribute 25% of the work completed at Portland area parks (Pixley, PP&R, 2015). PP&R offers weekend drop-in programs. Another program working with PP&R horticulturists in Washington Park has “deadheaders” snipping off the dead flowers of the park’s 11,000 rose bushes.

Parke Diem is a popular yearly event sponsored by the PPF. For two days every October, thousands of Portland citizens organize to, “unite, achieve, and raise awareness of our park systems’ needs” (PPF, 2015). Portland’s Greatest Volunteer Event typically completes over 100 local park projects over the two days.

Funding models:
Portland Parks and Recreation has a budget of 1 million dollars for park maintenance, but the need is ten times that. The PP&R is currently preparing a $200 million bond package - $1.5 million of which is obligated to the Portland Open-space Sequence rehabilitation (PP&R, 2015).

The Portland Parks Foundation was created in 2001 to garner public support and raise funds for Portland parks. The PPF is a partner to the Halprin Landscape Conservancy and together they raise and contribute funds to the conservation of the Portland Open-Space Sequence (HLC, 2015).
4.2 RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON CASE STUDIES

a. Consult Relevant “In-House” Experts from Departments, Boards and Commissions

b. Safety and Risk Management

- Install Emergency alarm buttons in the center (Freeway Park).
- Install security cameras (Freeway Park).
- Improve security patrol (Freeway Park).
- Restore pedestrian-scale lighting (Freeway Park PPS Plan).
- Railings to prevent people from falling in the fountains could be added (Fort Worth Water Gardens).
- Warning signs against swimming or splashing in the waters should be provided (Fort Worth Water Gardens).
- The depth of the water in the fountain should be reduced (Fort Worth Water Gardens).
- Consult with public safety personnel (Tucson Police, SMG Security) to design security.
- A stand alone risk management policy and document should be encouraged as an addendum to the TCC landscape documents.
- Adopt Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)
- Provide 24/7 security - Potentially with Downtown Tucson Partnership Ambassadors

d. Sustainability

- Carry out the plantings in a sustainable way by recycling the plants when they are removed from the park (Freeway Park PPS Plan).
- Reducing storm drain pollution and improving water quality (Falls Park).

e. Funding

- There is the need for a rigorous and more in-depth financial analysis and feasibility studies that will further established a funding model for the TCC landscape. This is necessary for the sustainability of the TCC landscape.
- Tourism related activities should be encouraged in and around the TCC landscape because this could be harnessed as a huge source of funding (Falls Park).
- Public, private partnership should be immensely encouraged as a means of funding and sustainability (Klyde Warren Park).
- Establish or work with current 501c organizations for advocacy, outreach and fundraising
- Expand/enhance Tucson Parks Foundation
- Elevate volunteer engagement programs to regular and citywide events
c. Vibrancy

Cultivating a Sense of Place and Stewardship

• Improve access and entrances of the site in order to increase awareness of the landscape to make it easier for visitors to identify the location. The entrances could be reinforced visually in many ways:
  - Landscaping
  - Adding art
  - Extending sightlines
  - Using lighting and signage (Freeway Park PPS Plan).
• Include suitable signage at every entrance and every intersection (Freeway Park PPS Plan).
• Insert maps at points of potential directional confusion (Freeway Park PPS Plan).
• Restore a dramatic lighting system to guide visitors through the different areas and highlight on the different features. For example, use pedestrian-scale lighting along major pathways and entrances and highlight on the fountains, trees, and corridors (Freeway Park PPS Plan).

Program of Use

• Expand the City of Tucson Skatepark Program and install a free skatepark/spot downtown
• Program several activities in several places through the center within various times of the day (Freeway Park PPS Plan).
• Establish events in the park such as “Out to Lunch” concerts and evening performances (Freeway Park).
• Establish a regular “Walk around the Park” on a designated route to increase “people presence” and for health purposes (Freeway Park PPS Plan, idea proposed by the Horizon House residents)

Advocacy Group:

• A Neighborhood Association could be established consisting of a neighborhood group and surrounding businesses leading members in order to revitalize the center, by raising funds, establishing events, etc. (Freeway Park).
• Residents involvement in the decision making process through workshops or online survey.

Infrastructure:

• Establish trimming guidelines for compact vegetation (Freeway Park PPS Plan).
• Remove incompatible planters with the park's design (Freeway Park PPS Plan).

Facilities:

• Expand the City of Tucson Skatepark Program and install a free skatepark/spot downtown
• Program several activities in several places through the center within various times of the day (Freeway Park PPS Plan).
• Establish events in the park such as “Out to Lunch” concerts and evening performances (Freeway Park).
• Establish a regular “Walk around the Park” on a designated route to increase “people presence” and for health purposes (Freeway Park PPS Plan, idea proposed by the Horizon House residents)
Stewardship Recommendations at The Tucson Convention Center Landscape
What is the design/historical significance of the TCC Landscape?
As detailed in the conservation master plan and the National Register nomination (Erickson 2012a; 2012b) as well as advocacy publications like Yetman’s (2010) contribution, the Tucson Convention Center Landscape is considered the work of a master—Modernist landscape architect Garrett Eckbo. Also of historical significance, is that the landscape was formerly home to ancestral Native Americans, the Tohono O’odham, Yaqui, and Apache Indians, Spanish soldiers and their families, Mexican-Americans, African Americans, Chinese, and some Anglos. At the time of the TCC Landscape’s construction this area was the heart of the Mexican-American community known as Barrio Libre or The Barrio (Otero 2010). The landscape is therefore a historically contested space.

Today the landscape is owned partially by Rio Nuevo Multipurpose Facilities District, Pima County, the State of Arizona, private investors, and is leased and owned in part by the City of Tucson. Some business function in the partially defunct La Placita Village. In 2014 SMG—the worldwide leader of public assembly facility management—was awarded a contract to manage the TCC following a request for proposals (RFP) conducted by the City of Tucson. SMG now manages most of the landscape infrastructure, namely coordinating its event space; the Arena, the Leo Rich Theater, and the Music Hall.

The landscape remains contested however, in that until 2010 the once grand civic and entertainment space, with its fountain features and interactive designed Modernist landscape, was nearly forgotten. It has therefore been underused and neglected. Most recently it has become home to some of Tucson’s homeless populations (“Dream Pods”) following a series of court rulings that granted free-speech in an adjacent park, Veinte de Agosto.

Recommendations to further understandings of the TCC Landscape’s historical significance:
- Mayor and Council should adopt the master conservation plan and SHPO should approve the nomination for further consideration by the Keeper of the National Register in Washington D.C.
- Continued partnerships with Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission, the Tucson Historic Preservation Foundation, the Arizona Historical Society, TCC Today, and Tucson-Pima Arts Council should work to educate the public and other municipalities as to the significance of the landscape.
What intended uses (e.g. events, community public space, and tourism destinations) are associated with activation of the TCC Landscape?

The TCC Landscape was originally intended to serve a wide variety of publics including local communities and tourists. La Placita Village was envisioned as a place for those enjoying the fountains and outdoor recreation, as well as those attending events held in the Arena, Leo Rich Theater, and Music Hall, to shop and eat. Given the TCC Landscape’s current status as the largest area of open, green space in Tucson’s urban center (~5.75 acres) and its many on-site public amenities and entertainment venues, this area should be used for special and impromptu events. A series of special events are currently associated with the use of the TCC Landscape or utilize areas in its proximity. These events should continue to use the space and nearby events should be encouraged to use the space.

Recommendations for the integration of established events:


  Although the folk festival is currently held in the El Presidio neighborhood, the TCC Landscape offers indoor venues for performers as well as good outdoor acoustics that, if utilized, would enliven the plaza area.

• **Tucson Modernism Week**: October 3-11, 2015 ([Figure: Tucson Modernism Week Map, www.tucsonmod.com](http://www.tucsonmod.com))

  This year Tucson Modernism Week is coming to the TCC Landscape. Organized by the Tucson Historic Preservation Foundation, professional preservationists at the Foundation understand the inherent value this space offers and its significance as a Modernist landscape.

• **Tucson Meet Yourself**: October 9-11, 2015 ([Figure: Tucson Meet Yourself, www.tucsonmeetyourself.org/](http://www.tucsonmeetyourself.org/))

  Tucson Meet Yourself is held near Presidio Park and the Pima County Library each year and vendor set-ups often spill out near the bridge that connects Pima County administrative buildings to the northern entrance of La Placita Village—beside the Eckbo Walkway Fountain. The Fountain Plaza is the perfect setting for additional vendors and patrons to congregate during this festival.

• **Second Saturdays Downtown**: the second Saturday of every month ([http://www.2ndsaturdaysdowntown.com/](http://www.2ndsaturdaysdowntown.com/))

  The TCC Landscape is often under-attended by those patrons using the area during Second Saturdays Downtown. This area is a short walking distance from many of the stages set up along Congress Street and should be advertised to musicians and buskers, downtown businesses, and potential product and commercial vendors—those selling food, jewelry, arts and crafts, books, games and toys, pre-packaged foods, etc.

• **Cinema La Placita Outdoor Movie Group**: every Thursday May through August ([http://www.cinemalaplacita.com/](http://www.cinemalaplacita.com/))

  Cinema La Placita offers movie screenings for all ages and backgrounds. A community-building activity that takes advantage of the space offered by the TCC, this event should be encouraged to continue. Cinema La Placita’s website even accepts suggestions for future screenings by interested parties.
TUCSON MODERNISM WEEK 2014

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 3

LECTURE (free)
5:30 - 6:30 pm
Martin Treu: Roadside America
American Evangelical Lutheran Church, 115 N. Tucson Blvd.

RECEPTION (free)
7:00 - 9:00 pm
Mid-Century Furniture Marketplace + Gist Furniture Exhibit
2903 E. Broadway Blvd.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 4

SHOPS (free)
10:00 am - 5:00 pm
Mid-Century Furniture Marketplace
2903 E. Broadway Blvd.

SHOW ($10)
10:00 am - 3:00 pm
Fina Community College, Downtown Campus

TOUR (free)
10:00 am - 3:30 pm
Fina Community College, Downtown Campus

LECTURE ($5)
10:00 - 11:00 am
Saving Adobe Modern - Panel Presentation
Faith Lutheran Church, 3925 E. 5th Street

LECTURE (free)
11:30 am - 12:30 pm
The Life and Work of Harry Bertoia - Celia Bertoya
Faith Lutheran Church, 3925 E. 5th Street

LECTURE ($5)
1:00 - 2:00 pm
Alexander Girard Design - Adam Call
Faith Lutheran Church, 3925 E. 5th Street

LECTURE (free)
2:30 - 3:30 pm
Moving Images of Western Modernity - Jennifer Jenkins
Central Church of the Nazarene, 404 S. Columbus Blvd.

LECTURE ($5)
3:00 - 4:00 pm
The Architecture of Seduction - Christopher Rawlins
Central Church of the Nazarene, 404 S. Columbus Blvd.

EVENT ($25)
7:00 - 9:00 pm
Charles Phoenix: ArizonaLand!
Loft Cinema, 3233 E. Speedway Blvd.

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 5

SHOPS (free)
10:00 am - 5:00 pm
Mid-Century Furniture Marketplace
2903 E. Broadway Blvd.

SHOW ($10)
10:00 am - 3:00 pm
Mid-Century Furniture Marketplace
Fina Community College, Downtown Campus

TOUR (free)
10:30 am - 2:30 pm
Modern Home Tour - self-guided tour of four modern homes
Pick up location map at 2903 E. Broadway Blvd.

LECTURE/TOUR (free)
5:30 - 7:30 pm
Garrett Eckbo - Modern Landscape in Tucson - Helen Erickson
Tucson Community Center, Leo Rich Theater

TUCSON MODERNISM WEEK 2014 SCHEDULE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 7

FILM ($10)
7:00 - 8:00 pm
The Vision of Paolo Soleri
Loft Cinema, 3233 E. Speedway Blvd.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 8

EVENT ($10)
7:00 - 9:00 pm
Reel Fashion - 3 Story Magazine + Fox Theatre
Fox Theatre, 17 West Congress Street

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9

LECTURE (free)
6:00 - 7:00 pm
Icon Architect: Robert Swaim, AIA
American Evangelical Lutheran Church, 115 N. Tucson Blvd.

RECEPTION (free)
7:00 - 9:00 pm
Chase Bank Architecture Exhibit
Chase Bank, 3033 E. Broadway

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 10

EVENT (free)
6:00 - 7:00 pm
Marshall Shore
American Evangelical Lutheran Church, 115 N. Tucson Blvd.

PARTY ($55)
7:00 - 10:00 pm
“a foothills home”

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 11

LECTURE/TOUR ($10)
Guy Green Landscape - Helen Erickson
10:00 am - 12:00 noon
Arizona Sonora Desert Museum (Limit 25)

TOUR ($20)
10:30 am - 1:00 pm
Retro Bus Tour: Broadway - 10 am, 11:30 am, 1 pm + 2:30 pm
Chase Bank, 3033 E. Broadway

LECTURE ($5)
11:30 am - 1:30 pm
Let’s Get Away From It All - Carlos Lozano
Unitarian Universalist Church, 4831 E. 22nd Street

LECTURE ($5)
1:30 - 3:00 pm
Follow the Money - Donna Reiner
Unitarian Universalist Church, 4831 E. 22nd Street

LECTURE ($5)
2:00 - 4:00 pm
Ralph Haver - Everybody’s Modernist - Alison King
Unitarian Universalist Church, 4831 E. 22nd Street

LECTURE ($5)
3:00 - 5:00 pm
Judith Ophae - a Tucson legacy - Christopher Domin
Unitarian Universalist Church, 4831 E. 22nd Street

EVENT ($5)
7:00 - 8:00 pm
Experience Modernism in 3D - Keith Poadl
American Evangelical Lutheran Church, 115 N. Tucson Blvd.

For tickets and more information go to tucsonmodernist.com

Tucson Modernism Week Map
Recommendations involving upcoming events:

A very significant event that is currently slated to use the spaces of the TCC Landscape includes:

- **Borderlands Theater production of “Barrio Stories”**: (http://www.borderlandstheater.org/about/whats-new/)

In October of 2014 Borderlands Theater received a $50,000 grant to launch the “Barrio Stories Project”. Dr. Lydia Otero (La Calle 2010) has been hired as a consultant. Borderlands Theater is also working with Pima Community College. The website states:

Led by new Producing Director, Marc David Pinate, the Barrio Stories Project will utilize cross-sector partnerships to collect oral histories from the residents of Tucson’s historic barrios. These narratives will be theatricalized and performed in sight-specific locations. The first iteration of the initiative will focus on Barrio Libre, Tucson’s original Mexican-American enclave that was demolished with the construction of the Tucson Convention Center. Pinate hopes to enlist the cooperation of the city and perform the work on the grounds of the Tucson Convention Center with promenade style staging. The play will open in March, 2016 as part of Borderlands’ 30th anniversary season...

Pinate conceived the project and has led the conversations with collaborating partners. His experience working with community, directing site specific works, and graduate research in civic practice make him a strong choice to lead this project. Pinate, along with his wife, playwright, Milta Ortiz, has already undertaken an interview based project for Borderlands Theater – the M.A.S. project, a new play commission about the banning of Mexican American Studies classes in the Tucson Unified School District.
Recommendations for future events that would take place at the TCC Landscape pending further funding and organization include:

- **Virtual Tours and Memoryscapes of the TCC Landscape** (Figure: TCC Splash Pad)

In conjunction with the “Barrio Stories Project” by Borderlands Theater, a digitally hosted virtual tour could be made available to users of the TCC Landscape. The tour could consist of a series of “landmark” stops, chronological in nature and some no longer in existence (for example, The Plaza Theater and Chinatown), that tell the storied history of the landscape’s diverse occupations. Beginning with Native American histories, Mexican-American and other minority histories as told through those who remember The Barrio, and ending with stops that detail the motivations of those entrenched in urban renewal and the Modernist movement, this tour would provide local communities and tourists with an intimate and interactive experience at TCC. The tour would also move people through the space and could include explanations of Eckbo’s design intent as reported through the works of Erickson (2012a; 2012b) and others. Additionally, this tour would be an easily archived and inexpensive activity on the part of landscape administrators and the public. The City might consult with an ethnographer, historian, website designer and a GIS specialist.

Tour components might include:

- **Downloadable maps**: Georeferenced and georectified historic USGS and GLO as well as Sanborn Fire Insurance maps or TCC design plans could be manipulated in ArcMap (ESRI’s proprietary GIS software) and then made into downloadable Google Earth files (.kmz, .kml). These could have “placemarks” for tour stops and might be hosted on a website (City of Tucson or TCC Today) for public consumption. Additionally, a circulation diagram could be conscripted with “placemarks” and associated information. This could be a downloadable .pdf file or made available in the visitor’s center at La Placita Village.

- **Oral histories**: Following consultation with stakeholders (Barrio residents, city planners working during urban renewal, members of Los Descendientes, landscape architects, etc.) recorded archival-quality ethnographic interviews could be conducted. Interview questions could target life The Barrio, urban renewal, and use of the fountains and TCC venues so that the landscape is portrayed as living history. The could be downloadable for those taking the tour.

- **Historic photographs**: Photographs representing the historic character of various tour stops could be made publicly available to those taking the tour.

Similar tours have been undertaken recently by William A. White (University of Arizona, School of Anthropology) in a traditionally African American neighborhood in Boise, Idaho. Using funds awarded from the Boise City Arts and Culture Grant, White started the River Street Digital History Project (http://www.riverstreethistory.com/).
• **Archaeological Expos and Sosa-Carrillo-Fremont House Artifact Exhibit** (Figure: Sosa Carrillo Fremont House)

The historic Sosa-Carrillo-Fremont House could be used to host an artifact exhibit of the material culture that was collected by Jim Ayres during urban renewal and the razing of The Barrio. These artifacts are currently held in the collections of the Arizona State Museum. An exhibit could be designed by a class at the University of Arizona and hosted at the house museum. The museum is currently managed by the Arizona Historical Society.

• **Cultural and Environmental Oriented Workshops**

Held in the plazas or venues of the TCC Landscape workshops and lectures might highlight the associated values (e.g. water in arid regions, rich heritage resources, and in-depth histories of land use and occupation) imbued in the space focusing on cultural diversity and sustainability practices in the desert. They could include the following topics and partners:

- Tohono O’odham basket weaving demonstrations (Tribal Historic Preservation Office)
- Hands-On Archaeology classes through Archaeology Southwest (http://www.archaeologysouthwest.org/what-we-do/hands-on-archaeology/)
- Watershed Management Group courses (http://watershedmg.org/)
- Native Seed Search lectures (http://www.nativeseeds.org/)
- Garrett Eckbo landscapes exhibit featuring Modernist movement sites

• **Rotating Artisan Emporium and Farmers Markets**

Capitalizing on the health and recreation, handcraft, grow local, and locavore movements along with the revitalization of Downtown Tucson—given its walkability and streetcar accessibility—the TCC Landscape could host local businesses and artists in the space as well as open the area up to a weekly farmers market. Nearby, the Mercado at San Augstin offers a farmers market every Thursday that could serve as a model for TCC (http://mercadosanagustin.com/event/thursday-farmers-market/).
• **Tucson Food Truck Round Up** ([http://tucsonfoodtruckroundup.com/](http://tucsonfoodtruckroundup.com/))

The popularity of food trucks in Downtown Tucson should also be considered. The TCC Landscape is an ideal location to have a food truck rally, especially before and after events at the Arena, Leo Rich Theater, and the Music Hall. Local food truck vendors are often observed serving patrons at Borderlands Brewing Company ([http://borderlandsbrewing.com/](http://borderlandsbrewing.com/)) on Toole Avenue and Tap and Bottle ([http://www.thetapandbottle.com/](http://www.thetapandbottle.com/)) on 6th Avenue. These businesses could be contacted to gain an understanding of how this relationship works. For a list of Tucson food trucks visit ([http://tucsonfoodtrucks.com/](http://tucsonfoodtrucks.com/)).

• **Mariachi Festivals and Performances** (Figure: Casino del Sol Mariachi Conference)

La Placita hosted one of the first mariachi festivals in Tucson. The continued popularity of mariachi and its defining role in Mexican-American heritage makes this type of event an ideal attraction to be hosted at the TCC Landscape. Currently the La Frontera’s Tucson International Mariachi Conference is held at Casino del Sol in April ([https://www.tucsonmariachi.org/](https://www.tucsonmariachi.org/)).

• **Latino/Cultural Lecture, Film, and Music Series**

Features could include the story of Lalo Guerrero, father of Chicano music. Guerrero grew up in The Barrio and in 1980 the Smithsonian Institution declared him a National Folk Treasure. Guerrero wrote and performed a song entitled “Barrio Viejo” that recounted his childhood there ([https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3KA5rtpofIM](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3KA5rtpofIM)) and often performed at El Charro (original store front serves as the La Placita Village visitor’s center). Additionally, African Americans were known in the Barrio and nearby, along Miracle Mile, the Blue Moon Ballroom saw many famous blues singers such as Tommy Dorsey play between 1920 and the 1940s. Inasmuch, the TCC Arena, Leo Rich Theater, and the Music Hall have a rich history of hosting trendsetting and classic performers. The TCC Landscape could offer a monthly lecture, film, or music series that focused on a particular person, era, or style of cultural expression that further celebrates Tucson’s dynamic past.

Continued capital improvements at the entertainment venues will draw more users but the remainder of the space should be used as well. These established and suggested events would serve the interests of many general users that come to the landscape for a variety of reasons, including attending convention center and music shows. Lastly, suggested events would appeal to audiences of all ages and backgrounds.
What unintended uses (e.g. homeless presence and unintended recreation like skateboarding) are associated with activation of the TCC Landscape?

Recommendations:

- A skate park could be installed near the TCC Landscape to discourage bikers and skateboarders from using the plaza areas.
- Secure showers and lockers could be provided for users of the landscape.
- A 24 hour security guard should be on site.

What suggestions are offered for the structure of ownership/management/stewardship organization at the TCC Landscape?

The City of Tucson and SMG managers should identify an outreach/oversight committee that is administered through the Tucson Pima County Historical Commission. The committee should be diverse and composed of members from local governments (City of Tucson, Pima County, Arizona Historical Society), non-profit groups (Downtown Tucson Partnership, TCC Today), preservation foundations (Tucson Historic Preservation Foundation), other historical commissions, art councils and museums (Tucson Pima Arts Council, Museum of Contemporary Art), special interest groups (neighborhood associations), academic institutions (University of Arizona, Pima Community College), and/or historic preservation specialists. The committee will serve as points of contact to help managers at the landscape develop renovation and rehabilitation plans, administer events, and monitor the condition of the landscape, among other tasks. A proposed schema is offered concerning future communication and stewardship of the TCC Landscape (Figure: Regulatory Framework)

Recommendations:

- Identify Outreach/Oversight Committee
- Adopt proposed schema
What should the preservation advisory and review process for rehabilitation and maintenance projects look like at the TCC landscape?

Recommendations:
Primary property owners include the City of Tucson and Rio Nuevo. As expressed in the Regulatory Diagram schema, the preservation and review process will include approval from subcommittees associated with the Tucson Pima County Historical Commission (see Figure: Regulatory Framework).

Who are the community stakeholders and what is their level of participatory involvement during the planning process at the TCC landscape?

The City should continue its efforts to identify all stakeholders with a vested interest in the TCC Landscape (Section 3 and Stakeholder Appendix), reaching out to neighborhood associations and local interest groups as well as interested citizens.

Recommendations include:
- Organize a public forum
- Invite heritage communities and other publics to tour the landscape
- Questionnaires (Mailed, Google Survey Forms, TPAC survey)

A series of mailed and online questionnaires could be administered through Google Survey Forms after compiling a list of appropriate contacts. Questionnaires should be directed at gaining insight into the level of knowledge concerning the TCC Landscape and how end users would like to see the space utilized. A public forum could be held at the TCC before questionnaires are developed or distributed.

Additionally, the City of Tucson could mine the information obtained by the Tucson-Pima Arts Council (TPAC) online survey. This survey is focused on gathering public feedback on the Eckbo designed portion of the landscape (http://www.tucsonpimaartsCouncil.org/public-art/special-initiatives/eckbo-landscape-surveyteckbo-landscape-surveygarrett-eckbo-landscape-at-the-tucson-convention-center/).

Recommendations:
- Increase warning signage
- Raise the bottom of the deepest fountain
- Employ a 24 hour security guard to monitor people’s actions
- Consult with managers of the Lovejoy landscape in Portland and Freeway Park in Seattle

Recommendations:
- A historic fountain conservator should be hired in addition to an appropriate construction company. Jean Carroon’s book Sustainable Preservation: Greening Existing Buildings (2010), in particular Chapter Four’s “Water and Site” should be reviewed (see 4.4 “Water and Mechanical Systems”).
- Water used in the fountains should be reclaimed/recycled
- An additional list of resources are available for review:
  1. NPS Maintenance Programs for Historic Fountains (http://ncptt.nps.gov/blog/maintenance-programs-for-historic-fountains/)
  2. Fountain Fundamentals, an Ever Evolving Conservation Collaboration (http://ncptt.nps.gov/blog/fountain-fundamentals/)
  3. Landshapes Historic Fountain Restoration (http://landshapes.net/blog/company-news/historic-fountain-restoration)
How should public outreach and education programs be administered at the TCC landscape so that a culture of stewardship is fostered for all stakeholders, general and end users, and maintenance administrators?

Public outreach and educational experiences might first be cultivated through a variety of media outlets.

**Recommendations include:**

- Press releases about events and the rehabilitation efforts
- Newspaper articles about the landscape, events, and rehabilitation efforts
- Reach out to alternative media
  - Access Tucson
  - Arizona Community Press
  - Blog for Arizona
  - Indigenous Action Media
  - Occupied Tucson Citizen
  - Three Sonorans
  - Tohono TV
  - Tucson Peace Calendar
  - Tucson Progressive
  - Tucson Sentinel
- A website dedicated to rehabilitation efforts and events
  - TCC Today could host a viewable live feed of rehabilitation work at the TCC Landscape to garner interest in the project
  - TCC Today could have an events calendar and host ticket purchases to events utilizing Paypal
- A phone App could be devised offering navigation through the landscape and updating users about upcoming events
- Tap into social media
  - Twitter/Instagram/Yelp Reviews/Tripadvisor Reviews

Pedestrian tours and pamphlets offering interactive and educational information about the landscape could be produced and available through the visitors center at La Placita Village. Additional interpretive signage could also be developed and posted.

- An interactive identification guide to TCC Landscape vegetation (See Supplemental Tables)
- A pedestrian tour with docents acting as guides could relay the historical significance of the landscape
- Partner with local landscape architects, architects, historians, interpreters, and museum staff to create signage for general use and tour groups

The City and SMG should also partner with the well known agencies like Arizona State Parks or the National Park Service to promote preservation efforts at the TCC Landscape. For example, the principles of the newly formed NPS Urban Agenda Initiative should be understood and embraced. The Urban Agenda seeks to intentionally demonstrate how a coherent system of urban parks, programs and partnerships can be deployed in an urban landscape. In 2015 Tucson was nominated to the list of eligible cities. This project will promote a greater sense of understanding, appreciation, and stewardship of NPS generally, and the local national parks specifically. Although focused on Saguaro National Park at the time, the TCC Landscape could be part of the initiative. Key goals of the Urban Agenda Tucson Project are:

- Advance the Urban Agenda initiative in Tucson.
- Advance the creation of a regional visitor center for Southern Arizona as an educational resource and an economic development strategy.
- Bring the hundreds of regional stakeholders together in support of creating a greater sense of place.
- Position the NPS and WNPA brands as leading institutions and as go to partners in the efforts above.

Lastly, public engagement strategies that foster the development of a responsible constituency of users should be built from participation in special events and continued investment in qualitatively understanding the needs of general users.
What would funding models at the TCC Landscape look like?

Recommendations include:

- **Community Sponsored “Do-Work/Hands-On” Workshops**
  Participation in community sponsored workshops could be one source of fund raising for landscape administrators. For example, having the public pay a fee to participate in the rehabilitation efforts while also educating them as to the process would be an appealing venture. Experiences like the “Demonstration Area” undertaken by TCC Today could be co-opted as a hands-on workshop for University of Arizona students and interested publics. Students from CAPLA, Pima Community College, and other interested parties could participate in a series of workshops to understand the process of historic rehabilitation adapted to twenty first century environmental and landscape needs.

- **A website dedicated to rehabilitation efforts and events**
  An inventory of incompatible art has recently been compiled by the Documentation and Interpretation of the Built Environment class previously mentioned in this document (Section 1.2). The condition and integrity of the incompatible artworks is reportedly high. Profits could be drawn from an art auction in which these pieces were removed from the landscape. Tickets could be sold to the event.

- **Outside Grant Funding**
  The City and SMG could search for additional grant funding such as National Park Service Urban Agenda Grants, Humanities and Arts Grants, and Cultural Landscape Grants.

- **2015 Bond Package Election**
  If Pima County voters pass the November 2015 bond package that was recently approved by Pima County Board of Supervisors, several million dollars will be allocated to rehabilitation efforts. At this time, the City of Tucson and its partners could hire preservation specialists and other contractors to continue plans for stewardship in perpetuity.

- **Establish a 501(c)3 non-profit specifically for the TCC Landscape**
- **Seek Philanthropic Partners**

As TCC Today’s website states: “To realize a project of this breadth, [partnerships] must include not only government revenues and funds, but also philanthropic gifts from individuals, families, corporations, and foundations. Across America, such public-private-philanthropic collaborations are yielding results that couldn’t be completed by one sector alone”

- **Arizona Gives Day (an example)** (azgives@arizonanonprofits.org; https://azgives.givebig.org/c/GivesDay/p/tools)

When an existing or new non-profit becomes actively involved in the stewardship of the TCC Landscape, Arizona Gives Day is an opportunity to raise funds. The event is held once a year for one 24 hour day. It is run by the Alliance of Arizona Nonprofits and the Arizona Grantmakers Forum. They offer tools and training to participants for organizing and utilizing social media outlets in preparation for the Day. This past April, the Rialto Theatre Foundation raised over $4,000.00 in just nine hours. There is a small fee.

The following is from the Arizona Gives Day website:

“On April 7, 2015 you will be presented with a state-sized opportunity to make a profound difference your community. Never before has one day provided such an amazing way for Arizonans to join forces to help their own. What cause are you passionate about? We’ve united hundreds of nonprofits across Arizona. Select the nonprofit of your choice and donate confidently knowing that your donation goes directly to that nonprofit, and not into some general fund. Remember, a better tomorrow begins with a better today. Donate here on Arizona Gives Day and help create immediate and enduring change throughout the state.”
## 5.1 LOOKING AHEAD: A PHASED PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Date to be Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1: Immediate Needs</strong></td>
<td>Mayor and Council should adopt the Conservation Mater Plan</td>
<td>December 31, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHPO should be urged to review the National Register nomination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The City of Tucson should identify an outreach/oversight committee to serve as points of contact for event organization, renovation/rehabilitation plan development and review, and all other maintenance concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the bond package is not voter approved, additional funding models should be explored</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2: Quick Wins</strong></td>
<td>Physical and mechanical upgrades for fountain systems should be assessed along with considerations made for the recent inventory and condition assessment documentation done by CAPLA, the Drachman Institute, and Pima Community College</td>
<td>June 30, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Established events should be publicized through various forms of media to enliven use of the TCC Landscape (Mariachi Festivals, Food Truck Round Up, Tucson Meet Yourself, Tucson Modernism Week, Farmers Markets, Second Saturdays Downtown, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public opinion should be gathered through public forums, questionnaire distribution to stakeholders, and by partnering with Tucson-Pima Arts Council to understand the results of their online survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public participation should be garnered through media outlets: press releases, websites, and social media as well as docent led tours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3: Suggestions Pending Future Funding</strong></td>
<td>A long range plan for cyclical maintenance should be developed</td>
<td>December 31, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A virtual tour of existing landmarks and memoryscapes accompanied by recorded oral histories should be developed in conjunction with the launch of the “Barrio Stories Project” by Borderlands Theater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programming for Community Sponsored “Do-Work/Hands-On” Workshops should be developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programming for Cultural and Environmental Oriented Workshops should be developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A museum-quality exhibit of artifacts from The Barrio should be conceptualized and housed at the Sosa-Carrillo-Fremont House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programming for a cultural lecture/film/music series should be developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programming for an incompatible art auction should be developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A phone App offering navigation and event announcements at the TCC Landscape should be developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 CONCLUDING REMARKS

To fully understand the relevance of the Tucson Convention Center and the Garrett Eckbo Landscape in the context of a rehabilitated public space, it is important to understand the ongoing study and debate regarding modernist resources in the field of preservation and the context of public management.

Modernist landscapes of the post-World War II development and urban renewal era all over the country are facing the same challenges (and potential rewards) of those facing the TCC. Modernist resources are valued for their spare design and straightforward materials. Those very artistic choices – or as preservationists describe them, the character defining features are the same elements that present a problem in conserving them today (Fixler, 2009).

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards defines the concept of integrity as the ability of a property to convey its significance (National Park Service (NPS), 2015). Aspects that affect integrity include:

- Location
- Design
- Setting
- Materials
- Workmanship
- Feeling
- Association

Though the principles developed by government and international charters and organizations in the business of preservation are often well applied in conserving modern resources, because of the nature of modern design, retaining integrity is often an experiment.

Rehabilitating features and systems designed of cement, metals and plastics of the period and suffering from deferred maintenance are technically difficult and expensive. Reimagining resources for twenty-first century use is often restrained by the programmatic intention of the original design. Framing preservation strategies for modern resources is a complex task and in the interest of the continuum of Modernism conservation, each resource must be evaluated within its distinct context.

Preservationists and public managers are charged with trying to prioritize between preserving the material integrity of a modern resource and in elevating it to an active purpose and use. David Fixler (2009) cites the Nara Convention of 1994 in his contention that authenticity (the international terminology for integrity) is a value which cannot be judged by, “fixed criteria”. Instead, determining authenticity should be an iterative process that is evaluated within the context of a project as it proceeds and to what degree the overall essence of a resource is maintained.

These notions are not contrary to the Secretary of Interior’s Standards. Neither is the idea that the effect of intervention is relative to how it affects experiencing a resource. Physical changes sometimes can be dramatic without changing the intent or feeling associated with the original concepts. Conversely, small changes can greatly affect the integrity of a resource if they were integral to the designer’s intent. The consensus from the field of preservation for best practices in conserving modern resources is in retaining as much of the original essence while activating it for current and future uses.
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