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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background:
Because the Light Rail Transit (LRT) Gilbert Road Extension is federally funded, a cultural resources impacts assessment will need to be conducted to determine potential impacts to historic properties as per Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), Department of Transportation Act Section 4(f), and National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA). HDR, Inc. contracted with Archaeological Consulting Services, Ltd. (ACS) to conduct a historic building inventory, a National Register of Historic Places (National Register) eligibility assessment of properties dating prior to 1968, and an impacts assessment—including potential visual and physical impacts—of the proposed undertaking on any identified historic properties within the area of potential effect (APE). The Gilbert Road Extension project includes a double-track LRT guideway that would operate along the middle of Main Street from just east of Edgemont to Gilbert Road, a total of two miles. Two Build Alternatives (2-Lane and 4-Lane) and one design option (2-Lane Roundabouts) were originally considered and are evaluated in this report. In addition, a Build Alternative (Hybrid) was recently developed which includes elements of the original alternatives and is also evaluated. On April 4, 2013, the City of Mesa Council approved the Build Alternative (Hybrid) as the preferred alternative (PA) for the project. Two park-and-ride options are also being considered: Park-and-Ride (North Option) and Park-and-Ride (South Option). The City Council approved the Park-and-Ride (South Option) as part of the LPA.

Identification of Eligible Properties:
The anticipated date of completion for the Gilbert Road Extension project is 2018, which would make 1968 the 50-year historic age cutoff normally considered in the evaluation of eligibility. Most of the commercial properties in the project area were built between 1940 and 1969. Eligibility evaluations identified nine buildings, including two previously recommended as part of the Central Mesa LRT Extension Project, and two objects (signs) within the APE that are recommended individually eligible for listing on the National Register.

Finding of Effects:
A finding of No Adverse Effect on all historic properties within the APE is recommended for the Gilbert Road Extension (4-Lane) and (2-Lane) Build Alternatives, as well as the Build Alternative (2-Lane Roundabouts) Design Option, and the Build Alternative (Hybrid). This finding is also recommended for both park-and-ride options.

Consistent with previous findings along the LRT corridor in the City of Mesa, neither an eligible historic streetscape along Main Street nor an eligible historic commercial district was identified within the APE. Historic-era curbs and sidewalks are present within the current APE, but the curbs and sidewalks are not individually eligible, nor are they contributors to an eligible streetscape or district. Although small parking lot takes will
occur at some recommended eligible properties, parking itself will be maintained (e.g., in front of buildings), preserving the historic use. The parking lots associated with the historic Bashas' Grocer Building (ACS-39) (now known as Food City) and the historic Safeway Building (ACS-9) (now known as Rancho Grande) are recommended contributing elements because they were historically large parking lots that serviced large grocery stores, therefore contributing to the historic setting and feeling of the properties. However, even if small parking lot takes occur from the project, the proportion of parking lot size to building size will remain relatively unchanged. Therefore, these parking lot takes will not impact the properties' ability to convey their historic significance and are considered no adverse effect. In addition, consistent with the findings for the Central Mesa LRT Extension Project, relocation of eligible signs on the property, maintaining relative position and visibility from the right-of-way (ROW), is considered no adverse effect.

The LRT features, including traffic and pedestrian signals and stations, will not introduce structures taller than existing buildings and street features with the possible exception of the park-and-ride. Therefore, these new features should not introduce an adverse visual effect or disruption of the historic setting. The two park-and-ride facility options located at the east end of the APE may produce visual impacts to surrounding structures if the park-and-ride facility is taller than two stories. However, no historic properties are located adjacent to or within the undisturbed viewshed of these structures.

**Recommendations:**
For the for the Gilbert Road Extension Build Alternatives (Hybrid), (4-Lane), and (2-Lane), as well as the Build Alternative (2-Lane Roundabouts) Design Option, it is recommended that appropriate shielding be provided for the TPSS on property next to the Bashas' Grocer Building (ACS-39) so that it does not alter characteristics of the property that qualify it for inclusion in the National Register.

For the Build Alternative (4-Lane), the widened cross section will require small strips of ROW from the parking areas of four properties (ACS-9, 10, 39, and 41) eligible for listing in the National Register. To qualify as no adverse effect, any historic elements associated with ACS-9 and ACS-39, such as original parking lot lights, located within the area of the partial acquisition will be relocated on the remaining parcel. In addition, for a no adverse effect finding, traffic circulation associated with these historic properties (i.e., egress and ingress) will be maintained.

For the Build Alternative (4-Lane), with regard to the El Rancho Motel (ACS-10) and First National Bank of Arizona (ACS-41), the parking areas and lights are not contributing features to these properties, and the small partial acquisitions required for each property would not substantially affect the supply of parking available. A finding of No Adverse Effect is appropriate for the small partial acquisitions from the parking of these two properties as long as traffic circulation associated with these historic properties (i.e., egress and ingress) will be maintained. Acquisition of additional ROW
will require relocation of the curb and sidewalk for all four properties, but the curbs and sidewalks are not historic. In addition, the historic El Ranch Motel neon sign and the Smoke Shop sign (ACS-10) are contributing elements located on the portion of property needed for acquisition. A finding of No Adverse Effect would be attained by relocating the contributing signs to a location which maintains the relative position and visibility from the right-of-way.

An LRT station would be placed in the middle of the roadway in front of one eligible property (ACS-39) and one eligible sign (ACS-61) on another property (buildings are not eligible). A TPSS would be placed on a property adjacent to one eligible property (ACS-39). It is recommended that appropriate shielding be provided for the TPSS on property next to the Bashas’ Grocer Building (ACS-39) so that it does not alter characteristics of the property that qualify it for inclusion in the National Register. The Build Alternative (4-Lane) avoids physical and visual impacts to the other historic properties within the APE.

For Build Alternative (2-Lane Roundabouts), the roundabouts at Horne and Lazona Drive will require small strips of ROW from the parking areas of two properties (ACS-9 and 39) which are eligible for listing in the National Register. To qualify as no adverse effect, any historic elements associated with these two properties, such as original parking lot lights, located within the area of the partial acquisition will be relocated on the remaining parcel. In addition, for a no adverse effect finding, traffic circulation associated with these historic properties (i.e., egress and ingress) will be maintained. The roundabout at Harris Drive will not require property acquisition from ACS-50. The curb and sidewalk would be moved toward the street centerline to accommodate this feature; thus the roundabout at Harris Drive would have no adverse effect. An LRT station would be placed in the middle of the roadway in front of one eligible property (ACS-39) and one eligible sign (ACS-61) on another property (buildings are not eligible). A TPSS would be placed on a property adjacent to one eligible property (ACS-39). It is recommended that appropriate shielding be provided for the TPSS on property next to the Bashas’ Grocer Building (ACS-39) so that it does not alter characteristics of the property that qualify it for inclusion in the National Register. This design avoids physical and visual impacts to the other historic properties within the APE.

For the Build Alternative (Hybrid), the widened cross section will require small strips of ROW from the parking areas of two properties (ACS-9 and 39) eligible for listing in the National Register. To qualify as no adverse effect, any historic elements associated with ACS-9 and ACS-39, located within the area of the partial acquisition will be relocated on the remaining parcel. In addition, for a no adverse effect finding, traffic circulation associated with these historic properties (i.e., egress and ingress) will be maintained. An LRT station would be placed in the middle of the roadway in front of one eligible property (ACS-39) and one eligible sign (ACS-61) on another property (buildings are not eligible). A TPSS would be placed on a property adjacent to one eligible property (ACS-39). It is recommended that appropriate shielding be provided for the TPSS on property next to the Bashas’ Grocer Building (ACS-39) so that it does not alter characteristics of
the property that qualify it for inclusion in the National Register. The existing curb would be moved outward toward the Main Street centerline in the area adjacent to Mesa Marine Boats Retail (ACS-50), now known as Tanaka Gallery. The Build Alternative (Hybrid) does not require acquisition of any portion of the historic property. The Build Alternative (Hybrid) avoids physical and visual impacts to the other historic properties within the APE.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND
This technical report details the historic building inventory for the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Gilbert Road Extension project. The report includes a brief background describing the project along with the Build Alternatives that are being considered, as well as a discussion of the federal, state, and local regulatory requirements that the project must meet. The report follows with previous research, historic contexts and areas of significance, methods for the field survey effort, a description of resources identified through the survey and their associated National Register eligibility recommendations, and a summary of potential effects and recommended treatment for each build alternative. Archaeological sites, including US 80 and the Consolidated Canal, are discussed in a separate technical report, Archaeological Resources and Traditional Cultural Properties, prepared by HDR, Inc. (Mark Brodbeck, Principal Investigator).

1.2 REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

1.2.1 Federal Legal Requirements

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (NHPA) (Public Law 89-665; 16 USC 470 et seq.), 36 CFR 800
Triggered when projects and programs that are funded, permitted, licensed, or authorized by a Federal agency, both on and off Federal lands (undertakings), Section 106 requires Federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and afford the other consulting parties and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) an opportunity to comment on the effects of the undertaking. The legislation requires a “reasonable and good faith effort” to identify historic properties in the Area of Potential Effect (APE).

Cultural resources are evaluated for their eligibility to the National Register. To be eligible for inclusion in the National Register, cultural resources must be at least 50 years old (unless it meets Criteria Exception G for Properties that Have Achieved Significance within the Past 50 Years), and meet one or more of the criteria set forth in 36 CFR 60.4:

- Criterion A: applies to properties that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- Criterion B: applies to properties that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
- Criterion C: applies to properties that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or that represent the work of a master, or
that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

- Criterion D: applies to properties that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

In addition to meeting one or more criteria, cultural resources must be significant within the context of prehistory or history. To determine a property’s significance, five things must be evaluated:

- The context of prehistory or history of the local area, state, or nation;
- The significance of the context of prehistory or history;
- Relevancy of the property type in illustrating the context;
- How the property illustrates that history; and
- If the property’s physical features convey the context of prehistory or history with which it is associated.

Significance can be at the local, state, or national level. Local significance represents a context within the history of a town, city, county, cultural area, or region, or any portions thereof. State significance is associated with contexts of history of the state as a whole, including properties whose significance extends beyond a single local area. National significance is reserved for those properties that represent a context of history of the United States and territories as a whole; these properties may also possess local or statewide significance. Nationally significant properties contribute to the understanding of the history of the nation through illustration of events or persons, architectural styles or types, or information potential with nationwide impacts.

Significant cultural resources must also possess integrity, which is the composite of seven qualities: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. All of these qualities do not have to be present for a cultural resource to be eligible for the National Register. In fact, the integrity of archaeological sites is usually based on the degree to which the remaining evidence can provide important information about the prehistory or history of an area. If the property represents an important aspect in history or prehistory and possesses sufficient integrity, the property can be considered qualified for listing on the National Register.

The agency with the highest degree of Federal involvement (degree of control or influence over undertaking) initiates consultation. For projects involving multiple Federal agencies, one agency often will serve as the “lead” Federal agency, taking responsibility for Section 106 compliance and consulting with the other agencies as needed. The lead agency initiates consultation with other consulting agencies/parties. Consultation begins during the planning phase of undertaking.
The head of the Federal agency (lead agency) initiates consultation with the SHPO, the Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO), and other land-ownership or interested parties. The Federal agency has the responsibility to consult with federally recognized tribes on a government-to-government basis, and cannot delegate this responsibility without prior written agreement from the tribe (36 CFR 800.2[c][2][ii][B] and [C]). The act also stipulates a consultation period for SHPO/THPO review of 30 days to provide comment on agency plans that affect historic properties or recommendations of eligibility for the State or National Registers. The agency also has an obligation to inform and involve the public. Section 106 consultation requires interaction between the Federal agency and consulting parties; however, it is critical to recognize that while consultation is required in each step of the Section 106 process, final decision-making rests solely with the Federal agency following consultation with the SHPO/THPO.

**National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), 40 CFR 1500–1508**

Only applicable to Federal actions—projects with Federal involvement, Federal funding, or requiring a Federal permit or other regulatory decision (e.g., power purchase or interconnection agreement), the act requires an interdisciplinary approach to Federal project planning and decisionmaking through environmental impact assessment. This approach requires Federal officials to consider environmental values alongside the technical and economic considerations that are inherent factors in Federal decision making. Environmental impact assessment calls for the unbiased presentation of direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental impacts, including impacts on cultural resources (40 CFR 1508.27[a]). This information is used by a Federal official before a decision is made.

One Federal agency is selected to administer the NEPA process and issue required documents (40 CFR 1508.16). The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) fulfills the Federal lead agency role for transit projects. Several steps are involved in the NEPA process:

- Determine the project’s purpose and need and the range of alternatives to be considered (including no-build/no-action alternative);
- Determine potential environmental impacts;
- Coordinate with relevant agencies;
- Involve the public;
- Determine mitigation for unavoidable impacts; and
- Document the analysis and decisions through an Environmental Assessment (EA), Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), or Categorical Exclusion (CE) supported by the administrative record.

The NEPA–Section 106 Integration process includes:

- Initiate the Section 106 process—identify undertaking and determine whether it has potential to affect historic properties.
- Identify consulting parties and public involvement—send scoping letter to SHPO and interested parties, seek comments.
- Identify historic properties and eligibility criteria.
- Assess, mitigate, and resolve effects—no historic properties affected; no adverse effect; adverse effects, Memorandum of Agreement (MOA).
- Document findings in draft report—specialist report (historic/archaeological technical reports), EA/EIS.
- Approval of the undertaking—document in Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) or Record of Decision (ROD); mitigate adverse effects and ensure approval is conditioned in MOA for FONSI or ROD.

The lead agency takes primary responsibility for preparing the EA and for supervising the NEPA process. Lead agency responsibilities in the NEPA process include, where applicable, inviting cooperating agencies, sending scoping letters to SHPO and prospective consulting parties, providing project information, conducting field reviews, developing consensus among a wide range of stakeholders with diverse interests, resolving conflict, and ensuring that issues are addressed and decisions are fully explained in the environmental document. Reliance on the NEPA process alone may not meet the regulatory standard for consultation essential to Section 106 review because NEPA may rely on scoping letters and/or verbal contacts, whereas Section 106 consultation requires interaction between the agency and the consulting parties.

Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (Title 49 USC 303)
As defined in 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 774.17, the “use” of a protected Section 4(f) property occurs when any of the following conditions are met.

Direct Use
A direct use of a Section 4(f) resource occurs when the property is permanently incorporated into a transportation facility. This may occur as a result of a full or partial acquisition of the property, permanent easement, or temporary easements that exceed regulatory requirements noted under Temporary Use.

Temporary Use
A temporary use of a Section 4(f) resource occurs when there is a temporary occupancy of property that is considered adverse in terms of the statute’s preservationist purpose of the Section 4(f) statute. Under the FHWA/FTA regulations (23 CFR 774.13), a temporary occupancy of property does not constitute a use of a Section 4(f) resource when all the following conditions are satisfied:
- Duration is temporary (i.e., less than the time needed for construction of the project) and there should be no change in ownership of the land
- Scope of work is minor (i.e., both the nature and the magnitude of the changes to the Section 4(f) property are minimal)
- There are no anticipated permanent adverse physical impacts, nor will there be interference with the protected activities, features, or attributes of the property, on either a temporary or permanent basis
- The land being used must be fully restored (i.e., the property must be returned to a condition which is at least as good as that which existed prior to the project)
- There must be documented agreement of the official(s) with jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) resource regarding the above conditions

**Constructive Use**
A constructive use of a Section 4(f) resource occurs when the transportation project does not permanently incorporate land from the resource, but the proximity of the project results in impacts (e.g., noise, vibration, visual, and property access) are so severe that the protected activities, features, or attributes that qualify a resource for protection under Section 4(f) are substantially impaired. For example, a constructive use can occur under at least one of the following conditions:

- The projected increase in noise level, attributable to the project, substantially interferes with the use and enjoyment of a noise-sensitive facility of a resource protected by Section 4(f).
- The proximity of the proposed project substantially impairs aesthetic features or attributes of a resource protected by Section 4(f), where such features or attributes are considered important contributing elements to the value of the resource. An example of such an effect would be locating a proposed transportation facility in such proximity that it obstructs or eliminates views considered part of a National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-eligible, architecturally significant, or historical building’s Section 4(f) eligibility. Another example would be locating a proposed transportation facility in such proximity that it detracts from the setting of a park or historic site which derives its value in substantial part due to its setting.
- The project results in a restriction on access that substantially diminishes the utility of a significant publicly owned park, recreation area, or historic site.
- Vibration associated with the proposed project impairs the use of a Section 4(f) resource.

**1.2.2 State and Local Legal Requirements**

**State Legislation**
The State Historic Preservation Act (SHPA) of 1982 (Arizona Revised Statutes [A.R.S.] §41-861 through §41-864) requires state agencies to identify and preserve historic properties and outlines criteria for listing of properties on the State Register (identical to criteria for listing on the National Register). The act also stipulates a consultation period
for SHPO review of 30 days to provide comment on agency plans that affect historic properties or recommendations of eligibility for the State or National Registers.

Arizona Antiquities Act (A.R.S. §41-841 through 41-847) stipulates that a permit is needed for excavation of prehistoric and historic sites on State Land or land owned or controlled by municipalities, and requires that the Arizona State Museum (ASM) be notified of the discovery of cultural resources or human remains. A.R.S. §41-844 and A.R.S. §41-865 ensure that human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony discovered on State lands, and human remains and associated objects from private lands, are treated with respect and dignity. These Arizona laws provide that groups claiming biological relationship or cultural affinity with the remains have a very significant role in determining the treatment and disposition of these culturally significant materials. At the same time the laws ensure that the various other relevant interests are also represented in the decision-making process. In Arizona, the Repatriation Coordinator at ASM is the authority designated to coordinate the treatment and disposition of human remains with Native American groups claiming biological or cultural affinity with such remains.

**Mesa City Code**
In 1980, an amendment to the National Historic Preservation Act established a framework for local preservation programs. This program allows cities and counties to apply to the SHPO to become Certified Local Governments (CLGs), and offers assistance and funding for local preservation programs. An official CLG under the State Historic Preservation Plan since October 5, 1995, the City of Mesa is responsible for enacting a preservation program that has included the formation of a Historic Preservation Committee (Mesa City Code, Title 2, Chapter 22), the preparation and adoption of an official Historic Preservation Plan, and the establishment of a local register of historic places. As amended in 1997, Mesa City Code has established goals for identification and protection of the city's historic resources, public education about Mesa's cultural heritage, neighborhood stabilization through preservation, and compatible contemporary design and development (Ordinance No. 3733). The local ordinance also establishes protocol for historic overlay and historic landmark zoning (Mesa City Code, Title 11, Chapters 23 and 74). Coordination with the Mesa Historic Preservation Office (MHPO) is required in the EA and Section 106 process.

1.3 METHODOLOGY OF INVESTIGATION

1.3.1 Archival Research Methods
Archival research was conducted to gather information regarding the historic development of the APE, and specific information regarding the individual properties within the project area. Resources and repositories consulted for historic background of the project area included:

**Arizona State University: Hayden Library**
Secondary sources relating to the history and development of Mesa were examined.

**Arizona State University: Hayden Library Arizona Collection**
Reference materials examined included city and business directories of Mesa and the East Valley.

**Arizona State University: Noble Science Library**
A variety of maps and aerial photographs were examined, including ADOT aerial imagery, as well as any vicinity maps that might be useful for the building survey.

**Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records**
Sanborn-Perris maps of the Mesa area were examined. Unfortunately, however, Sanborn-Perris maps did not cover lands east of the Mesa townsite. In addition, research was conducted of microfilmed newspapers to acquire pertinent information on residential subdivisions in the postwar era.

**Maricopa County Assessor’s Office and GIS Portal**
The Maricopa County Assessor’s Office administers real and personal property parcels for the county. Pertinent parcel data, including commercial construction dates were retrieved for filling out the inventory forms. The construction dates provided by the Assessor were compared for accuracy with aerial imagery provided by the Flood Control District of Maricopa County (FCDMC) and available on the County GIS Portal (Maricopa County 2008: accessed September 20, 2012).

**Mesa Preservation Foundation**
ACS gratefully acknowledges the guidance and contributions by Mr. Vic Linoff, President of the Mesa Preservation Foundation. He was able to provide the authors copies of several important studies on the Mesa’s historic architectural development, including *Historic Reconnaissance of Survey of Pre-1955 Development in the City of Mesa* (Ryden 1999), and *Mesa Postwar Modern Single Family Subdivision Development, 1946–1973* (Wilson and Abele 2004). Mr. Linoff also provided limited archival information relating to lighted commercial signage used in the postwar period along Main Street and Apache Trail.

**Mesa Historic Preservation Office**
Current landmark and historic district maps were reviewed to determine if important locally or nationally designated historic properties were located within the APE. No designated properties are within the APE. However, one recently listed residential district is located just north of the APE—the Frasier Fields Historic District was listed on the National Register in 2010 for its role in postwar subdivision development (Criterion A) and its architectural styles (Criterion C).

### 1.3.2 Field Survey
A field survey was conducted to inventory all historic-age properties with the APE. Field data was collected and each property was photographed.

1.3.3 **Inventory Forms**
An individual Historic Property Inventory Form (HPIF) was completed for each parcel within the project area that contained an eligible historic-age building or structure. Each parcel was assigned an ACS field identification number, although some clusters of related individual properties with the same address were combined and treated as one property for the purposes of this survey. The property name was derived from whatever historical association was found with a house or building. Commercial properties are identified with the historic name, if known, and the current commercial name now associated with the property. The primary street address for each parcel was determined by what is currently on record with Maricopa County Assessor records. The Tax Parcel Number information is based on data from the Maricopa County Assessor’s Office, which maintains information on listed parcels, current property ownership, and effective construction dates. Initially, the presumed construction date recorded was the Maricopa County Assessor’s Effective Construction Date. An effective construction date, however, does not always reflect a true original construction date of a building. If additions or other major alterations occurred since the date of original construction, the construction date on file is adjusted to reflect an “effective” construction date to incorporate those changes. An initial construction date was used if one could be determined; the effective construction date was used when an initial construction date could not be determined. A circa (Ca.) date is indicated on the form when an absolute original construction date is unknown and an estimated date based on available data is used. The physical condition of a building is based on evidence of reasonable maintenance and repair, or visible structural damage or deterioration. However, problems with structural condition are not necessarily an indication of a building’s integrity, which is based on an evaluation of whether character-defining architectural elements are intact, missing, or altered. The determination of historic and present property use is based on historic aerials, city directory listings, and visual evidence of a property’s design.

1.3.4 **Eligibility Understandings**
Approaches to specific property types regarding recommendation of eligibility and determination of effects were discussed in consultation with SHPO and City of Mesa HPO. Those points are listed below.

1.3.4.1 **Historic Curbs and Sidewalks**
Consistent with previous findings along the LRT corridor (Ryden Architects 2010), historic-era curbs and sidewalks are present within the current APE, but the curbs and sidewalks are not individually eligible, nor are they contributors to an eligible streetscape or district.

1.3.4.2 **Transportation Resources**
The Interim Procedures for the Treatment of Historic Roads (2002), as approved by the FHWA, ADOT, and SHPO, defines the Historic State Highway System (HSHS) as the network of roadways developed between 1912 and 1955 and whose remnants are preserved as in-use roadways and abandoned segments of roadway. As part of the HSHS, US 80 is considered eligible only under Criterion D for its potential to yield significant information about the development of Arizona’s highway system. Individual segments of linear transportation sites are evaluated to assess their contribution to the site’s overall eligibility. Additional information about US 80 may be found in the separate Archaeological Technical Report prepared in support of the Gilbert Road Extension EA.

1.4 AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECT
The APE includes properties that may be directly impacted (e.g., physical destruction or disturbance of any or all of the property either by the built project or during construction activities), as well as properties that may be indirectly impacted (e.g., through visual or audible impacts, changes in traffic circulation, or other effects to the environment that would diminish the integrity of a property’s surroundings) by project activities.

The APE is defined as the properties immediately adjacent to the LRT right-of-way along Main Street between Edgemont and just east of Gilbert Road, as well as properties adjacent to the two park-and-ride options (north and south of Main Street at Gilbert Road). If a potentially affected parcel is a component of a potential district or group of associated buildings (e.g., commercial business park, apartment complex, or mobile home park), the entire potential district boundary is included within the APE. The historic district is considered as a single unit for the sake of evaluation just as though it were an individual building on a single parcel. The effect of the proposed undertaking on the entire district is evaluated for its impact not only on the few properties adjacent to the track alignment, but also on the historic district as a whole.

2. DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES

2.1 BACKGROUND
The Gilbert Road Extension EA evaluates the impacts of a proposed 2-mile easterly extension of the LRT system to the intersection of Main Street/Gilbert Road in the City of Mesa, Arizona. The purpose of the project is to accommodate future regional travel demand needs and improve access to destinations for residents of Mesa and the East Valley region. The need for the project is based on present opportunities and anticipated future transportation deficiencies that have been identified in other studies. The project has
substantial potential to increase transit ridership and capture a sizeable portion of existing automobile trips destined for locations in west Mesa, Tempe, and Phoenix. The proposed LRT extension would provide intermodal transfer connections to other transit services in the area including local bus and the popular LINK Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service and help ensure the equitable distribution of transit services across the city. With the substantial economic development opportunities available in the project area, the introduction of LRT to Gilbert Road, in coordination with the City of Mesa’s adopted land use and zoning policies designed to encourage transit-supportive developments, can support the community’s goals for promoting concentrated urban development and revitalizing the east side of downtown Mesa.

In May 2009, the City of Mesa City Council (the Council) approved a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) to extend the region’s current LRT system by 3.1 miles from the existing Sycamore Station to Mesa Drive (the future eastern terminus of the existing LRT starter line). As part of this decision, the Council also approved funding for analysis of a future LRT extension east along Main Street to Gilbert Road, given the strong ridership demand, regional bus network optimization opportunities, and as a preferred long-range site for a park-and-ride facility to capitalize on emerging travel demand markets. This extension to Gilbert Road is the subject of the EA. Figure 1 shows the location of the Gilbert Road Extension in the City of Mesa in relation to the current and planned LRT and high capacity transit system.
2.2 STUDY AREA
Bounded by University Drive to the north, Broadway Road to the south, Gilbert Road to the east, and Mesa Drive to the west, the Project study area encompasses a land area of approximately 2 square miles (Figure 2). Two major east-west routes parallel Main Street within the study area: University Drive and Broadway Road. Both roads are identified as minor urban arterials. Major north-south aligned roads running through the study area include Mesa Drive, Stapley Drive, and Gilbert Road. Neighborhood collector streets intersect Main Street at quarter-mile intervals, although these streets are sometimes off-set, with the north segment not aligning with the south segment. Approximately 2 miles south of the study area is U.S. 60 (Superstition Freeway) and to the north of the study area is Loop 202 (Red Mountain Freeway). Both are east-west aligned freeways with interchanges at Gilbert Road, and both carry heavy traffic volumes daily to destinations between the easternmost reaches of the East Valley through Mesa and Tempe and into the City of Phoenix.

FIGURE 2: GILBERT ROAD EXTENSION AND STUDY AREA

2.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED
The EA evaluates the following alternatives:
- No-Build Alternative (serves as the baseline for comparison of effects)
- Build Alternative (4-Lane)
- Build Alternative (2-Lane)
  - Build Alternative (2-Lane Roundabouts) is a design option for this alternative
- Build Alternative (Hybrid)
The evaluation of the alternatives is for the year 2031 which coincides with the planning horizon year for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) prepared by the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG). Each of the alternatives is described below in greater detail.

2.3.1 No-Build Alternative
The No-Build Alternative includes programmed roadway and bus system improvements within the project study area. These improvements are specified in the appropriate agency Transportation Improvement Programs (TIP), community plans and regional or state transportation plans (depending on the ownership designation of the roadway) for which funding has been committed. The current transportation facilities and transit services, with minimal modifications or expansions, form the basis of the No-Build Alternative.

2.3.2 Build Alternative (4-Lane)
This alternative extends the LRT east along Main Street to Gilbert Road, a distance of 1.9 miles (Figure 2). It will connect with the 3.1-mile Central Mesa Extension (CME) project where the CME is slated to end on Main Street east of Mesa Drive near North Edgemont, a local road providing access to an adjacent residential neighborhood. The CME began construction in May 2012 and is scheduled to begin service in early 2016. The CME will connect with the existing 20-mile LRT Starter Line which traverses portions of west Mesa, Tempe, and Phoenix. When the Gilbert Road Extension is completed, the LRT system will operate a total of 25 miles within these three cities. Additionally, Valley Metro is planning a 2.1-mile modern streetcar system in the City of Tempe.

The major characteristics common to all the build alternatives being evaluated are presented in Table 1. The difference in the Build Alternative (4-Lane) compared to the Build Alternative (2-Lane) is that the 4-Lane alternative preserves the existing four travel lanes on Main Street (two lanes in each direction) using the same cross-section dimensions as the existing LRT Starter Line. This alternative has the highest requirements for additional right-of-way requiring property from an estimated 66 parcels. The current plans anticipate that at least three buildings, all used for commercial purposes, would be directly impacted by the acquisition of property for right-of-way purposes. These structures would need to be permanently removed (requiring full property acquisition) or physically altered (requiring partial property acquisition) in order to implement this alternative. The disposition of these properties would be determined in the latter design phases during property owner negotiations. All of the other parcels required to implement this alternative would be partial acquisitions of land in the form of linear strips paralleling the roadway. Much of the land area that would be purchased is currently used for surface parking. Additional right-of-way necessitating full acquisition of property as discussed in Section 2.4 will be required for a new park-and-ride facility and traction power substation (TPSS) at the eastern terminus of the LRT extension. Additional right-of-way will also be needed for a TPSS to be located midway along the...
LRT route. Typical cross sections for the Build Alternative (4-Lane) are presented in Figure 3.

2.3.3 Build Alternative (2-Lane)
This alternative includes the features presented in Table 1. However, the main difference between the Build Alternative (2-Lane) and the Build Alternative (4-Lane) is that the 2-Lane alternative eliminates two through travel lanes (one in each direction) providing a total of two travel lanes. This alternative has the least requirements for additional right-of-way (approximately 12 partial and 0 full property acquisitions). No business or residential relocations would be needed. As with the Build Alternative (4-Lane), this alternative necessitates full acquisition of property as discussed in Section 2.4 for a new park-and-ride facility and traction power substation (TPSS) at the eastern terminus of the LRT extension. Additional right-of-way will also be needed for a TPSS to be located midway along the LRT route. Typical cross sections for the Build Alternative (2-Lane) are presented in Figure 4.
TABLE 1: FEATURES COMMON TO THE BUILD ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route distance</td>
<td>1.9 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Beginning point</td>
<td>• Main Street - East of Mesa Drive (near Edgemont)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Termination point</td>
<td>• Main Street at Gilbert Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations begin</td>
<td>2018 (estimated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trackwork</td>
<td>• 2 median-running tracks (1 in each direction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continuously welded steel rails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Track rails embedded in a concrete slab for aesthetic purposes and provides level and smooth crossings for autos and pedestrians where such crossings are allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stations</td>
<td>• 2 stations provided:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Stapley/Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Gilbert/Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Rail Vehicles</td>
<td>• Same vehicles as used on LRT Starter Line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Carries 175 passengers per vehicle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Could operate as a two- or three-car train depending on demand. A two-car train will be the most common configuration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Catenary System (OCS)</td>
<td>• Distributes electricity to LRT vehicles, traction power substations, and signaling and communication systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Steel or concrete poles support power line. Poles about 25 feet tall and typically installed at intervals from 90 to 170 feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Poles normally located between the two bi-directional tracks. Sometimes located on the side of the LRT trackway with the overhead electrical line suspended over the LRT tracks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traction Power Substation (TPSS)</td>
<td>• Supplies electricity for LRT operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• An enclosed structure about 20-by-40 feet (30-by-60 feet including the grounding mat around the substation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2 TPSSs will be required. One to be located at the end-of-line near Gilbert Road and one approximately mid-way along the route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations and Maintenance</td>
<td>Uses existing LRT Operations and Maintenance Center (OMC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks/Bicycle Lanes</td>
<td>Bi-directional to be provided as currently exists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park-and-Ride</td>
<td>• A park-and-ride at Gilbert Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See Section 2.4 for additional</td>
<td>• May be surface parking or structure. To be determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information)</td>
<td>• Two optional locations being considered:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Park-and-Ride (North Option)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Park-and-Ride (South Option)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.3.1 Build Alternative (2-Lane Roundabouts)

A design option for the Build Alternative (2-Lane) could incorporate modern roundabouts at five street locations along the route to serve neighborhoods on either side of Main Street. The intersections at Stapley Drive/Main Street and Gilbert Road.
Road/Main Street will maintain a typical traffic intersection configuration and use traffic signals instead of roundabouts.

Modern roundabouts may reduce train travel times by allowing trains to maintain more consistent speeds, compared to stopping at signalized intersections. Roundabouts may also increase intersection capacity and improve traffic progression through intersections. In addition, turning movements would be simpler to maneuver, especially to and from existing north-south streets, as access to neighborhood streets would not be restricted.

This alternative would require approximately 27 partial and 0 full parcel acquisitions. No business or residential relocations would be needed. As with the other Build Alternatives, additional right-of-way will be required for the park-and-ride facility and two TPSSs. Typical cross sections at the signalized intersections for the Build Alternative (2-Lane Roundabouts) are the same as those shown for the Build Alternative (2-Lane) in Figure 4. Figure 5 illustrates how traffic moves through a roundabout.

2.3.4 Build Alternative (Hybrid)

As the study process and community input for the alternatives continued, it became evident that each Build Alternative considered had its pros and cons, and there was no clear community consensus for any of the alternatives. For these reasons a hybrid alternative was developed that combines elements of each of the Build Alternatives considered. The Build Alternative (Hybrid) represents a community-adopted compromise between the Build Alternatives and the roundabouts design option. It shares the features of the other alternatives listed in Table 1.

The Build Alternative (Hybrid) would consist of two traffic lanes (one in each direction) on Main Street from the eastern terminus of the CME to Miller Road (approximately one-quarter mile west of Stapley Drive). From Miller Road to Lazona Drive (approximately one-quarter mile east of Stapley Drive), four traffic lanes (two in each direction) would be provided. Because evaluation of the Build Alternative (2-Lane) showed congestion in the vicinity of Stapley Drive which did not occur with the Build
Alternative (4-Lane), it was decided that maintaining four lanes in this area would benefit traffic. East of Lazona Drive, Main Street would again be narrowed to two travel lanes (one in each direction) to Guthrie Street. East of Guthrie Street, four travel lanes (two in each direction) would be provided eastward to Gilbert Road.

Two modern roundabouts would be added on Main Street at the intersections of Horne and Harris Avenue. So, unlike the Build Alternative (2-Lane) and the Build Alternative (4-Lane), this alternative incorporates roundabouts, but only at two locations instead of five locations as proposed with the Build Alternative (2-Lane Roundabouts).

This hybrid alternative would require additional right-of-way from an estimated 37 parcels, so property needs would be less than the Build Alternative (4-Lane) but more than the Build Alternative (2-Lane) and its Roundabout Option. Like the Build Alternative (4-Lane), the Build Alternative (Hybrid) anticipates that the same three buildings, all used for commercial purposes, would be directly impacted by the acquisition, and the disposition of these properties would be determined in the latter design phases during property owner negotiations. All of the other parcels required to implement this alternative would be partial acquisitions of land in the form of linear strips paralleling the roadway. However, as with the other Build Alternatives, this alternative necessitates full acquisition of property as discussed in Section 2.4 for a new park-and-ride facility and traction power substation (TPSS) at the eastern terminus of the LRT extension. Additional right-of-way will also be needed for a TPSS to be located midway along the LRT route. On April 4, 2013, the City of Mesa Council approved the Build Alternative (Hybrid) as the preferred alternative (PA) for the project and selected the Park-and-Ride (South Option) as part of the PA. See Section 2.4 for information about the park-and-ride facility.

2.4 PARK-AND-RIDE FACILITY
A park-and-ride facility will be provided at the eastern end-of-line station at Gilbert Road. Surface parking is likely to be provided; however, a structure may also be considered. The type of facility will be determined as design advances and determination of need is better known during Project Development. Two options are evaluated:
- Park-and-Ride (North Option)
- Park-and-Ride (South Option)
FIGURE 4: BUILD ALTERNATIVE (2-LANE)
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At intersections with traffic signal

East of Stapley with station
The Park-and-Ride (North Option) is located at the northwest corner of Gilbert Road/Main Street. It consists of six parcels and would necessitate demolition of several permanent structures and approximately 6 business relocations. The Park-and-Ride (South Option) is located at the southwest corner of Gilbert Road/Main Street. It consists of three parcels with four businesses including three selling used cars and the fourth selling both recreational vehicles and used cars. All permanent and temporary structures on the parcels would be removed. Any business relocations would be carried out in conformance with the requirements of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 as amended.
3. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

3.1 HISTORIC PATTERNS OF DEVELOPMENT

The project corridor extends 2 miles east of the original Mesa townsite, which is located on an upper terrace south of the Salt River. Historically, the townsite of Mesa—like other communities in the Salt River Valley—was surrounded by fertile, cultivated lands that were watered by a network of private canal systems. Lateral ditches and unimproved roads generally followed section lines, with the exception of Main Street, which bisects sections east and west of the original townsite.

The Main Street alignment east of Mesa (which extends through the APE) was known as the Apache Trail after completion of Roosevelt Dam in 1911. By the early 1920s, Main Street was shared with the Mesa-Superior Highway, which was designated US Highway 80 in 1927. Through the Great Depression and World War II (1929–1945), lands within the current APE continued to reflect its original agricultural landscape, albeit bisected by the paved alignment of US Highway 80, which by this time was shared by US Highways 60, 70, and 89. Mesa, though expanding its incorporated boundaries, was still surrounded by a rural landscape from which cotton and citrus were harvested. The canal systems by this time were all operated and maintained by the Salt River Valley Water Users’ Association.

With the culmination of World War II in 1945, communities in the Salt River Valley experienced significant growth, both in size and population. In addition, the paved US Highways witnessed increasing use as travelers took to the road. Commercial and residential development expanded east and west along Main Street/US 80 from Mesa’s downtown center. Farm parcels that had once surrounded the quaint townsite of Mesa were transformed into residential suburbs that changed the character of the townsite into a metropolis.

3.2 CHARACTER OF THE EXISTING SETTING

The urban setting of the APE along East Main Street is a predominantly commercial landscape that is flanked by a large number of residential subdivisions. Two trailer parks established in the 1950s and 1960s also occur within the APE. A review of aerial photographs indicates that the APE was transformed from a rural to urban landscape from the 1940s through the 1960s. As such, the bulk of inventoried properties were constructed in the post World War II period, reflecting a midcentury modern character. A large number of modern buildings are also evident within the APE, many of which were constructed in the last three decades, replacing earlier structures that had once occupied the parcels. Within the 2-mile linear boundary of the current APE on Main Street (Mesa Drive to Gilbert Road), there is no vestige of the fields of cotton and citrus that once defined the rural character of Mesa.
Through the middle decades of the twentieth century (1930–1960), Main Street was a major transportation corridor from which US Highways 60, 70, 80, and 89 entered the Salt River Valley. In the postwar period, auto travel along the paved highways of Arizona increased substantially. Within the APE, commercial businesses were established to serve the travelers, including motels and auto courts, restaurants, and service stations. Simultaneously, postwar residential development occurred on both sides of Main Street as Mesa was transformed into a municipality. Intermixed with the commercial tourist businesses on Main Street were large grocery stores that catered to the expanding neighborhoods, as well as strip malls, banks, and fast food restaurants.

In this period of urban expansion, Main Street functioned not only as a major highway corridor, but also a municipal arterial street. Sidewalks and curbs were constructed for more effective pedestrian use, and medians were constructed in the roadway with centrally located streetlights. Today Main Street, as it extends east of the original townsite, is a four lane arterial corridor, and no longer claims shared use with the major US highways that historically passed through the Mesa townsite. In recent years, bus stops have been added along Main Street, along with bumpouts for street parking, although historic era curbs are present in discontiguous segments of the APE; ornamental landscaping also occurs sporadically along the alignment. This postwar transformation of the landscape is not unique to Mesa. Indeed, the Salt River Valley can be considered an extensive conurbation with several million residents.

3.3 HISTORIC OVERVIEW

The settlement and growth of the Salt River Valley in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was largely a result of an agricultural economy dependent on a sustainable irrigation system. The federal government established the National Homestead Act in 1862 to encourage settlement of public lands in U.S. territories, including the arid lands of Arizona. Initially, homesteaders were granted land parcels of 80 or 160 acres at no cost, so long as the homestead was settled for a period of five years, with at least four years of cultivation occurring on a segment of the claim. Alternatively, the patentee could commute his claim by purchasing the claim outright, thereby bypassing residency requirements; such purchases are known by the term “Cash-Entry (CE).”

Through the late nineteenth century, aided by the cadastral survey and homesteading of the Salt River Valley, intensive agricultural development and construction of independent canal systems occurred along the major drainages of Arizona—particularly in the Salt River Valley, where the communities of Phoenix, Tempe, and Mesa were established along the Salt River. Canals constructed north and south of the Salt River would eventually consolidate in the twentieth century under the Salt River Valley Water Users Association (SRVWUA), the predecessor of today’s Salt River Project (SRP). Within a generation after its founding, Phoenix and other communities in the Salt River
Valley emerged as the central hub of commercial activity in Arizona, with access to regional and national markets of commerce and industry.

3.3.1 Settlement and Development of Mesa: 1877–1969
The first documented historic occupation of the area occurred in the spring of 1877 by members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (Mormon). A group of Mormon settlers led by Daniel W. Jones, claimed lands along the south side of the Salt River. Jones and 12 additional families were called by Brigham Young to settle in the Southwest as part of the Mormon colonization effort. The group organized themselves at St. George, Utah Territory, and traveled southward to the Salt River Valley (Jones 1960; Mesa Unified School District 1978). With the help of local Native Americans, the Mormon settlers excavated the Utah Ditch to provide water for domestic use as well as irrigation for their crops. The community that developed was initially known as Fort Utah, but was later called Lehi. Through the twentieth century, Lehi retained its rural atmosphere, with most of the residents claiming descent from the earliest pioneer settlers. However, its economic and urban significance was soon eclipsed by the neighboring community of Mesa. Several factors contributed to the dominance of Mesa over the older settlement of Lehi. Land was limited, especially after the federal government set aside the area between present-day McDowell Road and the Salt River as part of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community in 1879. The lower land was also less desirable, as it lay in the floodplain of the Salt River where floods were common until completion of the Roosevelt Dam in 1911. Lehi remained an independent community until 1970, when it was incorporated by the City of Mesa (Jackman and Macnider 2000; Yost et al. 1999).

3.3.1.1 Mesa the Thriving City: 1878–1930
Following the success of the Jones party in settling Lehi in 1877, a second party of Mormons arrived from Utah in 1878. Though invited by Jones to join the Lehi party, this group was determined to dig their own ditch and settle on the mesa south of Lehi. The residents relied on existing prehistoric canals to guide their agricultural efforts, and finally settled on a canal location which had its heading upstream from the Utah Ditch. The Montezuma or Mesa Ditch delivered water to the homes and fields on top of the mesa. The small town was incorporated in 1883. By this time, a post office had been established and the population had grown to 300 residents. However, between 1881 and 1889 the town and post office was variously known as Hayden, Mesa, and Mesa City; apparently, the citizens couldn't adopt the names Mesa or Mesa City because of the existence of another settlement called Mesaville (Pinal County). With the demise of Mesaville in 1889, residents officially adopted the name of Mesa for the town and its post office (Mead and Price 1988).

The 640-acre townsite as platted in 1883 closely followed the Mormon concept of the “City of Zion”, which was characterized by large blocks separated by wide (132 ft) streets. As shown in Figure 7, the 36 square blocks in the town center were each comprised of eight lots that were drawn out alternately north-south or east-west. This
strategy was employed so that houses would not face one another on the wide streets, and to also ensure that “no one street would be built on entirely through the street” (http://www.library.cornell.edu/Reps/DOCS/smith.htm). This central core of Mesa City was surrounded by an additional 24 double lot blocks, and four single-lot blocks on each corner of the townsite. These smaller blocks may have been drawn for barns and stables that were not to be built within the large blocks of the town center. Two cemeteries were also plotted north of the townsite. As envisioned by the Latter Day Saints, irrigated farmlands surrounded Mesa City on all sides, including lands within the current project area (Figure 8).

**Fields of Cotton and Citrus**

Like other communities in the Salt River Valley, agriculture was Mesa’s principal industry through World War II. Initially, settlers of Mesa City farmed the lands surrounding the Mesa Canal and its associated laterals. The principal crop in these early years was grapes, as well as citrus, although alfalfa and sorghum were also raised for animal feed. At the turn of the twentieth century, the lands surrounding Mesa were firmly established for cultivation (Smith 2004:53–80).

As the community grew, other canals were excavated, including the Highland Canal (1888). In 1890, Dr. Alexander J. Chandler approached shareholders of the Mesa Canal with an offer to acquire control of the canal in return for cheaper annual rates and an improved canal system. His intent was to significantly expand the Mesa Canal and consolidate all the canals south of the Salt River (southside) in order to convey water to undeveloped lands south of Mesa, which he intended to acquire and develop. Over the course of the next 10 years, Chandler and the Consolidated Canal Company increased the capacity of the Mesa Canal and relocated the heading. Chandler also began construction of the Consolidated Canal, which was situated east of the Mesa Canal, extending southerly 19 miles to lands under his control. The southside canal system—which also included the Tempe, Utah Extension, and Eureka Canals—was consolidated in 1900, with all canals fed through the Consolidated Canal. By this time, Chandler had acquired an estimated 18,000 acres of undeveloped lands south of Mesa through questionable or illegal means (Zarbin 1997:127–138).

The National Reclamation Act was passed in 1902, triggering a Department of the Interior search for suitable dam locations across the western United States. Engineers in the Department of the Interior were confident that the Tonto Basin was an ideal location for a reservoir (Zarbin 1997:123–124). However, the government would not fund such an enterprise without assurances that farmers would receive all the benefits of the dam (Zarbin 1986:3). As a response, area landowners formed the SRVWUA in 1903. Although they did not yet have control of the canal system, or settled issues of water rights, SRVWUA leaders successfully lobbied the Department of the Interior to select the Tonto Basin as one of the first reclamation sites in the country (Glaser 1996; Luckingham 1989; Zarbin 1984). As originally conceived, Roosevelt Dam was to serve as a water-control structure to regulate and store the river waters, thus providing the
Salt River Valley with a reliable source of irrigation water. Ultimately, it would become a major producer of hydroelectric power for Arizona communities and mines, as well as a major recreational facility.

Because of its many advantages, Mesa was chosen over Globe as a commercial center for employment and materials for the construction of Roosevelt Dam in the Tonto Basin. The Apache Trail was constructed in 1904–1905 to transport materials to the dam site. This road became the principal automobile route between the Salt River Valley and Tonto Basin until the 1920s when the Mesa-Superior and Superior-Miami Highways were completed. With the completion of the Granite Reef Diversion Dam (1908) and the Roosevelt Dam (1911), Mesa’s reputation as an agricultural center was assured. In the early decades of the twentieth century, citrus, cotton, and dairy became strong staples in the Mesa area, and large sections of land were planted in oranges and cotton. In 1912, farmers in Mesa, Tempe, and Chandler began cultivating long-staple “Pima” cotton for use as an industrial grade fiber. The acreage planted in cotton increased nearly tenfold in 1913, and the Arizona cotton industry was firmly established (Solliday 2000; Stevens 1955:33–34). Central Arizona quickly became one of the leading cotton-producing regions in the nation.

While the new cotton industry had brought prosperity to central Arizona, reliance on a single crop eventually proved to be disastrous. In the spring of 1920, Pima cotton was selling for more than a dollar per pound, but by the time of the winter harvest, the market collapsed and prices fell to less than thirty cents a pound (Peterson 1975:53, 56, 74, 81; Stevens 1955:47–49). The Cotton Crash of 1920 brought the most severe economic depression experienced in central Arizona, leading to foreclosures and bankruptcies throughout the Valley. Within a few months, the young Arizona cotton industry was nearly destroyed (McGowen 1961:36; Solliday 2000; Stevens 1955:47–49). Although the cotton industry did eventually recover, farmers decided to diversify by growing a wider variety of crops. By the late 1920s, upland short-staple cotton had replaced Pima cotton as the principal cotton variety harvested in Arizona. Cotton production increased substantially as manufacturers of cottonseed oil and meal were established in Phoenix.
FIGURE 7: IMAGE OF THE MESA CITY PLAT, FILED IN 1883 (MARICOPA COUNTY RECORDER'S OFFICE)
The layout of the plat was based on the “City of Zion” plat as envisioned by the Latter Day Saints.
FIGURE 8: PORTION OF THE 1903 RECLAMATION MAP OF TOWNSHIP 1N, RANGE 5E, SHOWING THE MESA TOWNSITE AND SURROUNDING IRRIGATED FARMLANDS (COURTESY OF U.S. RECLAMATION OFFICE, PHOENIX)
Early Commercial Development on Main Street

Initially, commercial development in Mesa was limited to establishments catering to the needs of farmers that surrounded the small townsite. Mercantile and general merchandise stores supplied the goods demanded of the farmers. Additionally, cooperative enterprises were established by individual Mormon settlers, entrepreneurs, and civic leaders to serve their close-knit community and trade with neighboring communities. Notable “co-ops” formed in the final years of the nineteenth century included the Zenos Co-operative Mercantile and Manufacturing Institution (1884), Mesa Co-operative Cheese Factory (1891), and Mesa Co-operative Milling Company (1891).

Located at the eastern edge of the Salt River Valley’s commercial hub, Mesa commanded a significant advantage in freighting between the mining communities of Goldfield, Superior, and Globe. Interestingly, freighting as a profitable trade was initially discouraged by Mormon leaders, as they believed it would distract settlers from farming and homesteading (Merrill 1975:248). However, because of accelerated growth, an increasingly diverse population, and completion of railroad branch lines in the Salt River Valley, freighting was soon recognized as a viable industry in Mesa. The influx of new settlers and workers of the Granite Reef and Roosevelt dams greatly influenced Mesa’s downtown commercial development. In a ten-year period, between 1900 and 1910, Mesa’s population more than doubled from 720 to 1,700. This sudden growth initially spurred additional residential development in the Mesa townsite. This was accomplished by splitting the original lots represented in Figure 7. City blocks with no development were subdivided for residential use. Between 1908 and 1921, 30 subdivisions had been platted within and immediately adjacent to the original townsite. This period permanently altered the original concept of the townsite as a City of Zion model (Ryden Architects 2010:22–23; Smith 2004:80–84). The Mesa Daily Tribune declared on October 22, 1919:

Only a few years ago, Mesa was merely a few houses gathered together, while now it is a thriving city of 5000, with paved streets, a sewer system, sidewalks throughout, electric lights and power -- in fact all the conveniences of a modern city…

…Mesa is the first city reached by either highway or railroad transportation systems from the mining towns, which are in the richest copper mining section in the world. Imports are large and exports unprecedented for a town the size of Mesa, and this is only one of the signs of the growing commercial success if this city.

Mesa’s commercial development on Main Street at this time was characterized by one and two-story brick buildings with concrete sidewalks flanking the unimproved Main Street. Utility poles were installed on the edge of the unpaved Main Street. Traffic passing eastward through Mesa drove along Main Street, where it connected to the Apache Trail, continuing on to Roosevelt Lake. Agricultural lands dominated the landscape beyond the original townsite, including lands within the current project area (Figure 9). In July 1930, the City of Mesa re-platted the original townsite, incorporating many of the outlying subdivisions that had been established in the preceding decades.
(Figure 10). As shown, the expanded city boundaries extended a quarter-mile along Main Street to Hobson, incorporating the site of the newly completed LDS Temple and Pioneer Park. Mesa celebrated its status as a modern urban center of commerce in 1930 with a population numbering over 3,700 residents.

### 3.3.1.2 A New Era for Mesa: 1930–1969

The devastating economic impact of Black Friday and the Great Depression was slow to afflict the communities in the Salt River Valley. However, when copper values plummeted from $155.7 million in 1929 to $14.7 million in 1932, mines were shut down and workers were left jobless. The impact of the Great Depression did not spare the agricultural industry in Arizona; between 1930 and 1934, cotton production once again plummeted as wholesale prices fell to precipitous lows (Brown and Cassmore 1939:50).

Despite the economic downturn of the Great Depression over the Salt River Valley, Mesa’s population increased to 7,224 by 1940. One reason for this surprising growth was the steady expansion of the citrus industry in the 1930s. Indeed, between 1925 and 1931, the acreage of citrus orchards (principally grapefruit and orange) in the Mesa vicinity increased substantially from an estimated 2,500–3,000 acres to more than 17,000 acres, including many of the former farm parcels within the current APE (Smith 2004:252, 265):

> Undoubtedly, as much as any other form of agriculture practiced around Lehi and Mesa at the time, the citrus industry provided large-scale employment and an infusion of cash to local businesses that helped to soften the blow of the Great Depression.

The United States formally entered the Second World War on December 8, 1941. In the Salt River Valley, a number of airfields—including Thunderbird Field and Luke Field in the west Valley, and the Falcon Field and Williams Field in the east valley—were used by the military to train pilots and employ workers. Auxiliary fields associated with Thunderbird, Luke, and Williams Airfields were scattered across the Valley over the course of the war. Soldiers and pilots training at these airfields contributed significantly to the local economy.

Through the course of World War II, and in the ensuing postwar years of the 1950s, Mesa’s population increased substantially. This pattern was due in part to the return of veterans looking for work, as well as new technology industries that moved into the valley. In the decade between 1940 and 1950, Mesa’s population more than doubled from 7,224 to 16,790 (Maricopa County and City of Mesa 1961).
FIGURE 9: PORTION OF THE 1929 OWNERSHIP PLAT FOR TOWNSHIP 1N, RANGE 5E, SHOWING INDIVIDUAL FARM PARCELS LOCATED ALONG MAIN STREET IN THE PROJECT AREA (SECTIONS 23 AND 24) (ARIZONA STATE LIBRARY, ARCHIVES AND PUBLIC RECORDS)
FIGURE 10: IMAGE OF THE MESA PLAT, WHICH WAS RESURVEYED IN 1930
(MARICOPA COUNTY RECORDER'S OFFICE)
As shown, the amended plat included subdivisions that had been platted around the original townsite, as well as blocks occupied by the LDS Temple (Block 93) and Pioneer Park (Block 95).
4. ELIGIBILITY OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

4.1 AGE CRITERION FOR ELIGIBILITY
As previously noted, to be eligible for listing on the National Register, a property generally must be at least 50 years old unless it meets Criteria Exception G for properties that have achieved significance within the past 50 years. Historic age is determined as 50 years prior to the date of completion of the undertaking (i.e., construction). The anticipated date of completion for the current project is 2018, which would make 1968 the historic age cutoff. Most of the commercial properties in the project area were built between 1940 and 1969.

4.2 AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE

4.2.1 Community Planning and Development
Historic properties within the current APE are part of the extended commercial corridor along East Main Street and reflect Mesa’s postwar community planning development. In the decades preceding World War II, Main Street through Mesa was a major transportation route along which four major US highways converged. The highways were well traveled in the postwar period as the economy soared across the country and in the Salt River Valley. Simultaneously, residential development expanded significantly in Mesa and other incorporated cities in the valley. Cultivated fields of citrus and cotton gave way within a short time to a modern suburban landscape. Mesa’s commercial based corridor on Main Street expanded both east and west even as Mesa expanded its corporate boundaries.

4.2.1.1 Development of Main Street beyond the Original Mesa Townsite
In the early years of the twentieth century, the emergence of the automobile began to influence the development of the Salt River Valley. Initially, only the wealthy bought the new engine-driven horseless carriages, but when Henry Ford introduced his inexpensive Model T touring car in 1908, anyone with one hundred dollars for a down payment could afford to buy one. By 1910, there were 10 automobile dealers in Phoenix, and purchase prices soon dropped lower as competing manufacturers started offering other low-priced models (Goddard 1994.ix, 50, 54, 61; Kaszynski 2000:35; Luckingham 1989:51). In the decade between 1910 and 1920, cars within Maricopa County increased substantially, just shy of 14,000 vehicles, representing 40 percent of the state’s total inventory (Mawn 1979:520).

The advent of automobile travel drew attention to the county’s inadequate system of roads. Prior to 1919, the main artery between Mesa and other valley cities was the Tempe-Mesa Road. This road, first conceived in 1879 after county expenditures were set aside for its construction, originated near current Priest Drive on the northwest corner of Section 21 and continued along the 8th Street alignment to the Hayden Ditch, thence running northerly along the south bank of the Salt River to Lehi and Mesa. This...
original Tempe-Mesa road was replaced in 1892 when a new alignment was constructed across Tempe Canal near current Alma School Road, extending east to connect with Main Street in Mesa (Solliday et al. 2008). East of the Mesa townsite, Main Street connected with the Apache Trail, which had served initially as a construction road to the site of Roosevelt Dam. Upon completion of the dam in 1911, the Apache Trail was used by tourists traveling between Mesa, Roosevelt Lake, and Globe.

When Arizona became a state in February 1912, the role of the Territorial Engineer in improving transportation across the state was still not immediately clear. The counties were still responsible for nearly all road construction and maintenance. A tentative highway system was drawn in 1912 by the State Engineer (James Girand was the first State Engineer) that included two statewide highways—an east-west alignment between Yuma and Clifton, and a north-south alignment from Douglas to the Grand Canyon (these two statewide highways would later be designated US Highways 80 and 89, respectively) (Arizona State Engineer 1914).

Passage of the Federal Highway Acts of 1916 and 1921 were significant in that federal funds were made available for the construction and improvement of state highways to develop the continental system of highways previously advocated and funded by the organized road promoters. Highways included in the national system did not confer any federal ownership or control; such designation generally meant only that the highway was funded in part with Federal aid and met certain minimum design standards. Because the highway between Phoenix and Main Street in Mesa (along the Tempe-Mesa Road) was an important segment of a national highway, federal funds were allocated for road improvements and maintenance. On the south side of the Salt River, the highway extending through Tempe and into Mesa was completed under Federal Aid Project 8. Prior to 1919, the State Engineer had maintained the entire Phoenix-Mesa Highway as a graded 18-ft-wide road, with a caliche and/or decomposed granite surface and earthen shoulders (Figure 11). By 1923, the entire 18-ft wide alignment of the highway between Phoenix and Mesa had been paved with concrete.

In 1927, eligible highways across the country were assigned route numbers, which were posted along the roadways on standard signs with the Federal Highway shield (Arizona State University 1968:2; Cross et al. 1960:220; Kaszynski 2000:59–60). The east-west route of future U.S. Highway 80 was conceived along the Phoenix-Mesa Highway; consequently, it was the principal designation of this alignment. US Highway 89, representing the original north-south highway in Arizona, also followed this alignment as it crossed the Salt River Valley. U.S. Highways 60 and 70 were later extended through the Salt River Valley along this same alignment (ca. 1933). These four major highways converged at Florence Junction, followed the Apache Trail to Main Street in Mesa, and along the original Tempe-Mesa Highway into Phoenix (American Automobile Association 1930; Kaszynski 2000:35–42, 57; Luckingham 1989:82; Touring Guide Publishing Company 1926).
Through the late 1920s, automobile traffic increased significantly on U.S. 80 and the Salt River Valley; of particular concern to the newly formed Arizona State Highway Commission was the 18-ft-wide Tempe Bridge, which was incapable of accommodating two-way traffic over the Salt River. Consequently, the 36-ft-wide Mill Avenue Bridge was completed in the summer of 1931. Congested traffic conditions on the original 18-ft-wide Bankhead Highway between Mesa and Tempe was also a growing concern. A review of Arizona Highway Department as-built plans indicates that by 1935, the existing alignment along current Apache Boulevard was widened to 40 ft through Mesa (48 ft in some locations) (Figure 12). The concrete highway alignment was generally left in place, while successive layers of bituminous mix and a seal coat were applied over the improved highway.

After passage of the 1956 Federal Aid Highway Act, a new interstate system was developed to create a more efficient national transportation network, wherein all designated interstate highways would contain multiple lanes with no traffic intersections or commercial properties and structures within the right-of-way. Over several decades, traditional U.S. Highways were supplanted or converted into Interstate superhighways. Although Interstate 10 through Phoenix was not yet complete, the Yuma to Benson alignment of US 80 was officially eliminated in 1977 as a numbered route; by 1989 the remaining section through Douglas was eliminated (Weingroff 2004). Likewise in 1992, U.S. Highway 60 was relocated to the Superstition Freeway (Tempe Historical Museum 2009).

Currently, Main Street and Apache Trail are no longer on the national network of highways. Main Street continues to function, however, as a major arterial street through Mesa and the East Valley. Within the APE, Main Street is characterized as a four-lane arterial road with center medians, streetlights, and turn lanes. Discontiguous historic sidewalks are evident on both sides of the road for pedestrian travel. Stamps observed in the course of the architectural survey indicate the curbs and sidewalks were constructed between 1951 and 1958 (Figure 13). Commercial businesses continue to flourish along this roadway east and west of the original Mesa townsite.

4.2.1.2 From Citrus to Cul-de-Sacs: Residential Development in the Postwar Era: 1945–1969

Postwar population growth permanently altered the traditional agricultural landscape of Mesa. Residential subdivisions were established on lands once occupied by orchards. Farmers sold their lands and homebuilders constructed houses by the thousands. During this period, the city expanded its incorporated boundaries by annexing the new subdivisions. By 1960, the population of Mesa had doubled yet again to 33,772, with an incorporated area of 13.50 square miles; in a 20 year period between 1960 and 1980,
FIGURE 11: PORTION OF THE 1915 USGS MESA 15’ TOPOGRAPHY MAP SHOWING THE TEMPE-MESA ROAD (RED HIGHLIGHT) THAT EXTENDED BETWEEN THE TWO COMMUNITIES

FIGURE 12: PORTION OF THE 1952 USGS MESA 15’ TOPOGRAPHY MAP SHOWING THE ROUTE OF US HIGHWAYS 80, 89, 60 AND 70 THROUGH MESA AND TEMPE ALONG MAIN STREET AND APACHE BOULEVARD (RED HIGHLIGHT)
FIGURE 13: COLLAGE OF SIDEWALK AND CURB STAMPS OBSERVED WITHIN THE APE

Stamps observed on sidewalks within the APE

Brass stamp observed on a concrete curb within the APE
Mesa’s population soared to more than 162,000 residents (Maricopa County and City of Mesa 1961; Mead and Price 1988). Wilson and Abele (2004) classify Mesa’s postwar growth in three cycles between 1946 and 1973 (Table 2). In this period of significant growth, more than 300 subdivisions were platted in the city, with an estimated construction of 14,400 single family homes.

Aerial photographs of the APE and vicinity illustrate the transformation from citrus orchards to urban landscape between 1937 and 1959 (Figure 14, Figure 15, Figure 16). By 1960, only three active citrus fields occupied parcels within the APE (Figure 17). At least 18 subdivisions were platted on farmlands within the APE that had once been planted in cotton or citrus; the bulk of these were platted in a 17 year period between 1945 and 1962 (Table 3; Figure 18). These residential subdivisions reserved larger lots that fronted Main Street for commercial businesses. As shown in Figure 18, a sizable portion of parcels within and around the APE were not platted, although urban development did occur on these parcels.

### TABLE 2. SUMMARY OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IN AND AROUND MESA: 1946–1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Growth Period</th>
<th>Platted Subdivisions</th>
<th>Single Family Homes</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1946–1955</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2,904</td>
<td>By 1955, Mesa had increased its area to about 12 square miles. Subdivisions were platted in former agricultural fields that surrounded Mesa. Many of these subdivisions were recorded by landowners dubbed as “Mom and Pop” developers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956–1965</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>6,703</td>
<td>Growth increased significantly in this period. In 1960, Mesa’s area comprised 13.50 square miles, with an ever-growing population. The bulk of construction was single family homes, although trailer parks began to appear in greater numbers. An estimated 27 trailer parks were present in and around Mesa’s city limits by 1960, with an estimated population of 2,130. In this period, professional developers (title and trust companies, builders, realtors) platted a greater number of subdivisions, rather than individual landowners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966–1973</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6,143</td>
<td>Mesa’s land area in 1973 comprised 27 square miles, with a population of 72,000. By this time, more than 38,000 residential units were present in and around Mesa, including single family homes, trailers, as well as apartments, town homes and condominiums.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Information obtained from (Maricopa County and City of Mesa 1961:42–50; Wilson and Abele 2004:30–50)*
The only buildings present within the APE at this time were farm houses and associated outbuildings.
FIGURE 15: PORTION OF A 1949 MCFCD AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH, SHOWING INITIAL URBAN DEVELOPMENT ALONG EAST MAIN STREET (MARICOPA COUNTY 2006: ACCESSED SEPTEMBER 1, 2012)
FIGURE 17: 1960 MCFCD MAP OF MESA AND ITS SURROUNDINGS, ILLUSTRATING EXISTING CITRUS ORCHARDS (MARICOPA COUNTY AND CITY OF MESA 1961:PLATE 5)

The original platted townsite of Mesa is highlighted in red; the bold boundary outlines the incorporated boundary by 1960. As indicated by the blue arrows, only three orchards were present along East Main Street near Gilbert Road.
Plotted subdivisions with boundaries on East Main Street and the APE. See accompanying table for details.

Residential housing within designated subdivisions. Three residential subdivisions (G, H, I) may experience visual impacts as a result of proposed construction. As such, they are discussed in more detail in this report.

Un-platted parcels within the current APE.
TABLE 3. SUMMARY OF SUBDIVISIONS ESTABLISHED WITHIN OR ADJACENT TO THE CURRENT APE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subdivision</th>
<th>Date Recorded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Sierra Vista Park</td>
<td>12/08/1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Sierra Vista Park, Plat 2</td>
<td>11/14/1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Fraser Fields</td>
<td>04/08/1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Stewart’s East Mesa Addition</td>
<td>02/07/1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Randall Heights</td>
<td>07/10/1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Paradise Estates of Mesa</td>
<td>03/22/1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Beverly Estates</td>
<td>08/26/1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Secluded Village Unit 2</td>
<td>06/15/1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Secluded Village</td>
<td>04/26/1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Los Ranchitos</td>
<td>04/28/1943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K La Zona Acres</td>
<td>04/05/1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Golden Grove</td>
<td>02/15/1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Horne Homes</td>
<td>06/03/1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Moore Acres</td>
<td>01/31/1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Chula Vista Amended</td>
<td>02/25/1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P Allen Park</td>
<td>03/22/1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q Casa del Sol</td>
<td>09/13/1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Casa del Sol Replat</td>
<td>04/10/1962</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Refer to Figure 18 for locational information.
2 Fraser Fields is a residential subdivision that was listed on the National Register on February 3, 2010. The district boundary does not include commercial businesses along Main Street. Consequently, this district will not be impacted by proposed construction activities.
3 These residential subdivisions may be impacted visually by the Park-and-Ride (South Option), and are discussed in more detail in this report.

Only residential subdivisions located within the APE were evaluated for effects. Although several residential subdivisions are located adjacent to commercial properties that front Main Street, those commercial properties effectively separate the residential subdivisions from the APE. Three residential subdivisions (Beverly Estates, Secluded Village, and Secluded Village Unit 2) were assessed for visual impacts for the Park-and-Ride (South Option) and are discussed below.

**Beverly Estates**

The Beverly Estates subdivision is located in the E½ of the E½ of the SE¼ of Section 24, Township 1 North, Range 5 East (Gila and Salt River Baseline and Meridian) (Figure 19). This subdivision dates to 1955 and was developed by the Riskas Construction Company. It was a planned development, one of two subdivisions that opened concurrently in October 1955. According to an Arizona Republic article from October 16, 1955 and an Arizona Days and Ways Magazine article from October 23, 1955, its sister development, Beverly Village, was located at 35th Avenue and Camelback Road.
FIGURE 19: IMAGE OF THE BEVERLY ESTATES PLAT
(MARICOPA COUNTY ASSESSOR)
Beverly Estates was designed with 107 lots on rectilinear streets, with one cul-de-sac. Beverly Village had 104 lots on slightly curvilinear streets, with one cul-de-sac. Both subdivisions were laid out by Sparling Engineering Company. The homes ranged in price between $13,250 and $14,550 ($200 more in Mesa). This price included refrigeration, “lifetime” asbestos roofing, built-in kitchen range with Vent-A-Hood hood vents, 3-ft eaves, and 12-ft paved driveways.

Frank Fazio, the architect of record, designed five models, which were available in both developments: the Belair (three-bedroom, two-bath), Imperial (four-bedroom, two-bath), Overland (three-bedroom, two-bath), Riviera (three-bedroom, two-bath), and Mayfield (three-bedroom, two-bath, and a den). The homes had a variety of elevations with variations of treatments including board and batten, new and used brick, pumice block, gables, eave trim, inset entranceways, quarrel windows, window boxes, and bay windows. The two advertisements listed above noted that indoors, the homes also had recessed television areas, “dramatic” six-foot high, indoor planters, and built in bathroom vanities.

According to a collection of Arizona Republic articles (October 9, 1956; October 26, 1958; September 11, 1966; and January 18, 1970), the developer experienced legal challenges that likely slowed his progress in the development of this subdivision; only 37 homes were built in the subdivision by 1959. While Beverly Village built out in just a few years, Beverly Estates was only partially filled out when Bob Edmunds Construction Company began building homes in 1966. The southern portion of the subdivision, Lots 1 through 23 and Tract A, were refashioned into multiple-family residential lots. In the remaining portion of Beverly Estates, eight homes were built in 1969, with at least seven on the market in January 1970. Ten more were built in 1970, when the subdivision eventually filled out.

**Secluded Village and Secluded Village Unit 2**

The Secluded Village and Secluded Village Unit Two subdivisions are located in a portion of the west half of the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of Section 24, Township 1 North Range 5 East (Figure 20 and Figure 21). Both subdivisions were developed by the Clarke Construction Company in 1961 and 1962, respectively. There are 24 lots in Secluded Village and eight more in Unit Two. Both subdivisions have rectilinear layout with circulation designed to connect to adjacent subdivisions.

The Secluded Village subdivision was laid out by the Mesa Land Surveying Company in September 1960 and approved by the City of Mesa a month later. However, according to the Maricopa County Assessor’s Office, some of the homes were built as early as 1959. This is an unusual scenario, since the subdivisions are typically created and approved by the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors before lots are sold or built upon. Aerial flights of the area dated February 1959 do not show construction within either subdivision, so it’s possible assessor dates are inaccurate (Maricopa County 2006: accessed September 20, 2012).
FIGURE 20: IMAGE OF THE SECLUDED VILLAGE PLAT
(MARICOPA COUNTY ASSESSOR)
FIGURE 21: IMAGE OF THE SECLUDED VILLAGE UNIT 2 PLAT
(MARICOPA COUNTY ASSESSOR)
All of the houses in the Secluded Village subdivisions date to between 1959 and 1962 and do not appear to be a set of specific models, but rather varying interpretations of Ranch Style constructs with shared design features from other homes in adjacent subdivisions. Clarke Construction Company was owned by Wendell J. Clarke, who also owned Wendell Clarke Realty. The company was likely created to perform a general contractor function for residential construction; once the homes were built, the realty company would sell homes to perspective buyers. According to an Arizona Republic article from September 24, 1961, homes built by Clarke Construction were certified as Medallion Homes; they were totally electric and inspected by SRP to ensure they met the modern standards in wiring, appliances, and lighting.

**Mobile Home Parks**

The 1961 Comprehensive Plan for Mesa (Maricopa County and City of Mesa 1961) noted the growth of the mobile-home population in the postwar period. In this report, it was estimated that more than 2,000 residents and tourists were residing in an estimated 27 trailer parks located in Mesa and the immediate vicinity. Of these, more than half were seasonal residents older than 50 years, occupying their spaces in the winter months and vacating the premises through the summer. Within the APE, there are at least three trailer parks fronting Main Street, two of which were established within the period of significance. However, these properties are atypical of the dominant commercial landscape along East Main Street. Indeed, the bulk of trailer parks established by 1960 were located north and west of the Mesa townsite (Maricopa County and City of Mesa 1961:42–51).

**4.2.1.3 Commercial Development along East Main Street: 1940–1969**

As summarized above, lands within and adjacent to the APE were essentially undeveloped through the 1930s and early 1940s (see Figure 14). Farm properties and outbuildings were present along East Main Street, but intense urban development had not yet occurred. As the Second World War progressed, however, Americans and servicemen migrated to the Salt River Valley on US Highways 60, 70, 80, and 89, all of which entered Mesa on the Main Street alignment. As residential subdivisions appeared on the outskirts of Mesa, commercial development also spread both east and west of the original townsite along East Main Street. The 1946–1947 Mesa City Directory (Southside Directory Company 1946) lists addresses on East Main Street only to Edgemont, which was adjacent to Mesa’s east boundary. Beyond this point towards Apache Junction, the area was unincorporated and serviced as Postal Rural Route Two. The directory does not list a few commercial businesses established on this rural route, including Apache Junction Inn, Buckhorn Baths, Trails End Hotel, Rock Cabin Court, Rambo’s Cottages, Mesa Auto Court, and Sunset Trail Ranch. Clearly, these early businesses (none of which were located within the APE) catered to travelers driving through the valley on US 60-70-80-89.

Within a period of two years, however, Main Street commercial development quickly spread east of Mesa Drive and the original townsite boundary (Figure 15). The 1948–
1949 Mesa City Directory (Salisbury Publishing Co. 1948) lists addresses for residences and businesses as far as Stapley Drive. Predictably, businesses established within the APE between Edgemont and Stapley Drive catered primarily to highway travelers. Hotels and auto courts were present, including La Siesta Motel (ACS-12)\(^1\), West Ho Motel/El Rancho Motel (ACS-10), Mesa Auto Court, Winterest Court, Lariat Lodge, Citrus Paradise Motel (ACS-31), Mountain View Court, Lane’s Motor Cabins, and Lee’s Auto Court. Other businesses included food markets such as Don’s Grocery and Market (ACS-20), as well as service stations and at least one apartment complex.

Through the course of the 1950s, commercial businesses filled vacant farm parcels within the APE and expanded as far as Gilbert Road (see Figure 16). Indeed, as shown in Figure 22, Mesa’s commercial corridor had spread far to the east and west of the original townsite, reflecting the importance of Main Street as a US Highway and a major arterial street for its residents. Tourism by this time had become one of the principal industries in Mesa. The 1960 City Directory (Mullin-Kille Company 1960) listed 12 motels along Main Street within the APE, including El Rancho Motel (ACS-10), La Siesta Motel (ACS-12), Le Charm Motel (ACS-28), and Citrus Paradise Motel (ACS-31). Restaurants, service stations, and food markets were also prominent along Main Street, all of which catered to travelers. It is not surprising to know that by this time, tourism had become the principal industry of Mesa (Mead and Price 1988).

Equally important to the commercial development of East Main Street, however, was the rapid expansion of residential subdivisions east of Mesa. As summarized above, a large number of subdivisions were platted within and adjacent to the APE between 1945 and 1962. Businesses that catered to this new influx of residents included well-known grocery and retail chains like Safeway (ACS-09), Yellow Front (ACS-32), Bashas’ (ACS-39), and Skagg’s Drugstores (ACS-40). Strip office buildings also appeared within the APE (ACS-19, 21, 29, 43), with retail spaces available for small businesses. By 1969, the APE was essentially developed, with the exception of small, abandoned farm parcels that were being cleared for construction (Figure 23).

\(^1\) ACS numbers refer to historic age properties that were evaluated for eligibility in this report. See Tables 4 and 5 later in this chapter for additional information about each property. Appendix C shows locations of each of the properties recommended eligible.
FIGURE 22: 1960 MAP OF MESA AND ITS SURROUNDINGS, ILLUSTRATING CONTEMPORARY LAND USE (MARICOPA COUNTY AND CITY OF MESA, 1961:PLATE 10)

The original Mesa townsite is highlighted in red. By this time (1960), the lands within the APE (generally plotted with yellow highlight) were largely developed, with commercial businesses fronting Main Street (USD Highways 60, 70, 80, 89).

As shown, several vacant parcels were still evident along Main Street. However, these parcels no longer retained their agricultural character and were cleared for future development.
4.2.1.4 Architecture

The properties along East Main Street within the APE are primarily commercial, with the presence of a relative few occurrences of trailer park properties. Perhaps not surprisingly, a number of these commercial properties exhibit large road signs to attract the attention of travelers on Main Street/US 80. Vintage road signs from this era are treasured by enthusiasts of roadside architecture and midcentury modern architecture. Additionally, two buildings documented in the current APE (ACS-9 [Safeway] and ACS-41 [First National Bank]) included “Googie” architectural elements. This distinctive and dynamic architectural style, characterized by futuristic massing designs and exaggerated rooflines, was prevalent in roadside commercial buildings of the 1950s and 1960s. Following are brief summaries of midcentury commercial roadside signs and Googie architecture.

Commercial Business Signs

The commercial business sign has always been the primary advertising method for businesses. Commercial business signs began as standard shingles or signs hung on the front façade of a building targeting pedestrians’ viewpoints from sidewalks to adjacent storefronts along main streets in towns such as Glendale, Safford, Coolidge, and Florence. As the automobile took over transportation, bringing with it highways and Interstates, the commercial sign took on an even greater function as the first impression of a building for the passing motorist, designed to capture attention in a split-second of exposure. This was particularly important for buildings set back from the roadside within strip malls or surrounded by expanses of parking lots. New roadside businesses, particularly restaurants, auto parks, and lodging, followed the development of the highway system and by the mid-1920s, the “motel” (a combination of motorist and hotel) emerged. During the zenith of roadside lodging, over 100 motels lined the highways throughout the Valley with over three dozen situated along Main Street and Apache Boulevard (Mark n.d.).

Commercial signs, designed to create decorative interest, often used contrasting color and texture from the building background. Large, eye-catching, free-standing signs employed creative images or themes to reflect the business or just to catch attention through the use of memorable icons. The use of lighting not only aided in nighttime identification but also provided daytime brilliance, increasing advertising appeal and offering a visual respite for weary travelers driving through large expanses of dark, open desert. Lighting could be achieved through neon tubing on letter exterior faces, by illuminated light boxes with translucent faces, or through the use of exposed individual light bulbs. Indirect lighting could be created by constructing concealed light sources in the rear of each letter or through the use of flood lighting from a concealed source to illuminate the sign background (Ketchum 1948). Although neon lighting was available by the 1930s, it did not become widespread until after World War II (City of Phoenix Preservation Office and Ryden Architects 2010).
By the late 1960s, internally illuminated Plexiglas cabinet signs offered an inexpensive and easily-updated alternative to neon. As these signs became more popular, existing neon signs fell into disrepair and commission for new signs declined, particularly as local ordinances discouraged the use of “garish” or distracting signs (City of Phoenix Preservation Office and Ryden Architects 2010). A recent resurgence of interest in the research and preservation of historic signs has shed new light on their artistic and creative value, as well as their important contribution to the historic setting and feeling of commercial communities along historic highways.

Midcentury Modern and Googie Inspiration
Originally defined by Ship’s coffee shop in Los Angeles during the 1950s, where “Fred Flintstone and George Jetson could meet over a cup of coffee,” Googie architecture was tuned to the car culture with bold shapes and colorful spaces that attracted drivers (Hess 2004:22). The term originated from Googie’s Restaurant located on Crescent Heights past Sunset in California. The restaurant was designed by architect John Lautner and featured in House in Home magazine in 1952 by architectural photographer Julius Shulman and editor Douglas Haskell. Googie architecture allowed commercial properties to “throw off limitations of…traditional architecture and building practices” as whimsical, gravity-defying shapes were constructed using organic materials. These businesses formed a network of commercial enterprises within decentralized metropolises, an example of “transportation architecture” marketed to the masses (Hess 2004:24). The use of bright colors, neon signs, and exaggerated forms was utilized to attract the motorized consumer. These elements also acknowledged the juxtaposition of the ambitions of the future and celebration of the machines that won World War II with the apprehension of the unknown inherent in new technologies, the Atomic Age, the Space Age, and the Cold War (Hess 2004; Planning Resource Associates 2008; Ryden Architects 2010).

Googie influences combined primitive building materials and elements of nature with automobile and aerospace industries, with an eye towards “utopian future aspirations” (City of Phoenix Preservation Office and Ryden Architects 2010:85). Googie architecture features dramatic rooflines that mimic movement with soaring or undulating patterns; simple building forms with prominent artistic signage (often neon) or an unusual, eccentric building shape to lure passing motorists; use of humor and visual puns in building design and decoration; liberal use of glass, revealing well-lit and bustling interiors; and features amenable to automobile access, such as drive-in restaurants (City of Phoenix Preservation Office and Ryden Architects 2010; Painter 2010). The result was a “building with advertising function central to its art” (Hess 2004:25).

4.3 EVALUATION OF ELIGIBILITY AND INTEGRITY
The historic significance of properties in the project area is derived from their relationship to the historic context of Commercial Development along East Main Street (1940–1969) and Postwar Residential Development in East Mesa (1945–1969)
(Criterion A). Properties may also be individually eligible based on their embodiment of distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction (Criterion C). In the case of the Gilbert Road Extension, these considerations largely apply to commercial signs as well as a few buildings with significant architectural design.

Integrity refers to the physical characteristics of a property that allow it to show its significance and historic character. To be considered eligible for the National Register, a property must retain integrity of its basic form and character-defining features to the degree that it still provides a true and authentic representation of its historic appearance. The criteria used to evaluate the historic integrity of properties in this study were drawn from the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* (Weeks and Grimmer 1995), *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* (National Register of Historic Places 2002), and the newly revised Arizona SHPO policy statement on eligibility (Arizona State Historic Preservation Office 2011).

There are seven aspects of integrity that must be considered when evaluating the National Register eligibility of a property: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

**Location**
“Location is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred” (National Register of Historic Places 2002:44). Structures that have been moved from their original location are usually ineligible for listing on the National Register. However, under National Register Criteria Consideration B, if the moved property is significant primarily for architectural value or if it is the surviving property most importantly associated with a historic person or event, it may be eligible for listing.

**Design**
“Design is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property” and “…includes such elements as organization of space, proportion, scale, technology, ornamentations, and materials” (National Register of Historic Places 2002:44). An eligible property should still possess important elements of its design from its period of significance, such as roof type, fenestration, and decorative elements or—in the case of historic districts—layout, plan, circulation, and other related design aspects (see Standards #2, #3, and #9). Modifications that were made during the period of significance are usually considered an essential part of a building’s history (See Standard #4 above). If modifications were made after the period of significance and were sensitive to the original design, a building may still retain enough of its character-defining elements to communicate its historic character.

**Setting**
“Setting is the physical environment of a historic property” and “refers to the character of the place in which the property played its historic role” (National Register of Historic Places 2002:45). It consists of the relationship of a property to its surrounding natural and built environment. Relationships and features are considered both within the boundaries of the property and, especially in the case of historic districts, between the property and its surroundings (National Register of Historic Places 2002:45). Redevelopment and infill construction, demolition of nearby properties, widening of streets, and proximity of poorly maintained properties and vacant buildings can all adversely impact integrity of setting (see Standard #9). As with design, however, modifications to a property’s setting made during the period of significance are typically considered an essential part of the setting’s history (see Standard #4).

**Materials**

“Materials are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property” (National Register of Historic Places 2002:45). A property’s materials dating from the period of its historic significance should be preserved, properly maintained, and visible to the greatest extent possible (Standards #2, #5, #7, and #9). New materials used for repairs and maintenance should be similar to those that were used in the original construction (Standard #6). The loss of a building’s original materials is most evident in walls where brick masonry has been painted, stucco plaster has been applied over brick or concrete block, or metal, vinyl, or other siding materials have been mounted over exterior walls. Such applications are usually irreversible (see discussion below regarding evaluation of integrity in such cases). However, as with design and setting, modification to a property’s materials made during the period of significance may be considered an essential part of the property’s history and not constitute a loss of integrity (Standard #4).

**Workmanship**

“Workmanship is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory….Workmanship can apply to the property as a whole or to its individual components” (National Register of Historic Places 2002:45). To maintain historic integrity, character-defining features of workmanship originally evident in the property (or added during its period of significance [Standard #4]) must be preserved and remain visible (Standards #5 and #9). Workmanship also includes the treatment of small-scale features such as curbs, walls, sidewalks, and objects.

**Feeling**

“Feeling is a property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time. It results from the presence of physical features that, taken together, convey the property’s historic character” (National Register of Historic Places 2002:45). To retain historic integrity, a property must be able to communicate its historic character (Standards #2, #5, and #9).
Association
“Association is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property. A property retains association if it is the place where the event or activity occurred and is sufficiently intact to convey that relationship to an observer” (National Register of Historic Places 2002:45). In order to be considered eligible as contributors to a historic district, properties must be associated in an important way with the area of significance identified for the district and must still be able to convey that association (Standards #1 and #2).

Alterations to Historic Buildings
All buildings undergo change over time, so it is not essential that all seven attributes of integrity have been preserved intact, but an eligible property must still convey a sense of the time during which it attained its significance, including the following stipulations:
- historic wall material must be intact and visible
- additions must be sensitive to the historic design and materials of the building
- historic fenestration patterns must be intact and visible
- roof types must retain their original form
- front porches should not be removed, filled, or enclosed
- a property must not be obscured by modern walls or vegetation
- to be considered a contributor to a historic district, a property must be contiguous to other contributing properties.

4.3.1 Buildings and Districts
Within the APE, 60 buildings or districts were identified that met the 50-year age criterion (based on anticipated date of construction); no properties within the APE are currently listed on the National Register. Buildings or districts meeting the age criterion were researched and evaluated for significance within the contexts of community planning and development (Criterion A) or for their design and construction (Criterion C); no properties within the APE were associated with an important person (Criterion B). After this list of potentially historic properties was identified, a field survey was conducted to assess integrity for those properties that possessed significance either at the individual level or as a contributor to a district.

4.3.2 Objects (Signs)
Per the historic evaluation for the Central Mesa Extension, free-standing signs were evaluated as “objects” for individual significance or as contributors to individually eligible properties (Ryden Architects 2010). Other examples of objects include markers, mileposts, monuments, and statuary. Following the National Register guidelines, objects “should be in a setting appropriate to their significant historic use, roles, or characters” (National Register of Historic Places 2002). Previous consultation with William Collins (SHPO) for the Central Mesa Extension identified several design considerations when evaluating signs as eligible objects, including graphics, shape, and style; materials and
construction; and illumination and animation (Ryden Architects 2010). Aspects of integrity pertinent to these objects include design, materials, and workmanship. Therefore, signs within the APE were considered both in terms of their artistic merit (Criterion C) as well as relative to their function along transportation routes including highways (US 80) and Main Street.

4.3.3 Linear Transportation Structures
Although US 80 has lost aspects of integrity and has not been recommended as an eligible streetscape, it is still considered eligible under Criterion D for information potential regarding prehistory and history of the area. If archaeological remains are identified during construction activities, data recovery efforts would be conducted without change to build alternative design. The separate archaeological technical report prepared in support of the Gilbert Road Extension covers this in greater detail.

4.4 ELIGIBLE PROPERTIES
All properties of historic age within the APE, that is, properties constructed before 1968, were inventoried; no properties were identified within the APE that would qualify under Criteria Consideration G for exceptional properties less than 50 years old, and no properties currently listed on the National Register were identified within the APE. Two properties inventoried for the Central Mesa Extension and recommended eligible (13824115 [Bank] and 13828120C [Metro Valley Paint]) were identified within the APE (Ryden Architects 2010). In total, the inventory and research identified nine buildings and two objects (signs) recommended individually eligible for listing on the National Register (Table 4 and Appendices B and C). Individual Historic Property Inventory Forms were prepared for all properties recommended as eligible. These forms may be found in Appendix B. Consistent with the previous Central Mesa Extension, no eligible commercial historic district or historic streetscapes for Main Street were identified within the APE. The following summaries provide information regarding property significance, integrity, and eligibility recommendation for properties recommended eligible.
### TABLE 4: RECOMMENDED ELIGIBLE HISTORIC-ERA PROPERTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Recommended Status and Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13824115</td>
<td>Bank (Prime Time Child Care building and sign)</td>
<td>640 East Main Street</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13828120C</td>
<td>Metro Valley Painting</td>
<td>659 East Main Street</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-09</td>
<td>Safeway Stores Building (Rancho Grande and small businesses)</td>
<td>827 East Main Street</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A and C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-10</td>
<td>El Rancho Motel and Realty Buildings (El Rancho Motel and Smoke Shop) and Signs</td>
<td>719 East Main Street</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A (buildings) and C (signs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-25/26</td>
<td>J&amp;J Car Wash and Auto Service Building (Car Wash Auto Detail) and Sign</td>
<td>1060 East Main Street</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A (buildings) and C (sign)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-37</td>
<td>Arizona Bank Building (Bank of America)</td>
<td>1164 East Main Street</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-39</td>
<td>Bashas’ Grocer Building (Food City)</td>
<td>1242 East Main Street</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A and C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-41</td>
<td>First National Bank of Arizona Building (Gold Pawn Brokers)</td>
<td>1444 East Main Street</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A and C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-50</td>
<td>Mesa Marine Boats Retail Building (Tanaka Gallery)</td>
<td>1549 East Main Street</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-60</td>
<td>Ham Bone Sign</td>
<td>903 East Main Street</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-61</td>
<td>Frontier Motel Signs</td>
<td>1307 East Main Street</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1The first entry under “Property Name” was the name of the business, building, property, etc., when first built. The name in parenthesis indicates the current name as of the date of the field survey.

#### 4.4.1 Individual Buildings

No. 13824115 Prime Time Child Care: 640 East Main Street (1959)
This property was documented in 2009 by Ryden Architects (Ryden Architects 2010:54). Prime Time Child Care no longer occupies the property and the building is vacant. The following description is copied from that report.

**Significance:**
This building, originally designed as a branch bank, is a very good example of the influence of the automobile on the expansion of Main Street businesses beyond downtown Mesa during the late 1950s and early 1960s. Designed with Ranch style influence, the bank was intended to project a feeling of home-like security and welcome to its customers. Its location on a street corner also facilitated the use of the drive-through teller window shaded by a porte cochere. The eyecatching, free-standing sign uses the fired adobe masonry and heavy timbers of the building architecture and a raised planter to extend the imagery of the set-back building to the edge of the APE.

**Integrity:**
Although the building has been adapted for several uses since the banking function moved out, the building and its sign have retained a high level of architectural integrity having sustained no major alterations and no additions.

**Eligibility:**
This building and its free-standing sign are eligible for listing on the National Register at a local level of significance under Criterion A for their association with the expansion of Main Street business beyond downtown Mesa during the Great Post-World War II Boom, 1945–1975.

No. 13828120C Metro Valley Painting: 659 East Main Street (1963)
This property was documented in 2009 by Ryden Architects (Ryden Architects 2010: 54–55). The following description is copied from that report.

**Significance:**
This building represents the expansion of Main Street businesses beyond downtown Mesa during the mid-1960s. Its site plan layout relates to roadside visibility and convenient parking having the long deep building filling the east half (facing the side street) and the parking lot covering the west half. This box-like strip commercial building, influenced by New Formalism, reflects the popular use of ornamental concrete block (sometimes referred to as “breeze block”) to screen the windows. Other character-defining features include raised concrete block planters to create the illusion of a raised terrace, a stone-veneered pier, and standing seam metal fascia on the edge of the cantilevered flat roof.

**Integrity:**
This building retains a very high level of architectural integrity having sustained no major alterations and no additions.

**Eligibility:**
This building is eligible for listing on the National Register at a local level of significance under Criterion A as a good example of the expansion of Main Street businesses and professional offices beyond the downtown commercial area during the Great Post-World War II Boom, 1945-1975.
ACS-9 Safeway Store Buildings: 837 East Main Street (1965)

Description:
Safeway grocery stores constructed in the 1960s were built in a variety of architectural styles, one of which is known as the “Marina” style, named for the prototype, which was constructed in 1959 on Marina Boulevard in San Francisco (Painter 2010). This Safeway Store was built in the “Marina” style. The Marina style building is a commercial box structure that features Googie influences, including a curved roofline and a front façade dominated by aluminum display and transom windows. Double-door entrances are also evident along the front. Structural “wings” located on either side of the building feature a flat roofline detached from the more prominent curved roofline.

A smaller second building with similar architectural elements is situated immediately west of the Safeway store. This store appears to have operated as a Thrifty Drug Store (http://www.flickr.com/photos/roadsidepictures/229573148/sizes/o/in/photostream/). The property was abandoned for several years before being acquired and renovated as a Rancho Grande franchise store.

Significance:
Grocery supermarkets emerged in newly developed suburbs across the country in the 1950s as populations soared on the outskirts of downtown municipal areas. This Safeway store is an early example of one such supermarket that served new residential areas of Mesa. The building is midcentury modern International Style with Googie influences, including a whimsical undulating roof line, typical of many Safeway grocery stores of the period. The building also features large expanses of plate glass with entries along most of the exterior wall space. A second story of plate glass windows allows light to filter into the deep store space.

Integrity:
The building is in good condition, and retains integrity of design, workmanship, materials and feeling. The decorative tile affixed on the wings of the building was applied after 2003 as part of modern renovations for Rancho Grande. This ornate sheathing, however, does not compromise the overall integrity of the building. The property overall retains original historical contributing elements, including a large parking lot. Discontiguous portions of the original sidewalk are present, as well as the prominent store sign located in the northwest corner of the parking lot; however, these are not recommended as contributing elements.

Eligibility:
The building is potentially eligible for listing on the National Register at a local level of significance under Criteria A under the context of Main Street retail/commercial development beyond downtown Mesa from 1940–1969. The building is also potentially eligible under Criterion C for its unique Midcentury Modern Style with Googie influences.
ACS-10 El Rancho Motel and Realty Buildings: 719 East Main Street (1948)

**Significance:**
In the early postwar era, tourism was a primary industry for the City of Mesa. Motels were a common sight along Main Street on either side of the original townsite. This property is an excellent example of the once popular industry along Main Street and US 80 in the postwar period. It was constructed in 1948, operating initially as West Ho Motel. By the 1950s, the property was known as El Rancho Motel, displaying a prominent neon sign along Main Street.

The property is a roadside strip motel design, with four units surrounding a grassy courtyard and parking lot. The buildings exhibit a flat roof with wood shingled overhangs. The office building has steel casement and glass block windows, with aluminum sliding windows present on the remaining motel units. The Realty Building (currently Smoke Shop) is attached and constructed with concrete block. Decorative brick sheathing is evident on the front façade, as well as aluminum windows and an aluminum entry door. A Modernist Movement style sign, also recommended eligible.

**Integrity:**
The motel and attached building are in good condition and have changed little since the 1970s. Stucco and decorative brick facing have been applied to the property exteriors; the wood shingled overhangs were applied to the buildings in the late 1960s or early 1970s. Archival research at the Maricopa County Assessor’s Office and Mesa’s Development and Sustainability Department could not refine date(s) for these improvements. However, these applications do not detract from the original building design or impact the building's ability to convey its significance.

The original courtyard layout with original palm trees is still present in the center of the motel. The original neon sign is in good condition. The Smoke Shop sign is in fair condition—the insert has been replaced but distinctive sign shape and elements are intact.

**Eligibility:**
The building is potentially eligible for listing on the National Register at a local level of significance under Criterion A for its association with the expansion of Main Street retail/commercial development beyond downtown Mesa from 1940–1969, particularly that of the roadside motel servicing travelers along major highways. The associated neon El Rancho Motel sign and Smoke Shop sign are also recommended eligible under Criterion C for their quality of design emblematic of the Modernist Movement and craftsmanship at the local level. The main motel sign represents one of the few remaining examples of neon signs that were prevalent in the later postwar years along Main Street.
ACS-25/26 J&J Car Wash and Service Center Buildings: 1060 East Main Street (1964)

**Significance:**
This building, which was constructed in 1964, is an excellent example of a midcentury modern property type that catered to the expanding urban population of Mesa. The automatic car wash building is constructed with slump block and exhibits a tiled overhang and arched windows. An office is adjacent to the vehicle enclosure and consists of aluminum windows and wood door with corrugated metal overhang on the east face. A detached structure in the rear functions as an auto service center. The building is constructed with concrete block and exhibits eight sliding bay door openings. The prominent sign on Main Street is a tall, painted block pillar with attached lettering. An adjacent, tall metal pole supports the lighted sign. The building represents a particular type of commercial establishment geared towards the automobile-focused clientele utilizing Highway 80 through the east Valley.

**Integrity:**
The property is in good condition, with no significant architectural changes evident.

**Eligibility:**
The building is potentially eligible for listing on the National Register at a local level of significance under Criterion A for its association with the expansion of Main Street retail/commercial development beyond downtown Mesa from 1940 to 1969. The associated lighted sign on Main Street is also recommended eligible under Criterion C for its quality of design at the local level.

ACS-37 The Arizona Bank Building: 1164 East Main Street (1965)

**Significance:**
Branch banks emerged in the postwar era across the state to serve new suburban populations in a more efficient manner. This building, constructed in 1965, is a good surviving example of a midcentury modern bank that was built to serve the expanding urban population of Mesa.

The building is predominantly brick with a prominent decorative brick patterning on the front façade. Decorative concrete panels are also evident near the main front entrance. The multi-level flat roof of the building features a metal overhang that blends into the metal support posts for the main entry and attached drive-thru, which is located on the west façade. A slatted metal screen panel is affixed over the large east window offering shade and visual interest.

In the postwar period of the 1950s and 1960s, the Salt River Valley experienced significant growth as established communities aggressively annexed surrounding lands. New residential developments were no longer close to the traditional downtown business cores of large urban cities like Phoenix and Mesa. Whereas banks had once served their communities in these core areas in elaborately designed buildings, it was
clear to planners in the postwar period that a new design of branch banks was needed to cater to the automobile culture of middle-class America. Elements of the modern branch bank included (Reiner 2009:32–38):

- A smaller structural massing that served predominantly residents "on-the-go".
- Ample space within the bank for customers, as well as large prominent windows and displays of contemporary art for visual enhancement;
- Multiple entrances, including one in the rear near the parking lot;
- A generous amount of parking for the clientele;
- Intriguing exterior structural elements that would stand out for potential clients passing by on the street.

Architects in this period took advantage of the wide latitude offered to them by prominent banking institutions, such as Valley National Bank, First National Bank, and Arizona Bank. As such, the period between ca.1950 and 1975 witnessed a broad experimentation of bank shape, design, and materials. Common exterior features of the mid-century branch bank might include the following (Reiner 2009:52–55):

- Single story, flat roof structures;
- Use of brick masonry that often incorporated other materials, such as concrete, stone and metal;
- Prominent windows installed on the primary façades, and, in some cases, clerestory windows;
- Screens installed on windows to provide shade and appeal. These screens were made from a variety of materials, including concrete, metal, and block

ACS-37 is similar in design to Valley National Bank branch buildings that were designed by local architects Weaver and Drover, as cited by Reiner (2009:59–61) which included decorative brick elements and a metal shade structure. Archival research at the Maricopa County Assessor’s Office and Mesa’s Development and Sustainability Department could not identify the architect of the building.

**Integrity:**
The building is in good condition, with no significant architectural changes evident.

**Eligibility:**
This building is potentially eligible for listing on the National Register at a local level of significance under Criterion A for its association with the expansion of Main Street retail/commercial development beyond downtown Mesa from 1940 to 1969.

ACS-39 Bashas’ Grocer Building: 1242 East Main Street (1963)
Significance:
Grocery supermarkets emerged in newly developed suburbs across the country in the 1950s as populations soared on the outskirts of downtown municipal areas. This store is an early example of one such supermarket that served new residential areas of Mesa. The building, constructed in 1963, is a standard International Style commercial box fronted by a large parking lot, which was typical of the Bashas’ design throughout Arizona, beginning in the late 1950s.

The building features straight lines, low proportions, multi-leveled overhangs, and an emblematic steel-sheathed vertical pylon in the center of the building. Large expanses of plate glass with entries occupy most of the exterior wall space. These elements are similar to a contemporary Bashas’ store in Phoenix which represents a typical neighborhood supermarket designed to increase both curb appeal and design features to “integrate modern merchandising methods” to attract customers (City of Phoenix Preservation Office and Ryden Architects 2010:167). The current property is almost identical to the Bashas’ store located at 7th Avenue and Osborn Road in Phoenix as well as one located at 2124 East McDowell Road, also in Phoenix. The 7th Avenue Phoenix location was pictured as an excellent representation of the historic Bashas’ supermarket design in the City of Phoenix Preservation Office and Ryden Architects’ Mid-Century Marvels.

A complete survey of historic Bashas’ buildings in Arizona has not been completed; however, the Bashas’ brand is restricted to Arizona which limits the total sample size of similarly designed Bashas’ supermarkets. Moreover, the function of curb appeal in the design of these buildings makes historic facades less desirable as time progresses and buildings are “modernized”. These historic supermarkets are at high risk for remodeling and updating which results in loss of integrity, making historically eligible Bashas’ supermarket buildings increasingly endangered.

Integrity:
The building retains integrity of design, materials, and workmanship, with few modifications. New signage on the front façade highlights the current occupant, Food City. An attached addition with stack bond brick sheathing and flat roof is evident on the east façade of the main building. However, this does not detract from the primary view of the main building. The property overall retains original contributing elements, including large parking lot and an emblematic steel-sheathed vertical element in the center of the building from which the neon Bashas’ signage was displayed.

Eligibility:
The building is potentially eligible for listing on the National Register at a local level of significance under Criteria A under the context of Main Street retail/commercial development beyond downtown Mesa from 1940 to 1969. The building is also potentially eligible under Criterion C as a representative of the typical Bashas’ store style prevalent throughout Arizona in the middle twentieth century.
ACS-41 First National Bank of Arizona: 1444 East Main Street (1964)

Significance:
This building, constructed in 1964, is a midcentury modern International Style midcentury modern with Googie influences, including a polygonal roof line with exposed rafters. The concrete block building exhibits large, aluminum plate glass windows, with a double-door entrance on the central front façade. A small wing wall with pierced block elements is situated on the west corner of the front, seemingly separating drive-thru vehicle traffic from the pedestrian clientele. The drive-thru in the rear portion of the building is an open enclosure with exposed support rafters.

Integrity:
The building is in good condition, with no significant architectural changes evident. The parking lot surrounding the building, affording parking for bank patrons, is recommended a contributing feature of the property.

Eligibility:
The building is potentially eligible for listing on the National Register at a local level of significance under Criteria A and C under the context of Main Street retail/commercial development beyond downtown Mesa from 1940 to 1969 and is an excellent example of midcentury modern style with Googie influences.

ACS-50 Mesa Marine Boats Retail Building: 1549 East Main Street (1968)
Significance:
The building is a midcentury modern style with elements similar to that of car dealerships from the period, including large display windows that mimic a showcase effect. The view into the store would have served the Mesa Marine dealership well by attracting passers-by from both pedestrians on the sidewalk (who would subsequently pass beneath the elongated arches on either side of the building) as well as passing automobiles.

Integrity: The building is in good condition, with no significant architectural changes evident.

Eligibility:
The building is potentially eligible for listing on the National Register at a local level of significance under Criterion A for its association with the expansion of Main Street retail/commercial development beyond downtown Mesa from 1940 to 1969.

4.4.2 Individual Objects (Signs)
ACS-60 Ham Bone Sign: 903 East Main Street (1965)
Significance:
This sign is characteristic of Modernist Movement signs that were prevalent in the later postwar years along Main Street. The neon-lit sign is mounted on a steel pole and features a beer-guzzling pig with a staggered, inebrated text display.

Integrity:
The sign is in good condition, retaining integrity of design, workmanship, and materials. Some text on the sign has been painted, but original wording is intact.

Eligibility:
This free standing sign is an eligible object under Criterion C for its quality of design at the local level as one of the few remaining examples of neon signs characteristic of Modernist Movement that were prevalent in the later postwar years along Main Street. The strip mall property (ACS-19) where the sign is located, however, is not eligible due to loss of integrity resulting from significant alterations to the front façade.

ACS-61 Frontier Motel Apartments Signs: 1307 East Main Street (1948)
Significance:
The signs are characteristic of Modernist Movement signs that were prevalent in the immediate postwar years, wherein businesses on Main Street / US 80 catered to travelers and vacationers. The main neon lit sign is mounted on a steel pole that is partially sheathed with a slump block pillar. A concrete planter box appears to have been constructed along the base of the sign in recent years.

The sign itself features block text with no graphics. A smaller neon “vacancy” sign is present just below the primary motel sign. A coordinating neon “office” sign is also installed over the office building on the property.

Integrity:
The main sign, as well as two lesser signs on the property, are in good condition, having changed little in recent decades. The primary sign appears to have been repainted and the concrete planter and decorative brick pillar are likely modern improvements. However, these modern elements do not detract from the original historic fabric.

Eligibility:
The free standing sign, and associated signs, are eligible under C for its quality of design at the local level as one of the few remaining examples of neon signs characteristic of Modernist Movement that were prevalent in the later postwar years along Main Street. The motel property (ACS-36) as a whole, however, is not eligible, due to loss of integrity resulting from significant alterations to the original building fabric.

4.5 NON-ELIGIBLE PROPERTIES
As a result of detailed field notes and subsequent archival research, ACS determined that 50 buildings or districts inventoried in the current APE are not eligible for listing on the National Register (see Table 5). The table also summarizes the reasons that each property is not eligible. In addition, no eligible commercial historic district or historic streetscapes along Main Street were identified within the APE. No historic property inventory forms were prepared for non-eligible properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Property Name1</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Reason for Ineligibility</th>
<th>Reversible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACS-02</td>
<td>Commercial Building: Gem City Realty; Wynter Insurance Service (PM Plumbing and Mechanical, Inc.)</td>
<td>660 East Main Street</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Original residences have been modified into commercial properties, which no longer convey original use.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-03</td>
<td>El Taco Drive-In Building (El Asadero)</td>
<td>720 East Main Street</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Not individually significant for planning/development or architectural design</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-04</td>
<td>Baskin Robbins Ice Cream Building (Flor de Michoacan)</td>
<td>734 East Main Street</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Not individually significant for planning/development or architectural design</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-05</td>
<td>Crown Co. BR. Vacuum Cleaners Building (Superpawn)</td>
<td>740 East Main Street</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Not individually significant for planning/development or architectural design</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-06</td>
<td>East Main Speed Wash Building (Five Star Cellular)</td>
<td>742 and 744 East Main Street</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Not individually significant for planning/development or architectural design</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-07</td>
<td>Retail Building: Pleating Service; Realty and Beauty Salon (Uni-Sex Barber and Beauty)</td>
<td>746, 748 and 750 East Main Street</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Not individually significant for planning/development or architectural design</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-08</td>
<td>Apache Lanes Bowling Building (AMF Apache Lanes-Vacant)</td>
<td>816 East Main Street</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: front façade completely remodeled</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-11</td>
<td>Pacific Southwest Life Insurance Co. Building (Practice Pad Music Store)</td>
<td>711 East Main Street</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: new awnings and side additions mask original</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-12</td>
<td>La Siesta Motel Building (Multi-Family Apartments)</td>
<td>701 East Main Street</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: stuccoed exterior, new windows and doors</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-13</td>
<td>Duckworth Hair Fashion's Building (Quick Guns)</td>
<td>900 and 906 East Main Street</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: stuccoed exterior, new windows and doors</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-14</td>
<td>Bilt-Rite Blind &amp; Awning Co. Building (Vacant)</td>
<td>910 East Main Street</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: new windows &amp; doors</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site No</td>
<td>Property Name¹</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Year Built</td>
<td>Reason for Ineligibility</td>
<td>Reversible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-15</td>
<td>Kachina Restaurant Building (Sound Real Estate)</td>
<td>920 East Main Street</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: new windows, awnings, brick planters, brick facing</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-16</td>
<td>Floor Town Carpets Building (La Casita Fashion)</td>
<td>926 East Main Street</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: false wood front, new windows and doors</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-17</td>
<td>Matta’s Restaurant Building (Mi Hacienda)</td>
<td>928 and 932 East Main Street</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: stucco and brick facing, tile roof</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-18</td>
<td>East Mesa Market Building (Vacant)</td>
<td>955 East Main Street</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: stucco, tile overhang, new windows &amp; doors</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-19</td>
<td>Retail Building: TV Sales &amp; Service; Insurance (Family Dollar Strip Mall)</td>
<td>905 and 919 East Main Street</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: stucco, tile overhang, new windows &amp; doors</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-20</td>
<td>Don’s Grocery &amp; Market Building (Luxor Limos)</td>
<td>861 East Main Street</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: stucco exterior, new windows and doors</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-21</td>
<td>Sword’s Building (Able Body Labor)</td>
<td>849 East Main Street</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: new windows &amp; doors, metal upper portion, stucco</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-22</td>
<td>Giblin Realty Building (Multiple Retail Strip Mall)</td>
<td>1010 East Main Street</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Not individually significant for planning/development or architectural design</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-23</td>
<td>The Pizza House Building (Village Auto Electric)</td>
<td>1030 East Main Street</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: stuccoed exterior, new windows and openings</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-24</td>
<td>Ideal Cleaners Building (Miguel's Beauty Salon)</td>
<td>1042 East Main Street</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: stuccoed; new windows, doors, and porch overhang</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-27</td>
<td>Clarence Freestone Chiropractor (Money Now)</td>
<td>1128 East Main Street</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: stucco, new corrugated metal overhang</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-28</td>
<td>Le Charm Hotel (La Casa del Corte Beauty Salon)</td>
<td>1134 East Main Street and 10 North Parsell</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: large display windows filled on front and side, stuccoed</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-29</td>
<td>East Mesa Shopping Center (Strip Mall-Vacant)</td>
<td>1107 East Main Street</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: front façade completely remodeled</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-30</td>
<td>East Mesa Shopping Center (Su Casa de Empeno Pawn Shop)</td>
<td>1107 East Main Street</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: front façade completely remodeled</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-31</td>
<td>Citrus Paradise Motel (Motel)</td>
<td>1045 East Main Street</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: stuccoed exterior, filled windows, new pergola</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site No</td>
<td>Property Name¹</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Year Built</td>
<td>Reason for Ineligibility</td>
<td>Reversible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-32</td>
<td>Yellow Front Store (O'Reilly Auto Parts)</td>
<td>1021 East Main Street</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: stuccoed lower portion, new overhang</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-34</td>
<td>John's Flying A Service (Roadrunner Complete Auto Repair)</td>
<td>1205 East Main Street</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Not individually significant for planning/development or architectural design</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-35</td>
<td>Paul Perry's Smorgee Table (Sally's Fabrics)</td>
<td>1235 East Main Street</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: new entry doors and windows, porch alterations, siding</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-36</td>
<td>Frontier Motel Apartments Building (Frontier Motel)</td>
<td>1307 East Main Street</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: new windows, stuccoed exterior, second story addition</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-38</td>
<td>Wheat Nursery Building (Bosa Donuts)</td>
<td>1146 East Main Street</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: original building design not visible (current design 1970)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-40</td>
<td>Skagg's Drug Center Building (Lazona and Main Marketplace)</td>
<td>1410 East Main Street</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Loss of integrity for western portion of building: completely remodeled</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-42</td>
<td>Uni-Royal Home &amp; Auto Center Building (All Brands Auto)</td>
<td>1458 East Main Street</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Not individually significant for planning/development or architectural design</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-43</td>
<td>Retail Building: Martinizing Cleaners; Beauty Salon (Multiple Retail Strip Mall)</td>
<td>1460 - 1466 East Main Street</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: parapet addition, new awning, stuccoed upper portion</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-44</td>
<td>Speedy Drive-In Building (Millenium Auto Network)</td>
<td>1502 and 1506 East Main Street</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: decorative stone facing and planters detract from original</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-45</td>
<td>Humble Service Station (Vacant)</td>
<td>1534 East Main Street</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: complete remodel of front façade</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-46</td>
<td>Goettl's Metal Products Co. (Playground Installers)</td>
<td>1548 East Main Street</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: filled windows and doors, new overhang</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-47</td>
<td>JD's Drive-In (Auto Title Loans)</td>
<td>1552 East Main Street</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: stuccoed with decorative window surrounds</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-48</td>
<td>Suit You Trailer Park Building</td>
<td>1531 East Main Street</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: filled porch addition obscures original building, new siding</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site No</td>
<td>Property Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Year Built</td>
<td>Reason for Ineligibility</td>
<td>Reversible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-49</td>
<td>Complete Trailer Service (Star Fashion)</td>
<td>1533 East Main Street</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Not individually significant for planning/development or architectural design</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-51</td>
<td>Bar None Ranch Stop Building (M&amp;G Home Furnishing's)</td>
<td>1555 East Main Street</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: stuccoed, new windows and doors, new tiled overhang</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-53 / 54</td>
<td>Sun Valley Mobile Home Sales &amp; Service (Brown Brothers Automotive)</td>
<td>1850 East Main Street</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: loss of setting, new roof and windows, view obstructed</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-55</td>
<td>Main &amp; Gilbert Texaco Service Station (Axe Auto Sales)</td>
<td>1959 East Main Street</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: building completely remodeled</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-56</td>
<td>(Victor Martinez House)</td>
<td>1303 East Main Street</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: stuccoed, new window and door openings</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-57</td>
<td>Jack-in-the-Box Restaurant Building (Filiberto's Mexican Food)</td>
<td>1480 East Main Street</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: two-story addition, stuccoed</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-58</td>
<td>Bobbi's Dress Shop Building (Radio Shack)</td>
<td>1456 East Main Street</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: new peripet, stuccoed exterior, new awning</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-59</td>
<td>Shady Grove Trailer Park Building (Shady Grove Mobile Home RV Park)</td>
<td>1561 East Main Street</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: new windows &amp; doors, change of feeling and setting in park</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-62</td>
<td>Beverly Estates</td>
<td></td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: not enough contributing properties for a residential district</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-63</td>
<td>Secluded Village</td>
<td></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: not enough contributing properties for a residential district</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-64</td>
<td>Secluded Village 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Loss of integrity: not enough contributing properties for a residential district</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1The first entry under "Property Name" was the name of the business, building, property, etc., when first built. The name in parenthesis indicates the current name as of the date of the field survey. Site Nos. ACS-1, ACS-33, and ACS-52 were not used (buildings later determined not of historic age).

While both Beverly Estates and the Secluded Village subdivisions are over 50 years old and are associated with the history of the City of Mesa’s development during the 1950s and 1960s, they do not possess the qualities necessary to be considered historically significant. Post-World War II subdivision development in Arizona, especially in the Phoenix-Mesa metropolitan area, was ubiquitous, especially in the late 1950s and
1960s, when the homes in these two subdivisions were built. As previously written, more than 300 subdivisions were platted in the postwar period of Mesa.

In the case of Beverly Estates, the developer built two developments simultaneously in Phoenix and Mesa. While the Phoenix subdivision was an apparent success and quickly filled out, the subdivision in Mesa did not fare as well, and less than 50 percent of the homes were built as originally planned. Under Criterion A, individual homes do not convey their association with the trend of urban development in Mesa after World War II and there are not enough homes retaining integrity to evaluate the subdivision as a district.

The architect of record for both the Beverly Estates and the Beverly Village subdivisions was Frank Fazio. Fazio’s work can be found in midcentury commercial buildings in Phoenix. While his residential properties are not as well known, they are also unexceptional in design, and those that retain integrity do not embody distinctive characteristics that represent his work.

The Secluded Villages, though apparently custom built, also do not stand out as more significant than other similar developments in Arizona. While the architects of the homes are not yet known, they are not high-style or unique, nor are there enough homes retaining integrity to evaluate the subdivision as a historic district. Therefore, neither Beverly Estates nor the Secluded Village subdivisions can be recommended as eligible for listing on the National Register.

5. EVALUATION OF EFFECTS ON RESOURCES

The Section 106 process requires identification and evaluation of the effects of an undertaking on properties that have been listed or are eligible for listing on the National Register (36 CFR §800.4(d)). Effects evaluations were done in consultation with SHPO and City of Mesa. As per previous extensions of the LRT, it is assumed that alteration of non-historic curb alignments or establishment of stations away from historic properties is considered no adverse effect. Historic-era curbs and sidewalks are present within the current APE, but the curbs and sidewalks are not individually eligible, nor are they contributors to an eligible streetscape or district.

5.1 THE PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

5.1.1 No-Build Alternative
The No-Build Alternative would result in no effect to historic properties within the APE. The No-Build Alternative includes programmed roadway and bus system improvements within the project study area. These improvements are specified in the appropriate agency Transportation Improvement Programs (TIP), community plans, and regional or state transportation plans (depending on the ownership designation of the roadway) for which funding has been committed. The current transportation facilities and transit
services, with minimal modifications or expansions, form the basis of the No-Build Alternative.

5.1.2 Build Alternative
Effects determinations were conducted for three build alternatives and one design option considered for the Gilbert Road Extension. Evaluation of effects was conducted based on conceptual engineering plans overlaid on 2010 aerials of the APE. Preliminary engineering plans include depictions of existing curbs and ROW, as well as proposed ROW, curbs, paint, track locations, signals, stations, and park-and-ride facilities (Appendix D). Findings of effects are discussed in Section 5.3, and the appropriate treatments will be coordinated between Valley Metro, SHPO, and City of Mesa through consultation.

5.2 TYPES OF EFFECTS
Under Section 106 (Public Law 89-665; 16 USC 470 et seq.), 36 CRF 800, an undertaking’s adverse effects on cultural resources must be considered if a resource meets the eligibility criteria for listing in the National Register (i.e., historic property). Federal regulations define an adverse effect when the effect may lessen a historic property’s integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association.

5.2.1 No Historic Properties Affected (§800.4(d)(1))
A finding of no historic properties affected indicates that either there are no historic properties present or there are historic properties present but the undertaking will have no effect on them (direct or indirect). The agency official shall provide documentation of this finding to the SHPO/THPO and all consulting parties, and make the documentation available for public inspection prior to approving the undertaking. If the SHPO/THPO does not object within 30 days of receipt of the documentation, responsibilities under Section 106 are fulfilled.

5.2.2 No Adverse Effect (§800.5(d)(1))
A finding of no adverse effect may be proposed when the undertaking's effects do not meet the definition of an adverse effect, or the undertaking is modified or conditions are imposed to avoid adverse effects, such as the subsequent review of plans for rehabilitation by the SHPO/THPO to ensure consistency with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 CFR part 68) and applicable guidelines. For this project, “No Adverse Effect” to a listed or eligible historic property includes the following conditions:

A. Impacts to non-historic curbs, sidewalks, landscaping, or road features are considered no adverse effect.

B. No adverse effect occurs when a station is located within the median of the existing street rights-of-way or on the opposite side of the street from a historic property, and
the station platform does not affect the curb or property of the adjacent historic property.

C. Installation of overhead contact system (OCS) poles and wires between the curb alignments within the current property rights-of-way lines.

D. Small partial acquisition of a parking lot for a historic property where the parking will be maintained (e.g., in front of buildings), preserving the historic use is considered no adverse effect. In cases where a historically large lot is a contributing element that served a large store (e.g., Bashas’ or Safeway grocery stores [ACS-39 and ACS-9]), because the parking lot contributed to the historic setting and feeling, a finding of no adverse effect will be determined in cases where the proportion of parking lot size to building size will remain relatively unchanged (Table 6 and Table 7). To qualify as no adverse effect, any historic elements, such as original parking lot lights, located within the area of the partial acquisition will be relocated on the remaining parcel. In addition, for a no adverse effect finding, traffic circulation associated with historic properties (i.e., egress and ingress) will be maintained.

E. Although a historic-era linear transportation site, historic US 80, has lost many aspects of integrity, SHPO has determined it eligible under Criterion D for information potential, particularly related to buried archaeological remains that may be identified during construction excavation. See Section 4.3.3 for additional information.

F. Consistent with the findings for the Central Mesa Extension, the relocation of eligible signs on the property, maintaining relative position and visibility from the ROW, is considered no adverse effect (Ryden Architects 2010).

G. Relocation of curbs adjacent to a historic property to widen the street to accommodate the tracks plus combinations of features (such as stations, traffic and turn lanes and roundabouts, and bicycle lanes) is considered no adverse effect. The curbs may be moved toward the street centerline to accommodate the feature(s). The project does not require acquisition of any portion of the historic property, or if it does, the portion acquired does not alter characteristics of the property that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register in a manner that would diminish integrity of the property’s location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association.

H. Installation of a traction power substation (TPSS) adjacent to a historic property when appropriate shielding of the TPSS is provided such that the TPSS does not alter characteristics of the property that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register in a manner that would diminish integrity of the property’s location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association.
Where the project undertaking has No Adverse Effect on a historic resource, no resolution of effects is required as described in Section 800.6 of 36 CFR Part 800.

**TABLE 6: SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED PARKING LOT PARTIAL ACQUISITIONS ON HISTORIC PROPERTIES FOR BUILD ALTERNATIVES (2-LANE ROUNDABOUTS, 4-LANE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Build Alternative (2-Lane Roundabouts)</th>
<th>Build Alternative (4-Lane)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parking Lot Take (sq ft / % of Total)</td>
<td>Total Parking Lot (sq ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-9</td>
<td>Safeway Stores Building (Rancho Grande and small businesses)</td>
<td>827 East Main Street</td>
<td>220/0.2%</td>
<td>93,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>750/0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-10</td>
<td>El Rancho Motel and Realty Buildings (El Rancho Motel and Smoke Shop) and Signs</td>
<td>719 East Main Street</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>145/0.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-39</td>
<td>Bashas’ Grocer Building (Food City)</td>
<td>1242 East Main Street</td>
<td>150/0.1%</td>
<td>112,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,190/3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-41</td>
<td>First National Bank of Arizona Building (Gold Pawn Brokers)</td>
<td>1444 East Main Street</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>750/7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Build Alternative (2-Lane) would not require partial acquisition of parking from any historic property.

**TABLE 7: SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED PARKING LOT PARTIAL ACQUISITIONS ON HISTORIC PROPERTIES FOR BUILD ALTERNATIVE (HYBRID)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Build Alternative (4-Lane)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parking Lot Take (sq ft / % of Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-9</td>
<td>Safeway Stores Building (Rancho Grande and small businesses)</td>
<td>827 East Main Street</td>
<td>980/1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-10</td>
<td>El Rancho Motel and Realty Buildings (El Rancho Motel and Smoke Shop) and Signs</td>
<td>719 East Main Street</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-39</td>
<td>Bashas’ Grocer Building (Food City)</td>
<td>1242 East Main Street</td>
<td>4,190/3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-41</td>
<td>First National Bank of Arizona Building (Gold Pawn Brokers)</td>
<td>1444 East Main Street</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.3 **Adverse Effect (§800.5(d)(2))**

An adverse effect is found when an undertaking may alter, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of a historic property that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register, or would diminish the integrity of the property. Integrity is the ability of a property to convey its significance, based on its location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. Effects can be immediate in nature or may be foreseeable effects from an undertaking that may occur at a future date, at a distance from the project, or through indirect or cumulative effects associated with the project. Adverse effects on historic properties can include:

- Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property;
- Alteration of a property, including restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, stabilization;
- Removal of the property from its historic location;
- Change of the character of the property's use or of physical features within the property's setting that contribute to its historic significance; and
- Introduction of visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features,
- Neglect of a property that causes its deterioration, except where such neglect and deterioration are recognized qualities of a property of religious and cultural significance to an Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization; and
- Transfer, lease, or sale of property out of Federal ownership or control without adequate and legally enforceable restrictions or conditions to ensure long-term preservation of the property's historic significance.

A direct (physical) effect is defined as an impact or property take to a structure or contributing element(s) of an eligible property, including alteration, removal, or destruction; physical adverse effects require mitigation or treatment. Contributing elements may include significant features such as landscaping, parking, driveways, or fences that are found on the historic property. The adverse effect would typically require removal (either in-part or completely) of character-defining features of a historic property.

An indirect effect is characterized by changes to the integrity of setting, feeling, or design, and can result in an adverse effect. Most often, the indirect effect is a visual impact that may detract from or obstruct the view shed from or of a historic property. View sheds may be adversely affected by the introduction of project features such as stations, TPSS buildings, park-and-ride facilities, or other vertical structures when it would diminish the integrity of the features qualifying the property for eligibility for listing in the National Register. The view shed is not adversely affected by installation of overhead wire structures within the roadway. An indirect adverse effect also occurs if
the project results in atmospheric or audible elements that would diminish the integrity of the features qualifying the property for eligibility for listing on the National Register.

If not avoided by the project design, an Adverse Effect requires resolution.

5.3 Finding of Effects and Recommended Treatments

The finding of effects for the Gilbert Road Extension project is discussed below, including recommended treatment options to avoid an adverse effect on historic properties. Table 8, Table 10, Table 12, and Table 14 list a summary of effects for properties within each build alternative. Table 9, Table 11, Table 13, and Table 15 list recommended treatment options for historic properties to avoid adverse effects from each build alternative.

The LRT features, including traffic and pedestrian signals and stations, will not introduce structures taller than existing buildings and street features with the possible exception of the Park-and-Ride Options if a structure, rather than a lot, is constructed. Therefore, these new features should not introduce an adverse visual effect or disruption of the historic setting. The two Park-and-Ride Options located at the east end of the APE were evaluated for visual impacts to surrounding historic structures. However, no historic properties are located adjacent to or within the undisturbed view shed of these structures.

The Gilbert Road Extension would not significantly alter the width of the transportation right-of-way and will have little impact on levels of service along Main Street and arterial streets. Access to streets, neighborhoods, and businesses will be maintained, providing an unchanged level of traffic circulation. Transit projects in general, and the Gilbert Road Extension project in particular, may encourage redevelopment and up-zoning of residential districts to include either higher density residential or commercial use. Although no eligible historic residential properties occur within the APE, sensitive development with regard to historic residential properties adjacent to the APE can occur through compliance with the Mesa zoning ordinance. Valley Metro has no jurisdiction in land use planning issues of local governmental agencies.

Mesa City Code (Ordinance No. 3733) has established goals for identification and protection of the city’s historic resources, as well as compatible contemporary design and development. The local ordinance also establishes protocol for historic overlay and historic landmark zoning (Mesa City Code, Title 11, Chapters 23 and 74) and may require special permission be obtained for any development affecting designated structures or sites. In addition, goals for the City’s historic preservation program include identifying and resolving possible conflicts between historic preservation and alternative land uses, potentially facilitated by review and recommendations from the City’s Historic Preservation Officer and the Historic Preservation Committee.

5.3.1 Build Alternative (4-Lane)
A recommendation of No Adverse Effect for the project on historic properties for the Gilbert Road Extension Build Alternative (4-Lane) is discussed below. Table 8 lists properties with effects, including the description of effect and effect determination. Table 9 provides a recommended treatment for properties to maintain a no adverse effect. The proposed project is nearly all within the existing street ROW, with the exception of minimal ROW acquisitions to accommodate the somewhat widened roadway cross section along portions of the alignment to maintain the existing four-lane configuration as well as LRT trackway in the median. Because the existing on-street parking would be removed with this Build Alternative, the cross section width is not substantially larger than under existing conditions.

The widened cross section will require small strips of ROW from the parking areas of four properties (ACS-9, 10, 39, and 41) eligible for listing in the National Register. To qualify as no adverse effect, any historic elements associated with ACS-9 and ACS-39, such as original parking lot lights, located within the area of the partial acquisition will be relocated on the remaining parcel. In addition, for a no adverse effect finding, traffic circulation associated with these historic properties (i.e., egress and ingress) will be maintained.

With regard to the El Rancho Motel (ACS-10) and First National Bank of Arizona (ACS-41), the parking areas and lights are not contributing features to these properties, and the small partial acquisitions required for each property would not substantially affect the supply of parking available. A finding of No Adverse Effect is appropriate for the small partial acquisitions from the parking of these two properties as long as traffic circulation associated with these historic properties (i.e., egress and ingress) will be maintained. Acquisition of additional ROW will require relocation of the curb and sidewalk for all four properties, but the curbs and sidewalks are not historic. In addition, the historic El Ranch Motel neon sign and the Smoke Shop sign (ACS-10) are contributing elements located on the portion of property needed for acquisition. A finding of No Adverse Effect would be attained by relocating the contributing signs to a location which maintains the relative position and visibility from the right-of-way.

An LRT station would be placed in the middle of the roadway in front of one eligible property (ACS-39) and one eligible sign (ACS-61) on another property (buildings are not eligible). A TPSS would be placed on a property adjacent to one eligible property (ACS-39). It is recommended that appropriate shielding be provided for the TPSS on property next to the Bashas’ Grocer Building (ACS-39) so that it does not alter characteristics of the property that qualify it for inclusion in the National Register. The Build Alternative (4-Lane) avoids physical and visual impacts to the other historic properties within the APE.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Recommended Status and Criteria</th>
<th>No Adverse Effect</th>
<th>Adverse Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13824115</td>
<td>Bank (Prime Time Child Care building and sign)</td>
<td>640 East Main Street</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13828120</td>
<td>Metro Valley Painting</td>
<td>659 East Main Street</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-9</td>
<td>Safeway Stores Building (Rancho Grande and small businesses)</td>
<td>827 East Main Street</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A and C</td>
<td>A, C, D</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-10</td>
<td>El Rancho Motel and Realty Buildings (El Rancho Motel and Smoke Shop) and Signs</td>
<td>719 East Main Street</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A and C</td>
<td>A, C, D, F</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-25/26</td>
<td>J&amp;J Car Wash and Auto Service Building (Car Wash Auto Detail) and Sign</td>
<td>1060 East Main Street</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A and C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-37</td>
<td>Arizona Bank Building (Bank of America)</td>
<td>1164 East Main Street</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-39</td>
<td>Bashas’ Grocer Building (Food City)</td>
<td>1242 East Main Street</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A and C</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, H</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-41</td>
<td>First National Bank of Arizona Building (Gold Pawn Brokers)</td>
<td>1444 East Main Street</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A and C</td>
<td>A, C, D</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-50</td>
<td>Mesa Marine Boats Retail Building (Tanaka Gallery)</td>
<td>1549 East Main Street</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-60</td>
<td>Ham Bone Sign</td>
<td>903 East Main Street</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-61</td>
<td>Frontier Motel Signs</td>
<td>1307 East Main Street</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion C</td>
<td>B, C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effects are defined as follows:
No Historic Properties Affected: Refer to Section 5.2.1.
No Adverse Effect: For definitions of Conditions A through H, refer to Section 5.2.2.
Adverse Effect: Refer to Section 5.2.3.

ACS-10 El Rancho Motel, Realty Buildings, and Signs: 719 East Main Street (1948)

Description of Impact:
In addition to the effects summarized in Table 8, it should be noted that the predicted total project noise exceeds the FTA threshold for moderate impacts at the four units located closest to Main Street for the Build Alternative (4-Lane).

Effect Determination:
Although noise impacts exceed FTA’s threshold for moderate noise impacts, a finding of No Adverse Effect is recommended. Traffic noise is the major contributor to the impact because the existing on-street parking lane adjacent to the motel would be replaced by a traffic lane, thus moving traffic closer to the motel. However, these traffic noise circumstances are similar to the historic auditory setting for the motel (a heavily-trafficked urban highway) and they would have no adverse effect to features of the property that contribute to its integrity, and would not impact the ability of the property to convey its historic significance.
### TABLE 9: RECOMMENDED TREATMENTS FOR IMPACTS FOR BUILD ALTERNATIVE (4-LANE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Recommended Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACS-9</td>
<td>Safeway Stores Building</td>
<td>827 East Main Street</td>
<td>To qualify as no adverse effect, any historic elements, such as original parking lot lights, located within the area of the partial acquisition will be relocated on the remaining parcel. In addition, for a no adverse effect finding, traffic circulation associated with historic properties (i.e., egress and ingress) will be maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-10</td>
<td>El Rancho Motel and Realty Buildings (El Rancho Motel and Smoke Shop) and Signs</td>
<td>719 East Main St.</td>
<td>To qualify as no adverse effect requires relocating signs on property relative to the new right-of-way and circulation into and out of the parking area will be maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-39</td>
<td>Bashas’ Grocer Building</td>
<td>1242 East Main Street</td>
<td>To qualify as no adverse effect requires appropriate shielding of the TPSS such that the TPSS does not alter characteristics of the property that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register. In addition, any historic elements, such as original parking lot lights, located within the area of the partial acquisition will be relocated on the remaining parcel. In addition, for a no adverse effect finding, traffic circulation associated with historic properties (i.e., egress and ingress) will be maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-41</td>
<td>First National Bank of Arizona Building</td>
<td>1444 East Main Street</td>
<td>To qualify as no adverse effect requires circulation into and out of the parking area will be maintained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.2 **Build Alternative (2-Lane)**

A finding of No Adverse Effect for all historic properties within the APE is recommended for the Build Alternative (2-Lane). Table 10 summarizes effects on historic properties, including the description of effect and preliminary effect determination. Table 11 provides a recommended treatment for properties to maintain a no adverse effect. The proposed project is nearly all within the existing street ROW, with the exception of small partial acquisitions of a few properties along the route, and none of them would be on properties eligible for listing. An LRT station would be placed in the middle of the roadway in front of one eligible property (ACS-39) and one eligible sign (ACS-61) on another property (buildings are not eligible). A TPSS would be placed on a property adjacent to one eligible property (ACS-39). It is recommended that appropriate shielding
be provided for the TPSS on property next to the Bashas’ Grocer Building (ACS-39) so that it does not alter characteristics of the property that qualify it for inclusion in the National Register. The Build Alternative (2-lane) avoids physical and visual impact to the other historic properties within the APE.

5.3.2.1 Design Option (2-Lane Roundabouts)
A finding of No Adverse Effect for all historic properties within the APE is recommended for the roundabouts design option for the Build Alternative (2-Lane). Table 12 lists effects on historic properties, including the description of effect and preliminary effect determination. Table 13 provides a recommended treatment for properties to maintain a no adverse effect. The roundabouts at Horne and Lazona Drive will require small strips of ROW from the parking areas of two properties (ACS-9 and 39) which are eligible for listing in the National Register. To qualify as no adverse effect, any historic elements associated with these two properties, such as original parking lot lights, located within the area of the partial acquisition will be relocated on the remaining parcel. In addition, for a no adverse effect finding, traffic circulation associated with these historic properties (i.e., egress and ingress) will be maintained. The roundabout at Harris Drive will not require property acquisition from ACS-50. The curb and sidewalk would be moved toward the street centerline to accommodate this feature; thus the roundabout at Harris Drive would have no adverse effect. An LRT station would be placed in the middle of the roadway in front of one eligible property (ACS-39) and one eligible sign (ACS-61) on another property (buildings are not eligible). A TPSS would be placed on a property adjacent to one eligible property (ACS-39). It is recommended that appropriate shielding be provided for the TPSS on property next to the Bashas’ Grocer Building (ACS-39) so that it does not alter characteristics of the property that qualify it for inclusion in the National Register. This design avoids physical and visual impacts to the other historic properties within the APE.

**TABLE 10: SUMMARY OF EFFECTS¹ ON HISTORIC PROPERTIES FOR BUILD ALTERNATIVE (2-LANE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Recommended Status and Criteria</th>
<th>No Adverse Effect</th>
<th>Adverse Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13824115</td>
<td>Bank (Prime Time Child Care building and sign)</td>
<td>640 East Main Street</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13828120</td>
<td>Metro Valley Painting</td>
<td>659 East Main Street</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-9</td>
<td>Safeway Stores Building (Rancho Grande and small businesses)</td>
<td>827 East Main Street</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A and C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-10</td>
<td>El Rancho Motel and Realty Buildings (El</td>
<td>719 East Main Street</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A and C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site No.</td>
<td>Property Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Year Built</td>
<td>Recommended Status and Criteria</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Adverse Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rancho Motel and Smoke Shop) and Signs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-25/26</td>
<td>J&amp;J Car Wash and Auto Service Building (Car Wash Auto Detail) and Sign</td>
<td>1060 East Main Street</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A and C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-37</td>
<td>Arizona Bank Building (Bank of America)</td>
<td>1164 East Main Street</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-39</td>
<td>Bashas’ Grocer Building (Food City)</td>
<td>1242 East Main Street</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A and C</td>
<td>B, C, H</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-41</td>
<td>First National Bank of Arizona Building (Gold Pawn Brokers)</td>
<td>1444 East Main Street</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A and C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-50</td>
<td>Mesa Marine Boats Retail Building (Tanaka Gallery)</td>
<td>1549 East Main Street</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-60</td>
<td>Ham Bone Sign</td>
<td>903 East Main Street</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-61</td>
<td>Frontier Motel Signs</td>
<td>1307 East Main Street</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion C</td>
<td>B, C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Effects are defined as follows:
No Historic Properties Affected: Refer to Section 5.2.1.
No Adverse Effect: For definitions of Conditions A through H, refer to Section 5.2.2.
Adverse Effect: Refer to Section 5.2.3.
TABLE 11: RECOMMENDED TREATMENTS FOR IMPACTS FOR BUILD ALTERNATIVE (2-LANE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Recommended Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACS-39</td>
<td>Bashas’ Grocer Building</td>
<td>1242 East Main Street</td>
<td>To qualify as no adverse effect requires appropriate shielding of the TPSS such that the TPSS does not alter characteristics of the property that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 12: SUMMARY OF EFFECTS¹ ON HISTORIC PROPERTIES FOR BUILD ALTERNATIVE (2-LANE ROUNDABOUTS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Recommended Status and Criteria</th>
<th>No Adverse Effect</th>
<th>Adverse Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13824115</td>
<td>Bank (Prime Time Child Care building and sign)</td>
<td>640 East Main Street</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13828120</td>
<td>Metro Valley Painting</td>
<td>659 East Main Street</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-9</td>
<td>Safeway Stores Building (Rancho Grande and small businesses)</td>
<td>827 East Main Street</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A and C</td>
<td>A, C, D</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-10</td>
<td>El Rancho Motel and Realty Buildings (El Rancho Motel and Smoke Shop) and Signs</td>
<td>719 East Main Street</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A and C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-25/26</td>
<td>J&amp;J Car Wash and Auto Service Building (Car Wash Auto Detail) and Sign</td>
<td>1060 East Main Street</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A and C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-37</td>
<td>Arizona Bank Building (Bank of America)</td>
<td>1164 East Main Street</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-39</td>
<td>Bashas’ Grocer Building (Food City)</td>
<td>1242 East Main Street</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A and C</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, H</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site No.</td>
<td>Property Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Year Built</td>
<td>Recommended Status and Criteria</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Adverse Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-41</td>
<td>First National Bank of Arizona Building (Gold Pawn Brokers)</td>
<td>1444 East Main Street</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A and C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-50</td>
<td>Mesa Marine Boats Retail Building (Tanaka Gallery)</td>
<td>1549 East Main Street</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A</td>
<td>C, G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-60</td>
<td>Ham Bone Sign</td>
<td>903 East Main Street</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-61</td>
<td>Frontier Motel Signs</td>
<td>1307 East Main Street</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion C</td>
<td>B, C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Effects are defined as follows:
No Historic Properties Affected: Refer to Section 5.2.1.
No Adverse Effect: For definitions of Conditions A through H, refer to Section 5.2.2.
Adverse Effect: Refer to Section 5.2.3.
TABLE 13: RECOMMENDED TREATMENTS FOR IMPACTS FOR BUILD ALTERNATIVE (2-LANE ROUNDBOUTS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Recommended Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACS-9</td>
<td>Safeway Stores Building</td>
<td>827 East Main Street</td>
<td>To qualify as no adverse effect, any historic elements, such as original parking lot lights, located within the area of the partial acquisition will be relocated on the remaining parcel. In addition, for a no adverse effect finding, traffic circulation associated with historic properties (i.e., egress and ingress) will be maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-39</td>
<td>Bashas’ Grocer Building</td>
<td>1242 East Main Street</td>
<td>To qualify as no adverse effect requires appropriate shielding of the TPSS such that the TPSS does not alter characteristics of the property that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register. In addition, any historic elements, such as original parking lot lights, located within the area of the partial acquisition will be relocated on the remaining parcel. In addition, for a no adverse effect finding, traffic circulation associated with historic properties (i.e., egress and ingress) will be maintained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.3 Build Alternative (Hybrid)

A recommendation of No Adverse Effect for the project on historic properties for the Build Alternative (Hybrid) is discussed below. Table 14 lists properties with effects, including the description of effect and effect determination. Table 15 provides a recommended treatment for properties to maintain a no adverse effect. The proposed project is nearly all within the existing street ROW, with the exception of minimal ROW acquisitions to accommodate the somewhat widened roadway cross section along portions of the alignment where the existing four-lane configuration would be maintained.

The widened cross section will require small strips of ROW from the parking areas of two properties (ACS-9 and 39) eligible for listing in the National Register. To qualify as no adverse effect, any historic elements associated with ACS-9 and ACS-39, such as original parking lot lights, located within the area of the partial acquisition will be relocated on the remaining parcel. In addition, for a no adverse effect finding, traffic circulation associated with these historic properties (i.e., egress and ingress) will be maintained.
An LRT station would be placed in the middle of the roadway in front of one eligible property (ACS-39) and one eligible sign (ACS-61) on another property (buildings are not eligible). A TPSS would be placed on a property adjacent to one eligible property (ACS-39). It is recommended that appropriate shielding be provided for the TPSS on property next to the Bashas’ Grocer Building (ACS-39) so that it does not alter characteristics of the property that qualify it for inclusion in the National Register.

The existing curb would be moved outward toward the Main Street centerline in the area adjacent to Mesa Marine Boats Retail (ACS-50), now known as Tanaka Gallery. The Build Alternative (Hybrid) does not require acquisition of any portion of the historic property. The Build Alternative (Hybrid) avoids physical and visual impacts to the other historic properties within the APE.

**TABLE 14: SUMMARY OF EFFECTS\(^1\) ON HISTORIC PROPERTIES FOR BUILD ALTERNATIVE (HYBRID)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Recommended Status and Criteria</th>
<th>No Adverse Effect</th>
<th>Adverse Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13824115</td>
<td>Bank (Prime Time Child Care building and sign)</td>
<td>640 East Main Street</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13828120</td>
<td>Metro Valley Painting</td>
<td>659 East Main Street</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-9</td>
<td>Safeway Stores Building (Rancho Grande and small businesses)</td>
<td>827 East Main Street</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A and C</td>
<td>A, C, D</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-10</td>
<td>El Rancho Motel and Realty Buildings (El Rancho Motel and Smoke Shop) and Signs</td>
<td>719 East Main Street</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A and C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-25/26</td>
<td>J&amp;J Car Wash and Auto Service Building (Car Wash Auto Detail) and Sign</td>
<td>1060 East Main Street</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A and C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-37</td>
<td>Arizona Bank Building (Bank of America)</td>
<td>1164 East Main Street</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-39</td>
<td>Bashas’ Grocer</td>
<td>1242 East</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A, B, C, D</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site No.</td>
<td>Property Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Year Built</td>
<td>Recommended Status and Criteria</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Adverse Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-41</td>
<td>First National Bank of Arizona Building (Gold Pawn Brokers)</td>
<td>1444 East Main Street</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A and C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-50</td>
<td>Mesa Marine Boats Retail Building (Tanaka Gallery)</td>
<td>1549 East Main Street</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion A</td>
<td>C, G</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-60</td>
<td>Ham Bone Sign</td>
<td>903 East Main Street</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-61</td>
<td>Frontier Motel Signs</td>
<td>1307 East Main Street</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Eligible, Criterion C</td>
<td>B, C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Effects are defined as follows:
No Historic Properties Affected: Refer to Section 5.2.1.
No Adverse Effect: For definitions of Conditions A through H, refer to Section 5.2.2.
Adverse Effect: Refer to Section 5.2.3.

**TABLE 15: RECOMMENDED TREATMENTS FOR IMPACTS FOR BUILD ALTERNATIVE (HYBRID)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Recommended Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACS-9</td>
<td>Safeway Stores Building</td>
<td>827 East Main Street</td>
<td>To qualify as no adverse effect, any historic elements, such as original parking lot lights, located within the area of the partial acquisition will be relocated on the remaining parcel. In addition, for a no adverse effect finding, traffic circulation associated with historic properties (i.e., egress and ingress) will be maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS-39</td>
<td>Bashas’ Grocer Building</td>
<td>1242 East Main Street</td>
<td>To qualify as no adverse effect requires appropriate shielding of the TPSS such that the TPSS does not alter characteristics of the property that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register. In addition, any historic elements, such as original parking lot lights, located within the area of the partial acquisition will be relocated on the remaining parcel. In addition, for a no adverse effect finding, traffic circulation associated with historic properties (i.e., egress and ingress) will be maintained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Gilbert Road Extension is considered a federal undertaking subject to compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), as amended, as well as the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act, as amended. Each requires coordination with interested parties. On behalf of FTA, Valley Metro began consultation in November 2012 with SHPO, City of Mesa Historic Preservation, and the City of Mesa Curator of Anthropology. The Curator lends his considerable archaeological expertise to the City when requested. Consultation with these parties will continue through the design and construction phases of the project, as applicable. Valley Metro and FTA have also contacted Native American tribes with a potential interest in the project including: the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, Ak-Chin Indian Community, and the Hopi Tribe.

The Build Alternative (4-Lane) is recommended overall to have No Adverse Effect on historic properties within the APE regardless of the park-and-ride option selected for implementation, for the undertaking does not alter, either directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of historic properties that qualify those properties for inclusion in the National Register in a manner that would diminish their integrity.

The Build Alternative (2-Lane) is recommended overall to have No Adverse Effect on historic properties within the APE regardless of the park-and-ride option selected for implementation for the same reasons listed for the Build Alternative (4-Lane).

The Build Alternative (2-Lane Roundabouts) is also recommended overall to have No Adverse Effect on historic properties within the APE regardless of the park-and-ride option selected for implementation for the same reasons listed for the Build Alternative (4-Lane) and the Build Alternative (2-Lane).

The Build Alternative (Hybrid) is also recommended overall to have No Adverse Effect on historic properties within the APE regardless of the park-and-ride option selected for implementation for the same reasons listed for the other Build Alternatives. Note that the Mesa City Council has recommended implementation of the Park-and-Ride (South Option) in conjunction with the Build Alternative (Hybrid).

One of the major objectives of the public involvement program for the Gilbert Road Extension (as stated in the project’s Environmental Assessment) is to “Comply with FTA, NEPA, and Section 106 of the NHPA requirements for public participation.” Valley Metro has provided frequent opportunities for community outreach and stakeholder input on a variety of issues including historical and archaeological concerns. As of late November 2012, the following opportunities for public involvement have been afforded:
- 2 public meetings
- 3 informal community meetings held in front of a local grocery store
- 3 neighborhood groups meetings
- 2 presentations at local places of worship
- Numerous meetings with individual businesses and business groups
- 6 community board and committees meetings
- 1 meeting with the Mesa Historic Preservation Committee (at least 2 more meetings to be scheduled in 2013)
- Direct mail (2 project updates) and email (1 project update and public meeting notices) to interested parties
- 22,260 flyers hand delivered to residents and businesses within the study area

Additional opportunities for input will be provided in the coming months and years through the completion of project design and construction.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Automobile Association

Arizona State Engineer

Arizona State Historic Preservation Office

Arizona State University
1968 Thirteenth Arizona Town Hall on Traffic and Highways; research report, recommendations, and list of participants. Arizona Academy, Phoenix.

Brown, Malcolm, and Orin Cassmore

City of Phoenix Preservation Office, and Inc. Ryden Architects

Cross, Jack L., Elizabeth H. Shaw, and Kathleen Schifele (editors)

Federal Highway Administration, Arizona Department of Transportation, and Arizona State Historic Preservation Office

Glaser, Leah S.
Goddard, Stephen B.

Hess, Alan

Jackman, Karolyn, and Barbara S. Macnider

Jones, Daniel W.
1960  *Forty Years among the Indians*. Western Lore Press, Los Angeles.

Kaszynski, William

Ketchum, Morris

Luckingham, Bradford

Maricopa County


Maricopa County, and City of Mesa

Mark, Jay
Mawn, Geoffrey Padraic

McGowen, Joseph C.

Mead, Tracy C., and Robert C. Price

Merrill, Earl W.
1975  *One Hundred Echoes From Mesa’s Past.* Lofgreen Printing, Mesa.

Mesa Unified School District

Mullin-Kille Company

National Register of Historic Places

Painter, Diana J.

Peterson, Herbert B.

Planning Resource Associates, Inc.
2008  *Mid-Century Modernism Historic Context.* Prepared for City of Fresno, Planning and Development Department, California.

Reiner, Donna Jean
Ryden Architects, Inc.


Ryden, Don W.


Salisbury Publishing Co.


Smith, Jared A.


Solliday, Scott


Solliday, Scott, Victoria D. Vargas, and Thomas E. Jones


Southside Directory Company


Stevens, Robert Conway


Tempe Historical Museum


Touring Guide Publishing Company

Weeks, Kay D., and Anne E. Grimmer  

Weingroff, Richard F.  

Wilson, Liz, and Debbie Abele  

Yost, Stephen W., Margaret Glass, Karolyn Jackman, Caven P. Clark, and Bruce G. Phillips  
1999 *Treatment Plan and Research Design for Eligibility Testing and Data Recovery along the Arizona Department of Transportation Red Mountain Freeway (State Route 202) Project Right-of-Way (State Route 87 – US 60).* Archaeological Consulting Services, Tempe.

Zarbin, Earl  
Appendix A: Project Correspondence
Mr. James Garrison  
State Historic Preservation Office  
1300 W. Washington Street  
Phoenix, AZ 85007  

Dear Mr. Garrison:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA), in coordination with Valley Metro is initiating consultation with potentially interested parties pursuant with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (as amended) for the proposed federally-funded Gilbert Road Extension Project.

FTA has identified the following parties as having interest in the potential effects of the proposed undertaking on Historic and Archaeological Resources:

- State Historic Preservation Office  
- Mesa City Historic Preservation Office  
- Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community  
- Gila River Indian Community  
- Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation  
- Hopi Tribe  
- Ak-Chin Indian Community  

Project Description

Valley Metro has initiated planning to extend its Light Rail Transit (LRT) system east along Main Street from Mesa Drive to Gilbert Road. An Environmental Assessment (EA) is being prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act. The potential effects of the project on properties listed in or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places are being considered in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (Title 16, USC, Section 470). Potential uses of historic resources also are being considered pursuant to Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (Title 49, USC, Section 303).
The Gilbert Road Extension study area is bounded by University Drive to the north, Broadway Road to the south, Gilbert Road to the east, and Mesa Drive to the west, encompassing a land area of approximately two square miles (Figure 1). The EA will evaluate the following alternatives:

- No-Build Alternative - Implements existing and committed road and transit improvements as defined by the Regional Transportation Plan and coordinated with the City of Mesa.
- Build Alternative (4-Lane) – This alternative preserves the existing four travel lanes on Main Street (two lanes in each direction).
- Build Alternative (2-Lane) – This alternative eliminates two through travel lanes (one in each direction) providing a total of two travel lanes.
  - Build Alternative (2-lane Roundabouts) is a design option for Build Alternative (2-Lane) incorporating modern roundabouts at five street locations along the route to serve neighborhoods on either side of Main Street.

In addition, a park-and-ride facility will be provided at the eastern end-of-line station at Gilbert Road. Two options will be evaluated in the EA (Figure 2):

- Park-and-Ride (North Option) – This option is located at the northwest corner of Gilbert Road/Main Street.
- Park-and-Ride (South Option) – This option is located at the southwest corner of Gilbert Road/Main Street.

We are beginning the preliminary analysis, which involves compiling information about known cultural resources within the corridor. If you are aware of known Historic Properties, cultural resources, or traditional cultural properties within the study area, please provide that resource information in writing, within 30 days from the date of this letter.

We look forward to receiving your comments and working with you as the project moves forward. Please contact Paul Page at (415) 744-2734 if you have questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Leslie T. Rogers
Regional Administrator

Attachments

cc (by email):  Benjamin Limmer, Valley Metro  
                  David Jacobs, Arizona State Historic Preservation Office
November 20, 2012

Leslie Rogers, Regional IX Administrator  
Federal Transit Administration, U.S Department of Transportation  
201 Mission Street, Suite 1650  
San Francisco, CA  94105-1839

Attention: Paul Page  

RE: Light Rail Transit Gilbert Road Extension  
Main Street, Mesa Drive to Gilbert Road in Mesa, Arizona  
SHPO-2012-0881 (108878)

Leslie Rogers:

Thank you for initiating consultation with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office [SHPO] pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act as implemented by 36 CFR Part 800 regarding the Federal Transit Administration [FTA] proposed federally-funded Gilbert Road Extension Project in the City of Mesa in Maricopa County, Arizona. Your most recent letter [dated November 2, 2012] identifies some of the parties interested in the potential effects of the proposed undertaking in addition to the identification of a project “study area” and includes a request that our office provide historic property resource information in writing within 30 days from the date of your letter. We have reviewed the submitted materials and offer the following comments.

Provisions at 36 CFR Part 800.8 allow federal agencies to merge the National Environmental Policy Act [NEPA] processes, such as the preparation of an Environmental Assessment [EA], with Section 106 compliance consultation. Your letter also notes that the potential use of historic resources is also being considered pursuant to Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966 [Title 49, USC, Section 303].

Your letter’s list of parties interested in the potential effects of the proposed undertaking does include the formal state and city preservation agencies, as well as the appropriate tribal entities, however, missing are the other interested stakeholders such as the commercial and residential groups vested in the project’s area. Additionally, although a project “study area” is offered for the Gilbert Road Extension [Figure 1] and the park-and-ride facility options [Figure 2], there is no defined area-of-potential effect [APE] map, and our office would like to review one. Regarding compiling information about known cultural resources within the APE, it is our understanding the Valley Metro [mentioned in the first paragraph of your letter as working in coordination with FTA] will be helping with these efforts, and our office shall review and comment on these.
We appreciate your continued cooperation in complying with federal historic preservation requirements. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at 602/542-7140 or e-mail me at djacobs@azstateparks.gov.

Sincerely,

David Jacobs
Compliance Specialist/Archaeologist
Arizona State Historic Preservation Office

CC: Robert Forrest, Valley Metro
Appendix B: Historic Property Inventory Forms

Compiled by Archaeological Consulting Services, Ltd. and Ryden Architects, Inc.
**PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>ACS-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Area</td>
<td>Gilbert Road Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Name(s)</td>
<td>Safeway Stores Building (Rancho Grande and small businesses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>827 East Main Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City or Town</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Maricopa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Parcel No.</td>
<td>138-18-037A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot(s)</td>
<td>3-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plat (Addition)</td>
<td>Moore Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>1N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>5E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter Section</td>
<td>SE 1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of plat (addition)</td>
<td>1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTM reference Zone</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easting</td>
<td>1132654.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing</td>
<td>4295715.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS 7.5' quad map</td>
<td>Mesa, Ariz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builder</td>
<td>not determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Date</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STRUCTURAL CONDITION**

- **GOOD** (Well-maintained; no serious problems apparent)
- **POOR** (Major problems; imminent threat) Describe:
- **RUIN / UNINHABITABLE**

**USES/FUNCTIONS**

Describe how the property has been used over time, beginning with original use.

- Safeway Store (1965-ca.1990s)
- Rancho Grande (2006-present)

**PHOTO INFORMATION**

- Date of photo: 8/21/2012
- View Direction (looking towards): Southwest
- Negative No.: B09_12_132_032

**SOURCES**

- Mesa City Directory (1965) online research (http://www.azcentral.com/abgnews/articles/0921abg-mr-)

**STATE OF ARIZONA**

HISTORIC PROPERTY INVENTORY FORM

Please type or print clearly. Fill out each applicable space accurately and with as much information as is known about the property. Use continuation sheets where necessary. Send completed form to: State Historic Preservation Office, 1300 W. Washington, Phoenix, AZ, 83007.
SIGNIFICANCE

To be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, a property must represent an important part of the history or architecture of an area. Note: a property need only be significant under one of the areas below to be eligible for the National Register.

A. HISTORIC EVENTS/TRENDS (On a continuation sheet describe how the property is associated either with a significant historic event, or with a trend or pattern of events important to the history of the nation, the state, or the local community.)

B. PERSON (On a continuation sheet describe how the property is associated with the life of a person significant in the past.)

C. ARCHITECTURE (On a continuation sheet describe how the property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values.)

OUTBUILDINGS: (Describe any other buildings or structures on the property and whether they may be considered historic.)

INTEGRITY

To be eligible for the National Register, a property must have integrity, that is, it must be able to visually convey its importance. Provide detailed information below about the property's integrity. Use continuation sheets if necessary.

1. LOCATION  ✔ Original Site  □ Moved  date: ____________  Original Site: __________________________

2. DESIGN (Describe alterations from the original design, including dates - known or estimated - when alterations were made)

3. SETTING (Describe the natural and/or built environment around the property)

Retail/commercial area east of downtown Mesa with multi-lane street, medians and sidewalks

Describe how the setting has changed since the property's period of significance:

New passenger bustops, some ornamental landscaping, and on-street parking.

4. MATERIALS (Describe the materials used in the following elements of the property)

Walls (structure): Concrete block  Foundation: Concrete  Roof: Built-up

Windows: Aluminum

If the windows have been altered, what were they originally ____________________________

Wall sheathing: Stucco, decorative tile

If the sheathing has been altered, what was it originally Unknown

5. WORKMANSHIP (Describe the distinctive elements, if any, of craftsmanship or method of construction)

NATIONAL REGISTER STATUS (if listed, check the appropriate box)

□ Individually Listed  □ Contributor  □ Noncontributor to: ____________________________ Historic District

Date Listed: ____________  □ Determined eligible by keeper of the National Register  date: ____________

RECOMMENDATIONS OF ELIGIBILITY (opinion of HPO staff or survey consultant)

Property ✔ is  □ is not  eligible individually.

Property □ is  ✔ is not  eligible as a contributor to a potential historic district.

□ More information needed to evaluate.

If not considered eligible, state reason: __________________________________________

FORM COMPLETED BY

Name and Affiliation: Gregory, Jones, Murray @ ACS  Form Date: 8/31/2012

Mailing Address: 424 W. Broadway, Tempe, AZ 85282  Phone: 480-894-5477
INTEGRITY

2. DESIGN
Design is a commercial box with Googie elements including waved roof shape. Decorative tile is affixed to the front façade. Aluminum display and transom windows with double-door entrances are present. The property overall retains original historical contributing elements, including such as a large parking lot, parking lot lights. Discontiguous portions of the original sidewalk are present, as well as the prominent store sign located in the northwest corner of the parking lot; however, these are not recommended as contributing elements.

Safeway grocery stores constructed in the 1960s were built in a variety of architectural styles, one of which is known as the “Marina” style, named for the prototype, which was constructed in 1959 on Marina Boulevard in San Francisco (Painter 2010). The marina style Safeway building is a commercial box structure that features Googie elements, including a curved roofline and a front façade dominated by aluminum display and transom windows. Double-door entrances are also evident along the front. Structural “wings” located on either side of the building feature a flat roofline detached from the more prominent curved roofline.

A smaller second building with similar architectural elements is situated immediately west of the Safeway store. This store appears to have operated as a Thrifty Drug Store (http://www.flickr.com/photos/roadsidepictures/229573148/sizes/o/in/photostream/). The property was abandoned for several years before being acquired and renovated as a Rancho Grande franchise store.

SIGNIFICANCE

A. HISTORIC EVENTS/TRENDS
The building is recommended eligible for listing on the NRHP at a local level of significance under Criterion A for its association with the expansion of Main Street retail/commercial development beyond downtown Mesa from 1940-1969. Grocery supermarkets emerged in newly developed suburbs across the country in the 1950s as populations soared on the outskirts of downtown municipal areas. This Safeway store is an early example of one such supermarket that served new residential areas of Mesa beyond the downtown core.
C. ARCHITECTURE

The building is recommended eligible for listing on the NRHP at a local level of significance under Criterion C as an excellent representation of Googie architecture. The building is a midcentury modern style with Googie elements, including a whimsical undulating roof line and decorative tiled elements along the front of the building. Typical of grocery stores from the period, the building (originally a Safeway) features large expanses of plate glass with entries along most of the exterior wall space. A second story of plate glass windows allows light to filter into the deep store space.

Painter, Diana J.
HISTORIC PROPERTY INVENTORY FORM
CONTINUATION SHEET

An adjacent outbuilding appears may have been a Thrifty Drug Store historically. View facing southeast.


http://www.flickr.com/photos/roadsidepictures/229573148/sizes/o/in/photostream/
Rear façade of Safeway building, view facing northwest.

Front façade of Safeway building showing recent tile work on the exterior walls. View facing southwest.
STATE OF ARIZONA

HISTORIC PROPERTY INVENTORY FORM

Please type or print clearly. Fill out each applicable space accurately and with as much information as is known about the property.

Use continuation sheets where necessary. Send completed form to: State Historic Preservation Office, 1300 W. Washington, Phoenix, AZ, 83007.

PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION

For properties identified through survey: Site No. ACS-10 Survey Area: Gilbert Road Extension

Historic Name(s): El Rancho Motel and Realty Buildings (El Rancho Motel and Smoke Shop) and Signs

(Enter the name(s), if any, that best reflects the property’s historic importance.)

Address: 719 East Main Street

City or Town: Mesa County: Maricopa

Tax Parcel No.: 138-28-058 - 060

Lot(s): 3-4 Block: 1 Plat (Addition): Chula Vista Amended

Township: 1N Range: 5E Section: 23 Quarter Section: SW 1/4 Acreage: <1

Year of plat (addition) 1947

Block: 1 Lot(s): 3-4 Plat (Addition): Chula Vista Amended Year of plat (addition) 1947

UTM reference: Zone 12 Easting Northing USGS 7.5’ quad map: Mesa, Ariz.

Architect: known (source):

Builder: not determined known (source):

Construction Date: 1948 known estimated (source): Maricopa Cty Assessor

STRUCTURAL CONDITION

✓ GOOD (Well-maintained; no serious problems apparent)

☐ FAIR (Some problems apparent) Describe:

☐ POOR (Major problems; imminent threat) Describe:

☐ RUIN / UNINHABITABLE

USES/FUNCTIONS

Describe how the property has been used over time, beginning with original use.


Sources:

City Directories (1947/1948; 1948/1948; 1960; 1965; 1970)

PHOTO INFORMATION

Date of photo: 8/21/2012

View Direction (looking towards): Southeast

Negative No.: B10_12_132_006
SIGNIFICANCE

To be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, a property must represent an important part of the history or architecture of an area. Note: a property need only be significant under one of the areas below to be eligible for the National Register.

A. HISTORIC EVENTS/TRENDS (On a continuation sheet describe how the property is associated either with a significant historic event, or with a trend or pattern of events important to the history of the nation, the state, or the local community.)

B. PERSON (On a continuation sheet describe how the property is associated with the life of a person significant in the past.)

C. ARCHITECTURE (On a continuation sheet describe how the property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values.)

Outbuildings: (Describe any other buildings or structures on the property and whether they may be considered historic.)

INTEGRITY

To be eligible for the National Register, a property must have integrity, that is, it must be able to visually convey its importance. Provide detailed information below about the property’s integrity. Use continuation sheets if necessary.

1. LOCATION  ✔ Original Site  □ Moved  date:    Original Site:    

2. DESIGN (Describe alterations from the original design, including dates - known or estimated - when alterations were made)

See continuation form.

3. SETTING (Describe the natural and/or built environment around the property)

Retail/commercial area east of downtown Mesa with multi-lane street, medians and sidewalks

Describe how the setting has changed since the property’s period of significance:

New passenger bustops, some ornamental landscaping, and on-street parking.

4. MATERIALS (Describe the materials used in the following elements of the property)

Walls (structure): Unknown, conc blk  Foundation: Concrete  Roof: Built-up

Windows: Steel casement, glass block, aluminum (sliding)

If the windows have been altered, what were they originally

Wall sheathing: Stucco, decorative brick

If the sheathing has been altered, what was it originally Unknown

5. WORKMANSHIP (Describe the distinctive elements, if any, of craftsmanship or method of construction)

NATIONAL REGISTER STATUS (if listed, check the appropriate box)

□ Individually Listed  □ Contributor  □ Noncontributor to:    Historic District

Date Listed:    □ Determined eligible by keeper of the National Register  date:    

RECOMMENDATIONS OF ELIGIBILITY (opinion of HPO staff or survey consultant)

Property  ✔ is □ is not eligible individually.

Property  □ is  ✔ is not eligible as a contributor to a potential historic district.

□ More information needed to evaluate.

If not considered eligible, state reason:

FORM COMPLETED BY

Name and Affiliation:  Gregory, Jones, Murray @ ACS

Mailing Address:  424 W. Broadway, Tempe, AZ 85282

Phone:  480-894-5477
INTEGRITY
2. Design
   It was constructed in 1948, operating initially as West Ho Motel. By the 1950s, the
   property was known as El Rancho Motel, displaying a prominent neon sign along Main
   Street. The building is a typical roadside strip motel design with four units surrounding a
courtyard and parking lot. The office building features steel casement and glass block
windows; aluminum sliding windows are present on motel units.

   The building has a flat roof with wood-shingled overhangs. Archival photographs
indicate that this overhang was constructed sometime between 1960 and the early 1970s,
and may date to the period of significance. Archival research at the Maricopa County
Assessor’s Office and Mesa’s Development and Sustainability Department could not
refine date(s) for these improvements. Stucco and decorative brick facing have been
applied although these applications do not detract from original building design or impact
the building’s ability to convey its significance. Original neon sign is in good condition
and also recommended eligible. The original courtyard layout with original palm trees is
still present in the center of the motel. The Smoke Shop sign is in fair condition— the
insert has been replaced but distinctive sign shape and elements are intact.

   Attached building (Smoke Shop) is concrete block with decorative brick facing,
aluminum windows, and aluminum entry door. A Modernist Movement style sign, also
recommended eligible, is in fair condition—the insert has been replaced but distinctive
sign shape and elements are intact.

SIGNIFICANCE
A. HISTORIC EVENTS/TRENDS
   The building is recommended eligible for listing on the NRHP at a local level of
significance under Criterion A for its association with the expansion of Main Street
retail/commercial development beyond downtown Mesa from 1940–1969, particularly
that of the roadside motel along major highways. In the early postwar era, tourism was a
primary industry for the City of Mesa. Motels were a common sight along Main Street
on either side of the original townsite. This property is an excellent example of the once
popular industry along Main Street and US 80 in the postwar period.
C. ARCHITECTURE

The neon sign and Smoke Shop sign are both recommended eligible for listing on the NRHP at a local level of significance under Criterion C for their association with the Modernist Movement.
**STATE OF ARIZONA**

**HISTORIC PROPERTY INVENTORY FORM**

**CONTINUATION SHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of property</th>
<th>ACS-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuation Sheet No.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></th>
<th><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


El Rancho Motel sign, view facing east.
STATE OF ARIZONA

HISTORIC PROPERTY INVENTORY FORM
CONTINUATION SHEET

Name of property ACS-10

==================================================================================

Front view of an El Rancho Motel building, view facing south. Compare with postcards above.

View of motel courtyard with perimeter buildings, view facing south. Compare with postcards above.
View of ramada/storage room in center of courtyard. View facing northwest.

View of Smoke Shop building and sign, view facing southeast.
STATE OF ARIZONA

HISTORIC PROPERTY INVENTORY FORM

Please type or print clearly. Fill out each applicable space accurately and with as much information as is known about the property. Use continuation sheets where necessary. Send completed form to: State Historic Preservation Office, 1300 W. Washington, Phoenix, AZ, 83007.

PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION

For properties identified through survey:

Site No. ACS-25 / 26
Survey Area: Gilbert Road Extension

Historic Name(s): J&J Car Wash and Auto Service Building (Car Wash Auto Detail) and Sign
(Enter the name(s), if any, that best reflects the property’s historic importance.)

Address: 1060 East Main Street
City or Town: Mesa
County: Maricopa
Tax Parcel No.: 138-19-104

Lot(s): 38, 39, 4
Block: 3
Plat (Addition): Stewart’s East Mesa Add.
Township: 1N
Range: 5E
Section: 23
Quarter Section: NE 1/4
Acreage: <1

UTM reference:
Zone: 12
Easting: ______ Northing: ______
USGS 7.5’ quad map: Mesa, Ariz.

Year of plat (addition): 1946

Architect: known (source):
Builder: not determined known (source):

Construction Date: 1964

STRUCTURAL CONDITION

☑ GOOD (Well-maintained; no serious problems apparent)
☐ FAIR (Some problems apparent)
☐ POOR (Major problems; imminent threat)

☐ RUIN / UNINHABITABLE

USES/FUNCTIONS

Describe how the property has been used over time, beginning with original use.

J & J Carwash (1965-1970)
Sherwood Car Wash and Service Center (1970s)
Angelo’s Auto Detailing and Car Wash (ca.2005-present)

Sources:
City Directory (1965-1970) Maricopa County Assessor

PHOTO INFORMATION

Date of photo: 8/22/2012
View Direction (looking towards):
Northeast
Negative No.: B25_12_132_062
SIGNIFICANCE

To be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, a property must represent an important part of the history or architecture of an area. Note: a property need only be significant under one of the areas below to be eligible for the National Register.

A. HISTORIC EVENTS/TRENDS (On a continuation sheet describe how the property is associated either with a significant historic event, or with a trend or pattern of events important to the history of the nation, the state, or the local community.)

B. PERSON (On a continuation sheet describe how the property is associated with the life of a person significant in the past.)

C. ARCHITECTURE (On a continuation sheet describe how the property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values.)

Outbuildings: (Describe any other buildings or structures on the property and whether they may be considered historic.)

INTEGRITY

To be eligible for the National Register, a property must have integrity, that is, it must be able to visually convey its importance. Provide detailed information below about the property’s integrity. Use continuation sheets if necessary.

1. LOCATION  □ Original Site  □ Moved date: __________ Original Site: __________

2. DESIGN (Describe alterations from the original design, including dates - known or estimated - when alterations were made)

Concrete block car wash with tiled overhang and arched windows. Office features aluminum windows and wood door with corrugated metal overhang on east face. Rear concrete block service building with bay openings. Concrete block sign also recommended eligible.

3. SETTING (Describe the natural and/or built environment around the property)

Retail/commercial area east of downtown Mesa with multi-lane street, medians and sidewalks

Describe how the setting has changed since the property’s period of significance:

New passenger bustops, some ornamental landscaping, and on-street parking.

4. MATERIALS (Describe the materials used in the following elements of the property)

Walls (structure): Concrete block

Foundation: Concrete

Roof: Built-up

Windows: Aluminum

If the windows have been altered, what were they originally

Wall sheathing: Painted

If the sheathing has been altered, what was it originally Unknown

5. WORKMANSHIP (Describe the distinctive elements, if any, of craftsmanship or method of construction)

NATIONAL REGISTER STATUS (if listed, check the appropriate box)

□ Individually Listed  □ Contributor  □ Noncontributor to: ____________________________ Historic District

Date Listed: __________  □ Determined eligible by keeper of the National Register date: __________

RECOMMENDATIONS OF ELIGIBILITY (opinion of HPO staff or survey consultant)

Property  □ is  □ is not  eligible individually.

Property  □ is  □ is not  eligible as a contributor to a potential historic district.

□ More information needed to evaluate.

If not considered eligible, state reason:

FORM COMPLETED BY

Name and Affiliation: Gregory, Jones, Murray @ ACS  Form Date: 8/31/2012

Mailing Address: 424 W. Broadway, Tempe, AZ 85282  Phone: 480-894-5477
STATE OF ARIZONA

HISTORIC PROPERTY INVENTORY FORM
CONTINUATION SHEET

Name of property ACS-25 and 26

SIGNIFICANCE

A. HISTORIC EVENTS/TRENDS

The building is recommended eligible for listing on the NRHP at a local level of significance under Criterion A for its association with the expansion of Main Street retail/commercial development beyond downtown Mesa from 1940–1969.

C. ARCHITECTURE

The sign is recommended eligible for listing on the NRHP at a local level of significance under Criterion C for their association with the Modernist Movement.

View of the Auto Center building in rear portion of parcel. View facing northeast.
Name of property ACS-25 and 26

View of Car Wash building and sign, view facing west.
STATE OF ARIZONA

HISTORIC PROPERTY INVENTORY FORM

Please type or print clearly. Fill out each applicable space accurately and with as much information as is known about the property. Use continuation sheets where necessary. Send completed form to: State Historic Preservation Office, 1300 W. Washington, Phoenix, AZ, 85007.

PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION

For properties identified through survey: Site No. ACS-37 Survey Area: Gilbert Road Extension

Historic Name(s): Arizona Bank Building (Bank of America)

(Enter the name(s), if any, that best reflects the property's historic importance.)

Address: 1164 East Main Street

City or Town: Mesa County: Maricopa Tax Parcel No.: 138-19-184A

Lot(s): 39, 40 Block: 5 Plat (Addition): Stewart's East Mesa Add.

Township: 1N Range: 5E Section: 23 Quarter Section: NE 1/4 Acreage: <1

UTM reference: Zone 12 Easting Northing USGS 7.5' quad map: Mesa, Ariz.

Architect: not determined known (source):

Builder: not determined known (source):

Construction Date: 1965 known estimated (source): City Directory (1960 and 1965)

STRUCTURAL CONDITION

☑ GOOD (Well-maintained; no serious problems apparent)

☐ FAIR (Some problems apparent) Describe:

☐ POOR (Major problems; imminent threat) Describe:

☐ RUIN / UNINHABITABLE

USES/FUNCTIONS

Describe how the property has been used over time, beginning with original use.

Arizona Bank (ca.1965-1986)


Sources:

City Directories (1965, 1970); internet research

PHOTO INFORMATION

Date of photo: 8/22/2012

View Direction (looking towards): Northeast

Negative No.: B37_12_132_037
SIGNIFICANCE

To be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, a property must represent an important part of the history or architecture of an area. Note: a property need only be significant under one of the areas below to be eligible for the National Register.

A. HISTORIC EVENTS/TRENDS (On a continuation sheet describe how the property is associated either with a significant historic event, or with a trend or pattern of events important to the history of the nation, the state, or the local community.)

B. PERSON (On a continuation sheet describe how the property is associated with the life of a person significant in the past.)

C. ARCHITECTURE (On a continuation sheet describe how the property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values.)

Outbuildings: (Describe any other buildings or structures on the property and whether they may be considered historic.)

INTEGRITY

To be eligible for the National Register, a property must have integrity, that is, it must be able to visually convey its importance. Provide detailed information below about the property’s integrity. Use continuation sheets if necessary.

1. LOCATION  ✓ Original Site  ☐ Moved  date:  ____________  Original Site:  ____________

2. DESIGN (Describe alterations from the original design, including dates - known or estimated - when alterations were made)

Midcentury modern brick building with decorative brick patterning, decorative concrete panels and pierced block on front, side and rear façades. A drive-thru is located on the west side.

3. SETTING (Describe the natural and/or built environment around the property)

Retail/commercial area east of downtown Mesa with multi-lane street, medians and sidewalks

Describe how the setting has changed since the property’s period of significance:

New passenger bustops, some ornamental landscaping, and on-street parking.

4. MATERIALS (Describe the materials used in the following elements of the property)

Walls (structure):  Brick  Foundation:  Concrete  Roof:  Built-up

Windows:  Aluminum

If the windows have been altered, what were they originally  ____________

Wall sheathing:  None

If the sheathing has been altered, what was it originally  ____________

5. WORKMANSHIP (Describe the distinctive elements, if any, of craftsmanship or method of construction)

NATIONAL REGISTER STATUS (if listed, check the appropriate box)

☐ Individually Listed  ☐ Contributor  ☐ Noncontributor to:  ___________________________ Historic District

Date Listed:  ____________  ☐ Determined eligible by keeper of the National Register  date:  ____________

RECOMMENDATIONS OF ELIGIBILITY (opinion of HPO staff or survey consultant)

Property  ✓ is  ☐ is not  eligible individually.

Property  ☐ is  ✓ is not  eligible as a contributor to a potential historic district.

☐ More information needed to evaluate.

If not considered eligible, state reason:  ____________________________

FORM COMPLETED BY

Name and Affiliation:  Gregory, Jones, Murray @ ACS  Form Date:  8/31/2012

Mailing Address:  424 W. Broadway, Tempe, AZ 85282  Phone:  480-894-5477
INTEGRITY
2. Design
The building is predominantly brick with a prominent decorative brick patterning on the front façade. Decorative concrete panels are also evident near the main front entrance. The multi-level flat roof of the building features a metal overhang that blends into the metal support posts for the main entry and attached drive-thru, which is located on the west façade. A slatted metal screen panel is affixed over the large east window offering shade and visual interest.

In the postwar period of the 1950s and 1960s, the Salt River Valley experienced significant growth as established communities aggressively annexed surrounding lands. New residential developments were no longer close to the traditional downtown business cores of large urban cities like Phoenix and Mesa. Whereas banks had once served their communities in these core areas in elaborately designed buildings, it was clear to planners in the postwar period that a new design of branch banks was needed to cater to the automobile culture of middle-class America. Elements of the modern branch bank included (Reiner 2009:32–38):

- A smaller structural massing that served predominantly residents “on-the-go”.
- A ample space within the bank for customers, as well as large prominent windows and displays of contemporary art for visual enhancement;
- M ultiple entrances, including one in the rear near the parking lot;
- A generous amount of parking for the clientele;
- Intriguing exterior structural elements that would stand out for potential clients passing by on the street.

Ar chitects in this period took advantage of the wide latitude offered to them by prominent banking institutions, such as Valley National Bank, First National Bank, and Arizona Bank. As such, the period between ca.1950 and 1975 witnessed a broad experimentation of bank shape, design, and materials. Common exterior features of the mid-century branch bank might include the following (Reiner 2009:52–55):

- Single story, flat roof structures;
- Use of brick masonry that often incorporated other materials, such as concrete, stone and metal;
- Prominent windows installed on the primary façades, and, in some cases, clerestory windows;
- Screens installed on windows to provide shade and appeal. These screens were made from a variety of materials, including concrete, metal, and block.
ACS-37 is similar in design to Valley National Bank branch buildings that were designed by local architects Penn Weaver and Richard Drover, as cited by Reiner (2009:59–61). Archival research at the Maricopa County Assessor’s Office and Mesa’s Development and Sustainability Department could not identify the architect of the building.

SIGNIFICANCE

A. HISTORIC EVENTS/TRENDS

The building is recommended eligible for listing on the NRHP at a local level of significance under Criterion A for its association with the expansion of Main Street retail/commercial development beyond downtown Mesa from 1940–1969. Branch banks emerged in the postwar era across the state to serve new suburban populations in a more efficient manner. This building, constructed in 1965, is a good surviving example of a midcentury modern bank that was built to serve the expanding urban population of Mesa.

Reiner, Donna Jean
Close view of property, view facing northeast.
View of rear façade with breeze block elements and rear entrance. View facing northwest.

View of side façade with decorative metal window treatment. View facing northwest.
**PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION**

- **Site No.**: ACS-39
- **County**: Maricopa
- **Historic Name(s)**: Bashas' Grocer Building (Food City)
- **Address**: 1242 East Main Street
- **City or Town**: Mesa
- **Tax Parcel No.**: 138-08-076E
- **Lot(s)**: n/a
- **Block**: n/a
- **Plat (Addition)**: Unplatted
- **Township**: 1N
- **Range**: 5E
- **Section**: 24
- **Quarter Section**: NW 1/4
- **Acreage**: <1
- **USGS 7.5' quad map**: Mesa, Ariz.
- **UTM reference**: 12 Easting, 15 Northing

**ARCHITECTURAL INFORMATION**

- **Architect**: known
- **Builder**: known

**CONSTRUCTION DATE**

- **Construction Date**: 1963

**STRUCTURAL CONDITION**

- **GOOD** (Well-maintained; no serious problems apparent)
- **POOR** (Major problems; imminent threat) Describe:

**USES/FUNCTIONS**

- Bashas' Grocer (1963-2000s), currently Bashas' Food City

**PHOTO INFORMATION**

- **Date of photo**: 8/22/2012
- **View Direction (looking towards)**: Northwest
- **Negative No.**: B39_12_132_152

**SOURCES**

- City Directory (1965; 1970), Maricopa County Assessor.
SIGNIFICANCE

To be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, a property must represent an important part of the history or architecture of an area. Note: a property need only be significant under one of the areas below to be eligible for the National Register.

A. HISTORIC EVENTS/TRENDS (On a continuation sheet describe how the property is associated either with a significant historic event, or with a trend or pattern of events important to the history of the nation, the state, or the local community.)

B. PERSON (On a continuation sheet describe how the property is associated with the life of a person significant in the past.)

C. ARCHITECTURE (On a continuation sheet describe how the property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values.)

Outbuildings: (Describe any other buildings or structures on the property and whether they may be considered historic.)

INTEGRITY

To be eligible for the National Register, a property must have integrity, that is, it must be able to visually convey its importance. Provide detailed information below about the property's integrity. Use continuation sheets if necessary.

1. LOCATION   ✓ Original Site   □ Moved date: __________ Original Site: __________

2. DESIGN (Describe alterations from the original design, including dates - known or estimated - when alterations were made)

Commercial box with aluminum windows and entry doors (new), decorative stone and brick facing, a tall vertical decorative element extending from a flat roof, stone planters along front façade, and multi-level overhang. Original diamond pattern sidewalk still present.

3. SETTING (Describe the natural and/or built environment around the property)

Retail/commercial area east of downtown Mesa with multi-lane street, medians and sidewalks

Describe how the setting has changed since the property's period of significance:

New passenger bustops, some ornamental landscaping, and on-street parking.

4. MATERIALS (Describe the materials used in the following elements of the property)

Walls (structure): Brick

Foundation: Concrete

Roof: Built-up

Windows: Aluminum

If the windows have been altered, what were they originally?

Wall sheathing: Decorative stone and brick facing

If the sheathing has been altered, what was it originally? Unknown

5. WORKMANSHIP (Describe the distinctive elements, if any, of craftsmanship or method of construction)

Although decorative sheathing has been applied, distinctive Bashas' building design is not obscured.

NATIONAL REGISTER STATUS (if listed, check the appropriate box)

□ Individually Listed   □ Contributor   □ Noncontributor to: ___________________________ Historic District

Date Listed: __________ □ Determined eligible by keeper of the National Register date: __________

RECOMMENDATIONS OF ELIGIBILITY (opinion of HPO staff or survey consultant)

Property: ✓ is   □ is not   eligible individually.

Property: □ is   ✓ is not   eligible as a contributor to a potential historic district.

□ More information needed to evaluate.

If not considered eligible, state reason: __________________________________________

FORM COMPLETED BY

Name and Affiliation: Gregory, Jones, Murray @ ACS

Mailing Address: 424 W. Broadway, Tempe, AZ 85282

Form Date: 8/31/2012

Phone: 480-894-5477
STATE OF ARIZONA

HISTORIC PROPERTY INVENTORY FORM
CONTINUATION SHEET

Name of property ACS-39

Continuation Sheet No. 1

SIGNIFICANCE

A. HISTORIC EVENTS/TRENDS

The building is recommended eligible for listing on the NRHP at a local level of significance under Criterion A for its association with the expansion of Main Street retail/commercial development beyond downtown Mesa from 1940–1969. Grocery supermarkets emerged in newly developed suburbs across the country in the 1950s as populations soared on the outskirts of downtown municipal areas. This store is an early example of one such supermarket that served new residential areas of Mesa.

C. ARCHITECTURE

The building is a standard International-style commercial box fronted by a large parking lot, typical of the Bashas’ design prevalent throughout Arizona beginning in the late 1950s. The building features straight lines, low proportions, multi-leveled overhangs, and an emblematic steel-sheathed vertical pylon in the center of the building. Large expanses of plate glass with entries occupy most of the exterior wall space. These elements are similar to a contemporary Bashas’ store in Phoenix which represents a typical neighborhood supermarket designed to increase both curb appeal and design features to “integrate modern merchandising methods” to attract customers (City of Phoenix Preservation Office and Ryden Architects 2010:167). The current property is almost identical to the Bashas’ store located at 7th Avenue and Osborn Road in Phoenix as well as one located at 2124 East McDowell Road, also in Phoenix. The 7th Avenue Phoenix location was pictured as an excellent representation of the historic Bashas’ supermarket design in the City of Phoenix Preservation Office and Ryden Architects’ Mid-Century Marvels.

A complete survey of historic Bashas’ buildings in Arizona has not been completed; however, the Bashas’ brand is restricted to Arizona which limits the total sample size of similarly designed Bashas’ supermarkets. Moreover, the function of curb appeal in the design of these buildings makes historic facades less desirable as time progresses and buildings are “modernized”. These historic supermarkets are at high risk for remodeling and updating which results in loss of integrity, making historically eligible Bashas’ supermarket buildings increasingly endangered.
Close view of masonry sheathing on front façade, view facing north.

Close view of front façade with vertical element. View facing northwest.
View of west façade, showing brick addition, view facing northeast.

View of Basha’s supermarket on 7th Avenue in Phoenix, ca. 1950s.
(http://www.phoenixmag.com/Docs/publish_to_web_bashas/soundslider.swf)
Site No. ACS-41
County: Maricopa
Historic Name(s): First National Bank of Arizona Building (Gold Pawn Brokers)
Address: 1444 East Main Street
City or Town: Mesa
Tax Parcel No.: 138-05-146K
Architect: known
Builder: not determined
Construction Date: 1964 estimated

PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION
For properties identified through survey: Site No. ACS-41 Survey Area: Gilbert Road Extension
Historic Name(s): First National Bank of Arizona Building (Gold Pawn Brokers)
(Address, if any, that best reflects the property's historic importance.)
Address: 1444 East Main Street
City or Town: Mesa
Tax Parcel No.: 138-05-146K

STRUCTURAL CONDITION
☑ GOOD (Well-maintained; no serious problems apparent)
☐ FAIR (Some problems apparent) Describe:
☐ POOR (Major problems; imminent threat) Describe:
☐ RUIN / UNINHABITABLE

USES/FUNCTIONS
Describe how the property has been used over time, beginning with original use.
First Nat'l Bank of Arizona (1964-??)
Gold Pawn Brokers (1990s-present)

Sources:
City Directory (1965; 1970),
Maricopa County Assessor.

PHOTO INFORMATION
Date of photo: 8/22/2012
Negative No.: B41_12_132_132
View Direction (looking towards): Northeast
SIGNIFICANCE

To be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, a property must represent an important part of the history or architecture of an area. Note: a property need only be significant under one of the areas below to be eligible for the National Register.

A. HISTORIC EVENTS/TRENDS  (On a continuation sheet describe how the property is associated either with a significant historic event, or with a trend or pattern of events important to the history of the nation, the state, or the local community.)

B. PERSON (On a continuation sheet describe how the property is associated with the life of a person significant in the past.)

C. ARCHITECTURE (On a continuation sheet describe how the property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values.)

Outbuildings:  (Describe any other buildings or structures on the property and whether they may be considered historic.)

INTEGRITY

To be eligible for the National Register, a property must have integrity, that is, it must be able to visually convey its importance. Provide detailed information below about the property’s integrity. Use continuation sheets if necessary.

1. LOCATION  □ Original Site  □ Moved date: __________________ Original Site: __________________

2. DESIGN (Describe alterations from the original design, including dates - known or estimated - when alterations were made)

Commercial box with Googie-style octagonal roof design and wood beam supports. Aluminum display windows with double-door entry on front face, decorative block wing-wall, and drive-through teller located in rear.

3. SETTING (Describe the natural and/or built environment around the property)

Retail/commercial area east of downtown Mesa with multi-lane street, medians and sidewalks

Describe how the setting has changed since the property’s period of significance:

New passenger bustops, some ornamental landscaping, and on-street parking.

4. MATERIALS (Describe the materials used in the following elements of the property)

Walls (structure): Concrete block  Foundation: Concrete  Roof: Built-up

Windows: Aluminum

If the windows have been altered, what were they originally __________________

Wall sheathing: Painted

If the sheathing has been altered, what was it originally Unknown

5. WORKMANSHIP (Describe the distinctive elements, if any, of craftsmanship or method of construction)

NATIONAL REGISTER STATUS (if listed, check the appropriate box)

□ Individually Listed  □ Contributor  □ Noncontributor to: __________________ Historic District

Date Listed: __________________ □ Determined eligible by keeper of the National Register date: __________________

RECOMMENDATIONS OF ELIGIBILITY (opinion of HPO staff or survey consultant)

Property  □ is  □ is not  eligible individually.

Property  □ is  □ is not  eligible as a contributor to a potential historic district.

□ More information needed to evaluate.

If not considered eligible, state reason: __________________

FORM COMPLETED BY

Name and Affiliation: Gregory, Jones, Murray @ ACS

Mailing Address: 424 W. Broadway, Tempe, AZ 85282

Form Date: 8/31/2012  Phone: 480-894-5477
STATE OF ARIZONA

HISTORIC PROPERTY INVENTORY FORM
CONTINUATION SHEET

Name of property ACS-41

SIGNIFICANCE

A. HISTORIC EVENTS/TRENDS

The building is recommended eligible for listing on the NRHP at a local level of significance under Criterion A for its association with the expansion of Main Street retail/commercial development beyond downtown Mesa from 1940–1969. Branch banks emerged in the postwar era across the state to serve new suburban populations in a more efficient manner.

C. ARCHITECTURE

The building is recommended eligible for listing on the NRHP at a local level of significance under Criterion C as an excellent representation of Googie architecture. The building is a midcentury modern International-style box and canopy with Googie elements, including a hexagonal roof line with exposed rafters. An open decorative block wing wall separates the bank from the drive-through teller located on the west side of the building. Large plate glass windows and a double-door entrance front the central portion of the building.

Close view of roof line on front façade, view facing north.
View of rear façade with drive-thru windows and auto lanes, which may represent a later addition. Note the presence of exposed rafter beams on the overhang.

View of east façade showing attached building additions, view facing southwest.
**HISTORIC PROPERTY INVENTORY FORM**

Please type or print clearly. Fill out each applicable space accurately and with as much information as is known about the property.

**PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION**

For properties identified through survey:  
Site No. ACS-50  
Survey Area: Gilbert Road Extension  
Historic Name(s): Mesa Marine Boats Retail Building (Tanaka Gallery)  
(Enter the name(s), if any, that best reflects the property's historic importance.)

Address: 1549 East Main Street

City or Town: Mesa  
County: Maricopa  
Tax Parcel No.: 138-11-006D/007C

Township: 1N  
Range: 5E  
Section: 24  
Quarter Section: NW 1/4  
Acreage: <1

Block: n/a  
Lot(s): 5, 7  
Plat (Addition): Los Ranchitos  
Year of plat (addition): 1947

UTM reference: Zone 12  
Easting  
Northing  
USGS 7.5' quad map: Mesa, Ariz.

Architect: not determined  
Builder: not determined

Construction Date: 1968  
Known  
Estimated  
(source): Maricopa Cty Assessor

**STRUCTURAL CONDITION**

- **GOOD** (Well-maintained; no serious problems apparent)
- **FAIR** (Some problems apparent)  
  Describe:  
- **POOR** (Major problems; imminent threat)  
  Describe:  
- **RUIN / UNINHABITABLE**

**USES/FUNCTIONS**

Describe how the property has been used over time, beginning with original use.


Sources:  
Maricopa County Recorder's Office

**PHOTO INFORMATION**

Date of photo: 8/22/2012  
View Direction (looking towards): Southeast  
Negative No.: B 50_12_132_176
SIGNIFICANCE

To be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, a property must represent an important part of the history or architecture of an area. Note: a property need only be significant under one of the areas below to be eligible for the National Register.

A. HISTORIC EVENTS/TRENDS (On a continuation sheet describe how the property is associated either with a significant historic event, or with a trend or pattern of events important to the history of the nation, the state, or the local community.)

B. PERSON (On a continuation sheet describe how the property is associated with the life of a person significant in the past.)

C. ARCHITECTURE (On a continuation sheet describe how the property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values.)

Outbuildings: (Describe any other buildings or structures on the property and whether they may be considered historic.)

INTEGRITY

To be eligible for the National Register, a property must have integrity, that is, it must be able to visually convey its importance. Provide detailed information below about the property’s integrity. Use continuation sheets if necessary.

1. LOCATION  ✔ Original Site  □ Moved  date:  __________  Original Site:  __________

2. DESIGN (Describe alterations from the original design, including dates - known or estimated - when alterations were made)

Midcentury modern commercial box with decorative block arches at each end, aluminum display and transom windows, aluminum entry on east face, and overhang with wood beam supports along entire front façade.

3. SETTING (Describe the natural and/or built environment around the property)

Retail/commercial area east of downtown Mesa with multi-lane street, medians and sidewalks

Describe how the setting has changed since the property’s period of significance:

New passenger bustops, some ornamental landscaping, and on-street parking.

4. MATERIALS (Describe the materials used in the following elements of the property)

Walls (structure): Concrete block  Foundation: Concrete  Roof: Built-up

Windows: Aluminum

If the windows have been altered, what were they originally  ________________________________

Wall sheathing: None

If the sheathing has been altered, what was it originally  ________________________________

5. WORKMANSHIP (Describe the distinctive elements, if any, of craftsmanship or method of construction)

NATIONAL REGISTER STATUS (if listed, check the appropriate box)

□ Individually Listed  □ Contributor  □ Noncontributor to: ____________________________ Historic District

Date Listed:  __________  □ Determined eligible by keeper of the National Register  date:  __________

RECOMMENDATIONS OF ELIGIBILITY (opinion of HPO staff or survey consultant)

Property  ✔ is  □ is not  eligible individually.

Property  □ is  ✔ is not  eligible as a contributor to a potential historic district.

□ More information needed to evaluate.

If not considered eligible, state reason:  ___________________________________________________

FORM COMPLETED BY

Name and Affiliation:  Gregory, Jones, Murray @ ACS  Form Date:  8/31/2012

Mailing Address:  424 W. Broadway, Tempe, AZ 85282  Phone:  480-894-5477
SIGNIFICANCE

A. HISTORIC EVENTS/TRENDS

The building is recommended eligible for listing on the NRHP at a local level of significance under Criterion A for its association with the expansion of Main Street retail/commercial development beyond downtown Mesa from 1940–1969.

The building is a midcentury modern style with elements similar to that of car dealerships from the period including large display windows which mimic a showcase effect. The view into the store would have served the Mesa Marine dealership well by attracting passers-by from both pedestrians on the sidewalk (who would subsequently pass beneath the elongated arches on either side of the building) as well as passing automobiles.
View of arches on front façade of property, view facing east.
STATE OF ARIZONA

HISTORIC PROPERTY INVENTORY FORM

Please type or print clearly. Fill out each applicable space accurately and with as much information as is known about the property. Use continuation sheets where necessary. Send completed form to: State Historic Preservation Office, 1300 W. Washington, Phoenix, AZ, 85007.

PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION
For properties identified through survey: Site No. ACS-60 Survey Area: Gilbert Road Extension
Historic Name(s): Ham Bone Sign
(Enter the name(s), if any, that best reflects the property's historic importance.)
Address: 903 East Main Street
City or Town: Mesa County: Maricopa Tax Parcel No.: 138-18-066C/068A
Township: 1N Range: 5E Section: ______ Quarter Section: ______ Acreage: <1
Block: ______ Lot(s): ______ Plat (Addition): ______ Year of plat (addition) ______
UTM reference: Zone 12 Easting ______ Northing ______ USGS 7.5' quad map: Mesa, Ariz.

ARCHITECT:

Builder:

Construction Date: 1965

STRUCTURAL CONDITION

☐ GOOD (Well-maintained; no serious problems apparent)
☐ FAIR (Some problems apparent) Describe:
☐ POOR (Major problems; imminent threat) Describe:
☐ RUIN / UNINHABITABLE

USES/FUNCTIONS

Describe how the property has been used over time, beginning with original use.

The Ham Bone Restaurant (1965-present)

Sources:
City Directories (1965; 1970)

PHOTO INFORMATION

Date of photo: 8/21/2012
View Direction (looking towards):
East
Negative No.: Signs_12_132_049
SIGNIFICANCE

To be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, a property must represent an important part of the history or architecture of an area. Note: a property need only be significant under one of the areas below to be eligible for the National Register.

A. HISTORIC EVENTS/TRENDS (On a continuation sheet describe how the property is associated either with a significant historic event, or with a trend or pattern of events important to the history of the nation, the state, or the local community.)

B. PERSON (On a continuation sheet describe how the property is associated with the life of a person significant in the past.)

C. ARCHITECTURE (On a continuation sheet describe how the property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values.)

Outbuildings: (Describe any other buildings or structures on the property and whether they may be considered historic.)

INTEGRITY

To be eligible for the National Register, a property must have integrity, that is, it must be able to visually convey its importance. Provide detailed information below about the property’s integrity. Use continuation sheets if necessary.

1. LOCATION  ✓ Original Site  □ Moved  date:  ______________________  Original Site:  ______________________

2. DESIGN (Describe alterations from the original design, including dates - known or estimated - when alterations were made)

   The neon-lit sign is mounted on a steel pole and features a beer-guzzling pig with a staggered, inebriated text display.

3. SETTING (Describe the natural and/or built environment around the property)

   Retail/commercial area east of downtown Mesa with multi-lane street, medians and sidewalks

   Describe how the setting has changed since the property’s period of significance:

   New passenger bustops, some ornamental landscaping, and on-street parking.

4. MATERIALS (Describe the materials used in the following elements of the property)

   Walls (structure):  ______________________  Foundation:  ______________________  Roof:  ______________________

   Windows:  ______________________

   If the windows have been altered, what were they originally  ______________________

   Wall sheathing:  ______________________

   If the sheathing has been altered, what was it originally  ______________________

5. WORKMANSHIP (Describe the distinctive elements, if any, of craftsmanship or method of construction)

   Characteristic of Modernist Movement signs that were prevalent in the later postwar years along Main Street / US 80

NATIONAL REGISTER STATUS (if listed, check the appropriate box)

□ Individually Listed  □ Contributor  □ Noncontributor to:  ______________________  Historic District

Date Listed:  ______________________  □ Determined eligible by keeper of the National Register  date:  ______________________

RECOMMENDATIONS OF ELIGIBILITY (opinion of HPO staff or survey consultant)

Property  ✓ is  □ is not  eligible individually.

Property  □ is  ✓ is not  eligible as a contributor to a potential historic district.

□ More information needed to evaluate.

If not considered eligible, state reason:  ______________________

FORM COMPLETED BY

Name and Affiliation:  Gregory, Jones, Murray @ ACS  Form Date:  8/31/2012

Mailing Address:  424 W. Broadway, Tempe, AZ 85282  Phone:  480-894-5477
C. ARCHITECTURE

The neon sign is recommended eligible for listing on the NRHP at a local level of significance under Criterion C as characteristic of Modernist Movement signs that were prevalent in the later postwar years along Main Street. The neon-lit sign is mounted on a steel pole and features a beer-guzzling pig with a staggered, inebriated text display.
STATE OF ARIZONA

HISTORIC PROPERTY INVENTORY FORM

Please type or print clearly. Fill out each applicable space accurately and with as much information as is known about the property. Use continuation sheets where necessary. Send completed form to: State Historic Preservation Office, 1300 W. Washington, Phoenix, AZ, 85007.

PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION

For properties identified through survey:

Site No.: ACS-61  Survey Area: Gilbert Road Extension

Historic Name(s): Frontier Motel Signs

(Enter the name(s), if any, that best reflects the property’s historic importance.)

Address: 1307 East Main Street

City or Town: Mesa  County: Maricopa  Tax Parcel No.: 138-09-004 - 005

Township: 1N  Range: 5E  Section:  Quarter Section:  Acreage: <1

Lot(s):  Block:  Plat (Addition):  Year of plat (addition):  USGS 7.5’ quad map: Mesa, Ariz.

UTM reference: Zone 12  Easting Northing

Architect:  Builder:  not determined  known  (source):

Construction Date: 1948  known  estimated  (source): Maricopa Cty Assessor

STRUCTURAL CONDITION

☑ GOOD (Well-maintained; no serious problems apparent)

☐ FAIR (Some problems apparent) Describe:

☐ POOR (Major problems; imminent threat) Describe:

☐ RUIN / UNINHABITABLE

USES/FUNCTIONS

Describe how the property has been used over time, beginning with original use.

Frontier Motel Apartments (1948-present)

Sources:
City Directories (1960; 1965; 1970)

PHOTO INFORMATION

Date of photo: 8/21/2012

View Direction (looking towards): East

Negative No.: Sign_12_132_100
SIGNIFICANCE

To be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, a property must represent an important part of the history or architecture of an area. Note: a property need only be significant under one of the areas below to be eligible for the National Register.

A. HISTORIC EVENTS/TRENDS (On a continuation sheet describe how the property is associated either with a significant historic event, or with a trend or pattern of events important to the history of the nation, the state, or the local community.)

B. PERSON (On a continuation sheet describe how the property is associated with the life of a person significant in the past.)

C. ARCHITECTURE (On a continuation sheet describe how the property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values.)

Outbuildings: (Describe any other buildings or structures on the property and whether they may be considered historic.)

INTEGRITY

To be eligible for the National Register, a property must have integrity, that is, it must be able to visually convey its importance. Provide detailed information below about the property’s integrity. Use continuation sheets if necessary.

1. LOCATION  ✓ Original Site  □ Moved date: ______________________ Original Site: ______________________

2. DESIGN (Describe alterations from the original design, including dates - known or estimated - when alterations were made)

   The main neon lit sign is mounted on a steel pole that is partially sheathed with a slump block pillar. The sign itself features block text with no graphics. A smaller “vacancy” sign is below the primary motel sign with an “office” sign over the office building.

3. SETTING (Describe the natural and/or built environment around the property)

   Retail/commercial area east of downtown Mesa with multi-lane street, medians and sidewalks

   Describe how the setting has changed since the property’s period of significance:

   New passenger bustops, some ornamental landscaping, and on-street parking.

4. MATERIALS (Describe the materials used in the following elements of the property)

   Walls (structure): ______________________ Foundation: ______________________ Roof: ______________________

   Windows:

   If the windows have been altered, what were they originally ______________________

   Wall sheathing:

   If the sheathing has been altered, what was it originally ______________________

5. WORKMANSHIP (Describe the distinctive elements, if any, of craftsmanship or method of construction)

   Characteristic of Modernist Movement signs that were prevalent in the later postwar years along Main Street / US 80

NATIONAL REGISTER STATUS (if listed, check the appropriate box)

□ Individually Listed  □ Contributor  □ Noncontributor to: ______________________ Historic District

Date Listed: _______________  □ Determined eligible by keeper of the National Register date: _______________

RECOMMENDATIONS OF ELIGIBILITY (opinion of HPO staff or survey consultant)

Property  ✓ is  □ is not eligible individually.

Property  □ is  ✓ is not eligible as a contributor to a potential historic district.

□ More information needed to evaluate.

If not considered eligible, state reason:

FORM COMPLETED BY

Name and Affiliation: Gregory, Jones, Murray @ ACS  Form Date: 8/31/2012

Mailing Address: 424 W. Broadway, Tempe, AZ 85282  Phone: 480-894-5477
C. ARCHITECTURE
The sign is recommended eligible for listing on the NRHP at a local level of significance under Criterion C as characteristic of Modernist Movement signs that were prevalent in the later postwar years along Main Street / US 80 and catered to travelers and vacationers. The neon lit sign is mounted on a steel pole that is partially sheathed with a slump block pillar. A concrete planter box appears to have been constructed around the sign in recent years. The sign itself features block text with no graphics. A smaller neon “vacancy” sign is present just below the primary motel sign. A coordinating neon “office” sign is also installed over the office building on the property.
STATE OF ARIZONA

HISTORIC PROPERTY INVENTORY FORM

Please type or print clearly. Fill out each applicable space accurately and with as much information as is known about the property.

Continuation sheets may be attached if necessary.

Send completed form to: State Historic Preservation Office, 1300 W. Washington, Phoenix, AZ 85007.

PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION
For Properties identified through survey: Site No: 13824115 Survey Area: Central Mesa Light Rail Extension

Historic Name(s): Bank (Prime Time Child Care building and sign)
(Enter the name(s), if any, that best reflects the property's historic importance.)

Address: 640 East Main Street

City or Town: Mesa □ vicinity County: Maricopa Tax Parcel No: 13-82-4115

 Township: IN Range: 5E Section: 23 Quarter Section: NW Acreage: <1

Block: 0 Lot(s): 0 Plat (Addition): Year of Plat (addition): 0

UTM reference: Zone: 12 Easting: 424086 Northing: 3697586

USGS 7.5' Quadrangle Map:

ARCHITECT: [ ] not determined [ ] known Source: 

BUILD: [ ] not determined [ ] known Source: 

CONSTRUCTION DATE: [ ] 1959 [ ] known [ ] estimated Source:

STRUCTURAL CONDITION
[ ] Good (well maintained; no serious problems apparent)

[ ] Fair (some problems apparent)

[ ] Poor (major problems; imminent threat) Describe:

[ ] Ruin/Uninhabitable

USES/FUNCTION
Describe how the property has been used over time, beginning with the original use.

Historic: Branch Bank
Current: Child Care

Sources: Mesa City Directory

PHOTO INFORMATION
Date of Photo: 8/27/2009

View Direction: E

Negative No:
SIGNIFICANCE

To be eligible for the National Register, a property must represent an important part of the history or architecture of an area. The significance of a property is evaluated within its historic context, which are those patterns, themes, or trends in history which a property occurred or gain importance. Describe the historic and architectural contexts of the property that may make it worthy of preservation. Add sheets should be attached where necessary.

A. HISTORIC EVENTS/TRENDS

Community Planning and Development - Post-World War II extension of businesses on Main Street beyond the downtown.

Drive-thru carport reflects influence of automobile on branch bank design.

B. PERSON

List and describe persons with an important association with the building.

Not determined

C. ARCHITECTURE

Style: Modern Movement / Ranch Style

Stories: 1 □ Basement Roof form: Front Gable

Describe other character-defining features of its massing, size, and scale:

Covered drive-thru carport, low-pitched gables, fired adobe blocks, raised planters, monument sign with raised planter and materials match building (sign individually eligible).

INTEGRITY

To be eligible for the National Register, a property must have integrity, i.e., it must be able to visually convey its importance. The outline below lists some important aspects of integrity. Fill in the blanks with as detailed a description of the property as possible.

LOCATION □ Original Site □ Moved: date: 0 original site:

DESIGN Describe alterations from the original design, including dates:

MATERIALS

Describe the materials used in the following elements of the property.

Walls (structure): Fired adobe block Walls (sheathing): Plywood

Windows: Aluminum

Roof: Composite Shingles Foundation: Concrete

SETTING Describe the natural and/or built environment around the property.

Urban streetscape and corner lot along Main Street; surrounded by asphalt parking

How has the environment changed since the property was constructed?

Street has been widened and no longer designated a State Highway.

WORKMANSHP. Describe the distinctive elements, if any, of craftsmanship or method of construction:

Excellent masonry detailing of fired adobe bricks, a rare material in Mesa during this period. Domestic imagery of Popular/Culture is used to attract motorists.

NATIONAL REGISTER STATUS (if listed, check the appropriate box)

□ Individually listed □ Contributor □ Noncontributor to Historic District

Date listed: □ Determined eligible by Keeper of National Register (date):

RECOMMENDATIONS ON NATIONAL REGISTRER ELIGIBILITY (opinion of SHPO staff or survey consultant)

Property □ is □ is not eligible individually.

Property □ is □ is not eligible as a contributor to a listed or potential historic district. □ More info is needed to evaluate.

If not considered eligible, state reason:

□ Reversible

FORM COMPLETED BY

Name and Affiliation: Ryden Architects Date: 9/21/2009

Mailing Address: 902 W. McDowell Rd. Phoenix AZ 85007 Phone#: (602)253-5381
STATE OF ARIZONA

HISTORIC PROPERTY INVENTORY FORM

Please type or print clearly. Fill out each applicable space accurately and with as much information as is known about the property. Continuation sheets may be attached if necessary.

Send completed form to: State Historic Preservation Office, 1300 W. Washington, Phoenix, AZ 85007.

PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION

For Properties identified through survey: Site No: 13828120C Survey Area: Central Mesa Light Rail Extension

Historic Name(s): Metro Valley Painting

(Enter the name(s), if any, that best reflects the property's historic importance.)

Address: 659 East Main Street

City or Town: Mesa □ vicinity County: Maricopa Tax Parcel No: 138-28-120C

Township: IN Range: 5E Section: 23 Quarter Section: SW Acreage: <1

Block: Lot(s): Plat (Addition) Year of Plat (addition) 0

UTM reference: Zone: 12 Easting: 424086 Northing: 3697586

USGS 7.5' Quadrangle Map: MESA, ARIZONA

ARCHITECT □ not determined □ known Source:

BUILDING □ not determined □ known Source:

CONSTRUCTION DATE: 1963 □ known □ estimated Source:

STRUCTURAL CONDITION

☑ Good (well maintained; no serious problems apparent)

☐ Fair (some problems apparent) Describe:

☐ Poor (major problems; imminent threat) Describe:

☐ Ruin/Uninhabitable

USES/FUNCTION

Describe how the property has been used over time, beginning with the original use.

Commerce/Trade - Office

Sources Mesa City Directory; field observation

PHOTO INFORMATION

Date of Photo: 8/27/2009

View Direction: W

Negative No:
**SIGNIFICANCE**

To be eligible for the National Register, a property must represent an important part of the history or architecture of an area. The significance of a property is evaluated within its historic context, which are those patterns, themes, or trends in history which a property occurred or gain important. Describe the historic and architectural contexts of the property that may make it worthy of preservation. Addl. sheets should be attached where necessary.

### A. HISTORIC EVENTS/TRENDS

Describe any historic event/trends associated with the property.

- Community Planning and Development - Post-World War II extension of businesses on Main Street beyond the downtown.

### B. PERSON

List and describe persons with an important association with the building.

- Not determined

### C. ARCHITECTURE

**Style:** Modern Movement / New Formalism influence

**Stories** 1 □ Basement □ Roof form: Flat w/parapets and overhangs

Describe other character-defining features of its massing, size, and scale:

Ornamental concrete block sunscreens protect windows, raised concrete block planters, standing-seam metal fascia, stone veneer piers.

**INTEGRITY**

To be eligible for the National Register, a property must have integrity, i.e., it must be able to visually convey its importance. The outline below lists some important aspects of integrity. Fill in the blanks with as detailed a description of the property as possible.

**LOCATION**  
☑ Original Site □ Moved: date: 0 original site:

**DESIGN** Describe alterations from the original design, including dates.

No major changes

**MATERIALS** Describe the materials used in the following elements of the property.

- Walls (structure): Concrete Masonry Units (CMU)
- Walls (sheathing): Stone veneer, painted CMU
- Windows: Wood
- Roof: Built-up
- Foundation: Concrete

**SETTING** Describe the natural and/or built environment around the property.

Urban streetscape; building set at front property line with parking at side.

How has the environment changed since the property was constructed?

Street has been widened and no longer designated a State Highway.

**WORKMANSHIP** Describe the distinctive elements, if any, of craftsmanship or method of construction.

Design of sunscreen panels at regularly spaced windows with overhang and planter reflect New Formalism.

**NATIONAL REGISTER STATUS** (if listed, check the appropriate box)

- □ Individually listed
- □ Contributor
- □ Noncontributor to Historic District

Date listed: □ Determined eligible by Keeper of National Register (date):

**RECOMMENDATIONS ON NATIONAL REGISTER ELIGIBILITY** (opinion of SHPO staff or survey consultant)

Property ☑ is □ is not eligible individually.

Property □ is □ is not eligible as a contributor to a listed or potential historic district. □ More info is needed to evaluate.

If not considered eligible, state reason:

- □ Reversible

**FORM COMPLETED BY**

Name and Affiliation: Ryden Architects

Date: 9/21/2009

Mailing Address: 902 W. McDowell Rd. Phoenix AZ. 85007

Phone#: (602)253-5381
Appendix C: Maps of NR-eligible Properties within APE
Appendix D: Gilbert Road Extension Project Conceptual Engineering Drawings (Separate Volume)