

Preserving Modernist Designed Public Landscapes:

The Case of Garrett Eckbo at the Tucson Convention Center



Abstract

The Modernist movement of the mid 20th century was a time in which “traditional” forms of expression were rejected and replaced with new ideas and values. Although appreciation for Modernist architecture is becoming commonplace, the same is not true of Modernist landscapes. Instead, they are misunderstood in the eyes of the public and as a result are threatened throughout the country. One such landscape – designed by Garrett Eckbo for the Tucson Community Center - is threatened today after years of neglect and deterioration. This paper seeks to investigate the common challenges specific to the preservation of Modernist landscape architecture in hopes of developing strategies for bringing new life to Eckbo’s TCC landscape.

In the late 1960's and early '70s downtown Tucson experienced a major transformation as part of the trend of urban renewal prevalent at that time. During that era, entire blocks of the historic downtown and many of its minority neighborhoods were destroyed in order to build large civic complexes and buildings. The Tucson Community Center (now called the Tucson Convention Center) was one such project. Upon its grand opening in 1971, a local newspaper headline boasted: "Landscaping Accentuates 'People Place'". This landscape, designed by Modernist landscape architect Garrett Eckbo of EDAW (Eckbo, Dean, Austin and Williams incorporated) is threatened today after years of neglect and deterioration. It is just one of hundreds – perhaps thousands – of Modernist public landscapes throughout the country which are facing destruction in the 21st century. This paper seeks to investigate the common challenges that are specific to the preservation of Modernist landscape architecture in hopes of developing strategies for bringing new life to Eckbo's TCC landscape.

The National Register uses the following criteria to determine the integrity of a historic nominated entity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association (Tyler 2009). The term "Cultural Landscape" has been developed to help describe landscapes worthy of identifying and preserving and offers similar criteria for its definition. The Cultural Landscape Foundation describes that cultural landscapes "Provide a sense of place and identity; they map our relationship with the land over time; and they are part of our national heritage and each of our lives" (CLF *What* 2010). Types of cultural landscapes include: (1) Designed landscapes, (2) Vernacular landscapes, (3) Historic sites, and (4) Ethnographic landscapes (CLF *What* 2010). Though the National Register includes many historic landscapes, the concept of Cultural Landscapes is a much more contemporary idea and remains a somewhat grey area according to the national register. Because landscapes are not static and because they often have blurry boundaries, criteria necessary for their preservation has been much more difficult to define at a national level.

Modernism was one of the most radical movements that the U.S. has ever experienced. It occurred in the late 19th and early 20th centuries and

rejected "traditional" forms of expression as represented through art, architecture, etc. and instead embraced new ideas resulting from an emerging industrialized world (Wikipedia 2010). It was epitomized in design by the simplification of form. Modernist architects responded believed that new technology rendered old styles of building obsolete. This meant that a new "machine" aesthetic became common which rejected decorative motifs in design, instead using pure geometrical forms and emphasizing the materials used to create an object (Wikipedia 2010). The movement extended to influence the field of landscape architecture as well, as represented in the works of legendary practitioners such as Thomas Church, Lawrence Halprin and Garrett Eckbo. The public designs of these modernist landscape architects were epitomized by their design for "modern settings for modern living" wherein the designers were trying to bring into accord "social, material, and aesthetic ideas" of the times (Treib 2004).

While many modern buildings have been recognized for their contribution to the evolution of architecture and for their ability to serve as icons of the modernist movement, landscapes designs implemented during the era still receive little recognition for their contributions. Even more, they are still misunderstood in the eyes of the public at large. Much of this has to do with public perceptions and cultural preferences – both of which are continually evolving. To begin with, one scholar points out that in a study done by an artist years ago, Americans had the following visual preferences pertaining to fine arts: (1) art should be relaxing to look at, (2) art should be realistic, (3) soft curves are better than sharp angles, (4) colors should be blended as opposed to separated. He concluded that the work of modern landscape architects was almost in complete opposition to these preferences, with its sharp angles, blocks of color, and often linear layouts (Birnbaum *Preserving* 1999). From this, it is easy to see that from a purely aesthetic point of view, modern landscapes are already at a disadvantage to – for example – pastoral landscapes. Another challenge facing many public modernist landscapes is that they are associated with a conflicted history. Urban renewal was responsible for the destruction of many city centers which often displaced minorities, pushing them to the outskirts of the city. Though the landscapes were not necessarily

responsible for these consequences, they are no less often associated with an era of social injustice and as landscape architecture scholar Robert Bruegmann points out, the difficulty with modernism lies in "... how to explain to the public at large that the [modernist] work that was supposedly destroying the city in one decade has become the historic monument of another" (Bruegmann 1999).

One of the main reasons that modern public landscapes are becoming more apparent in the 21st century is because so many have fallen into disrepair and cities and municipalities are finding themselves faced with a defunct landscape with which they have no idea what to do. Most of the modern landscapes designed in the '60s and '70s require a precise and regimented maintenance schedule in order to convey the design's overall concept. When trees, for example, that are supposed to be perfectly pruned and in a straight row start to die out, are not replaced, and are no longer pruned, the lines and special forms that the designer specified in the original design no longer function. Similarly, water works as public art require meticulous mechanical maintenance. If and when knowledge of how the inner-functioning of such features works is not passed on, they are often replaced with new and potentially detrimental maintenance practices.

Integrity of a place is the main consideration given when a site is nominated to the National Register of Historic Places. It is defined as 'the authenticity of a property's historic identity, evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property's historic period' (Birnbaum *Preserving* 1999). In many cases, original character-defining features such as lamp posts, site specific furnishings, pavements, etc. are removed or changed over time as "upgrades" are done to a landscape. If these features are critical to the overall significance of the design, their removal may prevent the landscape's designation on the National Register because the overall integrity of the site is no longer intact (Birnbaum *Preserving* 1999).

Municipalities are also faced with liability issues that did not exist when most Modern landscapes were designed and built. Fountains, elevated terraces, and unmarked steps - features commonly used by landscape architects such as Lawrence Halprin, Thomas Church

and Garrett Eckbo – now pose challenges for public entities, who might be sued if a citizen is injured on them. In many cases, additional safety measures such as guard rails, pavement markings, etc. have been added which significantly alter a person's experience in the designed landscape and certainly change the look and feel of the space.

Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, modernist public landscapes have been forgotten by the public at-large, which means that there is no cultural or institutional memory to argue for the importance of such settings. This has to do in part with an overall lack of education and outreach at both the local and national level, and also has to do with a lack of archives or records for many of these landscapes. Whom they were designed by and why is quickly forgotten. This is further compounded by the fact that the field of Landscape Architecture is still relatively new (as compared to architecture) and that the general public has little to no knowledge of what Landscape Architecture is. Even within the field, landscape architects are conflicted about the landscapes of the modernist era and so public outreach has not materialized until fairly recently.

With all of these challenges in mind, many threatened modernist landscapes have been surfacing in recent years. There is a growing movement to save and revitalize modernist public landscapes throughout the country. Scholar Charles Birnbaum reports that "...these invisible landscapes are being taken up by a growing number of landscape architects around the country, who are organizing to protect their work, both as works of art and as vessels of cultural history" (Birnbaum *Preface* 1999). The next section looks at a few such landscapes which have managed to be "saved" and examines how they got there.

Park Central Square, Springfield, Missouri Designed by Lawrence Halprin (1974)

Design Features:

The plaza is paved with brick and is surrounded by a series of grass terraces separated by concrete steps making it a flexible, versatile place by design. One of its main features is a multi-level stone fountain with water flowing into a shallow basin – a signature design of Halprin – was inspired by a natural lime-stone water course in the area. Halprin intended for people of all ages to interact with (i.e. get in) the fountain and added specific features to protect the jets and other elements from damage. It was also designed to be dry half of the year, during the winter. A gazebo, given by a prominent family in town, lies on the northwest corner, while an abstract steel structure designed by Aristedes Demetrious sits in the southwest corner. There are also three flagpoles along the Southern edge of the square. Roughly one dozen trees and various large concrete flower planters are located throughout. It was intended that all auto traffic be removed from the square in a second phase, but it never was carried out. One citizen describes it as “a have in the center of our city to enjoy the nature and the people” (CLF *Forgotten* 2009).

History:

In 1974 Lawrence Halprin was hired to design a plaza in a major shopping district in downtown Springfield as a memorial to a significant pioneering family important to the city’s heritage. Recently, in 2006, a developer sought to “Fix up” the park as part of their development plan. This caught the attention of local residents. In December of 2007 a local resident wrote a letter to the editor of the local newspaper pleading that a proposed reconfiguration of the Park Central Square in downtown be reconsidered because it was the work of “America’s foremost landscape artist, Lawrence Halprin” (CLF *Halprin’s Park* 2009). Interestingly enough, this project was undocumented and the CLF noted that it does not appear in any of the early surveys of Halprin’s work. The CLF then contacted Mr. Halprin who sent them images of the plaza and gave them his personal recollections of the project. Nonetheless, in 2008 the Springfield City Council approved a redesign of Park Central Square at the request of an agreement with a developer, despite major local opposition. The Cultural Landscape Foundation worked to educate the City Council of the significance of the plaza and finally in 2010, it was added to the National Register of Historic Places after being nominated through a Section 106 process. This inclusion came as part of a Springfield Public Square Historic District boundary expansion by the City, to include Park Central Square (CLF *Halprin’s Park* 2009). This was the first of Lawrence Halprin’s works to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places.



Photos courtesy of Cultural Landscape Foundation

Preservation Strategies:

- concerned citizens
- contact with National Foundation
- education/outreach by Cultural Landscape Foundation
- listing on National Register
- inclusion in historic district

Mitchell Park, Palo Alto, California

Designed by Robert Royston

Design Features:

The park is at the center of a larger block comprised of schools, churches, a fire station, ball fields, and senior housing. Royston's design focused on forms and geometries gleaned from Modernist art - low curvy forms and simple vertical lines - and focused on function rather than formality. The layout was based on functional zoning (CLF 2010). For the children's play area, he was interested in incorporating design that catered to the psychological, social and physical needs of children in particular. As a result, it includes a multi story house and slide, bear sculptures, a wading pool, human-size "gopher holes", and a "freeway" with a pump station and garage (Pearson 2009).

History:

Mitchell Park is a 21 acre park designed and built in the mid 20th century. For the nearly fifty years since it has been well used and loved by the community of Palo Alto. Not surprisingly, after that many years of use a renovation was deemed necessary by the City. The City had concerns about safety codes and accessibility requirements, but initially didn't consider historic rehabilitation. In 2007 it hired Dillingham Associates, landscape architects to take on the project, who then helped conduct a series of public meetings to get input from the community. A focus on "state-of-the-art" new equipment was eventually replaced with an ethic of historic value as community members learned more through the series of meetings and conversations. Eventually they were able to come up with a project that balanced both design requirement and historic preservation needs. Soon after, Robert Royston was contacted and helped determine what changes should be made and how. As such, some of the old play equipment was replaced, but much of it stayed. Together, Royston and Dillingham Associates were able to develop a design that followed the original aesthetics and defining elements of the park's original design (Pearson 2009). Today it is still a well used park.

Preservation Strategies:

- communication with original designer
- active and engaged community public discussion
- rehabilitation that adapts but respects, replace with features that reflect original design concepts



Photos courtesy of Cultural Landscape Foundation

Heritage Park Plaza, Forth Worth, Texas Designed by Lawrence Halprin (1976)

Design Features:

Heritage Park Plaza is located in downtown Fort Worth along a 112 acre river park. The plaza rests on a bluff overlooking the river and the design's layout creates "...an intimate space composed of terraced concrete pathways, geometric rooms and flowing channels of water" (CLF 2010). Halprin's design created a series of terraced pools of water and cascading waterfalls, accompanied by oak trees and lawn. (See images to the right.)

History:

The plaza was designed by Lawrence Halprin and built in 1976 as part of a bicentennial celebration in commemoration of Fort Worth's establishment. Over the years the plaza fell into disrepair until 2007 when it was officially closed to visitors. When the Plaza was enclosed by cyclone fencing, it got the public's attention. This resulted in a local historic nonprofit – Historic Fort Worth, Inc. (HFW) – getting involved. The group contacted the city requesting information about what was occurring with Heritage Plaza and was denied. This led them to take legal action under the Freedom of Information Act in which they requested to learn more about a recent study of Heritage Plaza that had been done by a national engineering and architectural firm. Because the plan was privately funded, the city was not responsible for sharing it publicly, but it did end up sharing a Power Point summary of the summary with three HFW representatives and a landscape consultant from the National Trust for Historic Preservation. These representatives agreed that conclusions arrived at in the presentation were illogical and damaging. Soon thereafter, HFW hired experts who worked with the National Trust for Historic Preservation to complete a submission to the Texas Historical Commission to determine if the Plaza would be eligible for a listing on the National Register. In December of 2008, they received an answer that the Plaza was indeed eligible. As a result, Preservation Texas – a statewide non-profit historic preservation advocacy group – listed Heritage Plaza on its "Eleven Most Endangered List" (Tracy 2009).

After experiencing the city's resistance that led to legal action, HFW realized that public education and outreach about Lawrence Halprin and Heritage Plaza would be necessary in order to save it. In order to accomplish this they reached out to the Cultural Landscape Foundation which listed Heritage Plaza on its 2008 Landslide list. HFW also developed items to sell that would inform the public about Heritage Plaza and raise funds to support efforts to address it. Eventually, in March and April of 2009, the City of Fort Worth responded by scheduling two private Heritage Park workshops. One was held by Project for Public



Photos courtesy of Cultural Landscape Foundation

Preservation Strategies:

- take legal action
- work with local 501(c)(3) historic preservation organization
- work with state-wide historic preservation non-profit
- outreach and education
- fundraising
- public workshops
- listing on National Register

Spaces out of New York and the other was by The Olin Studio of Philadelphia (Tracy 2009). As a result of these efforts, public support for Heritage Park Plaza continued to grow.

The site was finally listed on the National Register of Historic Places as a significant Modernist landscape in May of 2010 and current efforts are being made to create a restoration plan for the space (CLF *Heritage* 2009). It was determined eligible for the National Register even though it was not yet 50 years old because it was determined "...as an outstanding example of a modernist urban water garden designed by the internationally-acclaimed architect, Lawrence Halprin" (Tracy 2009).

Overview of Preservation Strategies

Park Central Square, Mitchell Park, and Heritage Park Plaza represent three different ways in which Modernist landscapes were successfully "saved". The strategies and outcomes of each are slightly different, but were particularly successful because they were appropriate for their distinct issues and place-based circumstances.

In the case of Park Central Square, concerned citizens and the CLF were able to consult with Lawrence Halprin, which created a better platform for understanding and arguing for its integrity and significance. This was particularly helpful, because Halprin was able to confirm many original intentions which eventually supported the project getting listed on National Register (2010) under Criteria C "...as the work of a master in the field of landscape architecture" (CLF *Halprin's* 2010).

Mitchell Park is a great example of a Modernist landscape being upgraded while maintaining the integrity of the original design. Rather than having to resort to National Register nomination - a tactic which is sometimes considered aggressive and confrontational - citizens, the city, and Dillingham Associates were able to make decisions together that made everyone happy and ensures that the park will continue to be used and appreciated for generations to come.

Lastly, Heritage Park Plaza's listing on the National Register of Historic Places resulted from strong grass-roots pressure and exemplifies how preservation groups

at all levels of bureaucracy can be effective when they come together for a common cause. Its 2010 listing under Criteria C - as a significant modernist landscape - reflects the combined education and outreach efforts of national, state, and local advocacy groups. Given that it was one of the first Modernist landscapes to be listed even though it was under 50 years of age, it was a major feat.

These case reviews are just a few examples of the many threatened modernist landscape in the United States. They demonstrate that there are a range of preservation strategies that can be used in defense of these spaces. First and foremost, their preservation almost always begins with public outcry and/or support. This is essential to the next piece which is educating the public about the history and significance of the place and generating a public discourse about it. Other strategies demonstrated include: (1) consulting with the designer, (2) working with local and national foundations and organizations, and (3) nominating the work for the National Register of Historic Places. If changes or upgrades must occur, the case reviews reveal that they should respect and maintain the integrity of the original design and that new features should fall in line with the aesthetics developed by the designer.

There are many more preservation strategies revealed in scholarly journals, conference papers, and online resources. In addition to the preservation strategies identified by the previous case reviews, Charles Birnbaum offers the following list of strategies (some of which are similar to or the same as those identified in the case reviews):

- Establish a larger context for contemporary landscape architecture
 - Establish creative partnerships
 - Ensure proper homes for archives
 - Utilize current standards and guidelines when embarking on project work
 - Formulate a national strategy
- Birnbaum *Preserving* 1999

The Cultural Landscape Foundation (CLF) has been integral in starting to address these strategies at a national level. Founded in 1998, the CLF has provided a much needed platform for both gathering information about cultural landscapes and for educating the public

about their significance. It has created an extensive archive of projects and provided support and resources for efforts seeking to preserve various cultural landscapes.

Another important role that the CLF has played is in creating a dialogue within the Landscape Architecture profession regarding preservation and modernist landscapes in particular. At a recent conference focusing on these landscapes, one preservationist argued that the preservation of modernist landscapes in particular is in the hands of the landscape architecture profession. He suggested that their role is to inform themselves about the significance and uniqueness of public modernist spaces and then educate the public (Birnbaum *Preserving* 1999). In this way, the CLF is helping cultivate a national strategy for preserving modernist landscapes.

There are also many models of public/private partnerships throughout the country that focus on integrating preservation into future planning endeavors. The Lawrence Halprin Landscape Conservancy in Portland, Oregon is a great example of a public organization that works closely with private developers. It originated in 2001 when a real-estate developer – John Russell – became concerned about the neglected series of Halprin-designed landscapes which his office overlooked and decided to hire a firm to conduct a survey of the area, research the original design, consult with Halprin's office (and Halprin himself), and eventually develop an implementation plan to restore the landscape. This plan involves a combination of public and private entities, one of which combines the city's goals of urban forestry with the Conservancy's intention of restoring trees as per the original design. The focus of the group is to maintain, enhance and build appreciation for the Halprin landscapes (McInelly 2009).

The case of Garrett Eckbo's design for the Tucson Convention Center

Garrett Eckbo's motto of "Landscapes for Living" is one of the legacies of Modernist era which has been echoed and applied many times since in both modern and newer public works. His philosophies were respected and upheld by his contemporaries and in many cases influenced their work. All the same, many of his public designed landscapes are threatened today. The Fulton pedestrian Mall in Fresno, California and his design for Ambassador College in Pasadena, California both face many of the same threats and challenges that his design for the Tucson Convention Center is.

For the Tucson Convention Center, Eckbo developed a plaza-type landscape that functioned to tie a series of theaters and conference halls together. This design was the second of three landscapes in the area designed by Eckbo, which eventually became a linked series of public spaces. The first was Eckbo Park (now called Viente de Agosto Park) and the last was a linear corridor along the La Placita development which connects to the Convention Center plaza.

Today, the layout of the site consists of both formal and informal components. It includes upper and lower grid-based tree groves which are linked by a series of stepped concrete terraces. Carved into the terraces are a variety of shallow pools with hand-picked boulders used to form their perimeters. The pools and terraces create a series waterfalls - some of which flow smooth and sheet-like, while others burst like grand river rapids. It is easy to see that Eckbo was inspired

by the contrast of the surrounding Sonoran desert with its pine tree covered Catalina mountains to the north. His design of boulders and waterfalls cascading down the "urban canyon" was likely inspired by the nearby natural setting of Sabino Canyon. It is probable that his design intended to bring the mountains down into the city center in order to offer city dwellers an "urban swimming hole" as there are clear steps that lead down into the water. As noted by scholars Marc Treib and Dorothee Imbert in *Garrett Eckbo: Modern Landscapes for Living*, Eckbo "designed...in the public sphere, at times, for the lowest stratum of society" and that for him, landscape architecture was a "social art." In his design for the Tucson Community Center, he no doubt hoped to bring the locals back into the area that the Center displaced through its creation. His intentions for the design of the Tucson Community Center landscape are reflected in a brochure released shortly after the grand opening:

'The designers [EDAW] point out that the Community Center was intended to be a people place, and that activities and interests change as people become interested in new ideas. They designed the outdoor space to accommodate new expressions of ideas.'

-Tucson Community Center Happenings,
Special Opening Edition, 1971

His design for the plaza invites passers-by to participate in it. The various terraces provide a perfect setting for outdoor performance and informal gathering.

Over the years, the city of Tucson has struggled to manage Eckbo's landscape. Since the beginning, the



Photos courtesy of author



The plaza in its current state with turquoise painted pools (left); detail of tumbling water courses and shallow pools today (above)



Photos (above) courtesy of author



Photos (above, below) courtesy of Arizona State Historical Society



“Steps” for entry down into one of the pools of water (top); the eastern section of the completed plaza with grid-based tree grove intact (middle); details of original completed plaza prior to any upgrades or alterations (above)

city has failed to develop a plan that truly utilizes the cascading water features. In a hot, dry environment and with few other options in downtown, the pools became an urban swimming hole soon after the Community Center opened. Evidence of their appeal to Tucsonans was recorded as early as 1977 when the local paper reported that “...the sparkling ponds of water in the Tucson Community Center complex are an irresistible magnet for kids on hot summer days.” Today, the water features are viewed as a liability hazard and public signs forbid entering the pools.

Many changes to the original design have occurred over the years and at some point, the natural tones of the fountains (as specified by Eckbo) were replaced with a coat of turquoise paint. More recently, brightly colored metal chairs were bolted into the concrete in various locations in an effort to attract the attention of absent minded passers-by to the “hazardous” fountain edges. The edges of the low terraced steps have been painted bright yellow for the same reason. Public art has also been installed in various areas, which has no relation to the design of the plaza.

The immanent threat to Eckbo’s landscape is rooted in the annual maintenance cost that the design currently requires. This cost is shouldered by the city of Tucson, which is fiscally challenged by the current economic downturn. Today, a number of pools are in disrepair. Maintenance crews report that leaf debris and outdated technology make it hard to keep the waterworks functioning. Recently, the City Manager commissioned a local firm to come up with a complete redesign of the area. Last year, the city threatened to fill in the fountains with sand as a temporary measure to mitigate liability. Although local supporters managed to convince the city to hold off making a decision about Eckbo’s landscape, the threat of its destruction remains.

Preservation Strategies

A variety of the preservation strategies revealed and reviewed earlier in this paper are applicable to Eckbo’s Tucson Convention Center design. Most of the problems associated with the Eckbo landscape are related to insufficient and/or inappropriate programming within the space, challenges with maintenance, and a

general lack of awareness of the value of the fountains on behalf of the public. The following is a preliminary list of possible preservation strategies for the Eckbo TCC landscape. A summary of these challenges, strategies, and applications specific to the Eckbo TCC landscape can be seen in the table on the following page.

- 1) Generate public dialogue to increase awareness and garner support
- 2) Take an inventory of the site as it exists today
- 3) Conduct research to learn about the original design – this will inform how much of its “integrity” remains intact today (consult with Eckbo scholars as well)
- 4) Nominate the design to the National Register of Historic Places (work with the AZ SHPO office to do so)
- 5) Work with local and regional historic preservation agencies such as the Arizona Historical Society and the Tucson Historic Preservation Foundation
- 6) Work with national organizations to generate wide-spread awareness and for assistance in the entire process
- 7) Build public/private partnerships to help ensure future care of the site and possibly an official restoration plan (City of Tucson, Tucson Clean & Beautiful, La Placita – private development)
- 8) Consult with professional fountain conservator to improve function and efficiency of the fountains and to possibly decrease the cost of their maintenance
- 9) Recruit local cultural establishments to develop programming for the area (TMA, MOCA, UofA School of Dance, etc.) and negotiate with the city to develop a way in which citizens can interact with the fountains

Conclusions

Modernist designed public landscapes represent an important part of our cultural heritage as a nation. They signify a time of changing attitudes about public/private space and a time of a growing social consciousness. The fact that they are still met with uneasiness may reflect the historic unrest of the time in which they were created – a time which, no less, is an important piece of our collective history and is embodied in many of the designs and layouts of public spaces of this era. This notion of social space – held in the public trust – remains a complicated and conflicted subject in the 21st century. It will likely continue to do so.

Garrett Eckbo was one of the master landscape architects of the Modernist movement who embraced the ideas and values of it whole-heartedly. His vision and designs are not only valuable to the field of landscape architecture, but to the legacy of a world-wide movement. His landscapes deserve to be revered and respected for their unique design and context. Locally, there are many ways in which Eckbo’s design for the Tucson Convention Center may be preserved. As an important piece of **public space**, preservation strategies need to be explored and exhausted before the city can ethically call for the destruction of such a nationally significant landscape.

Garrett Eckbo Tucson Convention Center Landscape: Preservation Challenges, Strategies and Applications		
Challenge	Strategy	Application
Forgotten Landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programming 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional Affiliates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -ASLA • Local Preservation Organizations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -MAPP -Tucson Historic Preservation Foundation • Cultural Institutions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Arts (TMA, MOCA) -History (Tucson Historical Society) -Academia (UofA) • City Agencies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -City of Tucson Parks & Recreation (to allow for swimming/wading in the fountains)
Maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long Range Plan • Physical or Mechanical Upgrades • Strategic Partnerships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of Tucson Planning Department • Tucson Clean & Beautiful • Consultant/Expert Fountain Conservator • La Placita development • Corporate Naming Opportunities
Lack of Appreciation for Design/Designer and/or Conflicted History	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local and/or Regional Preservation Organizations - National Foundations • Build support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tours & Lectures • Tucson Historic Preservation Foundation • Arizona SHPO • Cultural Landscape Foundation • “Friends of...” Group
Neglect & Deterioration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preservation • Restoration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arizona SHPO • Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation
Lack of Documentation & Archival System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Inventory • Local Archives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural Landscape Foundation “What’s Out There?” • AZ Historical Society
Threatened by municipality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Status/Recognition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Register of Historic Places • Cultural Landscape Foundation “Landslide”
Liability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upgrade while maintaining design integrity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with City to develop compromises
Maintenance of Integrity of Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consult with Designer* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mark Treib & Dorothee Imbert (noted Eckbo scholars)

* Garrett Eckbo is deceased, but Eckbo scholars will likely have insights as to his design intentions

References

- Birnbaum, Charles. "Preface: Sharp Angles or Curves? You Decide." *Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture: Papers from the Wave Hill National Park Service Conference*. Ed. Charles A. Birnbaum. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Spacemaker Press, 1999. 4-5. Print.
- Birnbaum, Charles. "Preserving Contemporary Landscape Architecture: Is Nothing Permanent But Change Itself?" *Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture: Papers from the Wave Hill National Park Service Conference*. Ed. Charles A. Birnbaum. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Spacemaker Press, 1999. 6-8. Print.
- Bruegmann, Rovert. "Preservation and the Public." *Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture: Papers from the Wave Hill National Park Service Conference*. Ed. Charles A. Birnbaum. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Spacemaker Press, 1999. 21-23. Print.
- Colman, Devin. "Forgotten Halprin-designed Park Central Square at Crossroads." The Cultural Landscape Foundation, January 15, 2008. <http://tclf.org/landslides/forgotten-halprin-designed-park-central-square-crossroads>.
- "Halprin's Park Central Square added to the National Register." The Cultural Landscape Foundation, February 5, 2010. Web. 10 Oct. 2010. <http://tclf.org/node/3638>.
- "Heritage Park Plaza Added to National Register of Historic Places." The Cultural Landscape Foundation, 15 May 2010. Web. 10 Oct. 2010. <http://tclf.org/landslides/heritage-park-plaza-added-to-national-register-of-historic-places>.
- McInelly, Marcy. "Halprin Landscapes Conservancy, Restoration Master Plan & Tree Rejuvenation Project." The Cultural Landscape Foundation, 1 Oct. 2009. Web. 10 Oct. 2010. <http://tclf.org/features/halprin-landscapes-conservancy-restoration-master-plan-tree-rejuvenation-project>.
- McLaughlin, George. "Park Central Square: The Real Story." The Cultural Landscape Foundation, May 8, 2008. <http://tclf.org/landslides/park-central-square-real-story>.
- "Modern Architecture." *Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia*. Wikimedia Foundation, n.d. Web. 11 Oct. 2010.
- Pearson, Stephanie M. "Revisiting Robert Royston's Mitchell Park." The Cultural Landscape Foundation, 6 June 2003. Web. 10 Oct. 2010. <http://tclf.org/content/revisiting-robert-royston%E2%80%99s-mitchell-park>.
- Tracy, Jerre. "The Plight of Fort Worth's Modern Treasure." The Cultural Landscape Foundation, 1 May 2009. Web. 10 Oct. 2010. <http://tclf.org/landslides/plight-fort-worth%E2%80%99s-modern-treasure>.
- Treib, Marc. "Modern Landscape Architecture: Monuments and Icons." *The Journal of Architecture* 9.2 (2004): 199-207. *University of Arizona*. Web. 14 Sept. 2010.
- "Tucson Community Center Happenings, Special Opening Edition". Tucson: City of Tucson, 1971. Printed Brochure.
- Tyler, Norman, Ted Ligibel and Ilene Tyler. *Historic Preservation: An Introduction to its History, Principles, and Practice*. 2nd ed. New York: WW Norton & Company, 2009. 112-115. Print.
- "What are Cultural Landscapes?". The Cultural Landscape Foundation, 2010. Web. 13 Oct. 2010. <http://tclf.org/landscapes/whate-are-cultural-landscapes>.