EXHIBIT A

FOR THE MEETING OF: January 19, 2023
AGENDA ITEM: 7.a

TO:	**Historic Landmarks Commission**
THROUGH:	**Lisa Anderson-Ogilvie, AICP, Deputy Community Development Director and Planning Administrator**
FROM:	**Kimberli Fitzgerald, Historic Preservation Officer**
HEARING DATE:	**January 19, 2023**
CASE NO.:	**Historic Local Designation Case No. HIS22-30**
APPLICATION SUMMARY:	**A proposal to designate the Civic Center as a Salem Local Historic Resource.**
LOCATION:	**555 Liberty Street SE**
REQUEST:	**Class 4 Legislative Major Historic Review of a proposal to designate the Civic Center (c.1972), as a local historic resource, zoned PS (Public Service), and located at 555 Liberty Street SE 97301; Marion County Assessors Map and Tax Lot numbers: 073W27BD00100 and 073W27BA03200.**
APPLICANT:	**City Initiated**
APPROVAL CRITERIA:	**Salem Revised Code (SRC) Chapter 230.010 Historic Designation**
RECOMMENDATION:	**Recommend to the City Council APPROVAL**

BACKGROUND

At their November 17, 2022 meeting, the HLC adopted Resolution 2022-02 initiating the Local Historic Resource Designation for the Salem Civic Center (**Attachment B**).

Notice was provided to DLCD on December 15, 2022. Notice of public hearing was sent by mail to surrounding property owners and tenants pursuant to Salem Revised Code (SRC) requirements on December 28, 2022. Public hearing notice was also posted on the property in accordance with the posting provision outlined in SRC 300.620. The City of Salem Historic Landmarks Commission will hold a virtual public hearing for the case on January 19, 2023 at 5:30 p.m. (https://bit.ly/planningpublicmeetings).

PROPOSAL

The Salem Civic Center was listed on the National Register of Historic Places by the National Park Service on November 2, 2022 as a significant and important local example of the Brutalist architectural style as well as an excellent representation of the ideals of Salem's community planning and development in the late 1960s and early 1970s (**Attachment C**).

The Salem Historic Landmarks Commission has initiated the local historic resource nomination for the Salem Civic Center (1972). National Register Resources are significant resources which local jurisdictions are required to protect as outlined in OAR 660-023-0200. According to OAR 660-023-0200(8)(b) a local jurisdiction can only apply their locally adopted historic protection measures to National Register designated resources after a public hearing is held considering the local designation of the resource.

SUMMARY OF RECORD

The following items are submitted to the record and are available upon request: All materials in the case file including comments from public agencies, City departments, neighborhood associations, and the public. All materials are available on the City's online Permit Application Center at https://permits.cityofsalem.net. You may use the search function without registering and enter the permit number listed here: 22 119756.

FACTS & FINDINGS

1. Historic Designation

According to SRC 230.010(c)(2) the Historic Landmarks Commission may initiate the designation of a local historic resource. Designation is a Type IV procedure under SRC 300. The HLC shall hold a public hearing on the nomination and make a recommendation to City Council regarding the proposed designation. Provided owner consent is granted per SRC 230.010(f), under Salem Revised Code (SRC) Chapter 230.010 an application for the designation of a local resource designation may be granted by the Salem City Council if the resource meets the criteria for age, significance and integrity as outlined in SRC 230.010(e).

2. Neighborhood and Citizen Comments

The subject property is located within the Central Area Neighborhood Development Organization (CANDO).

Neighborhood Association Comment: Notice of the application was provided to CANDO pursuant to SRC 300.720(b)(2)(A), which requires notice to be sent to any City-recognized neighborhood association whose boundaries include, or are adjacent to, the subject property. As of the date of completion of this staff report, no comments have been received from the neighborhood association.

Homeowners Association: The subject property is not located within a Homeowners Association.

Public Comment: Notice was also provided, pursuant to SRC 300.720(b)(2)(A), to all property owners and tenants within 250 feet of the subject property.
At the time of writing this staff report, no comments were received from the members of the public.

Posted Notice: Pursuant to SRC 300.720(b)(3)(A), notice of the proposal was posted on the subject property.

3. City Department and Public Agency Comments

Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD): Pursuant to SRC 300.720(b)(1), notice was provided to DLCD on December 15, 2022. At the time of writing this staff report, no comments were received from DLCD.

City Departments: At the time of writing this staff report, no comments were received from City departments.

4. Historic Designation Criteria

SRC Chapter 230.010(e) are the criterion applicable to the evaluation of this proposal. Historic Landmarks Commission staff reviewed the project proposal and have the following findings for the applicable standards:

FINDINGS

1. **SRC 230.010 (e) (1) Age:** *The proposed historic resource is at least 50 years old, or demonstrates exceptional significance if less than 50 years of age.*

   Findings: The resource is 50 years of age; therefore, staff recommends the HLC find that this criterion has been met.

2. **SRC 230.010 (e) (2) Significance:** *The proposed historic resource demonstrates significance in at least one of the following areas:*

   a. **Cultural Significance:** *(i) Contributes to the character and historic identity of the neighborhood or City; (ii) Makes a contribution to the historic character of a historic resource, neighborhood, district, or City as a whole*

      Findings: Staff recommends that the HLC find that the potential resource has cultural significance for its association with Salem's community planning efforts in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The community planning efforts led by the City of Salem's Civic Center planning committee demonstrated a commitment to participatory community planning methods which were newly emerging across the nation during this time period. The participatory planning process is a process which focuses on identifying stakeholders and then establishing a framework where these participants can be part of the decision-making process. This process empowered stakeholders by allowing them to work together within a politically legitimatized framework which actively determined the proposed location and use of the new civic center.

      Staff recommends that the HLC find that the resource has cultural significance for its association with the local Salem community who came together to define its future and its priorities – public services in a well-designed and open public place designed to specifically address the needs of Salemites.

   b. **Human Significance***: (i) Is associated historically with the life or activities of a person, group, organization or institution that has made a significant contribution to the local community; or (ii) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution*

to the broad patterns of local history; or (iii) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, important information concerning prehistory or history.

Findings: The first documented efforts for a new Civic Center began in 1947 when the Salem Chamber of Commerce published their "Long-Range Plan for Salem, Oregon." This report identified a critical and urgent need for Salem as Oregon's Capitol City to lead the way in developing a new Civic Center. Multiple sites were considered including one north of downtown near Union Street, and one extending from High Street west to the Willamette River. These sites were deemed prohibitive due to the costs of land acquisition. However, a four-block area already partially owned by the city, bounded by Leslie and Trade streets, and by Liberty and Commercial on the east and west, known as the Hillside Site, became a strong contender. A Civic Center Committee was established, but multiple plans and bond measures failed again and again.

It was not until 1968, more than twenty years after efforts first began, when the community rallied together behind building a new Salem Civic Center at the Hillside site. The difference ultimately was the public outreach and education. Encouraging a 'yes vote' was accomplished largely by Salem's community of women – women who were identified in newspapers most often by their husbands' names. Over 500 women volunteered to host block parties, block coffees, distribute brochures, make and deliver buttons, and share "flipbooks" featuring the plans with the community. There were phone lines citizens could call with questions and women volunteers made their headquarters at the Chamber of Commerce office. These many dedicated volunteers took the information to the voters instead of relying on voters to find it. All of these efforts were successful and finally in 1968, the fourth bond measure passed approving a $6 million bond measure for the construction of the Civic Center, including the new municipal administration building, a central public library, police and municipal court facilities and a central fire station.

Staff recommends that the HLC find that the resource has human significance for its association with the local Salem community who worked for almost twenty years to identify a location for the new Civic Center and gain support for the funding to build it.

c. **Architectural Significance***: (i) Is significant as an example of a particular architectural style, building type, structural type, or method of construction; or (ii) Is the work of an acknowledged master or architect, or possesses high artistic values.*

Findings: In addition to noting the inadequacies of the current city hall and the mere $0.60 a month the bond measure would add to the average Salem household, the volunteers reaching out to the community highlighted the New Brutalist architectural and planning elements of the building. A 1968 radio broadcast described the building using the following phrases: 1) "not a monument but a functional efficient center for you and your government;" 2) "use of native Oregon materials, stone and brick, will enhance the simple beauty of the Civic Center Design;" 3) "designed to serve you, your children, and your children's children;" "designed to meet the needs of government;" and 4) "a truly beautiful and functional civic center."

The completed Salem Civic Center was featured alongside the First National Center in Portland, Oregon in a 1973 edition of *Tone* magazine. The magazine described the

Salem Civic Center as an excellent example of Brutalist architecture comprised of "poured-concrete buildings… [that] have a massive, contemporary look but have been designed with an airiness that orients beautifully with the open spaces of the twelve-acre park-like setting. The complex comprises a city hall, public library, and fire hall… A reflecting pond, five fountains, and extensive plantings are in the landscape plans. The entire area is designed as a refreshing space for public enjoyment, and all buildings and open areas are connected by ramps for wheelchairs. The center is the largest project ever undertaken by the City of Salem and, in the eyes of the administration, employees, and citizens of the capital city of Oregon, is a great success."

Staff recommends that the HLC find that the resource is an excellent local example of Brutalist architecture.

3. **SRC 230.010 (e) (3) Integrity:** *The proposed historic resource retains sufficient original design characteristics, craft work, or material to serve as an example of an architectural period, significant building type or structural type, or recognized architectural style.*

   Findings: The Salem Civic Center retains its original form and is in its original location. Staff recommends that the HLC find that the resource retains sufficient original integrity to convey its historical and cultural significance and this criterion has been met.

Owner Consent

4. **SRC 230.010.(f). Owner Consent:** *A property owner may refuse to consent to local historic resource designation at any point during the designation process. A refusal to consent shall remove the property from consideration for local historic resource designation. No permit for the demolition or modification of property removed from consideration for local historic resource designation shall be issued for 120 days following the date of the property owner's refusal to consent to local historic resource designation.*

   Findings: The property is owned by the City of Salem, and therefore the Salem City Council would need to consent to the designation which they have not yet done. The City Council consent (or refusal) can occur at any time during the designation process. The City Council will conduct their own public hearing on the proposal and will decide to consent, or not, at that time.

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the information presented in the application and findings as presented in this staff report, staff recommends that the Historic Landmarks Commission RECOMMEND to City Council **APPROVAL** of the proposal to designate the Salem Civic Center as a Local Historic Resource.

DECISION ALTERNATIVES

1. **RECOMMEND APPROVAL.** Should the HLC find that the proposed resource is eligible for designation and therefore recommend that the City Council approve the designation.

2. **RECOMMEND DENIAL**. Should the HLC find that the proposed resource is not eligible for designation and therefore recommend that the City Council deny the designation.

Attachments: A. Vicinity Map
B. HLC Resolution 2022-02
C. Submittal Materials National Register Nomination – Salem Civic Center

Prepared by Kimberli Fitzgerald, Historic Preservation Officer

G:\CD\PLANNING\HISTORIC\CASE APPLICATION Files - Processing Documents & Staff Reports\Type IV\2022\Civic Center\HIS22-30 Salem Civic Center. Staff Report.docx

Vicinity Map
555 Liberty Street SE
(073W27BD00100 and 073W27BA03200)



Legend

- Taxlots
- Urban Growth Boundary
- City Limits
- Outside Salem City Limits
- Historic District
- Schools
- Parks

0 100 200 400 Feet

CITY OF Salem AT YOUR SERVICE
Community Development Dept.

This product is provided as is, without warranty. In no event is the City of Salem liable for damages from the use of this product. This product is subject to license and copyright limitations and further distribution or resale is prohibited.

N:\CD\Proj\CP\Vicinity_Maps\073W27BD00100&073W27BA03200_555-LIBERTY-ST-SE.mxd - 11/7/2022 @ 1:57:21 PM

HLC RESOLUTION NO. _2022-02_____

A RESOLUTION INITIATING THE LOCAL HISTORIC RESOURCE DESIGNATION FOR THE CIVIC CENTER, LOCATED at 555 LIBERTY ST. SE (MARION COUNTY ASSESSOR'S TAX LOT NUMBERS 073W27BD00100 and 073W27BA03200).

Whereas, a Council priority is ***Welcoming and Livable Neighborhoods*** which includes ensuring that Salem residents have access to historic and cultural opportunities by supporting Salem's historically and culturally significant buildings and sites; and

Whereas, the Salem City Council adopted the updated 2020-2030 Salem Historic Preservation Plan (Plan)as components and support documents to the Salem Area Comprehensive Plan in 2020; and

Whereas, the Plan's adopted Goal 6 is: ***Survey and Designate Historic Resources***; and

Whereas, the City of Salem is a Certified Local Government and has a historic preservation program that includes a preservation ordinance and a local Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) that meets regularly and maintains a register of locally designated historic resources; and

Whereas, the National Park Service designated the Salem Civic Center on November 2, 2022 as an important local example of the Brutalist architectural style as well as an excellent representation of the ideals of Salem's community planning and development in the late 1960s/early 1970s; and

Whereas, A local historic resource designation may be initiated by the Historic Landmarks Commission by resolution pursuant to SRC 230.010(c)(1)(B); and

Whereas, the Historic Landmarks Commission is required to provide appropriate public notice, consider the matter at a public hearing and make a recommendation regarding the findings relating to the applicable criteria for local historic resource designation in SRC 230.010 to the City Council pursuant to SRC 300.1110; and

Whereas, a 35-day notification to the Department of Land Conservation and Development is required under SRC 300.1110(d).

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SALEM, OREGON RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The Historic Landmarks Commission hereby initiates the local historic resource designation for the Salem Civic Center located at 555 LIBERTY ST. SE (Marion County Assessor's Tax Lot 073W27BD00100).

Section 2. The Historic Landmarks Commission shall consider the matter at a public hearing at their December 15, 2022 meeting and will adopt findings and a recommendation to the City Council for their consideration and final decision at a public hearing which will be set for a future date.

ADOPTED by the Historic Landmarks Commission this 17th day of November, 2022.

Carroll Cottingham
Chair, Salem Historic Landmarks Commission

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

Attachment C

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations for individual properties and districts. See instructions in National Register Bulletin, *How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form.* If any item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, architectural classification, materials, and areas of significance, enter only categories and subcategories from the instructions. **Place additional certification comments, entries, and narrative items on continuation sheets if needed (NPS Form 10-900a).**

1. Name of Property

historic name Salem Civic Center Historic District

other names/site number Vern W. Miller Civic Center

Name of Multiple Property Listing N/A

(Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing)

2. Location

street & number 555 Liberty Street SE ☐ not for publication

city or town Salem ☐ vicinity

state Oregon code OR county Marion code 047 zip code 97301

3. State/Federal Agency Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended,

I hereby certify that this _X_ nomination ___ request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60.

In my opinion, the property __ meets ___ does not meet the National Register Criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant at the following level(s) of significance: ___ **national** ___ **statewide** _X_ **local**

Applicable National Register Criteria: _X_ **A** ___ **B** _X_ **C** ___ **D**

Signature of certifying official/Title: Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer Date

Oregon State Historic Preservation Office
State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government

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

Signature of commenting official Date

Title State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government

4. National Park Service Certification

I hereby certify that this property is:

___ entered in the National Register ___ determined eligible for the National Register

___ determined not eligible for the National Register ___ removed from the National Register

___ other (explain:) _____

Signature of the Keeper Date of Action

Salem Civic Center Historic District
Name of Property

Marion Co., OR
County and State

5. Classification

Ownership of Property
(Check as many boxes as apply.)

- [ ] private
- [X] public - Local
- [ ] public - State
- [ ] public - Federal

Category of Property
(Check only **one** box.)

- [ ] building(s)
- [X] district
- [ ] site
- [ ] structure
- [ ] object

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

Contributing	Noncontributing	
3	2	buildings
1		site
		structure
1		object
5	2	**Total**

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register

N/A

6. Function or Use

Historic Functions
(Enter categories from instructions.)

GOVERNMENT / city hall
GOVERNMENT / fire station
EDUCATION / library
RECREATION & CULTURE / outdoor recreation
LANDSCAPE / park
LANDSCAPE / plaza

Current Functions
(Enter categories from instructions.)

GOVERNMENT / city hall
GOVERNMENT / fire station
EDUCATION / library
RECREATION & CULTURE / outdoor recreation
LANDSCAPE / park
LANDSCAPE / plaza

7. Description

Architectural Classification
(Enter categories from instructions.)

MODERN MOVEMENT (Brutalism)

Materials
(Enter categories from instructions.)

foundation: CONCRETE
walls: CONCRETE
GLASS
roof: ASPHALT; CONCRETE
other:

Narrative Description

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

Summary Paragraph

The Salem Civic Center Historic District – bound by Trade Street on the north, Commercial Street on the west, Leslie Street on the south, and Liberty Street on the east – sits on four-city blocks just south of the commercial downtown in Salem, Marion County. Constructed between 1970 and 1972, the property has five contributing resources – the Central Fire Station #1, Mirror Pond and Pringle Creek, City Hall Parking Garage, City Hall (including City Council Chambers), and Plaza Fountain – and two non-contributing resources – the Public Library and Library Parking Garage – within the nominated property boundary of 12.85 acres.[1] The Central Fire Station #1 is located on the northeast corner of the property and can be accessed from both Trade and Liberty Streets. Between the Central Fire Station #1 and City Hall Parking Garage is open park space including the Mirror Pond, Pringle Creek, and sidewalks that connect the complex. The City Hall Parking Garage roof also features open space with concrete planter boxes. City Hall – which includes City Council Chambers – is located in the center of the property with access to the interior courtyard and city services from both the north and south elevations. Between the City Hall and Public Library buildings is the Plaza Fountain, an open space with decorative concrete elements surrounding a decommissioned water feature and statue. The Public Library and Library Parking Garage are located furthest south on the site. The Public Library building – completed in 1972 – has been substantially remodeled, receiving additions to the south elevation in 1991 and seismic upgrades in 2020-21 that have greatly diminished integrity. The Library Parking Garage was constructed in 1991 – outside the period of significance – on top of a planned children's park and surface parking. While these two individual buildings are no longer contributing, overall the Salem Civic Center Historic District retains a high level of historic integrity. It is in the original location, the setting has not been altered, and the design of the district – including the physical connections between the buildings and the common, unifying architectural details and materials – are highly intact. With the exception of the southern portion of the property, there have been relatively few material modifications and the workmanship of an early 1970s Brutalist complex is strongly represented. The Salem Civic Center retains high integrity of feeling and association. Character-defining features that unify the district include the layout of buildings on the site to take advantage of the natural, terraced topography and existing water features, the square and rectangular shape of the buildings, the common concrete material, and similar design features on the buildings (horizontal lines, concrete columns, concrete parapets, etc.).

Narrative Description

Note: The following descriptions only includes a discussion of interior spaces if they are character-defining (e.g., City Council Chambers). Given the nature of the buildings and changes in technologies and processes since 1972, the interiors have been continuously updated to accommodate evolving employee needs. However, none of these modifications have diminished the integrity of the Salem Civic Center or the individual contributing resources.

Setting and the Overall Site:

The four-block Salem Civic Center is located on a hillside south of Salem's commercial downtown. It is bound by Trade Street on the north, Commercial Street on the west, Leslie Street on the south, and Liberty Street on the east. From north to south the Salem Civic Center includes the Central Fire Station #1, Pringle Creek and Mirror Pond, City Hall Parking Garage, City Hall (including the City Council Chambers), Plaza Fountain, Public Library, and Library Parking Garage. Dispersed throughout the site are sidewalks, staircases, and ramps that connect the resources to each other and landscaping features

[1] City of Salem Dedication Committee, *Civic Center '72: Our Pride and Heritage* (Salem, OR, 1972).

like concrete planter boxes, benches, and lighting. The Central Fire Station #1 is the northern most building and sits at the corner of Trade and Liberty Streets. It is lowest in elevation and the site increases in elevation heading south. The City Hall and Public Library buildings have the most commanding views and prominence, both looking towards the commercial downtown to the north. The iconic Elisabeth Walton Potter summed up the site best noting "the rational, terraced scheme was enhanced by park-like landscaping which provided an effective foil for buildings of reinforced concrete."[2]

There are common design elements found in all of the buildings and structures that create a sense of design unity throughout the Salem Civic Center Historic District. In 1982, the Salem Civic Center received a Merit Award from the Oregon Chapter of the Oregon Chapter of the American Society of Landscape Architects. In the announcement the Chapter wrote, "The extensive repetition of architectural elements provides continuity."[3] All buildings were historically square or rectangular, and this shape is carried over into the decorative features of the Mirror Pond (Images 8-10). Each building from the period of significance has a flat roof with a wide, concrete panel parapet and features vertical concrete columns that create numerous bays. There are narrow, horizontal lines in the concrete that run around the buildings, especially along the parapets. Concrete is the primary building material around the complex, including at the Plaza Fountain, walkway railings, open space on the City Hall Parking Garage, and elements of the Mirror Pond. The poured concrete buildings are striated, and the ties were intentionally unfilled to avoid the appearance of patching.[4] While the main building materials are concrete and glass, there is some horizontal wood paneling found in City Hall, mainly in the Courtyard. Together these common elements take seven individual resources and create one civic space for one city moving towards one future.

Character-defining features of the site include the overall layout with sweeping staircases, ramps, and sidewalks that provide continuous access from one city service to the next. Notably, the design of the Salem Civic Center took into consideration accessibility, especially for Salemites requiring mobility assistance.[5] The overall landscaping scheme conveys the open and welcoming intent of the Salem Civic Center and is character-defining. The site – including the Mirror Pond and use of Pringle Creek – was intended to offer green space (and therefore capitalize on federal funds for park space acquisition, discussed in Section 8). The Civic Center retains "refreshing space, colorful plants, and fountains for Salemites relaxation."[6] It is less about what is planted in the planter boxes and more about their presence and the beautification they offer to create a complex where people want to spend time. Another character-defining feature is the orientation of the buildings to each other. The Central Fire Station #1 is strategically located away from city services and near main transportation arterials. It is also lowest in elevation. The City Hall and Public Library buildings are centered on the site with the most dominant presence and views. They were historically connected to each other in such a way that you could easily access all services from each other – leaving the historic main entrance of the Public Library, walking

[2] Elisabeth Potter Walton to Linda Norris, January 23, 2019, one file with the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office.
[3] From the Salem Civic Center File, on file with the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office.
[4] The poured concrete for the buildings was formed using Weyerhaeuser wood siding materials that were discontinued right as the project was coming to a close. The City had to search warehouses across the country to find enough to complete the project, and appropriately bragged that it could never be duplicated (Civic Center Fact Sheet, August 1972, Civic Center Files, City of Salem).
[5] In 1970, Joseph Fitzpatrick, who was the Salem Civic Center Project Manager, wrote a memo stating "there is wheel chair access throughout the entire project from Trade Street to Leslie Street whereby a wheel chair person can go from any point in the area to any other point without going up one step or without getting out of the wheel chair." This extended to also making sure that restrooms offered accessible stalls and proper wayfinding graphics (J.F. Fitzpatrick to B.T. Van Wormer, December 7, 1970, Civic Center Files, City of Salem).
[6] City of Salem Dedication Committee, 14. It is worth noting that the fountain in the Plaza Fountain has been decommissioned. However, there are still other water features around the space and integrity has not been diminished.

through the Plaza Fountain, and then entering City Hall. The spaces are sited and designed to provide functional government and easy access to services. Further, this layout and the common design elements found throughout integrate the individual public spaces (library, planning departments, fire, etc.) into one cohesive civic space. These character-defining features are a reminder that the Salem Civic Center was and is "a project of the people."[7] The Salem Civic Center dedication materials capture that the "massive, yet airy contemporary buildings [were] designed to create open space – space for the maximum use and enjoyment by the people of Salem."[8] Each of the contributing resources within the district retain their connection with this guiding principle and the historic significance.

Central Fire Station #1 (1971; Contributing):

Located at the corner of the Trade and Liberty Streets is Central Fire Station #1. The two story, concrete building has a flat roof and sits on a poured concrete foundation. The corners of the building feature simple, square columns that form a 90-degree angle but do not extend to the edge of the eave. There are also concrete columns on each of the elevations that form distinct bays (three bays on the north and south elevations, two bays on the east and west elevations). There are subtle but noticeable horizontal lines running across the concrete around the building, including on the columns, creating visual unity on the building and throughout the complex. The building has a concrete paneled parapet with an overhanging eave. The parapet features a distinct horizontal line between the panels and vertical divides aligned with the columns.

The north elevation faces Trade Street and is divided into three bays by vertical concrete columns (Image 2). The east and central bays each have two openings for firetrucks with rolling doors (each with 28 clear openings; total of four garage door openings) on the first floor. On the second story, each bay has three, four pane, fixed aluminum windows. The west bay and central bay are divided by a more prominent and wide vertical concrete column that houses the interior stairwell. There is one window located on the second story of this stairwell column. The west bay has a concrete awning between the first and second story and no other architectural details – though there is a piece of the World Trade Center under the awning in tribute to the firefighters who lost their lives on September 11, 2001. Historically, this area provided an entrance and had full length windows and a glass door (Figure 14). The second story also had two windows.

The east elevation faces Liberty Street and has two bays divided by concrete columns (Image 3). The south bay has a large concrete tower for drying and rerolling fire house protruding from the main wall. With the exception of two vents on the first story there are no architectural features on the north bay. There have been almost no modifications to this elevation with the exception of painting the hose tower.

The south elevation mimics the north elevation so that fire trucks can enter the building from the south and quickly exit out the north during emergencies (Image 4). The elevation is divided into three bays by vertical concrete columns. The west bay has a prominent and wide vertical concrete column, similar to the north elevation. The west bay has a concrete awning between the first and second stories and no other architectural details. The central and east bays each have two openings for firetrucks with rolling doors (each with 28 clear openings; total of four garage door openings) on the first floor. On the second story, each bay has three, four pane, fixed aluminum windows.

The west elevation, similar to east elevation, is divided by concrete columns into two bays. The north bay features two glass entry doors with a metal, flat roof entrance structure. The second story of the north bay has three, four pane, fixed aluminum windows. Centered on the south bay is two concrete columns with one, four-pane, fixed aluminum window centered on the second story between the two columns. The

[7] Ibid.
[8] Ibid.

west elevation has been substantially altered outside of the period of significance, likely in 1992 when the interior of the building was altered and 2010 when the building received seismic upgrades (Figure 13).

The main alterations to the Central Fire Station #1 have occurred on the west elevation, as noted above. Windows have also been replaced on the north and south elevations. Historically all windows on the second story were one light with no panes (Figure 14). The main entrance has also been relocated from the north elevation to the west elevation. The building underwent modifications in 1992 (mainly to the interior) and 2010 when seismic upgrades were completed (metal anchors were added in the parapet though they are barely visible). Even with these alterations, the Central Fire Station #1 retains sufficient integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. Overall, these alterations are compatible with the original design of the Central Fire Station #1 and do not detract from the historic integrity of the building or the Salem Civic Center. The primary materials – concrete and glass – are retained.

Character-defining features of the Central Fire Station #1 include the overall design (flat roof, concrete columns that create bays, concrete parapet, horizontal lines) and materials (striated, formed concrete). Another character-defining feature of the Central Fire Station #1 is the location and layout on the site to provide access from both Trade and Liberty Streets and the garage doors on both the north and south elevations. This allows fire trucks to enter through one door and quickly exit out another without having to back it up. The building maintains sufficient character-defining features a strong association with the overall goals of the Salem Civic Center and the siting of city services in one location for a more efficient and modern government.

Mirror Pond and Pringle Creek (1972; Contributing):
Located south of the Central Fire Station #1 and north of the City Hall Parking Garage is open space that utilizes two water features for maximum beautification – Pringle Creek and Mirror Pond. Pringle Creek runs east-west under bridges on both Commercial and Liberty Streets and between the Mirror Pond and Central Fire Station #1.[9] Pringle Creek was existing on the site when the location was being considered and utilizing the water feature was an early part of the design and a selling point when trying to get the 1968 bond passed.[10] Pringle Creek was minimally altered or not realigned during construction.

During the Salem Civic Center dedication, the Mirror Pond was described as being a “no-cost gravity flow water system [that] will keep the pond fresh at all times…for public enjoyment.”[11] The Mirror Pond is concrete lined and ranges in depth from 30” to 4’ (Images 7-10). It retains a series of square, concrete slabs that contrast with the more circular, organic shape of the pond and connect the resource to the square buildings. At the north end of the Mirror Pond are a series of concrete steps that connect it to Pringle Creek and allow water to flow down (Image 8). A sidewalk circles the entire pond and there are some wood and concrete benches scattered around the site close to the shore. While the Mirror Pond was not meant for swimming (even though the Salem Civic Center dedication book included photos of kids splashing in the water) it provides an aesthetically pleasing landscape feature.[12] And at one point it was used by the Santiam Flycasters Club to practice fly fishing casting.[13] Both Mirror Pond and Pringle Creek maintain a high amount of historic integrity and with the exception of some benches being removed, there have been no documented alterations to the design. With the exception of removing

[9] The Commercial and Liberty Street bridges are located outside of the Salem Civic Center historic property boundary and are not included in this nomination. They pre-date the period of significance and are not associated with the areas of significance. There were no notable upgrades to the bridges during construction of the Civic Center.
[10] Pringle Creek had been modified by Boise Cascade, who had a large facility west of the Salem Civic Center. Based on a review of historic aerials, the location of Pringle Creek was not modified during construction.
[11] City of Salem Dedication Committee, 14.
[12] “Mirror Pond Not Designed For Swimming,” *The Statesman Journal*, July 23, 1972.
[13] “Fish ‘shut out’ flycasters club at city hall pond,” *The Statesman Journal*, July 15, 1977.

some benches and new plantings, there have been relatively few modifications to either Mirror Pond or Pringle Creek and the integrity is highly intact.

Character-defining features include the location, design, and materials. The square, concrete elements around the pond and leading to Pringle Creek are essential for connecting Mirror Pond with the other buildings at the Civic Center, reminding the community that it is nature with purpose (Images 8 and 10). The sidewalks around the area also connect the district. You can easily access all of the buildings without having to cut across the grass. The Mirror Pond and Pringle Creek continue to provide enjoyment for Salemites, beautification, and connectivity for the Civic Center.

City Hall Parking Garage (1972; Contributing):
While partially connected to the City Hall building with surface level walkways and a semi-underground entrance, the City Hall Parking Garage is considered a standalone building. The concrete building features two levels of parking. One level is entirely underground while the top level is half covered by a concrete open park space and concrete planters and the other half is open (Images 11-13). Vehicular access to the City Hall Parking Garage is from the south and beneath the City Council Chambers, which sits over the road that provides access between Commercial and Liberty Streets (Image 14). North of the City Hall Parking Garage is the Mirror Pond. There is a set of stairs on the north elevation that provide access to all parking levels and the open space on the roof. The City Hall Parking Garage was sited intentionally to allow for the minimum amount of excavation, which afforded the City some cost savings in a ballooning project. The City Hall Parking Garage retains a high degree of historic integrity and has had relatively few modifications made since construction in 1972. As the City Hall Parking Garage used to house the Salem Police Department fleet until 2020, there have been some gates, lighting, and security added. However, none of the alterations have impacted the integrity of design, materials, or workmanship.

Character-defining features include the concrete materials, design, and location. Not only does the location of the building provide easy access to City Hall but the siting allowed for cost savings on excavation during construction. The flat roof and landscaping elements are also an important trait as it provides cars protection from the elements, a community space to gather, and something more than a paved parking lot. Like all other buildings on the site, the materials are formed concrete and there are horizontal lines. The sweeping staircase on the north elevation provides continuity and access around the site that is essential for the unity of the district.

City Hall (1972; Contributing):
City Hall is located at the center of the Salem Civic Center site. It can be accessed from the north elevation from the City Hall Parking Garage or from the Public Library and Plaza Fountain on the south elevation. It is a concrete, three-story, U-shaped building with waffle slab construction. The building has a flat roof with some mechanical equipment on the roof and a concrete panel parapet with a horizontal line running around the entire building. The corners of the building feature simple columns that form a 90-degree angle but do not extend to the edge of the eave. The building relies heavily on open circulation (see Courtyard description below). City Hall houses the majority of city services including the Mayor's Office, Public Works Department, Community Development Department, and other essential services. From 1972 until 2020, City Hall was also home to the Salem Police Department.

The south elevation of the building faces the Public Library and Plaza Fountain and was the intended main entrance of the building (Images 17 and 18). It can be accessed by concrete stairs or ramps. From this perspective, the building appears to be two-stories. The south elevation has nine bays demarcated by concrete columns that run from the ground to the parapet. For this description they are numbered from one to nine from west to east. Bay one features six, single light, fixed, aluminum windows inset on the first story with a decorative metal panel above and an outward sloping concrete feature on the bottom. The second story features six single light, fixed, aluminum windows. Bay two is similar though there are

only four windows on the first story and a portion of the bay is open to the entry plaza. Bays three to seven open on the first floor to a covered, entry plaza. The second story has a total of 24 single light, fixed, aluminum windows. Bays eight and nine have concrete panels on the first story and a total of 12 single light, fixed, aluminum windows. The ceiling in the covered entry space shows off the waffle slab construction methods (Image 20).

The west elevation faces Commercial Street and appears to be two-stories from this perspective (Image 17). It is divided into six identical bays each with six single light, fixed, aluminum windows inset on the first story with a decorative metal panel above and an outward sloping concrete feature on the bottom. On the second story, each bay has six single light, fixed, aluminum windows. The north two bays have an exposed bottom floor with single light, fixed, aluminum windows. There are no entrances or other architectural features on this elevation.

The north elevation is three stories and is split by the Courtyard and City Council Chambers to create the buildings U-shape (Images 15, 16, and 19). The west half of the north elevation features a staircase on the east and then an open-air hallway that provides access to city services and a view of the Mirror Pond and downtown Salem. The two bays west of the hallway each have (from ground level up) four single light, fixed, aluminum windows on the ground story; four single light, fixed, aluminum windows inset on the second story with a decorative metal panel above and an outward sloping concrete feature on the bottom; and four single light, fixed, aluminum windows on the top story. The east half of the north elevation also has an open-air hallway that provides access to city services. The eastern most bay has (from ground level up) a concrete panel, wood door, and two windows with a horizontal wood band on the first story; six single light, fixed, aluminum windows inset on the second story with a decorative metal panel above and an outward sloping concrete feature on the bottom; and six, single light, fixed, aluminum windows on the top story. The west bay has (from ground level up) four windows with a horizontal wood band on the first story; four single light, fixed, aluminum windows inset on the second story with a decorative metal panel above and an outward sloping concrete feature on the bottom; and four single light, fixed, aluminum windows on the top story.

The east elevation has four bays, each distinguished by concrete columns that run from the ground to the parapet and is three-stories (Image 19). The ground level features access doors and a number of meters and other utilities. On the second story, the south bay is enclosed with concrete panels, but each of the other three bays has six single light, fixed, aluminum windows inset on the second story with a decorative metal panel above and an outward sloping concrete feature on the bottom. Each bay of the third story has six single light, fixed, aluminum windows.

City Hall has been subject to relatively few exterior modifications since 1972 construction. There are likely some changes to the ground story of the east elevation for new utilities, but the rest of the building remains highly intact based on historic photographs and a review of building permits (Figures 7 and 12). One modification is that some city services have been relocated outside of City Hall. In 2020, the Salem Police moved to a new station north of downtown, and the other city agencies (e.g., Urban Renewal) are also located offsite. However, the majority of city services are still located in this building and overall it retains its association with providing easy access to government in one space. The building retains an incredibly high degree of historic integrity, especially with regard to materials and design, which are related to many of the character-defining features.

Character-defining features of the City Hall exterior include the concrete columns that create distinct bays, the fenestration pattern and details (e.g., outward sloping concrete below the windows), the visible elements of waffle slab construction in the ceiling, the plexiglass roof over the courtyard space, striated concrete, and the U-shape. Tie holes in the concrete piers (Image 22) were intentionally left open to

avoid a "patched" appearance.[14] At the time of construction, the plexiglass skylight over the Courtyard was the largest on the west coast and the Fire Marshal had to grant special permission and extra review to ensure it met code and would not pose a safety risk. Glass doors on the south elevation were not intended to be a barrier but were instead designed to prevent winter weather from entering the building. Another character-defining feature is the open access to and viewing of all city services. Floor to ceiling windows allow citizens to see their government in action and more actively participate (Image 22). Another character-defining feature of City Hall is the location with a prominent view overlooking the commercial downtown.

City Council Chambers:
The City Council Chambers are included within the resource count for City Hall but are worthy of a separate description. The Chambers sits on concrete columns and spans the access road that connects Commercial and Liberty Streets and offers vehicular access to the City Hall Parking Garage (Image 14). There are recessed lights on the underside of the building. There are two double-door entrances on the south elevation of the concrete building, each accessed by pedestrian walkways that connect the Chambers to the second story of the City Hall (Image 21). Historically, the Council Chambers entrance features large, wood doors with bronze carvings (Figure 22). These doors were replaced c.2021 with lighter, more secure, weather resistant metal doors (Image 37).[15] The building has a flat roof and concrete panel parapet with overhanging eaves. Notably the parapet does not feature any horizontal lines that are found on other buildings, including City Hall and Central Fire Station #1.

The south elevation of the City Council Chambers has three bays (Image 21). The east and west bays are inset and feature the two sets of double-doors and walkways noted above. The central bay has concrete panels, wood vents, and a window. The west elevation has large glass windows on the corners and five concrete panels in the center (Image 16). The north elevation has six, large glass windows that offer a commanding view of the downtown (Image 16). The east elevation mimics the west elevation in that it has large glass windows in the corners and four concrete panels in the center (Image 13).

The interior walls have horizontal Red Oak wood siding (which was actually a flooring material) and there are four striated concrete columns in the Chamber, covered in pictures of former mayors (Image 39). The ceiling is tiled and the center, inset lighting feature is a series of wood squares, similar to the design of the waffle slab ceiling found throughout City Hall (Figure 23). The Mayor sits with their back facing the south elevation and flanked by the City Manager and City Attorney. City Council member desks run perpendicular to the Mayor, with four Council Members on each side. There are two podiums for the public to offer testimony, both facing the Mayor and Council. There is tiered public seating surrounding the Council on the east, west, and north. There are many sculptures and pieces of donated artwork located throughout the Chambers.

Character-defining features of the City Council Chambers are the materials (concrete exterior with wood and concrete on the interior) and the separation from the rest of City Hall. The interior layout is also important as it allows for the public to be able to look down upon its elected representatives. While seating and desks have been replaced (Figures 15 and 23), this overall spatial organization remains, and the integrity of the City Council Chambers is highly intact.

***Courtyard*:**
Another portion of the City Hall Building that deserves a standalone description is the Courtyard. This best speaks to the open nature of the City Hall and the goal that city services be open and accessible. While most of the site has a combination of stairs and ramps for greater accessibility, the courtyard has a

[14] "Civic Center Fact Sheet," August 1972, Civic Center Files, City of Salem.
[15] The original carved wood doors were retained and will be displayed at City Hall. At the time of writing this nomination, the Salem Arts Commission is still determining an appropriate location.

series of staircases and elevators. There is one sweeping, center staircase and then multiple staircases on the east and west wings of the building (Image 23). The elevator is easily accessed from the main entrance on the south elevation. The center plaza is open and covered with an accordion, plexiglass ceiling so employees and Salemites can use the space year-round (Images 24 and 25). The ground floor of the courtyard has a series of planters (Images 21 and 23). City services enclose the courtyard and can be accessed by concrete walkways with simple railings. The walls are a combination of horizontal wood paneling and glass (Image 22). This allows Salemites to watch their government working for them.

The courtyard is one of the most character-defining spaces of the Salem Civic Center. The combination of materials and the overall design speak to the goal of the Civic Center – public accessibility to Salem's efficient and modern government. The space is open, and access is provided from multiple directions and methods. It is covered to keep out the rain, but the plexiglass ceiling allows for the sun to shine through. The concrete planters and benches allow for people to sit and enjoy the space. Included in the character-defining features of the courtyard are those structural items that were gifted to the city by Salemites. This primarily includes decorative doors located within office spaces and artwork (Images 38 and 40). It is important to note that Salem has a robust and active Arts Commission. While donated art pieces from the period of significance – like "Untitled" by Wiltzin B. Blix (Image 40) – are important to retain, it is more about using art in the space to create community that should be considered character-defining.[16]

Plaza Fountain (1972; Contributing):
Located between the Public Library and City Hall buildings, Plaza Fountain was completed in 1972 and was the location of many Civic Center dedication activities (Figure 11). The entire Plaza is concrete and features 33 concrete triangles of varying sizes arranged in a circle. Some of the triangles are used to support wood benches. Located in the middle of this feature was a water fountain that now displays a statue. It was decommissioned in c.2002. In 1987, Plaza Fountain was renamed and dedicated "Peace Plaza" to represent "tangible expressions of community concern about world peace and even better neighbor-to-neighbor relations in Salem."[17] With this new name and more guided purpose, the Plaza underwent a series of modifications. The Peace Wall located east of the center of the plaza was built in 1988 and is not character-defining to the Plaza, though it also does not detract and nor diminish integrity (Image 35).[18] A number of flag poles were also installed to display flags from Salem's Sister Cities. Even with a new name, purpose, and modified infrastructure, the Plaza Fountain retains sufficient integrity from the period of significance with regard to design, materials, and association to be a contributing resource.

Character-defining features of the Plaza Fountain are the location (connecting the Public Library to City Hall) and also the concrete materials, which connects the object to the other buildings. The open-nature and focal point (fountain/statue and concrete triangles) are also an essential element of the resource.

Salem Public Library (1972, 1991, 2021; Non-Contributing):
The Public Library was constructed in 1972 as one of the key components of the Salem Civic Center. It is located south of City Hall and the Plaza Fountain. The concrete building is three-stories and the primary entrance is on the south elevation facing the Library Parking Garage (Image 31). There is also an entrance on the north elevation from City Hall and the Fountain Plaza, which was the main entrance until renovations were completed in 1991 (Image 29). The building is surrounded by concrete surfaces with ramps and staircases. The Public Library was intentionally constructed as one of the primary features of the site and is partially built into the hillside. However, major renovations to the building in 1991 and seismic upgrades in 2021 have substantially diminished the historic integrity of design, materials,

[16] One of the major components of the Salem Civic Center dedication was the "Mayor's Invitational Art Show" which included 37 pieces either purchased or gifted for the Civic Center specifically.
[17] Mark Hatfield, "Our work must continue," *The Statesman Journal*, April 15, 1987.
[18] "Civic Center Plaza Shows Commitment," *The Statesman Journal*, July 6, 1988.

workmanship, and feeling. Therefore, the Public Library building is non-contributing to the Salem Civic Center complex.

In 1991, the building received an addition on the south elevation and the primary entrance was relocated from the north (towards Fountain Plaza and City Hall) to the south (facing the new Parking Garage). This addition, which is partially circular in nature, included a new auditorium space and children's area. It was also during the 1991 renovations the mezzanine and breezeway on the north elevation was enclosed and windows were added (Figures 11 and 16). Overall these renovations added 25,000 square feet to the building and diminished the connection of the building to City Hall and the overall space (specifically sidewalks around the site connected to the second-floor breezeway on the north elevation).

In 2020-21, the Public Library received seismic upgrades, including adding shear walls on all four sides of the building that stretch from the ground to the concrete parapet. These shear walls are continuous and do not feature the bold horizontal elements found on the historic Public Library. The three concrete bays on the west elevation were also removed and replaced with glass windows to allow for more natural light in the building (Image 30). An external concrete staircase that once connected to the breezeway was removed from the west elevation.

While these renovations have created a Public Library that safely meets the needs of the community, collectively they have yielded the building non-contributing as it is no longer reflective of the period of significance and context. The south elevation addition, shear walls, opening of the west elevation bays, and the substantial changes to the north elevation – relocating the entrance, enclosing the breezeway – have substantially and irreversibly altered the historic design. While the building is still concrete, glass is now an overpowering material of the Public Library, especially on the north and west elevations. The south elevation does not retain any elements from the period of significance. Given the overall loss of both design and materials, the integrity of workmanship as reflective of the 1970s craft is also diminished. Many of the concrete finishes have been replaced with glass and the shear walls break up the once unified look of the building. The building conveys a much more modern feeling and character. Considering these substantial renovations, the Public Library is non-contributing.

Library Parking Garage (1991; Non-Contributing):
Built in 1991, the two-story, concrete Library Parking Garage is located on Leslie Street between Commercial and Liberty Streets with entrances on the north and south elevations. There is both below ground and roof top parking. Historically, the location of the Library Parking Garage had surface parking, a Children's Play Area, and green space with landscaping and sidewalks (Figure 17). The only element that remains is a stepped concrete and brick structure between the south elevation of the Public Library and north elevation Library Parking Garage entrance (Image 34). Due to parking limitations and expanding library needs, the building was constructed in 1991. It is architecturally compatible with the overall Salem Civic Center with regard to style, scale, and materials, and does not detract from the setting, design, association, and feeling of the district. However, as it was built outside the period of significance, the Library Parking Garage is non-contributing.

Integrity:
Even with modifications to the Public Library building and the addition of the Library Parking Garage, the Salem Civic Center retains sufficient integrity to convey significance under Criteria A and C in the area of Community Planning and Development. The location remains the same as constructed in 1972. When Salemites were asked to pass the 1968 bond measure and fund construction (discussed below), they were also asked to select the location from two options. They overwhelmingly elected to construct at the present location which in part speaks to the desire to have city services overlooking downtown.[19] With the

[19] Voter selection of this location (known in 1968 as the Hillside Site) also had much to do with the fact that plans and cost estimates were completed and there were no drawings and only rough cost estimates for the other site

exception of the Library Parking Garage, all of the buildings and landscaping features remain in the same locations as originally constructed. The design of the Salem Civic Center also remains relatively intact. Even though some contributing buildings have undergone slight changes, like the Central Fire Station #1, contributing resources each individually retain their overall design with regard to form, style, and plan. The City and architects made very deliberate choices. The organization of the buildings, specifically the City Hall and Public Library sitting centered on the site and at the highest elevation, and their surroundings are still intact. The stairs, sidewalks, and ramps connect the space and create an accessible Civic Center complex. As the design of the complex is highly intact the historic function and significance is strongly conveyed through the property. The overall design of the property– including the planter boxes, greenery, water features – led John Terry, news editor of *The Capital Journal*, to conclude that the "overall design of the place lends itself to all sorts of activity ungovernmental [sic], and, when the grass and trees gain some maturity, the complex should prove one of the best places in town to go to simply goof off."[20] This is strongly retained, though probably more frowned upon.

While there has been development and new construction adjacent to the Salem Civic Center, the setting remains highly intact and the character of the complex from the period of significance is still conveyed. The property is still sited between two major north-south streets and south of the commercial downtown. Natural topography and green space are retained. Further, as noted above for design, the sidewalks, stairs, and ramps are in their historic locations. All of these elements together allow the property to serve Salemites and provide accessible government services. The exterior material integrity of the Salem Civic Center is highly intact for most of the contributing buildings. The Central Fire Station #1 has been subject to seismic upgrades and window replacements, but these new introductions do not detract. The City Hall Parking Garage and City Hall building have had almost no exterior modifications. Further, Mirror Pond, Pringle Creek, and Plaza Fountain have had almost no exterior materials modifications. The workmanship of the Salem Civic Center is also highly intact and retains the finishes and aesthetics of the Brutalist style that was common for this type of public building during the period of significance.

As a property that reflected what the City of Salem wanted to become, the integrity of feeling and association are essential for the property to continue to convey significance. The Brutalist style harkens back to period of significance and is reflective of the ideals of Salem at the time. The district is still strongly associated with the popular style from a time period when there was an increasing notion that government should include robust civic engagement and be more accessibly. The historic aesthetic and character is strongly intact. The Salem Civic Center was designed to guide Salem into the future and was a bold statement on the landscape that Salemites valued efficient government and wanted city services in modern buildings that were for *their* enjoyment and benefit. The link between the district, the architectural style, and the development of Salem is still conveyed to those in the community. Therefore, the Salem Civic Center continues to be directly related to this feeling and association.

(Mill Creek Site) when the bond measure was presented. Editorials on the failed bond measures had shown that voters wanted to know what they were getting for their money (see Section 8).

[20] John Terry, "Civic Center a great place to goof around," *The Capital Journal*, August 19, 1972.

Salem Civic Center Historic District
Name of Property

Marion Co., OR
County and State

8. Statement of Significance

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

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

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

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

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

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

Property is:

[ ] A Owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.

[ ] B removed from its original location.

[ ] C a birthplace or grave.

[ ] D a cemetery.

[ ] E a reconstructed building, object, or structure.

[ ] F a commemorative property.

[ ] G less than 50 years old or achieving significance within the past 50 years.

Areas of Significance
(Enter categories from instructions.)

COMMUNITY PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

ARCHITECTURE

Period of Significance

1971-1972

Significant Dates

1970; Groundbreaking ceremony

1971; Central Fire Station #1 completed

1972; City Hall, Public Library, and landscaping completed, dedication ceremony

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

N/A

Cultural Affiliation (if applicable)

N/A

Architect/Builder

Architects: Payne & Settecase (Salem, OR); Charles E. Hawkes (Salem, OR); Donald W. Richardson (Salem, OR)

Landscape Architects: Mitchell, McArthur, Gardner, O'Kane, and Associaties (Eugene and Portland, OR); George Rockrise (San Francisco, CA)

Interior Design: Shannon Oldham (Salem, OR)

Period of Significance (justification)

The period of significance for the Salem Civic Center Historic District spans from 1971 – when the first building (Central Fire Station #1) was completed – until 1972 – when the last buildings were completed, the complex was dedicated, and city services occupied the property.

Criteria Considerations (explanation, if necessary)

N/A.

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

The Salem Civic Center Historic District, completed between 1971 and 1972, is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places at the local level under Criterion A as the district represents the ideals of Salem's community planning and development in the late 1960s/early 1970s. The property is also eligible for listing under Criterion C as an important local example of the Brutalist architectural style. The period of significance is 1971 to 1972, which spans the dates of completion and dedication. Following World War II, Salem was rapidly growing, and the 1897 City Hall Building was no longer sufficient to house city services and meet the evolving needs of Salem government and increased expectations of civic engagement and participation in decision making. For over two decades, the community completed multiple studies to determine the best approach for a new civic center, and Salemites ultimately showed their strong support for the construction of a new complex that would unite all city services while also providing accessible public spaces. The Salem Civic Center was considered modern, functional, accessible, and for everyone's enjoyment and use. The Salem Civic Center Historic District is the best local representation from the period of significance of what Salemites wanted in their government and community, and how they wanted it to look, as they ventured into the future as a "safer, healthier, and more livable… modern urban community."[21]

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

Brutalism:

Deriving its name from the French phrase for "raw or unfinished concrete" – *béton brut* – Brutalist architecture is loved by some and hated by many.[22] The iconic Le Corbusier is credited with the first Brutalist building (*Unite d'Habitation*, Marseille, France, 1947-1952) which placed emphasis on the structure instead of decoration, to "build transparently, cleanly, and truthfully."[23] In 1957, Alison and Peter Smithson published a short but powerful essay on Brutalism, the movement and style they were in large part responsible for defining and creating.[24] In this often-cited piece they argue that past objectives for change can be "become useless…so new objectives are established."[25] Brutalism considers the "problem of human associations and the relationship that building and community has to them."[26] The Smithson's argue that Brutalism, as a new architectural style, is a response to society. If one is to sit and be critical about the use of raw concrete or the blocky shape of the building, then the intention of Brutalism is lost. For "its essence is ethical" not merely a style or aesthetic.[27]

The Smithson's expanded their notion of Brutalism to go beyond individual buildings, placing an emphasis on "town building" and planning. Peter Smithson described this as "the way the *buildings themselves* fit together and interact with each other which creates the actual places in which you move, and have a feeling of identity or lack of identity."[28] To design and construct in Brutalism was to accept "what is going on" and reject "chi-chi," which is when one "cannot be bothered to think out what the situation is, and how to work it out properly, and drops back into a formula of doing it which is a sort of lie."[29] The Smithson's also placed an emphasis on "urban re-identification" and architecture trying to provide a "feeling that you are somebody living somewhere."[30] This was carried out by categorizing spaces for different functions and land-uses. While this

[21] Vern W. Miller, December 27, 1968, Civic Center Files, City of Salem.
[22] "Brutalist architecture – a retrospective," *Architecture and Design*, September 5, 2019. https://www.architectureanddesign.com.au/features/list/a-look-at-brutalist-architecture# (accessed January 12, 2022).
[23] Ibid.; Nikil Saval, "Brutalism is Back," *The New York Times Style Magazine*, October 23, 2016, 54.
[24] The Smithson's referred to the style as "New Brutalism." However, for the sake of clarity and unless a direct quote, I will refer to style as "Brutalism" throughout this nomination. I imagine future preservationists will curse this decision much like I curse nominations of the past. For that, I apologize.
[25] Alison and Peter Smithson, *Architectural Design* 27 (April 1957), 113.
[26] Ibid.
[27] Ibid.
[28] Alison Smithson, Peter Smithson, Jane B. Drew, and E. Maxwell Fry, "Conversation on Brutalism," *Zodiac* 4 (1959), 75.
[29] Ibid., 76-77.
[30] Charles Jencks, *Modern Movements in* Architecture (Harrisonburg, VA: R.R. Donnelley and Sons, 1986), 302.

concept was not necessarily innovative or revolutionary, they carried it out by focusing on "connectedness." Peter Smithson said "we regard ourselves as functional, and therefore there is not only space in the town, but that space must signify what is going on, its function, and one of the things that we have to face in the twentieth century is that the space in towns has to indicate that it is a net of communication… there is more feeling of connectedness rather than the feeling of being in villages which is self-contained."[31] This was reflected in their designs by incorporating different sized buildings with different functions into a cluster that would be "comprehensible to its inhabitants."[32]

Brutalism also focused on raw, "real" materials – "wood, and concrete, glass, and steel, all the materials which you can really get hold of" – instead of the materials of the 1940s, which Alison Smithson described as "some sort of processed material such as Kraft Cheese."[33] Brutalist materials were "bold and confrontational…heavy, rugged forms forged of inexpensive industrial materials that disguised nothing at all."[34] But even though the name is derived from a material, Brutalism cannot be defined only by the materials, and instead should be grounded in "honesty: an uncompromising desire to tell it like it is, architecturally speaking."[35] Even the father of [New] Brutalism, Peter Smithson, admitted "I am obsessionally [sic] against the brick… [but] if common sense tells you that you have to got to make some poetic thing with brick, you make it with brick."[36]

Brutalism, with its "heavy, monumental, stark concrete forms and raw surfaces," was – as Ada Louise Huxtable put it – a "passing style." [37] While the first Brutalist building was built in the last 1940s, the style fell rapidly out of popularity by the mid-1970s. Concrete was becoming more expensive and critics became more outspoken against the "experimental forms…[and their disconnect] from the historical symbolism of architectural form."[38] However, this time period aligns with the same era America was seeing rapid construction of publicly funded infrastructure, especially public housing units and civic spaces. As such, there are swaths of many urban areas that feature Brutalist structures and designs. The popularity of the style also aligns with a time when civic spaces, especially city halls, were being built with new ideals and goals surrounding public engagement in government decisions.[39]

Civic Spaces in the Late 1960s and Early 1970s:

Civic spaces and city hall buildings offer a space for a citizen's to "participate directly in making public policy."[40] The "human conceived, designed, and constructed" nature of these spaces is evidence of the "political meaning" and purpose of the time period.[41] The "social meaning" of architecture says something about "those who inspired, built, arranged, and use it… nonverbal commentary about people, politics, culture, and civilization."[42] Cultural shifts regarding public participation in government in the 1960s and 1970s are evidenced in the architecture and design of civic spaces from this era. Federal funding to carry out the goals of the Great Society and fight the War on Poverty helped city governments physically grow at the same time "a new ethos of citizen participation in government emerged, stressing citizen boards, the prompt consideration of

[31] Smithson, et. al., 76-77.
[32] Jencks, 309.
[33] Smithson, et. al., 74.
[34] Michael Snyder, "Concrete Jungle," *The New York Times Style Magazine*, August 18, 2019, 192.
[35] Saval, 54.
[36] Smithson, et. al., 81.
[37] Anthony Vilder, "Learning to Love Brutalism," *docomomo Lectures* 47, no. 2 (2012), 1; Ada Louise Huxtable, "It's Stylish, But Is It Art – Or Spinache?" *The New York Times*, January 25, 1981.
[38] Barbara Campagna, "Redefining Brutalism," *APT Bulletin: The Journal of Preservation Technology*, 51, no. 1 (2020), 27.
[39] It is likely that some of the disdain for Brutalism is due to the association of the style with flawed and controversial Urban Renewal policy.
[40] Mary P. Ryan, "A Laudable Pride in the Whole of Us: City Halls and Civic Materialism," *The American Historical Review* 105,4 (October 2000), 1170.
[41] Charles T. Goodsell, *The Social Meaning of Civic Space: Studying Political Authority through Architecture* (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 1988), 7.
[42] Ibid., 7-8.

taxpayer complaints, minority employment in the bureaucracy, and an active citizen voice at public hearings and in city-council meetings."[43] Federal laws from the time, specifically the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, required programs be carried out with "maximum feasible participation" from local communities.[44]

It was also during this era that cities were building more "comprehensive civic centers" that included multiple public buildings with landscaping features (plaza, park, etc.) to create unity. This time period likewise saw the separation of city council chambers from larger city hall buildings. This disconnected the City Council from the day-to-day functions of government and created a sense of importance. Yet, the separation also managed to increase access and public accountability as sweeping staircases were replaced with ground level buildings accessed by ramps.[45] The grand, elite notion of government was physically taken down a notch. City, county, and state governments in the 1960s and 1970s relied heavily on the notion of community participation in policy development, and the architectural style adopted – often Brutalism – helped to accomplish this.

The Brutalist style lent itself well to public spaces and civic centers because of the process behind it – "starting with a conclusion and then working back towards a beginning."[46] The essence of the building – or what architect Louis Kahn called the "form" – should be at the center and then the "design" can create unique circumstances.[47] At their core, city halls contemporary to the Salem Civic Center were "designed for public access to civil servants and services."[48] There was an expectation that city hall provide a space where the public can interact with democracy and be heard. Outdoor plaza spaces that connect "into the building through ramps and steps that [imply] accessible officials" are a key feature of Brutalist civic spaces, including the Salem Civic Center.[49] Further, the concrete materials "suggested a fortified barricade and the weight of authority."[50] Public spaces "become significant symbols that remind everyone whose attention they command that they share a common heritage and a common future…"[51] This is the essential form of a civic space and city hall, and from there individual architects added individual design elements for the site and the community.

Buried in rolls and rolls of microfilm about the construction of the Salem Civic Center is a two-page flyer for a new city hall in Paducah, McCracken County, Kentucky. Designed by noted architect Edward Stone and finished in 1965, Paducah's City Hall is not really Brutalist and is only one building on one city block, though it does have a large interior plaza and took twelve years to get approved by local voters, which is very similar to Salem's Civic Center.[52] However, the most striking similarity and why this building was likely brought to the attention of Salem's City Manager and Civic Center Project Manager is that it was described over and over as "inviting." During the building dedication, William S. Foster, editor of *American City Magazine*, described the new city hall as "beautiful, delicately design, and inviting."[53] Foster went on to say that old city hall buildings were "temple like…with long flights of steps which demean people and separate them from their government."[54] In a shift away from earlier eras when government was elitist and participation was minimal, the

[43] Ibid., 142.
[44] Geoffrey Godbey and Richard Kraus, "Citizen Participation in Urban Recreation Decision-Making," *Community Development Journal* 8, no.3 (1973), 155. It is worth briefly noting that during this time period the State of Oregon was undergoing drastic local and statewide comprehensive land use shifts as the state faced rapid growth. Led in large part by Governor Tom McCall, these land use ideals relied heavily on local citizen engagement (Laura Jane Gifford, "Planning for a Productive Paradise: Tom McCall and the Conservationist Tale of Oregon Land-Use Policy," *Oregon Historical Quarterly* 115, no. 4 (2014), 483).
[45] Ibid., 192.
[46] Jencks, 228.
[47] Jencks, 228.
[48] David Monteyne, "Boston City Hall and a History of Reception, *Journal of Architectural Education* 65, no. 1 (October 2011), 45.
[49] Gwendolyn Wright, *USA: Modern Architectures in History* (London: Reaktion Books, 2008), 226.
[50] Ibid.
[51] Murray Edelman, "Space and the Social Order," *Journal of Architectural Education* 32, no. 2 (November 1978), 3.
[52] I would be a bad citizen of the Pacific Northwest if I failed to mention General William Clark of Lewis and Clark laid out the city of Paducah in 1827.
[53] Don Walker, "Welcome to Paducah's New City Hall," *Sun Democrat*.
[54] Ibid.

architecture and planning behind civic centers and city halls of the late 1960s and early 1970s, was about connecting people with government. The City of Salem, though not without struggle, would adopt these Brutalist design elements and community planning ideals for their new Civic Center.

Salem, Oregon:

Note: Given the number of National Register of Historic Places listed properties, including historic districts, in Salem, Marion County, the following historic context on Salem has been kept relatively brief and focused to best illustrate the areas and period of significance.

The City of Salem is located in the traditional homelands of the Santiam band of the Kalapuya. Salem's commercial downtown – located immediately north of the Salem Civic Center – was known as *Chimikiti*. Often written as Chemeketa today, this translates to "gathering place."[55] Historic documentation and the archaeological record indicate that the current location of Salem was a winter village for the Santiam bands since time immemorial.[56] The location of the Salem Civic Center Historic District was largely Oregon Oak prairie with intermittent springs.

The non-Native history of Salem does not extend nearly as far back as Tribal use of the region, and instead begins in the 1830s when a group of Methodist missionaries led by Jason Lee settled ten miles north of present-day Salem. In July 1840, Lee and his missionaries started the construction of a lumber and flour mill at High Street and Mill Creek near present-day downtown Salem.[57] This location was selected as Mill Creek offered more ideal water flows for power generation than the Willamette River. Lee's mill dissolved in 1844, and Salem was surveyed in 1846. Salem was designated the Marion County seat in 1849 and that same year the first post office opened.[58] In 1851, Salem was named the capital for the Oregon Territory after the original territorial government had convened in Oregon City in 1849. Oregon received statehood on February 14, 1859 and while it has seen multiple capitol buildings, Salem has been the capital city since.[59]

With the discovery of gold in California and southern Oregon in the 1850s, Salem become more prosperous and well established with hotels, newspapers, and stage lines in the downtown. Growth continued during the 1870s and 1880s evidenced by a bustling commercial downtown built of brick instead of wood. In the early 1900s, transportation infrastructure continued to grow in Salem, with a robust streetcar system, paved roads, and the first automobiles. The Southern Pacific Railroad and the Willamette River also helped to sustain local businesses.[60]

Population growth in Salem took a dip during the Great Depression, but the Works Progress Administration completed a number of public infrastructure projects in the city, including highway underpasses and new buildings around the Capitol Mall, including the State of Oregon Library building and landscaping. This work also included construction of a new capitol building in 1938 as the prior one burned in 1935. In 1940, Salem celebrated the centennial of Jason Lee constructing his mill and the population was just under 31,000. Following World War II, during which the city saw relatively few new infrastructure projects, the city began to geographically expand with post-war housing subdivisions around the city. By 1950 the city had approximately

[55] Chemeketa Community College, "Learn About Chemeketa," https://www.chemeketa.edu/about/ (accessed February 20, 2022).
[56] John O. Pouley, *Archaeological Investigations at the Dittman Biface Cache (35MA375), Marion County, Oregon* (Oregon State Historic Preservation Office, 2019), 59-61.
[57] National Register of Historic Places and National Historic Landmark Records, "Salem Downtown State Street – Commercial Street Historic District," National Park Service, https://npgallery.nps.gov/NRHP/AssetDetail/61610998-ad2e-4223-a6d0-4048ec50c253 (accessed January 30, 2022).
[58] Lewis A. McArthur, *Oregon Geographic Names* (Portland, OR: Oregon Historical Society Press, 1982) 645-6. The Salem Civic Center is located south of the original city plats.
[59] Except 1855 when the capitol was moved to Corvallis for the year (McArthur, *Oregon Geographic Names,* 646).
[60] For a more detailed history of Salem between 1870 and 1950, please see the National Register of Historic Places nomination for the Salem Downtown State Street – Commercial Street Historic District. It has been crudely summarized here for the sake of brevity.

43,000 residents and the focus of infrastructure was shifting towards the automobile with the construction of downtown parking garages and wider bridges spanning the Willamette River (e.g., the Marion Street Bridge, 1952). Salem also made additional improvements including an upgraded water supply system in 1952, demolishing and rebuilding public school buildings, and welcoming new businesses to the downtown. In 1952, the 1873 Marion County Courthouse was demolished for the construction of a more modern building. Twenty years later, Salem's City Hall would see a similar fate. Salem's population continued to boom into the 1960s. Interstate 5 between Portland and Eugene was completed and development near this corridor increased, pushing Salem to the east. In 1961, the Salem Urban Renewal Agency was formed and with it came great changes to the community – both beautification efforts and the demolition of historic resources.[61] It was also during the 1960s, after years of trying, that Salem's government was finally ready to physically move out of the past and into a new complex that would serve Salem for the future.[62]

Salem's City Government:

Today, Salem has a population of over 175,000 and the largest employers in the city are primarily public entities – state government, Salem-Keizer School District, and Marion County.[63] While Salem's history, development, and growth has always been aided by county and state government being located within the city, Salem's own city government developed somewhat later and was not established until February 18, 1857 when, in the council room at the Marion County Courthouse, Wiley Kenyon was declared the first mayor and four aldermen were selected. Their first order of business was to establish a committee to "draft rules for the government of the common council."[64] Streets and sidewalks were the next thing the council tackled, though efforts to prohibit gaming and stop swine from running freely came shortly after. In 1865, the City Council appropriated funds to purchase land for the fire department and in 1866 four special policemen were hired to address a "crime wave of sorts." In 1870, the City Council was meeting in the Patton Building (on State Street between Commercial and Liberty Streets, demolished in 1965) and it would not be until 1893 that the city would pursue funding for the construction of a dedicated city hall with space for the fire and police departments.

Located at the corner of High and Chemeketa Streets, designed by Walter D. Pugh, and built by Southwick and Hutchins, Salem's first city hall cost $80,000 and was 20,000 square feet (Figure 5). While construction started in 1893, the building was not completed until 1897 due to funding struggles and disagreements over who was responsible for what (including gratings and areaway walls for the basement).[65] In the 1890s, Salem had a population of around 6,000, but by 1960 the population of Salem was just shy of 50,000 – 44,000 more people in need of city services than the 1897 City Hall was designed to accommodate. In addition to struggling with building capacity, Salem's government structure itself underwent an overhaul in the late 1940s in an effort to become more efficient. In 1939, Salem's government was called a "three-ring circus" as it had one mayor and 14 city councilmembers. Each served for no pay and was responsible for the management of city departments.[66] In May 1946, Salem voters agreed to restructure city government to have one mayor, seven councilmembers, and a city manager responsible for the day-to-day operations of city departments – a council-manager form of government.[67] This was implemented in January 1947 and J.L. Franzen, Salem's first city manager, said that the objective of this type of government was to "work out ways to serve better [with] utmost efficiency in administration."[68] However, this new type of government continued to serve in out of date and inadequate buildings.

---

[61] Portland Development Commission, *Urban Renewal in Oregon: History, Case Studies, Policy Issues, and Latest Developments* (2002), 6.
[62] The timeline of events in the above paragraph, unless otherwise noted, was gleaned from the impressive work of the Salem Heritage Network, available at https://shineonsalem.org/ (accessed February 20, 2022).
[63] City of Salem, "Economic Data," https://www.cityofsalem.net/Pages/economic-data.aspx (accessed January 30, 2022).
[64] "First Settlers Erect Framework of City Government," *The Capital Journal*, July 2, 1938.
[65] "The City Council," *The Statesman Journal*, November 25, 1896.
[66] "Salem's Government Called 3-Ring Circus," *The Capital Journal*, November 14, 1939.
[67] In 1949, when West Salem was annexed, an eighth member was added to the Council.
[68] "New City Manager Assures City Department Heads of Support," *The Statesman Journal*, January 3, 1947.

By the 1960s, Salem city services were scattered in six different locations around the community. The City Engineer had offices in West Salem, the City Planning Director was located in the County Courthouse building, and the Parks Department was two miles south of City Hall.[69] The City Hall building was also deemed too difficult to heat and cool with inadequate restrooms and limited parking. Designed during a time of horse drawn fire engines, the building was not easily adapted to accommodate changes in fire technology, mainly automotive fire engines, and the existing space lacked appropriate living quarters for the firefighters – the area for hay storage had been converted into a kitchen. The Salem Police Department was located on the first floor of City Hall, but the conditions were dreary and basement like, making it difficult to retain officers (Figure 6). Further, the system of transferring prisoners from the basement jail to the courtroom left much to be desired with regard to security.[70]

By the 1960s there were similar outdated and inadequate buildings for the Public Library. In 1904, the Salem's Woman's Club hosted a "book social" and received fifty donated books, with more and more coming each day, and with this Salem's Public Library was born. Eventually the Salem's Woman's Club received permission from the Mayor and City Council to use "the east end of the council chambers" as a makeshift library.[71] Local carpenters volunteered to build shelves and the Club continued constant fundraising efforts, with little financial support from the city. In 1912, after the Salem's Woman's Club passed control of the library to the city, funding from Andrew Carnegie allowed for the construction of a 9,600 square foot Public Library building. But by 1968, there was no more shelf space, no off-street public parking, and no administrative spaces. It was clear that Salem's city services were designed for a Salem that no longer existed – a smaller population that relied on different transportation methods and had different needs. As Salemites planned for their future, they had to address their civic needs, and needed a physical manifestation that represented these goals and ideals.

Getting to the Salem Civic Center:
The first documented calls for a dedicated Civic Center space to replace the 1897 City Hall occurred in 1947 when the Salem Chamber of Commerce published the "Long-Range Plan for Salem, Oregon, First Annual Progress Report." This report called on Salem "as the capital city, [to] lead the way in civic center development" and act quickly.[72] Act quickly they did not and the initial discussion of a civic center sat idle until 1958 when the Chamber of Commerce completed a second study that looked at "future urban growth throughout the region."[73] The Committee on Building Needs – a subcommittee of the overall Citizens' Conference for Governmental Cooperation – concluded that "government offices should be centralized to give the best service to the public and permit best coordination, administration, and control."[74] The recommendation was specifically for Salem to plan for a "city-county annex adjacent to the Marion County Courthouse…[where] city departments could be located in close proximity to related county activities in the same building."[75] At this point, both the Salem City Council and Marion County Board of Commissioners requested that James L. Payne, a local Salem architect, start to plan the specifics of this shared space. Payne submitted his final recommendations in 1963, which included a "city-county office building, library building, central fire station, and prison camp" all located near the existing County Courthouse at High and Court Streets (built in 1954 and designed by Pietro Belluschi).[76] The $3.3 million bond measure that would have allowed for the construction of this shared facility was rejected by voters in May 1964.

[69] Vern Miller, Salem, OR, 1968.
[70] "Report on Proposed Salem Civic Center Including Bond Issues and Preference Ballot on Building Site, September 30, 1968," Salem City Club Bulletin, vol. 1 No. 16 (September 23, 1968), 72.
[71] "In Society," *The Capital Journal*, November 16, 1912.
[72] "Report on Proposed Salem Civic Center Including Bond Issues and Preference Ballot on Building Site," 72. The long-range plan was written as a type of "post-war program" for Salem. Other ideas included city expansion, transportation planning, and the construction of a sports arena ("Salem's Long Range Plan, *Eugene Register-Guard,* January 20, 1947).
[73] "Report on Proposed Salem Civic Center Including Bond Issues and Preference Ballot on Building Site," 72.
[74] Robert E. Gangware, "Need Seen for Combined City-County Office Structure in Downtown Salem," *The Statesman Journal*, May 9, 1959.
[75] "Report on Proposed Salem Civic Center Including Bond Issues and Preference Ballot on Building Site," 73.
[76] "Report on Proposed Salem Civic Center Including Bond Issues and Preference Ballot on Building Site," 73.

Even after facing recent defeat, considerations about a new civic center just for Salem continued. In 1965, Mayor Willard Marshall launched a series of ten studies looking towards Salem in the year 2000. Referred to as the Community Goals Studies, topics considered ranged "from what to do about the 1893-vintage City Hall to what to do to help the elderly combat boredom."[77] Salemites formed these groups and ultimately made recommendations and guidelines to the City for "genuine needs, and a long-range program" for how to accomplish this.[78] The entire process took 14-months and involved over 130 community members.[79] Referred to as the "Package For Progress," this ambitious plan "would see almost every city service, including parks, streets, police, fire, administration, legal, judiciary, traffic signalization and other public works, show dynamic improvements."[80] However, it was ultimately up to the voters to pass the bonds needed to fund these projects, something that was often easier said than done, especially in the case of the Salem Civic Center.

The Civic Center Committee was one part of the Community Goals Studies and tackled "the immediate needs of a better governmental headquarters… to the influence on civic center planning expected from future new Willamette bridges, downtown freeways and new relationships between city and county government."[81] Chaired by William L. Mainwaring, the Civic Center Committee encouraged the community to share "what they think a civic center ought to include in Salem's future."[82] Early meetings of the Civic Center Committee considered multiple sites – including one north of downtown near Union Street and one extending from High Street west to the Willamette River – many of which were deemed costs prohibitive due to the required land acquisition. Another early site was "just south of the Marion Motor Hotel," a four-block area already partially owned by the city "bounded by Leslie and Trade streets on the north and south, and by Liberty and Commercial streets on the east and west."[83] This site would later be known as the Hillside Site. While slightly farther from the County Courthouse than other options, Payne believed the "site would adapt well to civic center development" and had "good possibilities."[84] Certain members of the Civic Center Committee, specifically Sol Schlesinger, were concerned that voters would be unwilling to adopt a bond that could cover the cost of "extensive mall development on expensive downtown property."[85] Members of the Civic Center Committee also decided they would rather see the new facility located outside of the commercial downtown core.[86] As early as July 1965, the Civic Center Committee voted – seven of the eleven members in favor – to support the present-day, south Salem location citing "proximity to the downtown core, relatively low land costs, good traffic arterials adjacent and adaptability of the site to a grouping of public buildings" as key reasons.[87] The City already owned the block immediately south of Trade Street. Original plans called for the city to acquire property all the way to Mission Street (which is one block south of the current Civic Center boundary).

The Community Goals Library Subcommittee voted in July 1965 that the central branch of the Public Library should be included with the civic center, as long as the civic center plans fulfilled the Committees report – which included that the building "be no less than one standard city block in size," have abundant off-street

[77] "Study Starts of Community Goals Search," *The Statesman Journal,* February 11, 1955; "Salem Civic Center From County Courthouse to River Envisioned," *The Statesman Journal*, February 25, 1965.
[78] William Bebout, "Ayres Cuts City Project Goals to $10.2 Million," *The Capital Journal*, March 22, 1965.
[79] Allen J. Morrison, "City's Growth is Guide To Goals Program Cost," *The Statesman Journal,* March 13, 1966.
[80] Ibid.
[81] Ibid.
[82] Ibid. William Mainwaring was the Publisher and Editor of *The Capital Journal* during his time as Chair of the Civic Center Committee.
[83] William Bebout, "Grandiose City Mall Plans Discouraged," *The Capital Journal*, February 15, 1965.
[84] Ibid.
[85] Ibid. Sol Schlesinger was a local business owner (he operated two ladies shoe stores in downtown Salem) and was president of the Liberty Investment Co. (a property development association) at the time of his death. His 1970 obituary noted that "he had been active in development of the downtown Salem core area." ("Schlesinger Rites Pending, *The Statesman Journal*, November 4, 1970). This included being an opponent of downtown off-street parking requirements. Because everything in Salem always comes back to parking.
[86] Allen J. Morrison, "Minimum Security Jails Suggested for Alcoholics," *The Statesman Journal*, April 18, 1965.
[87] "South Fringe Favored as Civic Center Site," *The Statesman Journal*, July 22, 1965.

parking and would give the library building priority during construction.[88] The Library Subcommittee also wanted the building to be located on top of a hill for the most prominent views and placement.

Even though early plans for the complex only called for the city hall, library, fire, and police facilities, other organizations hoped they could be included in Civic Center design. The Salem Art Association requested the Civic Center Committee include a new art museum.[89] Another early topic that the Civic Center Committee faced (and a holdover from earlier conversations in 1963) was whether or not to build a "jail farm" or "prison camp" – an agricultural farm where prisoners would work, similar to those run by the State at the time.[90] It was determined the City did not have prisoners serving long enough sentences to make a farm viable, and instead, a new jail would "be constructed in conjunction with a new city hall in a civic center."[91] Early plans also took into consideration more than just the services that would be offered and factored in the "attractive setting" that could result from damming Shelton Ditch and creating a lake.[92]

In September 1965, the Civic Center Committee made their final recommendation – "locating buildings in the center, plus landscaping and parking, in four blocks extending south from downtown Trade Street – an area bounded by Trade, Commercial, Leslie, and Liberty Streets."[93] The earlier two-block plan was reconsidered based on the plans for the library building, parking demands, landscaping, office space, and future growth potential. The sole dissenter to the larger plan was Sol Schlesinger, who had been a voice for fiscal conservatism from the beginning of the Civic Center Committee meetings. The two-block building would cost an estimated $4.5 million and with the $800,000 needed for additional land acquisition, the four-block Civic Center project would total $5.3 million.[94]

The Civic Center Committee believed they had completed sound community planning work throughout 1964 and 1965 on behalf of Salemites which demonstrated the proposed Civic Center complex would address the needs identified by the community and the City was ready to ask for funding again. In May 1966, Salem voters were asked to fund the construction of the Civic Center Committee recommendation for the new Salem Civic Center complex. Measure 52 "would provide $4,800,000 in bonds to build not only a new city hall, but a much-needed new library and a central city fire station as well."[95] Those in favor of the new Civic Center argued that the existing City Hall did not offer adequate space for city services considering the building was constructed when the population of Salem was far less (Figure 18). Those who were opposed to Measure 52 had "concern about the lack of a final design for the building, the cost of the project, or the location."[96] One Salem resident said they would be voting no given the "low sprawling design" and "wasted areas between the building and around the various building wings," instead wanting a tall, multi-story city hall.[97] Another criticizer of the plan said "city fathers should come down to earth, give up the extravagance of hanging gardens and the Taj Mahal and erect a reasonably priced, adequate and beautiful city hall that can be financed and paid for."[98]

---

[88] "Center Library Aims Pushed," *The Statesman Journal*, July 28, 1965.
[89] "Art Association Requests Museum for Civic Center," *The Capital Journal*, March 13, 1965.
[90] Many city officials pushed for the "prison work camp" or "jail farm" concept given the poor conditions of the City's current jail in the old City Hall building ("Unquestioning Fact Finders," *The Capital Journal,* June 22, 1963). The "jail farm" was also intended to serve a rehabilitation program for alcoholics. Beyond concerns that the City did not have enough prisoners to make the facility viable, the plans seemed to be incomplete and experts were not being consulted about requirements and how to ensure rehabilitation would successful. Further many judges were not supportive of the plan and believed they would be asked to pass out longer sentences, especially to those individuals arrested for being drunk in public, to keep the jail farm operational (Chuck Grell and Scott McArthur, "Officials Skeptical About Jail Farm Plan," *The Capital Journal,* February 12, 1963).
[91] William Bebout, "City-Owned Jail Farm Faces Committee Veto," *The Capital Journal*, June 10, 1965. Voters rejected the combined City-County facility in 1963.
[92] "South Fringe Favored as Civic Center Site," *The Statesman Journal*, July 22, 1965.
[93] "Civic Center Plan Upped to 4 Blocks," *The Statesman Journal*, September 2, 1965.
[94] Ibid.
[95] "For a Civic Center," *Statesman Journal,* May 18, 1966.
[96] William Bebout, "City Council Races Lure 14 Candidates," *The Capital Journal,* May 11, 1966.
[97] M.W. Palmer, "Urges Tall City Hall," *The Statesman Journal*, May 19, 1966.
[98] C.M. Hecht, "Why a Salem Taj Mahal? He's Irked by Repeated Votes," *The Statesman Journal*, May 27, 1966.

Other residents were unsatisfied that tentative plans for the Civic Center stating, "before I give $5.00 to a clerk I want to know what I'm getting for my money – not what it might buy."[99] Ultimately, 7,715 voters were in favor while 8,653 voted no. Measure 52 failed and the new civic center remained unfunded.[100]

While much of the criticism about the Civic Center revolved around the design, it should be noted the City of Salem did not sponsor a contest for this design. While most Salem architects were in favor of the idea and were calling for an open competition since 1964, the City had entered into a "city-county agreement" with Payne in 1960. While some did not feel that represented a "written contract" and was for another project, Payne threatened legal action if the City opened the design up to competition or pursued another architect.[101] After many opinions from the city lawyer, in late January 1966, the City Council approved a new, written contract with Payne and Settecase for the design of the Civic Center.[102] Now to find the funding.

Fourth time at the polls was the charm for the Salem Civic Center project. Planning efforts for a new civic center continued even after the failed bond measure, as the condition of City Hall was not improving and the population of Salem was not shrinking. In 1968, twenty-six Salemites – representing various neighborhoods, ages, and occupations – were appointed to the Civic Building Committee, which was chaired by J. Wesley Sullivan.[103] The first meeting was held in June and by late July, the Committee made two recommendations to the City Council. The first was to ask voters to pass a $6 million bond measure for the construction of the Civic Center, including the "new municipal administration building, a central public library, police and municipal court facilities, and a central fire station."[104] The second issues was determining where the Civic Center should be located.

It was clear to the Committee that in order for the community to truly support the construction of the new civic center, they needed to have a direct say in the community planning decision making process and help determine the final location. Therefore, the Civic Center Building Committee asked Salem voters to select the site. The two options were the Hillside Site south of downtown (the present-day location of the Civic Center) and the Mill Creek Site north of downtown "bounded by D, Union, Winter, and High streets."[105] There were concerns that the Hillside site was too close to the railroad and that the Boise Cascade papermill adjacent to the site and near the Willamette River released an unpleasant chlorine odor. However, the site would be cheaper – not only did the city already own part of the property but they would be able to utilize some federal funds given the incorporation of public parks into space – and had better parking options. There were also plans for the Hillside Site which allowed for a better understanding of costs. The Mill Creek Site was located immediately adjacent to the Capitol Mall and away from railroad tracks. However, because there were no plans available, costs and other factors, like the design, were unknown. With a new measure in front of them, many Salemites united to get out the vote for the Civic Center.

Salem's community planning efforts were about to pay off. In 1968, when the country was divided over the Vietnam War, the community rallied together behind the idea of building a new Salem Civic Center. Public outreach and education encouraging a yes vote fell largely on the backs of women – women who were identified in newspapers most often by their husbands' names.[106] Over 500 women volunteered to host block

---

[99] Nancy W. Stevens, "Wants Final Plan," *The Statesman Journal*, May 23, 1966.
[100] This special election was the first time automatic voting machines were used in parts of Marion County. The new technology meant returns were slow to come in ("Center Plan Votes Close, *The Oregonian*, May 25, 1966). It is also worth noting that Salemites were asked to vote for other parts of the Community Goal Studies recommendations in this same election, mainly funds to acquire park space near the Willamette River and purchasing a city bus line. They only voted in favor of purchasing the bus system.
[101] "Payne Threatens Suit Over Contract Dispute," *The Statesman Journal,* January 21, 1966.
[102] "Payne & Settecase Contract on Civic Center Authorized," *The Statesman Journal,* January 25, 1966.
[103] Sullivan was the editor of *The Statesman Journal* during his time as committee chair.
[104] "Report on Proposed Salem Civic Center Including Bond Issues and Preference Ballot on Building Site," 73.
[105] Paul W. Harvey, Jr., "Salem Voters To Decided Fourth Time On Replacement Of Aging City Hall," *The Oregonian*, September 30, 1968.
[106] The irony should not be lost that the theme of the Civic Center campaign was NOW. Not to be mistaken with the

parties, block coffees, distribute brochures, make and deliver buttons, and share "flipbooks" with an audio recording featuring the plans with the community (Figure 19). There were phone lines citizens could call with questions and volunteers made their headquarters at the Chamber of Commerce office. The Civic Center Building Committee and Willamette University sponsored a "walk-a-thon" event around Salem to show the importance of grouping city services in one place. Many fraternity pledges and brothers participated for the first prize kiss from the reigning Miss Salem.[107]

The measure received endorsements by a variety of groups and relied on television coverage as well as banners hung at the two sites. These many dedicated volunteers took the information to the voters instead of relying on voters to find it. All of these efforts were successful and after twenty years of talking about it, Salem was finally poised to get a new Civic Center. The measure for funding the Civic Center passed 8,931 to 3,696. The Mill Creek Site received 5,111 votes and the Hillside Site received 6,644 votes.[108] Voters went to the polls on September 30, 1968 and at 10am on October 1, 1968, the Salem City Council held a special session to start the bond selling process.

Now that money was available, land acquisition could begin.[109] Purchasing all the land needed for the 12.85-acre site cost $2,037,000, quite the sum considering some land was already owned by the City.[110] Once property was cleared, groundbreaking ceremonies were held on May 20, 1970. During the ceremonies, Mayor Vern Miller said the Civic Center would be "a symbol of service, unity and progress."[111] Hoffman Construction won the bid to construct the project and set immediately to work, even managing to be ahead of schedule for an early period.[112] However, the $6 million bond proved to be insufficient in the face of rising material and labor costs. In early June 1970, just a few days after the groundbreaking ceremonies, Salemites were asked to approve a second bond measure for an additional $2.2 million. The additional funds would allow for the construction of the Fire Station, landscaping, electrical elevators, interior carpets and drapes, and furniture.[113] With only 15% voter turnout, the measure barely passed (2,679 in favor and 2,510 against).[114] The passing of this bond was an especially good thing as pride in the new Civic Center was already high and the City of Salem official letterhead featured the final design – including the fire station – as early as 1970 (Figure 21).

With funding secured construction on all elements of the complex continued. The Central Fire Station #1 was the first building completed in May 1971. In June 1972 the Public Library and City Hall began to move into their new homes. The landscaping of the complex was designed "for public enjoyment" and relaxation and included ramps to connect the space for maximum accessibility.[115] Embellishing the Civic Center was also a community driven effort. Many items were donated by the community, including the City Council Chambers wood and bronze entrance doors (Figure 22), carved wood doors for the mayor's conference room (Image 38), sculptures throughout the property (Image 40), benches, furniture, flag poles, and more. Dedication for the Salem Civic

---

National Organization of Women who, at the same time, was fighting for equal rights of women across the country. I remind you that the majority of women carrying the Salem Civic Center bond to victory were often identified by their husband's names with a Mrs. in the front.

[107] Allen J. Morrison, "Fast-Walking Phi Delt Wins Smooches," *The Statesman Journal*, September 26, 1968.

[108] Allen J. Morrison, "Project Passes 2-1 Vote," *The Statesman Journal*, October 1, 1968.

[109] Salem had to acquire 35 tax lots and there were approximately thirty buildings and ten detached garages at the Salem Civic Center site that had to be demolished and removed from the property. One of these properties was the Scottish Rite Temple.

[110] City of Salem Dedication Committee.

[111] "Civic Center Work Begins," *The Capital Journal*, May 20, 1978.

[112] Ron Blankenbaker, "Civic Center Is Ahead of Schedule," *The Statesman Journal*, June 21, 1970. One of the other bidders brought a lawsuit against the City for their award to Hoffman claiming Hoffman had not provided a sufficient bid bond per the contract requirements. The case was thrown out (Rob Blankenbaker, "Court Dismisses Suit, Clears Way for Civic Center," *The Statesman Journal*, May 13, 1970).

[113] Ron Blankenbaker, "City Structure Cost That Soars Above Estimate Is Not New to Salem," *The Statesman Journal*, June 2, 1970.

[114] Mitchell Hider, "Now – A Center by Early '72," *The Capital Journal*, May 3, 1970.

[115] City of Salem Dedication Committee.

Center was a weeklong affair in August 1972 with live music, art shows, food, parades, speeches, tours, and unveiling the City's new flag.[116] Honored guests included Governor Tom McCall (on horseback), Senator Mark Hatfield, and actor James Drury (whose mother happened to live in Salem) dressed in his *The Virginian* western attire. The only major hiccup was that a helicopter carrying a time capsule was unable to land on the City Hall roof due to gravel. But the time capsule arrived by foot thanks to the National Guard and Salem officially had a new civic center representative of what Salem wanted to be.[117]

The above history captures over two decades of community-based planning efforts led by private groups and Salem government regarding the need for a new Civic Center. This history is represented in the final design and use of the current Civic Center. The Salem Civic Center is historically significant in the context of community planning and development as a lasting reminder on the landscape of how, finally in the late 1960s, the city prepared to step into the future. Years of planning led to the creation of the Civic Center and it represents the goals, ethics, and ideals of Salem during the period of significance. Oregon's capital city had grown drastically following World War II, yet civic spaces had not been able to keep up with demand. Government, library, police, and fire services were all located in inadequate spaces. The new Civic Center took into consideration changing technologies – from everything from police communications to the preferences of employees regarding workspaces – and also the changing needs of Salemites and desire to participate in government. The Salem Civic Center is directly related to and the best example of how Salem chose to move forward. How a community came together to define its future and its priorities – public services in a well-designed and open public place designed to specifically address the needs of Salemites.

Salem Civic Center Design:

A Brutalist "building is allowed to be 'what it wants to be' – a structural, spatial, organizational and material concept that is 'necessary' for the particular type of building."[118] Ada Louise Huxtable captured this purpose when describing Boston City Hall (completed in 1969 and designed by Kallmann, McKinnell, and Knowles), another Brutalist civic space, writing the "space is molded to function, form, and expressive purpose."[119] Combine this style with the need for community engagement and accessibility and that is the foundation of the Salem Civic Center. Whether or not the architects of Salem's Civic Center would self-describe themselves as Brutalist is unknown, but the foundational tenets of the style are well represented in the Salem Civic Center design and how it was adopted by the community in the late 1960s.[120]

Ultimately architects James L. Payne and Phillip Settecase decided on a Civic Center design that was open, blocky, concrete, and all about the function and needs of the community. James Payne moved to Salem in 1945 after serving the Engineers Division of the United States Navy (Seabees). He opened his architecture firm in 1948. Phillip Settecase moved to Salem in 1956 and began working with James Payne in 1962, becoming a partner in 1964. Payne, and later with Settecase as the firm grew, designed a number of buildings in Salem during his tenure, but the one most relevant to the Salem Civic Center in the State Agriculture Building located at 635 Capitol Street NE. Completed in 1966, this property is very similar to the Salem Civic Center with regard to design, materials, and purpose. When speaking of this property, Payne noted the fundamentals of civic spaces. *The Statesman Journal* reported "Architect James Payne pointed out that the [Agricultural] building will be functional rather than 'monumental' like the show piece buildings designed for the

[116] Arvid Orbeck, a graphic designer from Portland, won the competition to design Salem's new flag ("Salem Flag Plan Given to Council," *The Statesman Journal*, May 9, 1972). At the time of writing this nomination Salem's flag is known for being quite ugly and there is a competition to replace it. Regardless of your opinions on Brutalist architecture, I think we can all agree the Salem Civic Center has aged far better than the flag.
[117] "Ron Blankenbaker, "Sun, City Smile as Salem Welcomes New Civic Center," *The Statesman Journal*, August 19, 1972.
[118] D. Theron, "The New Brutalists," *Theoria: A Journal of Social and Political Theory,* 24 (June 1965), 51.
[119] Ada Louise Huxtable, *On Architecture: Collected Reflections on a Century of Change* (New York: Walker Publishing Company, 2008), 50.
[120] In fact, the original design of the Civic Center proposed with the failed 1966 bond measure was a brick building with cooper roof, which was later replaced with concrete for the final design as the function was better determined. Brutalists would have encouraged this as the ethic of the building should rule over the appearance.

mall area next to the Capitol."[121] Payne also designed many of Salem's public schools. During a time when "team teaching" was considered the hot new pedagogy, Payne worked closely with the Salem School District to study the architectural requirements to make team teaching successful. While studying space needs, he concluded "the need now in school design is for flexibility so that buildings can be used for both team teaching and conventional classroom arrangement, by moving partitions."[122] While the Salem Civic Center was not an educational space, Payne had to apply the same tenets. Creating a space that had the necessary design elements to meet the publics needs in a civic center.

In 1968 Vern Miller and members of the Salem Civic Study Committee took advantage of the media to encourage a yes vote on the bond measure. In addition to noting the inadequacies of the current city hall and the mere $0.60 a month the bond measure would add to the average Salem household, the lobbying highlighted the architectural and planning elements of the building. A 1968 radio broadcast described the building using the following phrases: "not a monument but a functional efficient center for you and your government;" "use of native Oregon materials, stone and brick, will enhance the simple beauty of the Civic Center Design;" "designed to serve you, your children, and your children's children;" "designed to meet the needs of government;" and "a truly beautiful and functional civic center."[123] These phrases speak to the, as Huxtable described, "function, form, and expressive purpose" of the Civic Center.[124] The style leads to the function and is grounded in the community needs for an accessible government to create an engaged public.

The Statesman Journal published a one-page spread with frequently asked questions about the Salem Civic Center as another effort to get Salemites to adopt the bond measure in 1968. Some of those questions were specifically about the architecture and how this allowed for public participation in government. Speaking to the sprawling nature of the buildings on the four-block site, some asked "Why don't we just build a multi-storied building on one square block to house the city administrative offices?" The answer:

> "There are four very distinct functions severed by these buildings – library, police station, central fire station, and city administrative offices. The library should be at ground level to invite and make public usage convenient. This would not be possible on a one-block site. Police should have ready access to their emergency vehicles and have a jail separated from public view; again, not possible on a one-block site in a multi-storied building. The central fire station personnel have to sleep near the emergency equipment or immediately above it. In summary, too many functions need to be at ground level for effective community service for a one-block site to serve. Also, approximately 335 parking spaces are required for the above uses: spaces which can only be provided by multi-level underground or elevated parking on a one-block site. The committee also feels that some area for landscaping treatment was desired around these buildings, particularly the library."[125]

This concern for space, interaction, and movement is exactly what the Smithson's encouraged with "town building" and what the public demanded. Another frequently asked question was the impression the Civic Center site would have on the public:

> "Bounded by major highway routes, the buildings will be visible to tourists and others passing through the city, helping to show the pride that Salem people have in their city. The site itself offers a sweeping view of the heart of the city core area. This has been described as a Parthenon effect by San Francisco architect George Rockrise who helped prepare the plans. The city hall and library will not only have a commanding view of the city but can be seen from many parts of the downtown area, thus providing a visual symbol of city government to people visiting the city core."[126]

---

[121] Don Scarborough, "Need for Agriculture Building Told Solons," *The Statesman Journal*, April 9, 1963.
[122] Alfred C. Jones, "New School Designs Need Seen," *The Capital Journal*, November 23, 1962.
[123] Vern Miller, Salem, OR, 1968. Stone was removed from the final design.
[124] Huxtable, 50.
[125] "Most-Asked Questions and Answers on Civic Center Compiled," *The Statesman Journal*, September 17, 1968.
[126] Ibid.

The purpose of acquiring four blocks for buildings that could reasonably sit on only two blocks was "to create a green mall-like setting around the buildings."[127] This created a publicly accessible and welcoming space for those wanting to engage with a government meant to serve their needs.

The 1968 Civic Center design was described as "basically vertically reinforced concrete piers supporting a flat roof with horizontal exterior cedar beams at floor and roof levels. The areas formed by the vertical piers and horizontal beams are filled with glass. The Library and Municipal Administrative grouping [are] connected by covered walks. Walking areas are of concrete and brick."[128] The completed Salem Civic Center was featured alongside the First National Center in Portland, Oregon in a 1973 edition of *Tone* magazine, a publication dedicated to ceiling system interior designs sponsored by Armstrong Ceiling Systems. The magazine described the Salem Civic Center as:

> "poured-concrete buildings… [that] have a massive, contemporary look but have been designed with an airiness that orients beautifully with the open spaces of the twelve-acre park-like setting. The ten-million-dollar complex comprises a city hall, public library, and fire hall… A reflecting pond, five fountains, and extensive plantings are in the landscape plans. The entire area is designed as a refreshing space for public enjoyment, and all buildings and open areas are connected by ramps for wheelchairs. The center is the largest project ever undertaken by the City of Salem and, in the eyes of the administration, employees, and citizens of the capital city of Oregon, is a great success."[129]

Regarding the architecture, some city leaders believed that the high style gothic city hall from 1897 was an "eyesore" compared to the modern capital building and county courthouse.[130] Landscaping was a driver for the large site from the early development. Payne noted that the site could be only two-blocks and accommodate all the buildings, but "three blocks might be better, primarily because the additional space would permit a more extensive landscaping plan."[131]

As noted above there was considerable discussion (and dissent) about the four-block site and many believed that building taller on less land could provide cost savings. Mayor Miller responded to one Salemite who raised these concerns in January 1968 (before Salem even knew it would be getting a facility). He noted the design was based on "the analysis done of the traveling habits of Salemites, which determine[d] that ground level access is imperative… [and] high rise buildings are not practical for the type of functions to be located in these new civic buildings."[132] At the same time the City was aware that it would continue to grow and planned to build up on the City Hall building if there was a future need to expand city services. Studies and community engagement were driving the design.

The Salem Civic Center site allowed for "bolder and stronger architectural treatment" and relied heavily on real materials.[133] Even though there was a clear intent of getting Salem to vote for the project, the emphasis that was placed on the Civic Center representing the "appearance and the spirit of Salem" also speaks to ethic of Brutalism, which was beyond just the aesthetics.[134] When the City first set to work on designing the Civic Center, priorities included "accessibility to topography, architectural possibilities, cost, relationship to central business district."[135] The bold architectural style came from the materials, the layout of the site (which was also practical considering the parking area was designed to limit the amount of excavation needed and save money), and the demands of the community. The layout of the buildings in relationship to each other, the

[127] Ibid.
[128] "Report on Proposed Salem Civic Center Including Bond Issues and Preference Ballot on Building Site," 74.
[129] *Tone Magazine*, 1973 (21) 3, 13.
[130] Paul W. Harvey, Jr., "Salem Voters To Decided Fourth Time On Replacement Of Aging City Hall," *The Oregonian*, September 30, 1968.
[131] William Bebout, "Full City Block Asked for Salem Library," *The Capital Journal*, August 5, 1965.
[132] Vern Miller to M.L. Cohn, January 30, 1968, Civic Center Files, City of Salem.
[133] "Report on Proposed Salem Civic Center Including Bond Issues and Preference Ballot on Building Site," 79.
[134] Ibid., 73.
[135] "Most-Asked Questions and Answers on Civic Center Compiled," *The Statesman Journal*, September 17, 1968.

overall setting, the emphasis on function and raw materials, and the emphasis in the written record and on-going use highlight that it was "a project for the people."[136] The Salem Civic Center was not designed for faceless bureaucracy. It was designed for Salem's government and Salem's residents.

Comparative Discussion:

National Register Bulletin 15 notes that comparative examples are not required if the property "is the sole example of a property type that is important in illustrating the historic context or it clearly possess[es] the defined characteristics required to strongly represent the context."[137] In the case of the Salem Civic Center, both are true. While Salem is home to multiple public buildings as the capital city of Oregon, there is only one Civic Center that illustrates the context of local government community planning and development. Therefore, no comparative properties exist at the local level of significance under Criterion A. As noted above, many cities in Oregon and the United States constructed new city halls and civic center during the 1960s and 1970s, but there is only one Salem, Oregon.[138] Further, the Salem Civic Center maintains all of the necessary characteristics to convey the Brutalist context under Criterion C. Most state buildings built during the 1960s and 1970s, like the State Agricultural Building, were only one building and did not include the larger landscaping element that is essential for the significance of the Salem Civic Center. The Capitol Mall and other state buildings also pre- or post-date the period of significance and are not Brutalist in nature. While Payne and Settecase completed a number of projects at Willamette University in Salem, these were individual buildings and not redefining the entire campus plan. Finally, people may want to compare the Salem Civic Center to Salem's urban renewal projects built around the same time (and right across the street). Yet, this would also be a faulty comparison. While the Salem Civic Center capitalized on its location adjacent to a designated urban renewal zone (that was completed in 1974) and utilized some limited federal funds for land acquisition associated with park space, it was not an urban renewal project and is not representative of that historic context. There is no other property like the Salem Civic Center at the local level. The city built one Brutalist Civic Center for one city moving forward.

Conclusion:

When describing the 1969 Boston City Hall, Ada Loise Huxtable opined the building "is meant to be impervious to the vicissitudes of changing tastes and administrations."[139] At the same time and 3,000 miles west, the City of Salem built a smaller but still impressive civic space with similar goals. Not only is the Salem Civic Center historically significant as a civic space in the Brutalist architectural style, but it also serves as a prime example of the direction Salem was aspiring towards with regard to community planning and development in the late 1960s/early 1970s. The architectural style of the building best reflected the aspirations and ethics for the City of Salem – "what it is and what it can be… civic buildings for the service and enjoyment of all people."[140] With the Salem Civic Center came the opportunity for cleaning up the environment, "triumphs over illness and peace over war."[141] The design and function was to ensure that Salem would not be – as Alison Smithson so perfectly described – "Kraft cheese" and would instead venture into the future as a nice sharp cheddar (probably from nearby Tillamook) filled with accessibility and public participation in decision making.

---

[136] City of Salem Dedication Committee.

[137] National Park Service, *National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, (1997), 9. The author of this nomination would like to use this footnote as an opportunity to share her personal frustrations that this guidance, so important for a wide variety of preservation activities, has not been updated in 25 years.

[138] These buildings would only provide a useful comparison if the property were being listed for statewide significance. It is also tempting to point to Eugene City Hall. However, that building was more Mid-Century Modern than Brutalist and no one needs to remember the pain its demolition caused the preservation community.

[139] Huxtable, 50. Boston City Hall not only came up repeatedly in the research on New Brutalist civic centers, but it was also on the minds of some Salemites. In 1971, *The Statesman Journal* Women's Editor, Jeryme English, discussed her recent trip to Boston by stating "If anyone…thinks Salem's Civic Center is not beautiful (architecturaly [sic] speaking), Boston's new City Hall is a monstrosity… We couldn't believe our eyes, just a mass of brick and cement with no design" (Jeryme English, "Historic Boston Sites," *The Statesman Journal*, October 29, 1971).

[140] City of Salem Dedication Committee.

[141] "Sun, City Smile as Salem Welcomes New Civic Center," *The Statesman Journal*, August 19, 1972.

John Terry, news editor of *The Capital Journal*, wrote "best of all is the sense of community which the [Civic Center] achieves. It is not just a place for the wheels of government to grind their meaningless fodder. It's a place where people can encounter themselves and neighbors; to feel as though they belong."[142] The Salem Civic Center was and is the community of Salem. The Civic Center is a reminder to all Salemites of the ideals of Salem in the late 1960s and early 1970s – a desire for efficient and prominent government services worthy of the growing community in a building that was less focused on fancy and more aligned with function. The Salem Civic Center is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A in the area of community planning and development and Criterion C in the area of architecture at the local level. It retains sufficient historic integrity – especially with regard to location, setting, design, materials, workmanship, association, and feeling – to continue to convey its important role in shaping the Cherry City of yesterday, today, and tomorrow.

9. Major Bibliographical References

Bibliography (Cite the books, articles, and other sources used in preparing this form.)

Campagna, Barbara. "Redefining Brutalism." *APT Bulletin: The Journal of Preservation Technology*, 51, no. 1 (2020): 25-36.

Chemeketa Community College, "Learn About Chemeketa," https://www.chemeketa.edu/about/ (accessed February 20, 2022).

City of Salem. "Economic Data." https://www.cityofsalem.net/Pages/economic-data.aspx (accessed January 30, 2022).

City of Salem Dedication Committee. *Civic Center '72: Our Pride and Heritage*. Salem, OR, 1972.

Edelman, Murray. "Space and the Social Order." *Journal of Architectural Education* 32, no. 2 (November 1978): 2-7.

Gifford, Laura Jane. "Planning for a Productive Paradise: Tom McCall and the Conservationist Tale of Oregon Land-Use Policy." *Oregon Historical Quarterly* 115, no. 4 (2014): 470-501.

Godbey, Geoffrey and Richard Kraus. "Citizen Participation in Urban Recreation Decision-Making." *Community Development Journal* 8, no.3 (1973): 155-160.

Goodsell, Charles T.. *The Social Meaning of Civic Space: Studying Political Authority through Architecture.* Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 1988.

Huxtable, Ada Louise. *On Architecture: Collected Reflections on a Century of Change*. New York: Walker Publishing Company, 2008.

Jencks, Charles. *Modern Movements in* Architecture. Harrisonburg, VA: R.R. Donnelley and Sons, 1986.

McArthur, Lewis A.. *Oregon Geographic Names*. Portland, OR: Oregon Historical Society Press, 1982.

Monteyne, David. "Boston City Hall and a History of Reception." *Journal of Architectural Education* 65, no. 1 (October 2011): 45-62.

Pouley, John O.. *Archaeological Investigations at the Dittman Biface Cache (35MA375), Marion County, Oregon*. Oregon State Historic Preservation Office: 2019.

[142] John Terry, "Civic Center a great place to goof around," *The Capital Journal*, August 19, 1972.

National Register of Historic Places and National Historic Landmark Records. "Salem Downtown State Street – Commercial Street Historic District." National Park Service. https://npgallery.nps.gov/NRHP/AssetDetail/61610998-ad2e-4223-a6d0-3848ec50c253 (accessed January 30, 2022).

Portland Development Commission, *Urban Renewal in Oregon: History, Case Studies, Policy Issues, and Latest Developments*, by Nina Johnson and Jeffrey Tashman, (2002).

"Report on Proposed Salem Civic Center Including Bond Issues and Preference Ballot on Building Site, September 30, 1968." Salem City Club Bulletin, vol. 1 No. 16 September 23, 1968.

Ryan, Mary P.. "A Laudable Pride in the Whole of Us: City Halls and Civic Materialism." *The American Historical Review* 105, no. 4 (October 2000): 1131-1170.

Salem Heritage Network. https://shineonsalem.org/ (accessed January 30, 2022).

Saval, Nikil. "Brutalism is Back." *The New York Times Style Magazine*. October 23, 2016.

Smithson, Alison, Peter Smithson, Jane B. Drew, and E. Maxwell Fry. "Conversation on Brutalism." *Zodiac* 4 (1959): 73-81.

Smithson, Alison and Peter Smithson. *Architectural Design* 27 (April 1957): 113.

Snyder, Michael. "Concrete Jungle." *The New York Times Style Magazine*. August 18, 2019.

Theron, D.. "The New Brutalists," *Theoria: A Journal of Social and Political Theory* 24 (June 1965): 49-52.

Trachtenberg, Marvin and Isabelle Hyman. *Architecture From Prehistory to Post-Modernism.* New York City: H.N. Abrams, 1986.

Vilder, Anthony. "Learning to Love Brutalism. *docomomo Lectures* 47, no. 2 (2012).

Wright, Gwendolyn. *USA: Modern Architectures in History*. London: Reaktion Books, 2008.

"Brutalist architecture – a retrospective." *Architecture and Design*. September 5, 2019. https://www.architectureanddesign.com.au/features/list/a-look-at-brutalist-architecture# (accessed January 12, 2022).

Newspaper Sources:
Bebout, William. "Full City Block Asked for Salem Library." *The Capital Journal*. August 5, 1965.

-----. "City Council Races Lure 14 Candidates." *The Capital Journal.* May 11, 1966.

-----. "Grandiose City Mall Plans Discouraged." *The Capital Journal*. February 15, 1965.

-----. "Ayres Cuts City Project Goals to $10.2 Million." *The Capital Journal*. March 22, 1965.

-----. "City-Owned Jail Farm Faces Committee Veto." *The Capital Journal*. June 10, 1965

Blankenbaker, Ron. "Sun, City Smile as Salem Welcomes New Civic Center." *The Statesman Journal*. August 19, 1972.

-----. "Civic Center Is Ahead of Schedule." *The Statesman Journal*. June 21, 1970.

-----. “Court Dismisses Suit, Clears Way for Civic Center.” *The Statesman Journal*. May 13, 1970.

-----. “City Structure Cost That Soars Above Estimate Is Not New to Salem.” *The Statesman Journal*. June 2, 1970.

English, Jeryme. “Historic Boston Sites.” *The Statesman Journal*. October 29, 1971.

Gangware, Robert E.. “Need Seen for Combined City-County Office Structure in Downtown Salem.” *The Statesman Journal*. May 9, 1959.

Grell, Chuck and Scott McArthur. “Officials Skeptical About Jail Farm Plan.” *The Capital Journal.* February 12, 1963

Harvey, Jr., Paul W.. “Salem Voters To Decided Fourth Time On Replacement Of Aging City Hall.” *The Oregonian*. September 30, 1968.

Hatfield, Mark. “Our work must continue.” *The Statesman Journal*. April 15, 1987.

Hecht, C.M.. “Why a Salem Taj Mahal? He’s Irked by Repeated Votes.” *The Statesman Journal*. May 27, 1966.

Hider, Mitchell. “Now – A Center by Early ’72.” *The Capital Journal*. May 3, 1970.

Huxtable, Ada Louise. “It’s Stylish, But Is It Art – Or Spinache?” *The New York Times*. January 25, 1981.

Jones, Alfred C.. “New School Designs Need Seen.” *The Capital Journal*. November 23, 1962.

Morrison, Allen J.. “Fast-Walking Phi Delt Wins Smooches.” *The Statesman Journal*. September 26, 1968.

------. “Project Passes 2-1 Vote.” *The Statesman Journal*. October 1, 1968.

-----. “City’s Growth is Guide To Goals Program Cost.” *The Statesman Journal.* March 13, 1966.

-----. “Minimum Security Jails Suggested for Alcoholics.” *The Statesman Journal*. April 18, 1965.

Palmer, M.W.. “Urges Tall City Hall.” *The Statesman Journal*. May 19, 1966.

Scarborough, Don. “Need for Agriculture Building Told Solons.” *The Statesman Journal*. April 9, 1963.

Stevens, Nancy W.. “Wants Final Plan.” *The Statesman Journal*. May 23, 1966.

Terry, John. “Civic Center a great place to goof around.” *The Capital Journal*. August 19, 1972.

“Art Association Requests Museum for Civic Center.” *The Capital Journal*. March 13, 1965.

“Center Library Aims Pushed.” *The Statesman Journal*. July 28, 1965.

“Center Plan Votes Close.” *The Oregonian*. May 25, 1966.

“Civic Center Plan Upped to 4 Blocks.” *The Statesman Journal*. September 2, 1965.

“Civic Center Plaza Shows Commitment,” *The Statesman Journal*, July 6, 1988.

"Civic Center Work Begins," *The Capital Journal*, May 20, 1970.

"First Settlers Erect Framework of City Government." *The Capital Journal*. July 2, 1938.

"Fish 'shut out' flycasters club at city hall pond," *The Statesman Journal*, July 15, 1977.

"In Society." *The Capital Journal*. November 16, 1912.

"Mirror Pond Not Designed For Swimming," *The Statesman Journal*, July 23, 1972.

"Most-Asked Questions and Answers on Civic Center Compiled," *The Statesman Journal*, September 17, 1968.

"New City Manager Assures City Department Heads of Support." *Statesman Journal*. January 3, 1947.

"Payne & Settecase Contract on Civic Center Authorized." *The Statesman Journal.* January 25, 1966.

"Payne Threatens Suit Over Contract Dispute." *The Statesman Journal.* January 21, 1966.

"Salem Civic Center From County Courthouse to River Envisioned." *The Statesman Journal*. February 25, 1965.

"Salem Flag Plan Given to Council." *The Statesman Journal*. May 9, 1972.

"Salem's Government Called 3-Ring Circus." *The Capital Journal*. November 14, 1939.

"Salem's Long Range Plan." *Eugene Register-Guard.* January 20, 1947.

"Schlesinger Rites Pending." *The Statesman Journal*. November 4, 1970.

"South Fringe Favored as Civic Center Site." *The Statesman Journal*. July 22, 1965.

"Study Starts of Community Goals Search." *The Statesman Journal.* February 11, 1955.

"The City Council." *The Statesman Journal*. November 25, 1896.

"Unquestioning Fact Finders." *The Capital Journal.* June 22, 1963.

Previous documentation on file (NPS):

____preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67 has been requested)
____previously listed in the National Register
____previously determined eligible by the National Register
____designated a National Historic Landmark
____recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey #_____
____recorded by Historic American Engineering Record # _____
____recorded by Historic American Landscape Survey # _____

Primary location of additional data:

__X__State Historic Preservation Office
____Other State agency
____Federal agency
__X__Local government
____University
____Other
Name of repository: _____

Historic Resources Survey Number (if assigned):

Salem Civic Center Historic District — Name of Property
Marion Co., OR — County and State

10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property 12.85 acres
(Do not include previously listed resource acreage; enter "Less than one" if the acreage is .99 or less)

Latitude/Longitude Coordinates
Datum if other than WGS84: _____
(enter coordinates to 6 decimal places)

	Latitude	Longitude		Latitude	Longitude
1	44.938302	-123.043343	3	44.934050	-123.039975
2	44.938302	-123.039975	4	44.934050	-123.043343

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

The historic property boundary for the Salem Civic Center is a four-block area bound by Trade Street on the north, Leslie Street on the south, Commercial Street on the west, and Liberty Street on the east.

Boundary Justification (Explain why the boundaries were selected.)

This boundary was selected as much of the historic documentation for the development of the Salem Civic Center refers to a "four-block" area. While there are no contributing resources in the southern portion of the boundary, this Hillside Site as a whole is reflective of the direction that Salemites envisioned for the future of their city.

11. Form Prepared By

name/title Tracy Schwartz date March 2022
organization Salem Historic Landmark Commission telephone (847) 431-3408
street & number 3022 SE 73rd Avenue email schwartzpreservation@gmail.com
city or town Portland state OR zip code 97206

Additional Documentation

Submit the following items with the completed form:

- **Regional Location Map**
- **Local Location Map**
- **Tax Lot Map**
- **Site Plan**
- **Floor Plans (As Applicable)**
- **Photo Location Map** (Include for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources. Key all photographs to this map and insert immediately after the photo log and before the list of figures).

Photographs:

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

Photo Log

Name of Property: **Salem Civic Center**

City or Vicinity: **Salem**

County: **Marion** **State:** **Oregon**

Photographer: **Tracy Schwartz**

Date Photographed: **February 2022**

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

Photo 1 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0001
Central Fire Station #1 west elevation, looking southeast

Photo 2 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0002
Central Fire Station #1 north elevation, looking southwest

Photo 3 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0003
Central Fire Station #1 north and east elevations, looking southwest

Photo 4 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0004
Central Fire Station #1 south elevation, looking northwest

Photo 5 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0005
Overview of the Salem Civic Center, looking north

Photo 6 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0006
Overview of Mirror Pond and City Hall Parking Garage, looking southeast

Photo 7 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0007
Overview of Mirror Pond and City Hall Parking Garage, looking west

Photo 8 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0008
Mirror Pond and Pringle Creek, looking north

Photo 9 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0009
Mirror Pond and City Hall, looking south

Photo 10 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0010
Mirror Pond, looking northeast

Photo 11 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0011
City Hall Parking Garage, looking east

Photo 12 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0012
City Hall Parking Garage, looking northeast

Photo 13 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0013
City Hall Council Chambers and landscaping, looking west

Photo 14 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0014
City Hall Council Chambers, looking west

Photo 15 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0015
City Hall north elevation east bay, looking south

Photo 16 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0016
City Hall north elevation west bay, looking southeast

Photo 17 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0017
City Hall west and south elevations, looking northeast

Photo 18 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0018
City Hall south elevation, looking northwest

Photo 19 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0019
City Hall east and north elevations, looking south

Photo 20 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0020
City Hall waffle slab construction in the front entry, looking east

Photo 21 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0021
City Hall Courtyard and Council Chambers, looking northwest

Photo 22 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0022
City Hall example of offices, looking northwest

Photo 23 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0023
City Hall Courtyard, looking southeast

Photo 24 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0024
City Hall Courtyard, looking west

Photo 25 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0025
City Hall Courtyard ceilings, looking southeast

Photo 26 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0026
City Hall Dedication Plaque, looking west

Photo 27 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0027
Fountain Plaza, looking west

Photo 28 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0028
Fountain Plaza, looking southeast

Photo 29 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0029
Public Library north elevation, looking southeast

Photo 30 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0030
Public Library north and west elevations, looking southeast

Photo 31 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0031
Public Library south and east elevations, looking northwest

Photo 32 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0032
Public Library north and east elevations, looking southeast

Photo 33 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0033
Public Library Parking garage, looking southwest

Photo 34 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0034
Landscaping between the Public Library and Public Library Parking Garage, looking northeast

Photo 35 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0035
Fountain Plaza Peace Wall and Light fixtures, looking northeast

Photo 36 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0036
Staircases leading to City Hall, looking southeast

Photo 37 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0037
City Council Chamber Doors, looking north

Photo 38 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0038
City Hall Mayor's Office Doors, looking south

Photo 39 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0039
City Council Chambers, looking north

Photo 40 of 40: OR_MarionCounty_SalemCivicCenter_0040
"Untitled" by Wiltzin B. Blix located at the south entrance of the City Hall building, looking west.

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement: This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C.460 et seq.).
Estimated Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 100 hours per response including time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Office of Planning and Performance Management. U.S. Dept. of the Interior, 1849 C. Street, NW, Washington, DC.

List of Figures
(Resize, compact, and paste images of maps and historic documents in this section. Place captions, with figure numbers above each image. Orient maps so that north is at the top of the page, all document should be inserted with the top toward the top of the page.

Figure 1: Regional location map.

Figure 2: Local location and nominated property boundary (aerial), coordinate vertices.

Figure 3: Site plan.

Figure 4: Photo key plan.

Figure 5: 1897 City Hall under demolition (1972).

Figure 6: Salem Police Station in the 1897 City Hall (c.1968).

Figure 7: Salem City Hall Courtyard (1972).

Figure 8: Salem Civic Center model (1969).

Figure 9: Salem Civic Center construction aerial looking south (1971).

Figure 10: Construction of Salem Civic Center, south elevation of City Hall and Plaza Fountain (1971).

Figure 11: Salem Civic Center dedication, facing southeast (1972).

Figure 12: City Hall, looking southwest (1972).

Figure 13: Central Fire Station #1, west elevation (1972).

Figure 14: Central Fire Station #1, north elevation (1972).

Figure 15: City Council Chambers interior (1973).

Figure 16: Public Library east and north elevations (1972).

Figure 17: Salem Civic Center aerial (1972).

Figure 18: Advertisement for the 1966 Salem Civic Center Bond Measure.

Figure 19: Volunteers working for passage of the 1968 Salem Civic Center bond measure.

Figure 20: Newspaper advertisement for the 1968 Salem Civic Center bond measure.

Figure 21: Salem Civic Center letterhead from as early as 1970.

Figure 22: Original City Council Chamber doors (c.2020).

Figure 23: City Hall Chamber interior (2019).

Figure 1. Regional Location Map. Image from Google Earth.



Figure 2. Local location and nominated property boundary (aerial), coordinate vertices. Image: Google Earth.



Figure 3. Local location and nominated property boundary. Image from City of Salem.



Figure 4. Photo key plan. Image from City of Salem.



Figure 5. 1897 Salem City Hall under demolition (1972). Image from Oregon Historic Photograph Collection (Photo Identification SJ1383).



Figure 6. Salem Police Station in the 1897 City Hall (c.1968). Image from the 1968 Salem Civic Center Bond Flipbook.

Figure 7. Salem City Hall Courtyard (1972). Image from City of Salem Archives (Lawrence S. Williams, Negative 149753).

Figure 8. Salem Civic Center model (1969). Image from Oregon Historic Photograph Collection (Photo Identification SJ1346).



Figure 9. Salem Civic Center construction looking south, aerial (1971). Image from Oregon Historic Photograph Collection (Photo Identification SJ269).



Figure 10. Construction of Salem Civic Center, south elevation of City Hall and Plaza Fountain (1971). Image from Oregon Historic Photograph Collection (Photo Identification SJ1367).



Figure 11. Salem Civic Center dedication, facing southeast (1972). Picture shows Plaza Fountain as well as the north elevation of the Public Library. Image from Oregon Historic Photograph Collection (Photo Identification SJ1366).



Figure 12. City Hall, looking southwest (1972). Image from City of Salem Archives (Lawrence S. Williams, Negative 149752).

Figure 13. Central Fire Station #1, west elevation (1973). Image from Oregon Historic Photograph Collection (Photo Identification SJ1328).

Figure 14. Central Fire Station #1, north elevation (1972). Image from City of Salem Dedication Committee, *Civic Center '72: Our Pride and Heritage* (Salem, OR, 1972), 15.



Figure 15. City Council Chambers interior, 1973. Image from Oregon Historic Photograph Collection (Photo Identification SJ1392).

Figure 16. Public Library east and north elevations, 1972. Image from Oregon Historic Photograph Collection (Photo Identification SJ947).

Figure 17. Salem Civic Center aerial, 1972. Note the children's play area and surface parking at the bottom of the image (pink arrow). Image from Oregon Historic Photograph Collection (Photo Identification AR028).



Figure 18. Advertisement for the 1966 Salem Civic Center Bond Measure. Image from *The Statesman Journal*, May 15, 1966.

4. Should members of Congress be required to make public disclosure of all their sources ago. Twenty years ago it was $10,000 plus a $2,500 expense allowance which was repealed treatment is given businessmen for expenses while on business away from home. phone calls and 100,000 words in telegrams each year for official business, without charge. rent home offices and $1,200 for office expenses. 7. Clerical salaries ranging on official business, with actual expenses paid by the government.

VOTE "YES" MAY 24th for SALEM Progress.....

Vote 'YES' on Measure No. 52 for a Modern Civic Center Complex

Vote 'YES' on Measure No. 51 For Capital Improvements in Your Neighborhood

- 61 traffic signals
- street repairs, storm drains and sidewalks in every section of the city.
- new playgrounds and parks, development of existing park lands. Every neighborhood benefits.
- Modernized fire fighting equipment and extension of water mains which eventually will mean lower insurance rates for all.
- Cover Olinger and Leslie swimming pools.
- Extension and modernization of municipal airport.
- And literally hundreds of other improvements which will benefit every resident in our community.

SALEM MUST MOVE FORWARD

Vote 'YES' on Measure No. 54 For a Healthy Bus System

Salem's public transportation system already has gone through one bankruptcy and another threatens. a year-long, careful study by experts and Salem citizens agree a bus system must be maintained, but operated with the help of public financing. We must provide safe transportation for our youngsters and senior citizens.

Vote 'YES' on Measure No. 53 For More Salem Park Area!

Our greatest natural asset, the Willamette river, either can become an eyesore or a magnificent island of recreation and beauty in the heart of our thriving business community.
WE MUST BUY LAND NOW FOR OUR PARKS TOMORROW!

VOTE 51 (X) YES!
VOTE 52 (X) YES!
VOTE 53 (X) YES!
VOTE 54 (X) YES!

VOTE 4 SALEM PROGRESS

Paid Political Advertisement by Package for Progress Committee, Al Randall, Chairman, 665 Winding Way SE

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Salem Civic Center
Name of Property
Marion Co., OR
County and State
N/A
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number Additional Documentation Page 53

Figure 19. Volunteers working for passage of the 1968 Salem Civic Center bond measure. Image from *The Statesman* Journal, September 15, 1968.

Women Volunteer to Promote Civic Center

Statesman's HOME Panorama
Women . . . Music . . . Fashions . . . Features
(Sec 3) Statesman, Salem, Ore., Sunday, Sept. 15, 1968

Over 500 Salem women have volunteered to assist in the campaign to promote the Salem Civic Center. On Monday, Sept. 30 citizens will vote on the proposed Center and in the meantime volunteers will distribute over 11,000 brochures at block parties explaining the need of a functional, efficient Center for municipal government. Standing by a few stacks of the brochures are (left to right) Mrs. Exie Faust, Mrs. Ray H. Latky and Mrs. Gerald Bartz.

Ms. Eugene Lowe, chairman of the Block by Block campaign for the Civic Center, spent the last month of her summer vacation before resuming her teaching duties organizing the volunteers. She hopes there will be a coffee in every city block during the next two weeks to inform citizens of the need of the Center. Mrs. Lowe stands by one of the flip charts that will be used to illustrate the proposed Center, accompanied by a record. She also serves on the 26-member Civic Building Committee.

NOW support the Salem Civic Center, is the slogan on 22,000 buttons to be worn by enthusiastic supporters for the proposed center. Looking over the buttons are Mrs. Shannon L. Odum (left) and Mrs. Robert H. Donovan. Everyone attending a block coffee will be given a button. September 30 is the date for Salem citizens to vote on a new Center.

Telephone lines have been busy for weeks lining up hostesses for the block coffees to promote the Salem Civic Center. To date there are over 450 hostesses and more are needed. Pictured above checking their lists (left to right) are Mrs. George B. Martin, Mrs. Donald C. Seymour and Mrs. Donald Armgriest. The later two are members of the Civic Building Committee. Headquarters for the Center are at the Salem Chamber of Commerce.

Two supporters of the Salem Civic Center are pictured at the right looking over the model which will be on display at various public buildings during the next two weeks. Mrs. Charles E. Hefty (left) and Mrs. Melvin H. Cleveland, trustees of the Salem Public Library, are more than interested in the new library which will be part of the Center. The present library was built to serve 12,000 people in 1912 and today the same library is trying to serve 67,000 persons.

(Statesman Photos by John Erickson)

Figure 20. Newspaper advertisement for the 1968 Salem Civic Center bond measure. Image from *The Statesman Journal,* September 23, 1968.



Figure 21. Salem Civic Center letterhead from as early as 1970. Image from the City of Salem.

Figure 22. Original City Council Chamber doors. Replaced in 2021. Camera facing north. Photo from the City of Salem (c.2020).



Figure 23. City Hall Chambers. Public participation in government in action, 2019. Image from Oregon Public Broadcasting.

Photo 1 of 40. Central Fire Station #1 west elevation, looking southeast.

Photo 2 of 40. Central Fire Station #1 north elevation, looking southwest.

Photo 3 of 40. Central Fire Station #1 north and east elevations, looking southwest.

Photo 4 of 40. Central Fire Station #1 south elevation, looking northwest.



Photo 5 of 40. Overview of the Salem Civic Center, looking north.

Photo 6 of 40. Overview of Mirror Pond and City Hall Parking Garage, looking southeast.

Photo 7 of 40. Overview of Mirror Pond and City Hall Parking Garage, looking west.



Photo 8 of 40. Mirror Pond and Pringle Creek, looking north.

Photo 9 of 40. Mirror Pond and City Hall, looking south.

Photo 10 of 40. Mirror Pond, looking northeast.

Photo 11 of 40. City Hall Parking Garage, looking east.

Photo 12 of 40. City Hall Parking Garage, looking northeast.

Photo 13 of 40. City Hall Council Chambers and landscaping, looking west.

Photo 14 of 40. City Hall Council Chambers, looking west

Photo 15 of 40. City Hall north elevation east bay, looking south.

Photo 16 of 40. City Hall north elevation west bay, looking southeast.

Photo 17 of 40. City Hall west and south elevations, looking northeast.

Photo 18 of 40. City Hall south elevation, looking northwest.

Photo 19 of 40. City Hall east and north elevations, looking south.

Photo 20 of 40. City Hall waffle slab construction in the front entry, looking east.

Photo 21 of 40. City Hall Courtyard and Council Chambers, looking northwest.

Photo 22 of 40. City Hall example of offices, looking northwest.



Photo 23 of 40. City Hall Courtyard, looking southeast.

Photo 24 of 40. City Hall Courtyard, looking west.



Photo 25 of 40. City Hall Courtyard ceilings, looking southeast.

Photo 26 of 40. City Hall Dedication Plaque, looking west.

Photo 27 of 40. Plaza Fountain, looking west.

Photo 28 of 40. Plaza Fountain, looking southeast.

Photo 29 of 40. Public Library north elevation, looking southeast.

Photo 30 of 40. Public Library north and west elevations, looking southeast.

Photo 31 of 40. Public Library south and east elevations, looking northwest.

Photo 32 of 40. Public Library north and east elevations, looking southeast.

Photo 33 of 40. Public Library Parking garage, looking southwest.

Photo 34 of 40. Landscaping between the Public Library and Library Parking Garage, looking northeast.

Photo 35 of 40. Peace Wall and light fixtures, looking northeast.

Photo 36 of 40. Staircases leading to City Hall, looking southeast.



Photo 37 of 40. City Council Chamber doors, looking north.

Photo 38 of 40. City Hall Mayor's Office Doors, looking south.

Photo 39 of 40. City Council Chambers, looking north.

Photo 40 of 40. "Untitled" by Wiltzen Blix located at the south entrance of the City Hall building, looking west.