

**HISTORIC SITES REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES
SENTENEL BUILDING, TUCSON, ARIZONA
SEPT 28, 2012**

A. CALL TO ORDER

- a. Terry Majewski called the meeting to order at 9:35 AM

B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS

1a. HSRC Committee Members present

- a. Terry Majewski
- b. Brooks Jeffrey
- c. Don Ryden
- d. John Jacquemart
- e. Patricia Olson
- f. John Lacy
- g. Jan Balsom

1b. HSRC Committee Member absent

- a. Kathleen Henderson
- b. Doug Kupel

2. SHPO Staff Members present

- a. James Garrison
- b. William Collins
- c. Vivia Strang
- d. Robert Frankeberger
- e. Mary Robinson

PROCEEDED ON THE TOUR OF THE JOESLER HOUSES.

TOOK STAFF REPORTS EARLIER IN THE MEETING, WHILE WAITING FOR ATTENDEES.

E. STAFF REPORTS

1. SHPO REPORT

a. National Register update

No new National Register listings since the last meeting

b. SHPO Staffing

- New SHPO staff person Kris Dobschuetz Compliance Specialist, Archeologist
- SHPO has officially taken over the Main Street Program and Eric Vondy is the Arizona Main Street Coordinator
 - The deputy director requested a budget for the Main Street Program. This final budget is now \$250,000. To be used to implement a new Main Street Grant Program
 - Potentially to entice the Main Street Program to come to Arizona
 - Included in the budget is a full time position to run the Main Street Program.

c. Review and Compliance

- AZ Game and Fish Department (AGFD) along with the Town of Eagar was to construct a fishing pond with funding from US Fish and Wildlife. Last February pond digging began and they dug for 11 days before they discovered they had been excavating prehistoric bodies. Tribes have become involved. AGFD has been very apologetic. The Zuni may initiate a lawsuit. AGFD is developing policies to insure this doesn't happen again.
- Luke Air Force Base has decided to go forward with their potential solar array. As part of that project the Air Force will have the site surveyed. SHPO insisted on a meeting with the tribes due to Luke's switch from the firm already working on the survey to a firm out of Louisiana an unfamiliar with the area. At the meeting that some of the cost of mitigation was raising so high that Statistical Research would exceed their contractual ability with the Air Force. While this is all worked out there will be a yearlong delay.

- Davis Monthan having solar array installed. The contractor for the project contacted the Governor's office when SHPO requested a survey be done at the site. The ? sent a letter to the Governor stating that SHPO was required by Federal Guidelines to request a survey.
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is investigating Electronic 106. Arizona might be selected to test the feasibility of Electronic 106. FHWA, ADOT, SHPO will work together to develop the system, which may be used by other agencies.
- Gatlin Site near Gila Bend, National Historic Landmark, has been compromised. It is State Trust Land that has been given to the Town of Gila Bend with the proviso that they protect and maintain the site. An archaeologist from Arizona State Museum (ASM) visited the site and the fence was down and things were uncared for, which prompted us to write a letter to the Mayor who passed it on to the City Manager. The fence has been repaired. SHPO will be meeting with the City Manager on Tuesday to resolve the issues with the site. The City is not living up to the terms in the Preservation Easement and may have to forfeit the land.

d. Survey and Inventory

e. Grants

f. Legislative Issues

The Agency has been meeting with the Governor's office regarding the budget:

- All the money State Parks takes in is to operate the parks won't be taken from the parks; it will be used to operate the parks. There are plans for small project throughout the parks system
- The Legislature still has to sign off on the budget

C. NEW BUSINESS

This session will be handled differently. We are going to divide the nominations into groups according to residential registration requirements as laid out in the SHPO Joesler Document. They will be reviewed according to the group assigned. The groups will be: Eligible - group 1; Probably Eligible, but needs more work – group 2; Ineligible – group 3; Miscellaneous – group 4. Some of the criteria are cut and dried i.e. original location or not original location or documented year of construction.

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4
Andersen House	DeCenso House	Woollen House	Jackson
Goodman House	Bradley House	HH Brown House	
Remer House	Brandt House	Warren House	
Wilson House	Dunn House	Gould-Drexel House	
Brown, G. & E. House	Frankovitz House		
Craig House	McMahon House		
	Nagoda House		
	Gould-Drexel House	← (Moved to Group 2)	

1. JOESLER NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS IN GROUP # 1

Majewski: We will begin with Group # 1. We need a motion.

Motion: **Lacy** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Andersen House, Goodman House, Remer House, Wilson House, Brown, G. & E. House and Craig House** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria "**C**" at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that the nominations be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Balsom**.

Andersen House Discussion: Criteria C- MPDF Context 2 - Local Level of Significance

- ⇒ In this and several of the Joesler Nominations the Period of Significance started at the date of construction and ended with Joesler's death. Period of Significance should only be the date of construction unless there is another reason for the ending date of 1948. (Need the same guideline for other nominations.)

- ⇒ **Janet Parkhurst, Preparer:** There are photos dated from 1948 showing what was in place at that time. Making 1948 the appropriate end of the Period of Significance. Also, the house is actually built of real adobe with brick liners. The 1948 photos prove that the stucco was there at that time.
- ⇒ In 1948 Joesler was the supervising architect for Catalina Foothills Estates and approved changes made to residences in the Estates.
- ⇒ Clarification on acreage – 7.8 acres is the correct size
- ⇒ More elevation photos, in particular showing all alterations and additions the property. (Need the same documentation for all the other nominations.)

Goodman House Discussion: Criteria A – MPDF Context 1 - Local Level of Significance

- ⇒ See previous Andersen Nomination for requirements for all Joesler Residences.

Remer House: Criteria C- MPDF Context 2 - Local Level of Significance

- ⇒ See previous Andersen Nomination for requirements for all Joesler Residences.
- ⇒ In the nomination it states that the property meets all registration requirements, but doesn't relate what has been altered.
- ⇒ Acreage needs to be more clearly and accurately described. (In all nominations) Page 3 states the acreage has been modified; figures don't match the parcel map that states 5.3 acres. The statement should be that the original lot size was 5.3 acres, but even with a smaller lot size it still conveys what is was at 5.3 acres.
- ⇒ Aerial photos very helpful. They would be more helpful if they were keyed to the photos in the nomination. (Also, for other nominations)
- ⇒ Don't use Context 1
- ⇒ Better articulate how it meets the registration requirements.

Wilson House: Criterion A & C – MPDF Context 1 & 2 - Local Level of Significance

- ⇒ See previous Nominations for requirements for all Joesler Residences with the exception of photos, which were excellent in this nomination.
- ⇒ Stylistic consistency – On page 7 under the summary, line 3, "Spanish Colonial Revival Style, Joesler designed some interesting variations of style. This one has a unique simple character". In the narrative is states, "the Betty Jean Wilson House is a straight forward interpretation of the Spanish Colonial Style". Need to be consistent. Wording that might work better would be, "On the Betty Jean Wilson House Joesler used Spanish Colonial Revival Elements".
- ⇒ Consistency between the Narrative and the Summary.

Brown, Grace & Elliot House: Criterion A & C – MPDF Context 1 & 2 - Local Level of Significance

- ⇒ Check spelling on pages 3, 6, and 8.
- ⇒ Revise boundary of acreage and clarify changes in lot size.
- ⇒ Document all the additions are in the plan
- ⇒ In all nominations documentation of some sort that shows the original and the additions.
- ⇒ Page 8 clarification of stylistic typology, choose one and be consistent.

Craig House: Criteria C- MPDF Context 2 – Local Level of Significance

- ⇒ Clarification about Guest House
- ⇒ Photo documentation of additions and alterations.
- ⇒ Check spelling on pagers 3, 4,5, and 7.
- ⇒ Photo Keys needed in all nominations

Lacy amended the motion to reflect Criteria and Context changes in HSRC discussion. **Balsom** seconded the amendment.

Majewski: Called for the vote

6 Ayes, Motion Carried



2. JOESLER NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS IN GROUP # 2

Majewski: We will begin with Group # 2.

Lacy moved that the nominations on **DeCenso House, Bradley House, Brandt House, Dun House, Frankovitz House, McMahon House, Nagoda House, and Warren House** be returned to the preparers for clarification and then returned to the committee for review. **Brooks** seconded the nomination.

DeCenso House: Criteria C- MPDF Context 2 – Local Level of Significance

- ⇒ Period of Significance should be 1930 and not extend to 1956.
- ⇒ Focus on architecture, but mention the reduced acreage from 6.7 to 2.7.
- ⇒ The narrative includes both Context 1 and 2. It should be only 2.
- ⇒ Need photos of additions and alterations.
- ⇒ The plan for second floor didn't match the actual structure. More explanation of that or drawings showing the final second floor design.
- ⇒ Move to Group # 1. Address later in meeting.

THE FOLLOWING COMMENTS APPLY TO THE FOLLOWING NOMINATIONS UNLESS OTHERWISE STATED

- ⇒ Documentation for nomination should include text, photo, site plan.
- ⇒ Address significance directly. Omit the use of percentages in descriptions of alterations and additions in all nominations. Use the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.
- ⇒ Don't use superlatives; need to be objective.
- ⇒ Consistency of language.
- ⇒ Documentation of alterations and additions – text, photos and plans.
- ⇒ Double hatch the additions and single hatch remodels. That would make it easier for the Keeper to understand additions and alteration. Also, add a key to the diagram for clarification.
- ⇒ Need to leave out sentence containing, only a few of these properties have maintained their original acreage. From the nominations we have today that is clearly an inaccurate sentence.
- ⇒ Need to see nomination again with changes.

Bradley House: Criterion A & C – MPDF Context 1 & 2 – Local Level of Significance

- ⇒ On original acreage, so add Criteria A - MPDF Context 1.
- ⇒ Need clarification as to which part of the house is original and which parts are additions or changes.
- ⇒ **Ralph Comey, preparer:** On the plan the cross-hatching designates additions. Joesler added the lounge on the front of the house about 2 years after it was built. That's why it was not shown as an addition. The garage addition isn't clearly defined in the nomination, but Photo 9 is indicates the garage addition.
- ⇒ The caption should state that the splice is between the 2 windows. That with a photo key of remodel plan. According to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards the addition should be compatible but not the same and with this addition that is not the case. This is a secondary side and photos taken of the primary side might be more advantageous.
- ⇒ All we could see as we drove up to the cul-de-sac was a wall and the stuccoed stepped incinerator chimney. Neither was found on the original plan or the revised plan. They formed an auto court that was not original to the property. Needs to be included on the plan as an addition. The aerial photograph provided by Linda Mayro shows them clearly.
- ⇒ Split site – was originally approximately 20 acres.
- ⇒ What are the SHPO integrity limits? The Secretary of the Interior's Standards are the only guidelines for nominations.
- ⇒ Stylistically this is not a Spanish Colonial Revival. A better term should be found.
- ⇒ Photo # 4, little tiles brings to mind the Morgan House. Perhaps comparing the 2.

Brandt House: Criteria C- MPDF Context 2 – Local Level of Significance

- ⇒ Should change the title to the "Arthur A and Lilly Brandt House". Arthur Brandt was one of the best-known Geophysicists in the world and the house should bear the name of the most prominent owner.
- ⇒ The preparer could not find the plans for this house, but it is on a list of Joesler designed houses.
- ⇒ There has never been a stone fireplace in a Joesler. Need documentation that attributes this property to Joesler. If it can be attributed to Joesler, mention that the stone fireplace is unusual is an unusual feature for a Joesler.
- ⇒ The term Sonoran Revival with variants on the style is used to describe the house, but later it is referred to as an excellent example of Sonoran Revival. There needs to be consistency in language.

Dun House: Criteria C- MPDF Context 2 – Local Level of Significance

- ⇒ Remove reference to community planning and development.
- ⇒ Get rid of Context 1 on page 7 in the Narrative. Too many modifications including size of lot (modified down to 1 acre).
- ⇒ Need to discuss the uniqueness and eclecticism of the house.
- ⇒ There is the rendering that shows the walled entry sequence that it is not shown on the plan. Is it still there?

- ⇒ **Ralph Comey, preparer:** It has changed a little, but it is still there as shown in Photo # 8 and that is a slight change from the rendering.
- ⇒ At the bottom of page 5 you state the property maintains “excellent integrity” which follows the statement “the setting has changed the character of the property. Again inconsistency of language.
- ⇒ Error on floor plan showing the main entrance.
- ⇒ Need a key on the map and make the directional arrow on the map more apparent.

Frankovitz House: Criterion A & C – MPDF Context 1 & 2 – Local Level of Significance

- ⇒ Add Criteria A and Context # 1, as it is on the original plot.
- ⇒ Make the directional arrow on the map more apparent.
- ⇒ Inconsistency in description on page 5 “the addition is not being counted as historic although the casements are” – statement is confusing. Perhaps a better plan or drawing showing additions especially the more recent ones.
- ⇒ On page 14 the porch isn’t shown as enclosed. It is documented in the narrative, but not on the drawing.

McMahon House: Criterion A – MPDF Context 1 – Local Level of Significance

- ⇒ Better description of Context # 1.
- ⇒ Better description of house and site.
- ⇒ HRSC needs more information.

The Nagoda House: Criteria C- MPDF Context 2 – Local Level of Significance

- ⇒ Remove reference to community planning and development on page 6.
- ⇒ Narrative will have to change since it is only Context 2.
- ⇒ In the summary paragraph it states that the property “is an excellent example of ranch style”, but in the narrative it states, “ it is an unusual and subtle interpretation of the ranch style. Further down it adds a craftsman style to the descriptors. There needs to be a better and more consistent description of the house.
- ⇒ There is reference to the integrity being excellent, but then there discussion of all the modifications that have been made.
- ⇒ Floor plan states the master bedroom is likely historic. If it was is not there in 1938 then it is not historic. It wouldn’t fall under the period of significance.
- ⇒ On page 13 the real estate proposal is not needed.
- ⇒ What is the date on the builder’s floor plan?
- ⇒ Reference the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, Compatible but Distinct.
- ⇒ Was the original material burnt adobe and then stuccoed.
- ⇒ Remove the realtor’s sheet from the nomination, since it only distracts.

Warren House

- ⇒ Possibly not a Joesler.
- ⇒ Not a Murphey either.
- ⇒ Not his drawing style.
- ⇒ His seal is on it as the approver of the plan and not as the architect.
- ⇒ Work with Brooks to resolve this issue.
- ⇒ Move it to group 3.
- ⇒ Need to see nomination again with issues resolved.

Lacy moved to amend the motion omitting **DeCenso House** and moved to Group 1 and sent to the Keeper; & **Warren House** moved to Group 3 for discussion on October 12, 2012. **Brooks** seconded the nomination.

Majewski: Called for the vote
6 Ayes, Motion Carried

Lacy moved that the nominations on **Bradley House, Brandt House, Dun House, Frankovitz House, McMahon House, The Nagoda House** be returned to the preparers for clarification and then returned to the committee for review. **Brooks** seconded the nomination.

Majewski: Called for the vote
6 Ayes, Motion Carried

Motion: **Lacy** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **DeCenso House** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria "**C**" at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that the nominations be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Brooks**.

Majewski: Called for the vote
6 Ayes, Motion Carried

Strang: There are 2 nominations that may be submitted on their own and not as a part of the Joesler MPDF. One is the Jackson House and the other is the Gould-Drexel House.

Gould-Drexel House

Discussion:

- ⇒ Period of significance at 1937, date of construction.
- ⇒ Remove Community Planning and Development.
- ⇒ More clarity in architectural discussion.
- ⇒ Plan and photos of additions and alterations.
- ⇒ Varying degrees of integrity description (inconsistency)

Motion: **Brooks** moved that the **Gould-Drexel House** be moved to Group 2 and be returned to the preparer for revision based on comments from the HSRC Committee and subsequently be returned to the Committee for review. Motion Seconded: **Balsom**.

Majewski: Called for the vote
6 Ayes, Motion Carried

Majewski: Would a teleconference call be appropriate for the properties in Group 3 and 4?

- ⇒ This meeting can be extended. We can recess the meeting and reconvene at a later date.
- ⇒ Teleconference meeting set for October 12, 2012 at 10:00 am.
- ⇒ The properties that are not Joesler will have to be rescheduled for another HSRC meeting.

Recessed at 5:00 pm



**HISTORIC SITES REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES
TELECONFERENCE RECONVENE OF
SEPT 28, 2012 HSRC MEETING, ARIZONA
ON OCTOBER 12, 2012**

A. CALL TO ORDER

- b. Terry Majewski reconvened the meeting at 10:35 AM

B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS

1. HSRC Committee Members present on Phone

- h. Terry Majewski
- i. Brooks Jeffrey
- j. Don Ryden
- k. John Jacquemart
- l. Patricia Olson
- m. John Lacy
- n. Jan Balsom
- o. Kathleen Henderson
- p. Doug Kupel

2. SHPO Staff Members present at SHPO

- f. William Collins
- g. Vivia Strang
- h. Robert Frankeberger
- i. Mary Robinson

3. Guests present

- a. Janet Parkhurst
- b. Ralph Comey
- c. Demion Klinco
- d. Linda Weed

Strang: Gave an explanation of the schedule for sending the Joesler Nominations the Keeper of the National Register Group # 1 – after minor revisions the following nominations will be sent to the Keeper. Vivia requires that the amended nominations be in her office by November 1, 2012. The nominations received at that time, will be sent to the Keeper as a group.

- a. Anderson, Arthur Olaf and Helen S House
- b. Goodman, John and Aline House
- c. Remer, Ross T House
- d. Wilson, Betty-Jean House
- e. Brown, Grace and Elliott House
- f. Craig House

Jeffrey: Questioned the addition of Criterion “A” to Criterion “C”. Context 1 was linked to Criterion A and Context 2, was linked to Criterion C. This has caused some confusion. Need guidance from SHPO.

Collins: In a discussion at the last meeting the committee came to the conclusion that those properties with integrity issues and nominated under “C” only, would be nominated under Criterion A and C.

- ◆ Criterion “C: alone has been the focus of SHPO’s MPDF and the guidelines created by Jim Garrison were for “C” level of significance.

◆ There were no guidelines for Criterion “A” within the MPDF document.

Discussion:

- ◆ Both Context 1 and 2 may be linked to Criterion “C”, either alone or combined.
- ◆ When the discussion refers to Context 1 it speaks to subdivision planning, development, and open space.
- ◆ When the discussion refers to Context 2 it speaks to architecture.

Brooks Moved the Committee reconsider the Group 1 nominations of the **Goodman House**, the **Wilson House**, and the **Grace** and the **Elliott Brown House** be amended to Criterion "**C**" only at the **Local** level of significance. Seconded by **Lacy**.

Majewski: Called for the vote
8 Ayes, Motion Carried
Unanimous

Brooks Moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place **Goodman House, the Wilson House**, and the **Grace and Elliott Brown House**, on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion "**C**" at the **Local** level of significance and recommend these nominations be forwarded to the Keeper for placement on the National Register of Historic Places. Seconded by **Balsom**.

Majewski: Called for the vote
8 Ayes, Motion Carried
Unanimous

GROUP 3 REVIEWS

JACKSON, LAMBERT AND EVELYN HOUSE

Discussion:

- ◆ Joesler did not design three properties on the agenda.
 - Jackson House
 - Brandt House
 - Warren House
- ◆ Submit as stand-alone nominations, not under the Joesler MPDF.
- ◆ Context 1 developer Murphey MPDF and Contest 2 Joesler Architecture.
 - The criterion for Context 1 the property was built and the area subdivided by Murphey. Therefore there is the attribution to Murphey.
 - Also the lots are intact with the original boundaries. The integrity of the site parcel has been maintained according to the Murphey criteria for the Catalina Foothills Estates.
- ◆ Joesler as the supervisory architect would have approved the plans.
- ◆ Move up to # 2 group?
- ◆ Joesler homes should be separate from the non-Joesler homes and continue discussion about the Joesler designed homes.
- ◆ SHPO – Multiple context
 - Every building in the subdivision shares in the unique concept and is designed within the context of the subdivision.
 - The buildings need to be nominated under C and not add A.
 - Property lines are irrelevant. Either the building retains its setting or it doesn't.
 - Non-Joeslers should be nominated under the context of their architectural style as individually eligible houses.
- ◆ These homes that have merit in design, setting and placement by unknown architects who understood the point of subdivision plan and the genre of the styles.
- ◆ Making them stand alone nominations will allow them to move forward and not wait for the Joesler's Group 1 approval as well as the MPDF approval.
- ◆ Give the preparers that option with comments from SHPO and the HSRC Committee.



WOOLLEN, HERBERT AND IRMA HOUSE

Brooks Moved that the **Woollen, Herbert and Irma House** be placed on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion “C” at the **Local** level of significance and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper for placement on the National Register of Historic Places. Seconded by **Henderson**.

Discussion:

- ◆ **Parkhurst:** provided a map and a floor plan showing the alterations.
- ◆ There is a letter from the architect, Andy Andersen, who worked on the last revisions or changes to the house.
- ◆ The biggest issue was the intrusion of the porch on the back in 1964. It compromised the outdoor circulation that is one of the character defining features of a Joesler house. The definition on page 8 refers to it as a functionally acceptable rehabilitation. That statement may not be accurate.
- ◆ There are no photos in this nomination showing the details of alterations and changes that have been made to the house.
- ◆ The infill addition does not differ in design from the original portions of the house including materials and design.
- ◆ Aerial Photograph # 1 shows the addition.
- ◆ **Parkhurst:** Why is there so much being made of the rear addition and the Andy Anderson revision. They can't be seen from the front. That doesn't seem like enough to disqualify the house.
- ◆ **HSRC:** The house is not being disqualified for these 2 changes.
- ◆ The connector in the front does diminish the indoor-outdoor flow to the house, which is a Joesler signature effect.
- ◆ **Linda Weed, owner:** In the dining room area the flow from one porch to the other is maintained and still has that connection between the indoors and outdoors. Joesler designed the porch and the windows are 8-foot window maintaining the connection to the outside.
- ◆ Photos must match the narration.
- ◆ With all the Joesler properties in the Catalina Foothills Estates there are no front façades, all elevations must maintain their significance.

Brooks the **Woollen, Herbert and Irma House** nomination is subject to the providing of photographs sufficient to meet the concerns expressed, be received by the end of the month, and be distributed to members of HSRC. If any member of the committee thinks that the nomination needs to be reviewed by the HSRC then the nomination will be held for the next available meeting. If the nomination is complete and accepted by SHPO, it moves to Group 1 and if not it moves to Group 2. Seconded by **Henderson**.

Majewski: Called for the vote
8 Ayes, Motion Carried
Unanimous



BROWN, H.H. HOUSE

Brooks Moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place **Brown, H.H. House** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion “C” at the **Local** level of significance and recommend the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper for placement on the National Register of Historic Places. Seconded by **Ryden**.

Discussion:

- ◆ The scale of the additions dwarfs the original house. This creates problems for its significance.
- ◆ There has been no documentation of the additions and alterations including photos that show those changes.
- ◆ The house does not match with Registration Requirements.

- ◆ **Ralph Comey, preparer:** There is a floor plan that shows the additions: expansion of kitchen area, a fill-in on the front façade. I can take more pictures to show additions and changes.
- ◆ **Frankeberger:** *"The biggest mistake is - the enclosure of the porch alters the essential form of the principal space. In addition the infill, which subsumes the original attached garage within the body of the house. Together with the extended wings, substantially alters the buildings massing and scale."*
- ◆ Would the committee want to see the nomination again with more photos and documentation?
- ◆ There is no differentiation between original fabric of the house and new alterations and additions.
- ◆ No need to see it again.
- ◆ Even with better documentation will it maintain significance?
- ◆ SHPO had concerns with the nomination.

Majewski: Called for the vote
3 Ayes, 5 Nays, Motion Failed



D. TIME AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING

a. 9:30 am – November 16, 2012 – Phoenix AZ

E. PUBLIC COMMENT

Demion Klinco, preparer: Gould-Drexel House. With revisions won't completed in time to be on the November agenda. Will it be on the Spring Agenda?

- ◆ If the nomination is received in time to make it on the agenda.
- ◆ Will be a stand alone nomination and it was moved to Group 2.
- ◆ Move to Criterion "C" only

Ralph Comey, preparer: If the HH Brown House nomination were to be reworked could it be resubmitted to the committee?

HSRC Committee: No, the house with all the changes no longer maintains its integrity.

E. ADJOURNED AT

Brooks moved to adjourn at 11:57 AM. Seconded by **Jacquemart**

Majewski: Called for the vote
8 Ayes, Motion Carried
Unanimous

