

**HISTORIC SITES REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES
CUTLER-PLOTKIN JEWISH HERITAGE CENTER
March 26, 2010**

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. Terry Majewski chaired the meeting
2. Meeting called to order at 11:05 AM

B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS

1. HSRC Committee Members present
 - a. **Terry Majewski**
 - b. **Kathleen Henderson**
 - c. **Don Ryden**
 - d. **John Jacquemart**
 - e. **Patricia Olson**
 - f. **Doug Kupel**

2. HSRC Committee Members absent
 - a. **Brooks Jeffery**
 - b. **John Lacy**
 - c. **Jan Balsom**

3. SHPO Staff Members present
 - a. **Jim Garrison**
 - b. **Bill Collins**
 - c. **Vivia Strang**
 - d. **Mary Robinson**
 - e. **Eric Vondy**

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. **New National Register Nominations**

Marist College Campus Historic District, Tucson

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the **Marist College Campus Historic District** nomination.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Marist College Campus Historic District** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria "**A & C**" at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places.

Motion Seconded: **Ryden**

Discussion:

Ryden: Criterion Consideration "A" was not mentioned in the motion and it is an important part of what makes this property important.

Jennifer Levstik, Tucson Historic Preservation Foundation – Preparer: In addition to this nomination being accepted for the National Register at the Local Level of significance, our goal is for it to be listed at the National Level of Significance. At the National Level of Significance grant money would be available for stabilization. While adobe architecture is important to Arizona, it may not be so in the rest of the nation, so we didn't emphasize it. Also the school was integrated at a time when most of the schools in the nation were segregated which makes a case for nominating it at the national level of significance.

Ryden: Was "A Consideration" checked off because it is owned by a religious organization?

Levstik: The Arch Diocese currently owns the property, but has stated they would donate it to the City of Tucson if it achieves National Register Status.

Jonathan Mabry, City of Tucson Historic Preservation Officer: We are seeking National level of significance, because it is worthy of that level of significance. It is critical for the city to maximize opportunities for federal funding in order to save this property. The City is working with Congressman Grijalva on a Federal Appropriations request for 2 million dollars to take care of stabilization and seismic retrofitting of this building. The interior is going to require another 3-4 million dollars in rehabilitation.

Kupel: The nomination before us is for local level of significance and a strong enough case for National Level of Significance has not been made. In section 7 – page 3, it states that Manuel Flores was a Master Builder. There isn't a strong enough explanation as to why he is considered such. Also under Criterion "C" work of a master usually refers to an Architect, but could refer to excellence of adobe construction. Modification of the chapel in the 1980s – change of the front entry and the new orientation should be discussed. How does the new entry impact the property's integrity? The Setting of the buildings needs to be discussed in more detail. The property is being nominated under Criterion "Consideration A", as a religious institution owns it and it is being nominated for its association with education. There needs to be an explanation of why both are in the nomination. Period of Significance dates are not consistent throughout the nomination and there are editing errors that will be passed on to the SHPO staff. On page 15 there is an issue with the boundary, which removes three buildings from the remaining property and that needs to be discussed more fully.

Majewski: A case needs to be made for a change from Local to National Level of significance.

Ryden: Why use 2 criteria if 1 will work for National Register purposes. Also there are only 2 other adobe buildings that compare in size to this one, San Xavier del Bac and Arizona National Guard Amory, with similar massing. How will you achieve your goal? If you are going after the National Level of Significance then comparisons need to be done with National level examples. You can make a case for either or both - parochial education or an example of a rare adobe structure. Both will need to be researched and discussed.

Majewski: Does the group think that C would be a harder nomination to send to the Keeper?

HSRC Committee: Either or both would work with a strengthening of discussion.

Majewski: R. Brooks Jeffery forwarded his remarks and they are mostly editorial, which I will pass on to SHPO Staff. If this nomination moves forward do we recommend that the preparer meet with SHPO staff to bring it up to a National Level of Significance?

Garrison: Your job is not to secure funding for the property, but it is to look at the nomination on its own. Traditionally under Save America's Treasures Program and Preserve America Program Congress splits the money between National Park Service and Earmarks, but there is no guarantee funding will become available for this property. We need to move forward with the nomination and address other issues as they become pertinent. I have no reservations that this building is of State significance, because of its unusual adobe construction. As funding becomes available, stabilization issues may be addressed. At that time strengthen the other integrity issues and make a case for a National level of significance.

Majewski: Does the committee concur with Mr. Garrison's suggestion?

HSRC Committee: Concurred with Mr. Garrison's suggestion.

Amended the Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Marist College Campus Historic District** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria "**A & C**" at the **State** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Ryden**

Levstik: Concur

Majewski: Called for the vote
5-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Review of Reclassification Application for Property in Winterhaven Historic District

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the **3373 North Forgeus Avenue, Tucson** reclassification

Majewski: R. Brooks Jeffery stated in his opinion, the property was ineligible based on the introduction of the arched addition.

Motion: **Ryden** moved that **3373 North Forgeus Avenue** retain its current status as a non-contributor to the Winter Haven Historic District. Motion Seconded: **Henderson**

Discussion:

After minimal discussion:

Kupel: Called for the question.

Majewski: Called for the vote
5-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Kupel: Procedural Question: Brentwood is not part of the MPDF. This property should be discussed prior to the MPDF discussion.

Majewski: Discuss Brentwood prior to the MPDF discussion.



Brentwood Historic District, Phoenix

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the **Brentwood Historic District** nomination.

Motion: **Olson** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Brentwood Historic District** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria “**A**” at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded:

Jacquemart

Discussion:

Kupel: In part 8 there should be a summary paragraph. On that same page in section 16 Hackbarth is used as a source for the street park and a better source would be Flemming. Page 8 – section 21 there is a reference to Redburn and that should be in the bibliography. In section 8 the discussion regarding architectural description should go in section 7.

Henderson: Prehistoric site La Ciudad should be mentioned, but not added to the map and add a label for the church.

Kevin Weight, City of Phoenix Office: Spoke in favor of the nomination, stating that the nomination has been in the works since 2002.

Majewski: Called for the vote
5-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Historic Residential Subdivisions and Architecture in Central Phoenix, 1912-1963 MPDF

Majewski: Vivia sent out an email summarizing the problems with this MPDF. There is a MPDF from 1993, which is being amended by Bill Collins. We are reviewing the new document with a list of problems and items that need to be incorporated into the document.

Collins: I took the 2 MPDFs and put them side-by-side, checking each document and how it approached the same topics. The amended document was confusing with supplemental information and certain sections of expanded context in other sections. At the same time there was some contradictory placement of information. It would be cleaner to take the approach that the amendment should be a replacement document. In that respect the original document would not be referred to at all. Good material, found in the original document would be inserted into the amended document. In that way all the districts covered in the old document would be covered as well as new. Originally I considered this to be a

supplement to the original document. The earlier document had a cutoff date of 1950, but actually has little context related to the 1940s. To this end, I will work with the City of Phoenix staff to accomplish this task.

Majewski: It would be helpful if there were a statement in the very beginning of the amended version referring to the original document for clarification.

Collins: There will be a preface as well as a more detailed section H.

Terry Meyers, Preservation Central: Chrystal Brown and myself have been working on this project for the past 2 years. The scope of work for this project originally, was to write an amendment to the original document. We completed that document and were given additional instruction to simply complete a document that started where the original ended. We have the earlier document and we would like to be involved in the creation of a new MPDF.

Collins: Enough material has been researched and can be found in both documents, making this primarily an editing job. The only issue raised was the conflict regarding bungalows. The way both nominations approached that property type is not consistent and needs to be worked out.

Majewski: We do need a motion prior to working on the nominations being considered under this MPDF. Brooks Jeffery concurred in his email, which pointed out problems with the MPDF, but stated he would be comfortable with allowing the preparer and SHPO sort this out. He also stated that he had no substantive comments on any of the proposed districts including Brentwood. Bob Frankeberger's reviewed the Phoenix nominations and his comment regarding the MPDF amendment was, "The amendment is superfluous, confusing and should be thrown out."

Garrison: Mr. Frankeberger is in favor of combining the two documents.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Historic Residential Subdivisions and Architecture in Central Phoenix, 1912-1963 MPDF** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places.

Motion Seconded: **Henderson**

Discussion:

Kupel: The current version of the MPDF seems cobbled together and confusing. It needs to be a unified product. There needs to be one editor working to make it more cohesive. There are references in the document that do not appear in the bibliography. There is an overlap in the descriptions of the subdivisions, which dictates the need for a discussion regarding the overlapping subdivision construction time frames. There are multiple formatting issues. FHA loans being a factor in subdivision design is not supported in facts. How do we determine how many of the houses had FHA loans, is that a significant number? Section E – page 26 states a significant portion of Phoenix's residential construction owes its form and appearance to a Federal Housing program. How can form and appearance be based on mortgage? Why is the Title 1 discussion included?

Collins: The original MPDF had the discussion regarding FHA loans in it.

Jacquemart: FHA set the patterns of designs for homes that received loans from FHA. There are set plans for FHA loans available from that period. In Yapple Park you can see those exact designs. That does carry over Nationally where you see those designs. FHA used specific designs, which carried over to homes built after World War II using FHA loans. Is Ms. Finbraaten available to work with SHPO on the MPDF?

Weight: Yes, Ms. Finbraaten is available to work on this document.

Garrison: Can the issue of how the subdivisions were developed in relationship to FHA and the developer be discussed? The developer subdivided the land into different plats. The developer became the builder and the FHA facilitated by mortgaging the individual properties. In short, FHA mortgages influenced the whole construction process.

Weight: The influence that FHA had in the housing market was discussed in the original MPDF, but it didn't tell the whole story and we decided to strengthen that discussion in the amended MPDF. FHA loans jumpstarted the housing market at the end of the Depression and therefore were an important part of the discussion. The FHA determined layout of the subdivisions, materials used, and design of homes.

Kupel: How do we know which homes are financed by the FHA?

Collins: Unless the individual house is researched there is no way to know. The original MPDF had an abstract discussion of FHA and how it worked. The amended MPDF was more specific.

Weight: At the beginning of this project I wondered how the FHA influenced design in this time period, but after researching designs used, it became easy to determine which designs were FHA. All the developer's advertisements – "FHA Financing Available" was a prominent part of the ads.

Garrison: In the 70s HUD set the standards for subdivisions and was a great influence on the homes built at that time. In that manner FHA mortgages were major influences of subdivisions 1935 - 1963.

Collins: I didn't read the MPDF section on FHA loans as meaning that if a property received an FHA loan it was eligible. This is about the FHA Loan Era, which is just as significant as the Streetcar Era. The effect of the streetcar varied from neighborhood. Which is the same way neighborhoods varied due to availability of FHA loans. FHA loans changed the way neighborhoods were developed in a specific time frame.

Kupel: The discussion needs to be strengthened.

Ryden: How, can any type of financing manifest itself physically in design? Whether it is the scale of the subdivision or the size and shape of houses. FHA is different in that it has specific standards required for a FHA loan. What should be stated is that houses built under FHA standards are a manifestation of those standards. How the house is financed is of no importance unless you document a neighborhood and find FHA ranches in that neighborhood, and then the influence of the FHA loan could be determined. This MPDF could be set up in a better manner. There's a piece of this puzzle that hasn't been included in our 10 districts. The MPDF doesn't set up the evaluation for cookie cutter subdivisions. There needs to be better criteria in the document for determining eligibility. The aspects of subdivision development are: financing, advertising, zoning and code consideration, real estate development, design of setting or site, construction methods, materials, architectural design. Use those criteria as registration requirements to determine eligibility requirements and then apply them to the older buildings, as opposed to the cookie cutter buildings. Thereby making a filter by which the whole thing can be organized. In certain neighborhoods some aspects are more important than others. We need to have this filter for future cookie cutter neighborhood nominations.

Majewski: MPDFs can always be edited. Do terminology problems need to be addressed?

Ryden: There is a need for definitions for styles terminology regarding neighborhoods.

Jacquemart: All FHA loans were through Valley National Bank and all Valley National Bank loans were FHA. Research could be done to determine lender and thereby determine FHA loan.

Majewski: Do we need to see this again or can we vote now.

HSRC Committee: Consensus was to vote with understanding that SHPO and the City of Phoenix work on problems with document.

Majewski: Called for the vote
5-0 In Favor of Eligibility

HSRC meeting adjourned for lunch at 12:30 pm



HSRC meeting reconvened at 1:00 pm

Campus Vista Historic District, Phoenix

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the **Campus Vista Historic District** nomination.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Campus Vista Historic District** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion "**A & C**" at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Jacquemart**

Discussion:

Olson: A column added to the inventory table stating why a property is not eligible would be helpful.

Ryden: Why is building 843 West Osborn Road considered ineligible? I am familiar with this building and it hasn't changed over the years.

Weight: It was an integrity issue.

Ryden: It was originally built as a music studio. The building hasn't changed much over the years. Indicate where important buildings are on the map. A discussion regarding Temple Beth Israel and the large number of Jewish families who live in close proximity to it would be helpful.

Majewski: Called for the vote
5-0 In Favor of Eligibility



East Evergreen Historic District, Phoenix

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the **East Evergreen Historic District** nomination.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **East Evergreen Historic District** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion “**A & C**” at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Olson**

Discussion:

Ryden: Regarding the Era of Significance, build out was later than the date listed of 1930. Properties at 502, 1409, and 1430 seem to be respectable ranch style buildings, but are considered non-contributors.

Weight: In the original nomination the duplexes were considered contributors. Building ceased between 1930 and 1947 so there is a significant gap in construction in the neighborhood and the duplexes were constructed in 1949.

Ryden: They should be considered eligible. Encanto Palmcroft Historic District is one example where there is a significant gap in construction in the development of the area. The duplexes should be added in and that construction date used as the build out date.

Garrison: Non-contributors at the edge of the district are problematic for the Keeper especially a gerrymandered boundary around a district. The delineation of the park, a contributor, doesn't appear so in this instance.

Ryden: Indicate it in parenthesis – (Contributor Park)

Olson: Why are 502-538 East Willetta Street included and 321-339 East Willetta Street not included?

Weight: They were not considered Historic Resources.

Collins: Are there any problems with the moved building?

Ryden: This building was moved into a neighborhood of similar styles and does not appear out of place. This building contributes under Criterion “C” and shouldn't be a problem.

Majewski: Called for the vote
5-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Encanto Manor Historic District, Phoenix

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the **Encanto Manor Historic District** nomination.

Motion: **Doug** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Encanto Manor Historic District** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion “**A & C**” at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Henderson**

Discussion:

Kupel: What is Razor Stone?

Weight: It is a very narrow sharply cut stone.

Kupel: Why isn't the Shopping Center, an important building, in the neighborhood included the nomination?

Weight: It could be included, but we left it out, because the owner didn't want it included.

Ryden: The term Picturesque was used in reference to this subdivision and 2 curved streets.

Weight: The term was used to describe more than 2 streets. There is the proximity of the Golf Course, which is a big amenity for the neighborhood. Also, Encanto Manor and Encanto Vista are considered completing pieces of the larger Encanto puzzle (320 acres) as James W. Doris, developer, envisioned it.

Ryden: The Golf Course needs to be mentioned in the discussion. The large number of teachers living in the area is mentioned so you should also mention Phoenix College being in the neighborhood. Encanto Village Shopping Center should at least be mentioned in the nomination.

Majewski: Called for the vote
5-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Encanto Vista Historic District, Phoenix

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the **Encanto Vista Historic District** nomination.

Motion: **Doug** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Encanto Vista Historic District** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion “**A & C**” at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Henderson**

Discussion:

Kupel: With respect to housing – in section 8 – page 19 non-essential housing is discussed and in other places in the nomination material shortages are discussed. The discussion needs to be consistent. If Encanto Vista and Campus Vista are adjacent to one another, why aren't they one district?

Brooks: Encanto Vista is laid out in a horseshoe pattern and the district holds together with that pattern. That is what ties that district together.

Garrison: Doris developed them both. The Doris house is in Encanto Vista. It seems logical to combine them. The Keeper may look at these nominations and consider one of them to be ineligible. There is a better chance of these moving forward as one nomination.

Weight: When the neighborhood approached the City of Phoenix, they proposed doing the 2 neighborhoods as one. Their suggested name was Encanto Park View. Over time it became clear that the neighborhoods began to want their own district nomination. Encanto Vista went on the city register in 2003 and Encanto Manor in 2006. The boundaries followed the subdivision plats. Encanto Vista was plated in 1943 and Encanto Manor was plated in 1945. There are some subtle differences and the City's preference is that they remain separate.

Ryden: Make the subtleties more obvious. Why is 730 Encanto Boulevard labeled as a non-contributor?

Chrystal Brown, preparer: Not sure.

Ryden: I am familiar with this house and research needs to be done regarding when the addition was constructed or if it was an addition or original. The addition was there when I lived in the neighborhood.

Kupel: In section 7 – page 12 states in the nomination that there are alterations including a 2-story addition that make it ineligible.

(On the map of the Encanto Manor Nomination indicate the frontage road and landscaped median on Thomas, because that type of feature has played prominent roles in determining adverse effect due to public works projects. i.e. Light Rail Placement and other like projects.)

Olson: On page 19 it states that 50 builders constructed homes in the district, but there is a list of approximately 20 in the nomination who were significant. Is there a place in the nomination with an explanation?

Brown: The names on the list are ones that we could find.

Olson: Perhaps change the title to “Known Builders”.

Majewski: Called for the vote
5-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Garfield Historic District, Phoenix

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the **Garfield Historic District** nomination.

Motion: **Doug** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Garfield Historic District** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion “**A**” at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Henderson**

Discussion:

Kupel: Section 7 – page 11, Ideal Block is mentioned. The term is not familiar and needs to be referenced. Also, the double roof house needs more explanation. Section 8 – page 46, the school at Washington and 9th Street and its name should be used.

Henderson: Section 8 – page 49, the park was named for the Verde River Pipeline (canal).

Ryden: Label important commercial buildings.

Kupel: Section 8 – 52, infill bungalows were designed by Ryden.

Ryden: Since streetcar lines were important to the development of the subdivision, streetcar lines should be indicated on the map. (Also in any nominations considered streetcar neighborhoods.)

Majewski: Called for the vote

5-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Los Olivos Historic District, Phoenix

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the **Los Olivos Historic District** nomination.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Los Olivos Historic District** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion “**A & C**” at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Olson**

Discussion:

Ryden: During our tour, was the house at 363 pointed out as already listed on the register?

Weight: Yes, the property was pointed out as listed.

Ryden: If this is a neighborhood with streetscape features so important that they are listed, then shouldn't they be indicated on the map?

Barbara Stocklin, City of Phoenix Historic Preservation Officer: It would not make a difference, as long as the district boundary is given, utility work would have to come through the Phoenix Historic Preservation Office for clearance. If we know ahead of time then we have a better chance to negotiate.

Garrison: A Google map included with the nomination would be an accurate means of documentation

Majewski: Called for the vote

5-0 In Favor of Eligibility



North Garfield Historic District, Phoenix

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the **North Garfield Historic District** nomination.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **North Garfield Historic District** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion “**A**” at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Henderson**

Discussion:

Olson: Need to be consistent with beginning of period of significance. There are contradictions throughout the document. On page 4 it is 1955 and on the top of page 9 it is 1896.

Kupel: Section 8 – page 32, the dates are stated as between 1838 and 1945.

Ryden: On page 40, west half map, upper right hand corner, the first vertical line on 12th street. The vertical line should be deleted, because that is the open end of the map on the next page.

Majewski: Called for the vote

5-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Villa Verde Historic District, Phoenix

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the **Villa Verde Historic District** nomination.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Villa Verde Historic District** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion “**A & C**” at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Ryden**

Discussion:

Kupel: Section 2 – page 20, additional items mentioned as included are missing.

Garrison: An aerial photo would help show how this neighborhood is an island in the midst of a commercial area.

Majewski: Called for the vote

5-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Woodlea Historic District, Phoenix

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the **Woodlea Historic District** nomination.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Woodlea Historic District** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion “**A & C**” at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Henderson**

Discussion:

Ryden: Was the build out 1955 and is that the cut off?

Weight: Yes, it was.

Ryden: The unusual sidewalks need to be mentioned.

Majewski: Called for the vote
5-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Yaple Historic District, Phoenix

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the Yaple Historic District nomination.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Yaple Historic District on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion "**A & C**" at the Local level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Henderson**

Discussion:
After minimal discussion:

Majewski: Called for the vote
5-0 In Favor of Eligibility



D. Old Business

1. Approval of Minutes from the January 29, 2010 HSRC Meeting

Motion: **Ryden** moved to approve the minutes from January 29, 2010 HSRC Meeting. **Jacquemart** seconded the motion.

Majewski: Called for the vote
5-0 in Favor of Eligibility



E. Staff Reports

1. **Collins:** National Register update
 - a. Sacred Heart Home for the Aged
 - b. There are approximately 14 nominations at the Keeper's Office

2. **Garrison:**
 - a. Gave an overview of State Parks Budget. As a result of the Legislature sweeping State Parks funds we have a budget of 9.5 million dollars. Additional layoffs for both central office and parks were made. The goal is to try to get an initiative on the ballot that will give State Parks a funding source. The Legislature swept the Heritage Funds for this year and eliminated the Heritage Funds from next year. Next year's budget could be worse.
 - b. Survey and Inventory: Expanding carport infill policy to include porch infill, or any kind of infill, and giving direction to the 2 strike rule policy regarding modification of a property and its integrity after modification.
 - c. SHPO is working on stylistic issues regarding terms Sonoran Revival, Territorial and others. I propose creation of a Sub-Committee consisting of myself, Don Ryden, and R. Brooks Jeffery, to work on this issue. Majewski appointed a working committee of Jim Garrison, Don Ryden, and R. Brooks Jeffery to discuss this issue further and bring before the HSRC members.
 - d. Gave an overview of legislative issues.
 - e. Gave an overview of the 100 Architects List that he is compiling for the Centennial.
 - f. The preservation conference is going forward and will be in Flagstaff May 14 & 15, 2010.

F. Public Comment: None

G. Agenda Items: None

H. Time and Date:

Strang: Next meeting date suggested is October 29, 2010. Requested HSRC members check their calendars and get back to her.

Majewski: How many HSRC meetings will there be this year?

Garrison: Bill Collins suggested a policy meeting this year with no nominations scheduled, during the summer.

Majewski: Send suggested dates and times to the committee and we can check our schedules.

Lawrence Bell, Executive Director: Gave an overview of the history of the Cutler-Plotkin Jewish Heritage Center and the process by which it was rehabilitated. A tour followed the meeting's adjournment.

Adjourned at: 3:43 pm