

**HISTORIC SITES REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES  
ARIZONA STATE PARKS, PHOENIX ARIZONA  
MARCH 21, 2014**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

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

**B. CALL TO ORDER PUBLIC SESSION/ AND ROLL CALL**

**1. HSRC Committee Members present**

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

**2. HSRC Committee Members Absent**

- a. Jan Balsom
- b. Kathryn Leonard

**3. SHPO Staff Members present**

- a. Jim Garrison
- b. Bill Collins
- c. Robert Frankeberger
- d. Mary Robinson
- e. Eric Vondy
- f. Mary Ellen Walsh

**4. Election of Chair and Vice Chair for 2014**

- a. **Kupel** nominated Terry Majewski to be Chairperson of the HSRC Committee for 2014 and Don Ryden as Vice-Chair.
- b. **Jeffrey** seconded the nominations.
- c. **Lacy** Moved the nominations be closed.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote  
Motion Carried

**C. NEW BUSINESS**

**1. NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS**

**a. Thompson Draw Summer Homes Unit 1 Historic District, Payson, Gila County**

**Kupel** recused himself from the committee. He is one of the preparers of the nomination.

Collins gave an overview of **Thompson Draw Summer Homes Unit 1 Historic District**

Motion: **Jeffrey** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Thompson Draw Summer Homes Unit 1 Historic District** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion “**A**” 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: **Lacy**.

**SHPO Staff Comments:**

*“The original National Register Nomination (NRN) was reviewed by SHPO staff for determination of eligibility and the primary concerns were the lack of historic context for Arizona Forest Service Summer homes and the pictures provided only showed the roads with the cabins in the background. SHPO staff believes that the current NRN does contain an adequate historic context and the pictures show the individual properties. The remaining issue is the integrity of the individual properties; in some cases there have been multiple additions and changes. What basis is offered that confirms, “The property possesses the physical features necessary to convey the aspect of history with which it is associated?” Integrity, in the parlance of historic preservation, means: The ability to convey historical significance, i.e., the perception of physical features and characteristics that bear the signs and signature of a historical theme, placing such a property within, or associated with, an historical context.”*

**Discussion:**

- The Period of Significance end date was listed as the 50-year cutoff at 1964. Why not 1960, because that seemed to be the build out period?

**Kupel, A Preparer of Nomination:** Used the customary 50-year cutoff date.

**Bob Graham, A Preparer of the Nomination:** Issues SHPO brought up on this project were the additions and alterations made to the properties. We found that there were a number of additions and alterations had been made, but they were made within a few years of the construction of the homes. Changing the cutoff date might make some of the properties non-contributors. There are no verified dates for the changes made to the properties. All the contributing properties were constructed prior to 1960.

**Roger Juszcak, Owner:** First off I would like to thank SHPO staff for working with the preparers on this nomination and to say the majority of owners are in favor of the nomination.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote

Motion Carried



**b. Negrette Residence, Williams, Coconino County**

Collins gave an overview of **Negrette Residence**

Motion: **Ryden** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Negrette Residence** 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: **Olson**.

**SHPO Staff Comments:**

*“The Negrette Residence was determined potentially eligible with some SHPO recommendations for changes in the NRN. Those changes were addressed and incorporated in the current nomination, which is now being forwarded to HSRC for review.”*

**Discussion:**

- Need clarification on Period of Significance, Significant Dates and Criteria “A” and “C.”
  - As to the Period of Significance it is understood why it states the 1920s to 1940s making that a period. Customarily Significant Dates mark some event making the 1920s to 1940s too broad. Did something special occur during this time frame? Zooming in on an event or getting rid of the decade references would help.
  - “A” and “C” are not often broken apart in the Period of Significance. The house has had 2 lives, one as staff housing for the lumber mill and the other as a private residence. If architecture is the only thing marked for significance then why use Criterion “A?” Why not just Criterion “C?” It has been a residence in both instances.

**Kerry L. Carter-Moda, Owner:** I thought the bunkhouses and offices would be considered industry and significant as such to our town, because that's who built the town and the residences had nothing to do with the industry. Giving the structures 2 different lives.

- Then industry should be added to your statement of significance, which would then support your breaking them apart into Criteria "A" and "C."
- Nothing was marked on the cover sheet, and in Section 8 page 12 under summary it states the residence is eligible under Criterion "C," which was marked out and noted change to "A" in red. Then on Section 8, page 8 both "A" and "C" are marked. Which is it?
- It appears to be a bit of editing.
- There is no narrative about Criterion "A." There is only a narrative about Criterion "C."
- Section 8, page 12 was to be the narrative about Criterion "A."
- Only 1 Criterion is needed for the National Register. Look at this building as domestic architecture – going from staff housing to a single-family residence. Showing how a domestic building changes character within the historic period.
- **Ryden** amended the motion to Criterion "C" only and **Olson** seconded it.
- Why wasn't this property included in the historic district?
- Include other features on the property within the nomination. Well and wall in particular should be added.

**Carter-Moda:** The block includes a Safeway, Dairy Queen, and 2 historic homes. The original boundary was drawn on the other side and excluded this area. To redraw the boundary would reopen the entire district. Also I wanted it to be eligible on its own for some manor of protection.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote  
Motion Carried



### **c. Shrine of Santa Rita in the Desert, Vail, Pima County**

Collins gave an overview of **Shrine of Santa Rita in the Desert**

**Jeffrey** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Shrine of Santa Rita in the Desert** 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**.

#### **SHPO Staff Comments:**

*"The Shrine of Santa Rita in the Desert received a recommendation of preliminary eligibility from SHPO staff. It was recommended for listing under A for its role as one of the area's leading cultural institutions from 1934 to the present, when it housed the areas largest Catholic congregation and served as a community meeting/gathering place and social service center and under C as a property that embodies the distinctive characteristics of a religious building constructed in an eclectic combination of Mission Revival and Spanish Colonial Revival Style. Additionally, the Shrine embodies distinctive methods of construction - primarily adobe. During Pima County's review it was determined that the boundaries had changed in 2013, but does not affect any contributing Shrine properties. Those changes will be made to the NRN."*

#### **Discussion:**

- Styles need to be specific. Terms Mission, Mission Revival, Spanish Colonial Revival, Mission Colonial Revival, and Gothic Revival are all mixed in the nomination. Need to determine the appropriate style.
- Page 18 states that Mission Heritage started with Mission Inn in 1876 at Riverside that predated the popularity of Mission Revival that hit America in 1893 at the Chicago Worlds Fair. In 1876 it was a wooden building, it wasn't until 1903 when Frank Miller the owner of the inn built the 1<sup>st</sup> mission wing. Clean up the narrative about 1903 and after that the 3 wings and the rotunda.
- Add the Santa Fe Railroad to the Southern Pacific Railroad reference.
- Broader explanation on the aspects of integrity not discussed. A couple sentences regarding the most important aspects would strengthen the nomination.

- The context was not well developed for “A” and “C.” “C” was better developed and “A” was weak.

**Ian Milliken, Pima County Cultural Resources:** Didn’t regard the content within our scope to comment upon. We do think the nomination is strongest under “C.” The context should discuss how this building continues to play a major role in the Hispanic community.

- The period of significance should end at 1939 when it was transferred to the diocese and the diocese operated the community center.
- The closest style would be Spanish Colonial Revival.
- It is a religious structure, but it doesn’t fit the Mission Colonial Revival.
- The site plan doesn’t have a boundary showing the National Register District.
- Under Criterion Consideration A, there is no discussion of its life as religious facility.

**Milliken:** The plan has been drawn, but it is skewed. It is not oriented correctly, and J. J. Lamb will correct the boundary for the district.

- There are other technical mistakes – lime-plaster glazed walls aren’t appropriate, the period of significance is too long, and it isn’t correct to call it adobe revival.
- There is some repetition in the nomination that needs to be addressed.
- Was this the social center in town or were other public buildings also gathering places for the community? Would this strengthen the “A” Criterion?
- “C” is better covered; strengthening “A” should be done if it is to be cited. If not use Criterion “C” only.
- Add a summary statement for Criterion “C.”
- Make the Narrative Statement of Significance about Criterion “C.”
- The social aspect becomes additional developmental activity.
- The period of significance should end with the diocese purchase.
- Should criterion F be marked since it is a memorial property? No, not necessary.
- On page 16 it states that it is the only Catholic Church in the United States built as a memorial for a Japanese citizen.
- Dropped Criterion “A” changing it to “C” only. **Jeffrey** amended the motion and **Ryden** seconded it.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote  
Motion Carried



**d. Kirkland-McKinney Ditch, Tempe, Maricopa County**

Collins gave an overview of **Kirkland-McKinney Ditch**

**Lacy** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Kirkland-McKinney Ditch** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion “**A**” at the **Local** level of significance, and recommended that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Jacquemart**.

**SHPO Staff Comments:**

*“The Kirkland-McKinney Ditch was approved for listing and submission to the Keeper’s Office at the 11/16/12 HSRC meeting. The City of Tempe was listed as the property owner, and they were notified of the HSRC meeting, but actually the property had been sold. One of the new property easement owners objected to the boundaries and not being notified of the HSRC meeting. The NRN was returned from the Keeper’s Office and per the new owner’s attorney the corrected boundaries were included in the current NRN and notification of the HSRC meeting was provided to the property owner and their attorney.”*

**Discussion:**

- Nominations like this are important to keep around and to call attention to our early history.
- There was no discussion of the legal basis for the ditch.

- The ditch was created in 1869, prior to any of the reclamation acts. The assumption is that the ditch was created under the Right-of-Way Act.
- The Period of Significance justification statement is missing.
- It is mentioned in the section that covers SRP changing it under their rehabilitation program representing the ending date for the period of significance. Put a heading and place that justification in that section.
- The farm started in 1869 and the earliest the canal could have been constructed is 1870.
- There is no federal right-of-way for this property.
- SRP may have more information about the appropriate date and also dates would have been filed with the county recorder.
- We are seeing this again, because protocol was not followed. This time it has been followed and the nomination has been correctly noticed.
- What is the previous boundary and how has the new one changed?

**Joe Nucci, City of Tempe Historic Preservation:** The boundary didn't change, the ownership changed.

**Justin Martinez, Owner of a property adjacent to the ditch:** The legal description was revised and has been updated on the current application. The verbal description is very basic and encompasses the open ditch from Gary Drive almost to the headwall. It is the easement portion of all 4 properties. Not to exceed 16 feet into any of the 4 parcels.

- Delineate boundaries on map to avoid confusion about what is in the actual nomination and show all 4 properties boundaries.
- On current application there are a few.

**Martinez:** On page 2 under category of property, "Structure" should be checked and not "Site." That affects page 3 discussing the resources within the property. On page 15, the UTM reference used to verify the location of the property needs to be verified. Latitude & Longitude could be used. The giant reed is not historically correct and will be replaced with a native plant. The Palo Verde and Cottonwood trees are outside the boundary, but will not be removed.

- Is the SRP easement line part of the boundary?
- No it is not.
- Only looking at the above ground ditch.
- How do we modify the justification statement on page 19?
- Put a period after Tempe Canal on page 17, delete the remainder of the sentence, and adjust the description on page 6. Those are not references to contributing properties, but there are a couple of old trees providing a setting for the property.
- Need a clarification shown on the map of previous discussion.
- Should the Local level of significance be changed to State?
- It is the longest continuously used open ditch in the Salt River Valley.
- Lacy amended the motion to State Level of Significance, and Jacquemart seconded it.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote  
Motion Carried



## 2. UPDATE ON JOESLER MPDF:

**Collins:** *"The Joesler MPDF and its accompanying nominations were returned with comments from the Keeper's staff. We have been struggling with this trying to interpret both Lisa Deline's comments, work among ourselves to try to clarify our views on this issue. As you know there have been unending disagreements on approaches for this. There has yet to be resolution. You have the latest statement from SHPO staff. Bob Frankeberger wrote this up and it is probably the best version of his many memos on this topic to date. I think it clarifies one of those points. On the other hand, much of what this bulletin talks about is the reopening of the Context. The statements/comments received from the Keepers Office concentrated mainly on the section on building criteria. Whether those can be truly separated, is one of the questions in the air. As we discuss this you will see that there is a lot of disagreement among everyone regarding this issue."*

## **THE RESIDENTIAL ARCHITECTURE OF JOSIAS JOESLER IN TUCSON, AZ 1927-1956 – Robert Frankeberger**

*SHPO staff observations/recommendations for revising the Multiple Property Documentation Form (MPDF) and individual Joesler designed National Register Nominations.*

*As SHPO staff understands the message in the various NR bulletins, a nomination must begin with a definable context, identifying its characteristics followed by the identification of those features that may be recognized in Joesler's buildings as conveying the signs, signature, i.e., significance, and characteristics of the historical context.*

*Context and registration requirements are inexorably connected. There cannot be a context and a separate and discrete set of defining characteristics derived solely from Joesler's body of work. His work must be indicative of the historical context within which it is derivative. In order to be historically significant, a property must signify a recognized trend, theme or movement important in history, at either the national, state or local, but not personal, level of significance.*

*That Joesler's skill improved over successive periods in his career, no doubt qualifies his personal history; but the character of his oeuvre did not emerge from a vacuum. It, like every human endeavor, is expressive (significant) of a shared experience.*

*We should be direct and simplify what has become an inordinately complex matter:*

*Identify the context, i.e., the architectural trends and fashions, from which Joesler's work derives; describe the characteristics of this school or theory of aesthetic design; indicate the signs and signature, of that aesthetic, as characteristic of Joesler's designs; and finally for each of Joesler's buildings, assess whether or not, and integral to a specific design, that characteristic significance is still conveyed.*

*A casual review of architectural literature and publications of Joesler's formative years and that of his contemporary practitioners, indicates both a basic approach to the design solution, usually involving a hierarchy of discrete spaces, often informed by a directed progress or articulated circulation sequence, with attention to setting and orientation, and the whole enveloped within an historicist reference or a stylistically retro expression. A regional style might be Mission Revival, Spanish Colonial Revival, Pueblo Revival or Vernacular as in Mexican Ranch House.*

*Designs of this school of architectural thought differ from the Modern style which pursued a pronounced separation from past fashions, pursuing technological innovation in both new materials, their production and construction, characterized by open, flowing spaces.*

*Ordinarily the defining characteristics in architecture are those qualities, such as massing, scale and proportion, and size, which are evident in all buildings irrespective of the manner and style in which they are fashioned.*

*If no other context comes to mind, we can agree that Joesler was "old school," along with Mahoney or Fitzhugh as differentiated from, say, Arthur T. Brown or Cliff May.*

### **Discussion:**

**Jeffrey:** As preparers we have been trying to follow the Keepers guidelines and it has been a frustrating process. It was a disappointment when those comments came back. I immediately tried to contact Lisa Deline for clarification. The first was sent back to the SHPO. Bob's comments related more to the context as opposed to Lisa's comments on the Registration Requirements. The Registration Requirements seemed straightforward and contradicted some of the recommendation that SHPO provided in terms of Primary and Secondary features. I am happy to do that. I would like some clarification regarding the discrepancy on working on context that Lisa Deline didn't address. We will be happy to fine-tune the requirements.

**Collins:** There is a gap here, since Vivia Strang is not here. She has also had phone conversations with Lisa Deline. The impression that I got from Vivia was that Lisa did not put all the comments that she had in her mind in that document. She did in fact have problems with the context, much of which went back to the first rejection letter.

**Frankeberger:** In the first paragraph of Lisa's comments tried to precisely connect the Context with the qualifying Registration Requirements.

**Jeffrey:** Her first statement was, "The major problem with the MPDF is that it needs stronger and clearer Registration Requirements."

**Collins:** In my opinion, the Registration Requirements have their problems as she stated. It is my belief that they cannot be resolved without reopening the context study. An attempt to tweak it again will fail because it needs to be fully reexamined. Lisa indicated "that the Registration Requirements were clearly designed to include all the buildings in this submission. They saw

through that. The range of changes that those building have gone through in many ways raises the question whether there is any characteristic of Joesler's work that is essential. They clearly do not believe they are all eligible.

**Jeffrey:** Do you have guidance for prepares to be as exclusive as possible? Then this notion of exclusion versus inclusion should be addressed.

**Collins:** My feeling on that was, in all those nominations, I only considered one as eligible. It is what I refer to as John Wayne Cutout house and was the only one that still had the feeling of the in-door out-door relationship. It was the only one with a porch that had not been glassed in or any other modifications. You walked in and Helen Murphy's artwork was right there. You could smell the open air. If you cannot smell the open air, then you do not have an in-door relationship. That was the essential Joesler residence.

**Jeffrey:** Lisa's other comment regarding the Rehabilitation Standards and Guidelines, it is then the onus of the property owner to address whether or not it complies with the Secretary of the Interior Standards. Isn't the MPDF's role to provide an inclusive list of potentially eligible properties and not only pure expressions of Joesler are eligible. Individual nominations would come stating that here are some variations of individual nominations that meet the Secretary of the Interior Standards.

**Collins:** No MPDF can ever contain all the possible variations.

**Jeffrey:** That's what we were trying to do. We were trying to be as inclusive as possible to determine, stating that we think these buildings still have integrity, still convey significance, ones that are either acceptable or unacceptable. So that is not the role?

**Jeffrey:** Lisa is for the MPDF. It shouldn't be aiming toward defining those boundaries, but rather saying this is the pure essence of it and it is up to the individual nominations.

**Collins:** Here are the important features that make up the total context. You can't possibly list everything that could happen. Yes, it is up to the individual nomination to show that it is a potential candidate for listing.

**Jeffrey:** Lisa is saying don't mess with the secondary features, just do the primary features and leave it at that.

**Collins:** Lisa doesn't want to see this again until it is completely finished. She delegated the rest of this process to the SHPO.

**Jeffrey:** Would it be possible to have a phone call among SHPO staff, the preparers, and Lisa?

**Collins:** Definitely not. She does not want to be a part of those discussions. She clearly delegated to the SHPO. She does not want to see this again.

**Collins:** SHPO staff is divided on this.

**Garrison:** It is a matter of idealism versus what is the shortest path to resolving the issue. Lisa is asking an integrity question and not a significance question. Bob is arguing that significance and integrity are interrelated and there needs to be a to be amendments to the significance statement to qualify the integrity issues. That's what the issue is for SHPO. I think that if the group is willing to work on the integrity issue that we might have someone look at and resolve the larger context issue and possible look into one that examines housing in the west or Arizona as a larger context study. This would make it possibly for some of the other architects in Tucson to be examined by the larger context scope of that study. Where the context is weak is, "How do you assess a Joesler against another Joesler." One of the things we realize regarding the purity of a Joesler design is if they retain integrity and they are eligible. Where is the line of how many changes can be done to a Joesler before it is no longer considered eligible? That is the crux of what this issue has been about.

**Collins:** I think the context is being made more difficult than it should be. The real issue here is the evolution of Tucson's Architectural Heritage in broad terms. Starts off with a Mexican Pueblo, second phase is after the railroad comes in (Americanized with new materials and new styles), early twentieth century – Regional Spanish Romanticism (out of California and New Mexico), and in the 30s to 50s Modernism enters Tucson. In the later part of the twentieth century continuing tension is created between Regional Romanticism and International Modernism. That's the context. Who's contributing to that context and in what way? There are several architects contributing. The primary contributors are the Murphey's, not Joesler. The Murphey's have a vision in their minds and buy into the Spanish Romanticism of the time. They want Tucson to be a new Santa Barbara. They need someone to materialize what they want to do and find an unknown draftsman by the name of Joesler, who turns out to be skilled in his craft. Joesler dies and they find a new architect, Juan Worner y Boz, who does exactly the same thing by materializing their view. That is the story. You now have the broad outline of Tucson architecture. You have the role of the Murphey's with Joesler in particular. If this document had followed that path none of this would have been a problem. What defines the characteristics of Spanish Romanticism would have emerged from the document. Bob would add additional context about beaux-arts traditions in relationship to Joesler.

**Jeffrey:** What you are implying puts Joesler into a regional if not national context, when we are really talking about a local level of significance and this where we get confused in preparing a larger context. Yes we understand trends, how they trickle down to the local level and that we need to address these. What you are describing is something for a future CLG grant.

**Garrison:** It's what is happening in Tucson in relationship to that. I think Bill's outline is correct. The question is, "Does the body of work exist?" to compile from the original research.

**Frankeberger:** I agree with Bill that this has become overly complicated. Look at the bulletins to which you attach the significance to a context under “C” as an example Spanish Colonial Revival, Mission Revival, or vernacular. That is a very difficult context to establish. The only difference is what Jim referred to, the beaux-arts parti which would be the distinction between open spaces and discrete spaces and how that relates to the treatment and therefore integrity. As knocking out a wall is detrimental to discrete spaces then enclosing a patio would affect the feeling of indoor-outdoor relationships.

**Garrison:** Trying to find the line is difficult.

**Frankeberger:** The question becomes does the change meet the Standards and that is really the conveyance of significance. There doesn't seem to be a connection between the determination of eligibility and the finding of affect doesn't seem to come together in the nominations.

**Garrison:** That's why we have a policy regarding the “C” eligible determinations and that is what should be applied to the conditions.

**Jeffrey:** What I am hearing from Bill is a reorganization of the context as opposed to re-writing the context.

**Collins:** No. I think the second version of section E was inferior to the first version. This was affected mainly by writing out the Murphey's participation. Lisa Deline's comments were that there needed to be additional information about that connection not to leave them out completely. Now Joesler becomes an autonomous design genius. All we have now are the many phases of Joesler. I think the Murphey's are more important than Joesler.

**Jeffrey:** We have been trying to convey that from day one, that there was a patron/architect relationship that was vitally important.

**Garrison:** If we can complete a piece of this nomination, I am willing to take it to the Keeper, asking if this is the appropriate direction. And then do so for each piece until we have a completed document. I don't see how we can get to a completed document without interaction with the keeper.

- Narrow the MPDF approach to the Murphey–Joesler residential designs.
  - Discussion of site planning and the big subdivision or are we looking at a house on a lot.
  - Is the layout of the land for views, landscape and other reasoning for positioning of homes not as important?
  - The Murphey Joesler approach to laying out the subdivision is what needs to be discussed.

**Janet Parkhurst, Architect:** I am in the process of retirement and will have time to work on this project with anyone else in an editorial/secretarial manor. We should take the best of what SHPO has offered regarding criteria considerations and expanding of the context. It doesn't need to be just Joesler and when he practices with Murphey, because he did practice on his own in a Murphey subdivision and there had to be some collaboration.

**Garrison:** We do have to tell the owners in this subdivision that there is the option of preparing individual nominations.

**Ralph Comey, Architect:** People have been waiting for 3 years.

**Collins:** My interpretation is that the guidelines are being too inclusive.

**Linda Weed, Owner:** This needs to be resolved. I think the problem is timeliness and lack of communication. Delays in this process have created hardship for owners, and properties are being broken up.

**Garrison:** There needs to be a phone call with Pima County staff, SHPO and the preparers on the line to work toward consensus. Lisa does not want to be involved until we have a real product to review. A schedule will be given to the committee once a consensus is gained.



### **3. STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN:**

**COLLINS:** Gave an overview of the plan that was sent to the National Parks Service, approved and will be brought before the State Parks Board in May.

### **D. OLD BUSINESS**

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM – November 15, 2013**

Moved to accept Lacy seconded by Kupel.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote  
Motion Carried



**E. STAFF REPORT**

**1. SHPO REPORT**

- a. National Register Update – Nothing at this time
- b. SHPO staffing and program news – Mary Robinson retiring as of April 1, 2014.
- c. Review and Compliance – Nothing major going on at this time, with the exception of some mining issues.
- d. Survey and Inventory - Nothing at this time.
- e. Grants – Nothing at this time.
- f. Legislative Issues – Nothing at this time.
- g. HP 2014 Conference – Vondy gave an update on the conference.

**F. PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

**G. AGENDA ITEMS:** None

**H. DATE FOR UPCOMMING 2014 MEETING:** July 25, 2014

**Adjourned at:** 12:26 PM

