



Historic Preservation Commission Executive Minutes

September, 2018

MONDAY

6:00 p.m.

2600 FRESNO STREET
CONFERENCE ROOM A
2nd Floor, City Hall

I. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL- 6:00 p.m.

*The meeting was called to order by **Chair Patrick Boyd** at 6:02 PM.*

Commissioners Present: Patrick Boyd, Robin Goldbeck, Paul Halajian, Jason Hatwig, Ron McNary, C. Kristina Roper.

Staff Present: Laura Groves van Onna, John Hastrup (CAO), Amber Piona, and Dan Zack.

II. APPROVE MEETING MINUTES

A. Approve Minutes for August 27, 2018.

The minutes for August 27, 2018 were approved 5-0-1 with a motion by Commissioner Hatwig and a second by Commissioner Goldbeck. Commissioner Roper abstained.

III. APPROVE AGENDA

The agenda with was approved 6-0 with a motion by Commissioner Roper and a second by Commissioner Halajian.

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

None

V. CONTINUED MATTERS

None

VI. COMMISSION ITEMS

A. STAFF PRESENTATION FOR FRESNO TROLLEY CARS DINER (STANDARD DINER) (HISTORIC PROPERTY #099) LOCATED AT 1731 S. CHERRY AVENUE.

Historic Preservation Specialist Laura Groves van Onna and Deputy City Attorney John Hastrup presented an update on the Fresno Trolley Cars (Standard Diner), Historic Property #099. Since the previous meeting permission to serve via publication was granted. There was a 30 day period for the property owner to respond; the property owner has not responded. There was a hearing on September 10, 2018. Deputy City Attorney Chad Snyder was present at that hearing, however no one showed up on defense side. The minute order from that hearing requested that the City file a default judgement to take back the property. The next hearing is set for November 13, 2018, however is possible that court will accept the City's default filing before then. Once the City receives the default judgement, the next step is to do a levy procedure through the Fresno County Sheriff's Office to retake title. It was determined that the best situation at the moment was to have the property as well as the cars themselves. The cars are not currently in good condition, and it would not be advised to move the cars before they could be restored. It's possible that by the next HPC meeting that the City will have repossessed the property.

Chair Boyd: So once City takes possession of this property with historically significant cars, then what? Do we have leeway or latitude to do something with the cars? I don't think the City does restoration work.

Deputy City Attorney John Hastrup: People are thinking/working on this, but it is out of my hands.

Assistant Director Dan Zack: Yes, that will be determined. The key thing is to make sure that the cars are not further degraded and neglected and then after that we will work on a plan.

Commissioner Ron McNary: Will City Maintenance come in and keep up the property?

Zack: Not sure. It will be City property at the end of this process; if it goes the way that it's looking like it will go, and as City property we will be able to stabilize the property and then go from there.

Commissioner Jason Hatwig: I imagine that if the City gets it to a certain point, they could flip the property. There are probably quite a few potential buyers.

Zack: I am aware of one person who had been interested in it at one point in the recent past.

Commissioner Paul Halajian: Are [the Trolley Cars] listed?

Zack: Yes.

Halajian: So, can they be moved?

Hastrup: It would probably come to this body. What is the listing; was it the cars or was it the property?

Commissioner Robin Goldbeck: It's just the cars; they are listed as artifacts.

McNary: So the land isn't part of the listing?

Hastrup: No. Well, from a legal standpoint they made the cars into a restaurant; it doesn't take much to make an easy to remove foundation to make a structure legally considered part of the real estate. You could probably in an afternoon turn a trailer into a building for legal purposes. If it was considered a significant change to a historic resource it might have to come to the Commission, but my guess is that it could probably be moved under Laura's authority. I don't think we'd have any controversy either way.

McNary: So when it became a restaurant they turned it into a building, and the building was on the property and the property was subject to foreclosure.

Hastrup: Correct. Let me go through the levy process. We had a default; the default says we're owed \$20,000. We immediately go to the Sheriff and say that the way we'd like to collect this \$20,000 is by taking back the property. The Sheriff's office will do their investigation and pre-work, which is mostly to make sure that there isn't a dwelling on the property. The levy process is considerably more difficult if it involves a residence even if there is no one there, and even if it's not owner occupied it's still a big hassle. But [in our case] it's not. At that point, hopefully, a Sheriff's sale could be set and then the City would be able to bid with whatever amount of money it has in its judgement, let's say it was \$20,000. We'd be able to bid up to \$20,000. To go beyond that there would have to be new monies put in. If somebody is willing to bid beyond that number that's probably not a bad thing, because that would suggest that they might have some interest in restoring it.

McNary: So it could be sold in the Sheriff's sale?

Hastrup: It could. Considering that it kind of got secretly, well not secretly, but unceremoniously sold off for \$5,000 or less not that long ago, it would be surprising if someone came forward. If someone did come forward, it would hopefully be someone who was interested in the cars. Discussions about how to deal with that are taking place is my understanding.

Goldbeck: Laura can you scroll to what criteria this was nominated under?

Historic Preservation Specialist Laura Groves van Onna: Criteria 1 and 3.

Hatwig: It's good to finally see some action on this. It sounds like this last month has been interesting.

Boyd: Do we need to make any motions on this? Is this information only?

Groves van Onna: This was posted as a discussion item. Unless you feel a need to make an action?

Hastrup: We didn't notice this as an action item.

Halajian: A good scenario would be that someone purchases these, moves them to a more prominent location and gives them a new life. If that were the case and they are listed, what latitude does that person have to change them to make them viable as whatever enterprise they choose to use them for?

Groves van Onna: That would have to come to HPC if it's a substantial alteration proposed, so it would be up to you all.

Hastrup: Under the Historic Preservation Ordinance, a non-substantial alteration (for example putting in a couple of signs for code purposes) could be approved by Laura. My guess is that if there were any major thing, Laura's pretty conservative and tends to run things by HPC. Any major change is going to come here.

Goldbeck: How do we know that?

Boyd: Any restoration process on this property is going to be major; there really isn't a surface on this property that you couldn't touch.

Hastrup: Yes, it would be difficult to fit it in a ministerial process. If anything major happens it's probably coming here. And that would be a good thing!

Boyd: I think it would be good, once the City does gain control of the property, if we could get access and do some more documentation to get a clear understanding of the condition it is in. So when whoever purchases it is making proposals we understand what it's going to entail to do that. Maybe the future owner doesn't want to make it a dining car, maybe they want to make it a library or something. There has to be some wiggle room.

Hatwig: Or a play space or any number of things.

Zack: Or put it back in service.

Hatwig: Right, put it on the rails!

Boyd: I would assume, once again, that it's the exterior that we're concerned about and less the interior. But it would be good to know what that interior is like.

Zack: I know at one point in the not too distant past they caught on fire, so I can't imagine that there's too much left inside, anyway.

Groves van Onna: One thing it was significant for was its property type as a diner in the 1920s and 1930s. I would argue that that property type would relate to the interior, if there is still any fabric left.

Boyd: Bar stools and counters. I think the kitchen was detached.

Groves van Onna: For something such as relocation, I would want to bring it here; at least one of the cars has been here since 1936, and location is one of the aspects of integrity.

Boyd: How many cars are there?

Goldbeck: Two.

Boyd: So obviously we'd have an issue, too, if someone wanted to purchase it and move it outside the city of Fresno.

Groves van Onna: It's not necessarily out of the question, just something that would need to come before you all for review. Are there any other questions at this point?

Boyd: None for me.

No Public Comment

Item Closed.

VII. CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT

None

VIII. UNSCHEDULED ITEMS

A. Members of the Commission

1. Building on the Fulton District App- Commissioner Roper inquired about doing something similar to the recently released Fulton Mall mobile app for another district like the Tower District with her Cultural Resource Management class students. Would that be feasible? She wrote an email to [Deputy City Manager] Laura Gloria. Would staff and the Commission support that?

Zack: Interesting. The Fulton Mall app process was pretty involved. I can't commit to the resources being devoted for that. I love the idea, though. There has been some learning that took place putting together one app, so I imagine it would be easier to do another. It would be something that we'd be happy to look into now that framework exists, how tough is it to clone that?

Commissioner Kristina Roper: My students could provide the

meat of it, the photos, the data, the information. It is then putting that information into the structure.

Zack: We can look into that, and see if the answer is “no way, no how” or “maybe.”

Roper: We can take something small and manageable. The Tower District came to mind in that it’s diverse.

Zack: Huntington Boulevard is also small.

Boyd: Is this a City-sponsored app?

Roper: It’s a mitigation measure from the Fulton Mall.

Goldbeck: What’s it called, Dan?

Zack: Fulton District. You can find it in the Google Play store or the Apple App store. It has a little green silhouette of the Pacific Southwest building. It’s a really neat thing and now that framework is there, who knows? It might be doable, might not. We’ll report back next month, maybe.

Boyd: [to Commissioner Roper] So your intent is to take one of our existing districts and take the skeleton of the Fulton District app and populate it with the historic district data? How do you use that data in the app?

Zack: It acts like a self-guided tour.

Roper: You’re somewhere and you say “what’s around me?” and it will tell you how to get there, something about it and there are little quizlets.

Goldbeck: If you dial a number does it give you the story, like the state park ones?

Roper: It doesn’t have that, but it has an awful lot of interpretive layers.

Hatwig: It has links, too, if they want to know deeper layers.

Roper: Yes, definitely takes advantage of the already existing information. I don’t want to reinvent the wheel.

Groves van Onna: Is it just a semester class?

Roper: Yes, but I have it frequently so it can be an ongoing thing. I do in-house consulting at Caltrans, which is where I

heard about the Fulton District app. Today Laura showed me how to get there, and I spent the afternoon going “Wow!” I shared it with my class (I had to use special software that allows mobile apps to work on a computer), but they thought it was cool and I thought it was cool.

2. **Mills Act-** Commissioner McNary requested a clarification about the Mills Act ten year contract requirements. The Commissioner believed that it applied to exteriors only, but some applicants have put things like sanding the floors on their contracts. Is that allowed? Wasn't this supposed to be exterior only?

Hatwig: Yes, this was supposed to be for exterior repairs only, paint, porch repairs, roof repairs.

Zack: Last year all of the improvement plans were exterior.

McNary: On my tour with Laura, there were two applicants where at least half of the repairs proposed were interior.

Hatwig: Applicants come with their own list of proposed projects, but you can refine that list. For example re-seeding the lawn would not be an appropriate item for the contract.

McNary: Laura and I discussed it and she mentioned that in other jurisdictions interior repairs were allowed to be listed as a line item on the contract. I thought it was strictly exterior. I need clarification as to what is allowed.

Groves van Onna: What I have been telling property owners is that we only require inspection of the exterior features, but that they have the option, if they would like to, to include interior features. But it is certainly not required. Another factor here is that we're not charging an application fee for these inspections, but in another city I have worked in we would have a flat fee to do the exterior requirements and we would charge an extra fee to do the interior if the property owner wanted to. I don't want to prevent property owners from receiving feedback on their interior rehabilitations if they want it. I am open to discussing how we want to frame it moving forward.

Goldbeck: I am confused. It sounds to me that you're saying that you're okay, as long as we're doing inspections we can look at the interior. But does that also follow that they make applications for interior repairs?

Groves van Onna: Not necessarily. Some people want to show off the interior of their homes, or perhaps to seek advice on

certain things. Some people need repairs in the interior of their homes and seek advice on that. A good example is saying that people include paint as an exterior item on their Mills Act work plan; that's not something that we regulate but it is something they can list.

Zack: Ron, you're talking specifically about the ten year schedule of improvements, right?

McNary: Yes. Looking at an applicant's ten year list, I saw a number of interior items on it. I thought this list was only for exterior items.

Halajian: It's a financial issue, is that right? They are getting tax relief, which is public money, to spend on the interior of the house. Is that your point?

McNary: Yes.

Halajian: Following on that, to be listed, it's about the exterior not about the interior. So there's incongruousness there.

Hastrup: I think that the evaluation that staff and the HPC is going to be doing when considering these Mills Act contracts is whether you feel that that the schedule of improvements is appropriate based on the criteria. If applicants are putting interior stuff, in some ways they are hurting themselves a little bit because they are putting on these legally binding commitments to interiors that they don't really need to put in there. What is the likelihood that the City is going to be enforcing interior changes? If they were not in compliance with their exterior commitments they would be subject to enforcement.

Zack: The basic idea is that you are getting a benefit from the public in the form of lower taxes and the public get something in return. Last year, we steered people to the exterior because that is what the public is able to enjoy. If the public is going to subsidize improvements, let's focus it on what the public can enjoy from the public right of way. There were a few that weren't really visible from the street or sidewalk but were important to keeping the building structurally sound and so the group was comfortable with approving those sorts of improvements. Someone brought up kitchen remodel as a potential item, and we said that they could do that if they wanted, but it wouldn't go into the schedule of improvements. These have to be approved by the Commission and forwarded to the Director. So when they come through, whatever the property owner is suggesting

doesn't have to be rubber stamped. There is some give-and-take there. You all need to feel like the public is getting something for the money.

Halajian: So, on the subject of give and take. It seems to me that there was no give and take on whether or not the structure is meritorious of being listed in the first place; it's about the exterior. It seems to me that there should be a connection between the Mills Act criteria and the register criteria. To get into a freestyling process about what a group thinks is a slippery slope. It ought to be consistent with the requirements to make the list in the first place.

McNary: That is my point. I think it's great that the guy wants to sand his floors and refinish them.

Halajian: But the public doesn't get to go in and see his new floors.

McNary: Right. We're responsible for the exterior and that is what the Mills Act is about.

Halajian: You can have a historic interior that is listed, can you not?

Zack: It's not common, but yes. Courthouses sometimes have historic interiors.

Halajian: Okay so in that case the criteria would include the interior, and if that was a Mills Act project then the interiors could be included. But if you got listed because of your beautiful Victorian façade, I don't think it benefits the public for you to do work on the interiors.

Hatwig: Now, if it were a restaurant or something like that, the restaurant has an interior public space.

McNary: The Meux Home also has public access to the interior. In general, our jurisdiction is the exterior of the building.

Goldbeck: By the same token, we don't typically have jurisdiction outside of the façade that is visible from the street, but we approve Mills Act items on all four sides of the exterior.

Zack: It's a gray area, there is some discretion involved.

Groves van Onna: Which is why I was saying it's optional; the interiors are not required. If it were a property that definitively had

the interior nominated, we'd require it.

McNary: But by saying 'not required' it infers that it is perfectly acceptable to include the interior on your line items. Is it acceptable or isn't it?

Boyd: Both of you [Halajian and McNary] teased out the point that it depends upon the listing and what it's listed for. We could probably legally stand on that, too, if someone wanted to fight back. We might want to clarify that so that applicants know that going in. [to Historic Preservation Specialist Groves van Onna] I think what you're saying is that the Mills Act program doesn't tease that out, but we might want to include that in what we're funding.

Halajian: Would that encourage more people to include more interiors in their nomination?

Groves van Onna: It could be another factor if the process becomes competitive.

Hastrup: Hopefully people understand that the Commission is looking at it from a public benefit and publically acknowledged historic resources. If we get to a situation in which people think that they have a perfectly good exterior and think that they can get on the Mills Act to help with interior work. Ultimately we're looking to not only help people who buy a historic home, but also incentivize preservation.

Goldbeck: Laura, is there any wording in the Mills Act about exteriors primary or exteriors only? Is it completely not stated?

Hatwig: I don't think it's stated.

Halajian: On that point, you talked about incentivizing preservation. Are we trying to incentivize preservation of exteriors or interiors, or buildings in their total?

Roper: I think the latter.

McNary: If that's the case, and we do the insides, you couldn't put a new stove in.

Roper: I think we have to use a case by case judgement. There is something about incentivizing people to restore, and often times they go together.

Hastrup: To be clear, I don't think anyone is talking about

regulating the inside. Usually what this is someone says that they promise they're going to do these ten things on this schedule.

Hatwig: You could also incentivize and say that say 80% has to be exterior.

Goldbeck: Show us that your exterior is the priority for the public good, and then because you got that help you're a little freer to do what you want on the inside.

Hatwig: No one would take a roof that needs to be replaced and only replace the side that you can see from the public right of way.

Zack: It's a bit of a gray area and I think it's important for you all to keep a little discretion on this to see things on a case by case basis. The discussion isn't what's allowed; all kinds of things are allowed. We've seen entire interior's gutted down to the studs and modernized, but the exterior looks amazing, that is totally allowed. But what are we (as a community) willing to pay for is really the discussion. We're giving them a tax break, which is money the public should be getting, and the applicant is going to get that money instead to improve a structure. I think we've heard good direction here and Laura can work with the applicants to see if there is more fine-tuning on their proposed ten year schedule of improvements. Then at the meeting, when you are considering it, you guys can suggest or require changes for your approval. I think the direction is pretty clear and Laura can work with folks if any of their applications needs a little tightening up to reflect what you've been saying.

Groves van Onna: I think everyone is on the same page, working with the applicants they are very clear that the exterior is the focus, and the historic character is the focus. They are well aware of how the process needs to go. Everyone has most of their items as exterior; just a few people have a few items that involve interior historic features.

McNary: I would say that half of the Minnewawa property was interior. At least. He needed a new roof and he was going to paint, but that was about it.

Groves van Onna: He also had "replace exterior windows and doors." I would say maybe half of his items were interior and I would also say he was an outlier among the applicants.

Boyd: Part of the process then needs to be to guide them in the direction we want.

Zack: We're under no obligation to approve their first proposal.

Boyd: Absolutely not. We want to make sure that if they don't understand the purpose of the program and why it's this way, we are able to inform them.

Zack: It could be a matter of trimming, too. Jason, you and I did the one in Wilson Island, and they had really piled a lot in there. When you think about the dollar amount of what they would be saving in taxes versus what they were proposing on the first draft of their ten year plan, they were going to spend way more than they were going to get back. Some of it was backyard stuff, historic flatwork, or some of it was work on the kitchen and we told them that's not what we're focusing on. After trimming that stuff out, you still had a really great catalog of the exterior projects that gave us more than our money's worth.

McNary: Another question. In the Minewawa house, they are going to need a new roof. Could that be extended for two years, because that will be an expensive project?

Groves van Onna: Yes. It can be a year range.

Zack: If you recall, that is definitely in the realm of possibility. There is precedent for that locally, with our Rowell building. The Rowell building went through Mills Act and is undergoing a \$24 million restoration right now. Year One of their plan was "Full Restoration" and Year Two through Year Ten were "Maintain as needed."

McNary: Okay, that's acceptable. I didn't want interior to be at least half the focus.

Hatwig: Last year during the walkthrough we trimmed as we went. The owners don't know. We asked them to develop a wish list of all the things they'd like to do.

Zack: Laura is almost done with the inspections. Thanks to all of you who helped you with those. There are two more left. Once those are done we can look at those and see if any of them need fine tuning.

Groves van Onna: Or we can discuss it on a case by case basis next month.

Goldbeck: I have a question. You mentioned "in case it gets competitive," what does that look like? Is there a certain dollar amount from the County that we're held to each year or?

Groves van Onna: I'm not certain.

Zack: We lose a little revenue with each one of these. In the grand scheme of things it's not a lot, and I think it's more than worth it. However if we started getting a flood of 50 applications a year, then we might run into a problem where we don't have enough staff resources to process that many. You guys wouldn't want to have thirty meetings a year to look at these and at that point we might want to start limiting it to twenty a year. With 50 applications and only 20 slots you'd have to make it competitive, and at that point you'd want to score it based on the merits of what they're proposing.

Hastrup: The City of L.A. they take their cumulative loss at \$2 million per year (which is arbitrary), and they've gotten to the point where commercial and multi-family is not considered quite as often. At this point they are mostly single-family. They have a competitive process and they charge a fee. I don't know if it's successful, but it is used a lot.

Hatwig: I'd love that problem. We do need to be careful to have some sort of uniformity when it comes to districts is important. Neighbors are neighbors and they are going to want to compete with each other. Being consistent with districts is something to be aware of.

Zack: Thanks for that direction.

Groves van Onna: I had a question, when the Mills Act applications were brought to HPC last year was it all as one item?

Zack: It was all at one meeting.

Goldbeck: I believe we discussed them individually and voted on them as a group.

Zack: Amber, do you recall?

Recording Secretary Amber Piona: I do not recall.

Hastrup: I wasn't here in the earliest part of this, and neither was Laura. Amber was here. All four of them were voted on the same day.

Groves van Onna: As one action item?

Goldbeck: I think we voted as a group.

Hastrup: It would be up to the Chair. The point is that they were all considered on the same day and this allows the commission to think about consistency amongst the applications. You have the ability to pull any out and consider them; the Commission has total freedom on this point at this point.

3. **Armenian Town-** Chair Boyd reported that the subcommittee received information today from Deputy City Attorney John Hastrup. Boyd stated that the Subcommittee needs to process will get back to Hastrup. Moving forward on it.

B. Staff

1. **Herndon Substation Control Building-** Historic Preservation Specialist Laura Groves van Onna updated the Commission on the City Council meeting for the Herndon Substation Control Building. At the meeting the City Council disapproved the nomination of the property. Assistant Director Dan Zack noted that Councilmember Brandau made the motion to approve, however it failed for lack of a second. The discussion revolved around property rights.

Hatwig: The owners were not in favor of designation?

Zack: Yes.

Boyd: When they were here they said loved the building, but it was smack dab in the middle of their property.

Goldbeck: They did state it was a problem.

Zack: During public comment a representative spoke requesting it not be put on the register.

Goldbeck: Is the demo permit the next step? Is it already down?

Groves van Onna: No, they have not reapplied yet.

Hastrup: They withdrew their demo permit application prior to the meeting, presumably in some sort of political maneuver. On August 28, 2018, we received a letter from the PG&E Council stating that the City has no jurisdiction over their property so it doesn't matter what you do, but we want you to stop what you're doing. We researched it a bit. My view was that yes, we did have jurisdiction to put it on the local register. In some cases utilities are under the sole jurisdiction of state regulatory bodies. For example we couldn't tell them how to construct their power transmission lines. This is heavily litigated but the municipalities always lose those arguments. Our position is that PG&E does not have carte blanche to do whatever they want with historic resources that are not connected to their power transmission or

generation system. They said it didn't matter what we said. If it truly didn't matter, then we could designate it and they could go to PUC [Public Utilities Commission] and get permission to demolish it. However they won, politically. It did not get designated; there is not a new demolition permit.

Zack: We anticipate one will be forthcoming.

Hastrup: It's a strange position for PG&E to be in because they never changed their position that the City doesn't have jurisdiction, so if later they reapply for the demo permit they are being inconsistent. Demolitions for non-historic properties are ministerial, there's no CEQA.

Hatwig: Any state involvement that is possible?

Hastrup: Maybe PUC has jurisdiction over potential historic resources. I didn't find anything in that. Although permits that get sent to PUC do sometimes discuss historic resources, it isn't clear that PUC considers that part of their jurisdiction. My non-legal advice is that I don't think it's very likely that anything is going to get approved over the objection of the property owner.

Groves van Onna: Discussions last Thursday did not even get to the argument of jurisdiction, it was cut off at the issue of private property rights.

Hastrup: PG&E is the least private of private property owner and they still won on that argument. We'll update you if there is a permit application.

McNary: It's a done deal, anyway.

Hastrup: The HPC is prohibited under the code from re-recommending the property; the Council would have to do that on its own. Not very likely.

Boyd: We don't have a great track record for owners who aren't on the list.

2. **Mills Act** – Historic Preservation Specialist Laura Groves van Onna thanked the Commission for the discussion tonight. There are two more site visits left to complete. The next step is to prepare for the meeting next month.
3. **Hotel Fresno** – Deputy City Attorney John Hastrup updated the Commission that the owners of Hotel Fresno project are seeking an amendment to their owner participation agreement with the successor to the Redevelopment Agency. The recommendation for the National Register designation has already occurred. The current proposal is in serious jeopardy of failing. They have requested that the project be altered, and think they will have financing in place by the end of the year. They are putting a

Historic Preservation Commission, September 24, 2018

proposal to City Council on Thursday, although it is likely to get continued to Oct 11, 2018; there is nothing for the HPC to do at this time.

Hatwig: My memory is that they have dollars set aside for that already.

Hastrup: The City's commitment is in play. The owners have not come up with money to make it pencil out. The change that occurred is that the prior project was to be a mix income, ½ low income of various AMI levels, ½ market-rate. The folks who looked at it have decided that to be infeasible under current market conditions downtown. Their proposal to make it 100% affordable, but now 80% AMI, but 55 year covenant to make it remain low income. Working hard to make this pencil out and move forward.

C. General Public

None.

IX. NEXT MEETING: October 22, 2018, 6 PM Conference Room A, City Hall.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Boyd adjourned the meeting at 7:03 PM.

Respectfully submitted:

Laura Groves van Onna, Historic

Preservation Specialist

Amber Piona, Recording Secretary