

March 1, 2016

**Historic Preservation Commission
Council Chambers**

Members Present: Steve Hinick, Mitzi Rossillon, Bill Ryan, John Weitzel, Butch Gerbrandt and Jennifer Petersen

Staff: Mary McCormick, Historic Preservation Officer
Carol Laird, Secretary

MINUTES

- I. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 5:32 P.M.
- II. ROLL CALL: Roll call was taken and a quorum was established.
- III. READING/APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF February 2nd, 2016:

Mr. Weitzel thanked them for their thoughts and asked to change Jean to Eugene Dunmire. Mr. Ryan moved to approve the Minutes with Ms. Rossillon seconding the motion. The motion passed 6-0.

- IV. PUBLIC COMMENT – ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

Mr. Hinick said they had written comments from JJ Shive that are attached and made a part of these Minutes. Mr. Shive talked about the Design Review COA for 823 S. Main, the Utility Chase demo request at the Travona Mine and the Programmatic Agreement for HUD projects and the CLG Grant Application.

- V. BOARD ACTIONS – NEW/OLD BUSINESS

- A. Design Presentation – Park Street Parking Garage – Collaborative Design Architects – Bill Haynes and Jeff Kanning

Mr. Hinick said the HPC had given preliminary approval for the design and this was an update on the design progress.

Mr. Haynes summarized the ideas identified from the previous meeting, while presenting pictures – Brick, Façade Design, Corners and Awnings, Signs & Lighting and Gargoyles. Comments back in November -- typical Butte brick color, traditional cornice, define

auto entrance, study rear façade, unique signs/art wall, add detail to spandrels and maybe gargoyles.

Mr. Haynes then showed a virtual video of how the parking garage would look.

Mr. Kanning showed the HPC a panel they had put together with the materials they planned to use and described the materials and how they would add to the structure. Also provided was a replica of a gargoyle proposed for use as “a point of contact” on the benches to define where people sat and to also stop the skateboarders.

Mr. Hinick asked about the size of the brick. Mr. Kanning said jumbo brick was what they were proposing. Mr. Hinick thought that would work. He also liked that they took the horizontal line on the Park St. façade and raised it at the vehicle entrance to the parking garage. He thought the cornice line balanced out the stair tower somewhat. Mr. Kanning said precast panels would be used on the rear and east facades and they would be faced with thin-set but real bricks and mortar.

Mr. Weitzel liked the white letters and dark background on the sign proposed for denoting the parking area entrance. Mr. Kanning said they proposed an internally lit box, illuminated from the inside, so it would glow day and night. The sign has a framework with a little bit of a cant so to mimic a mine headframe.

Mr. Hinick said the overhead clearance into parking garage seemed low and Mr. Kanning said it was intentionally low so somebody didn't get too far into the garage. There would be a sign that if you hit it, you would be alerted that you would hit the concrete soon.

Ms. McCormick asked if the parking garage was accessible on Galena. Mr. Kanning said traffic on Galena would only access the garage's ground level and would be both in and out; there is no communication between the two levels. He said because of their site constraints, they were a couple of feet narrower than what they would like to be. The parking stall width and drive-out width was compliant for getting a pick-up or van or suburban through with care and would accommodate large vehicles on all levels. They meet ADA requirements for an ADA van.

Mr. Hinick asked if the Phoenix parking ramp would be demolished and Mr. Kanning said it would. They were meeting with the Phoenix group tomorrow; Karen Byrnes is working on purchasing a development agreement with them and they would come back in

and do some things to their outer parking to make sure it worked for everybody.

Mr. Hinick asked about the operating system for the garage and Mrs. Byrnes said one hadn't been chosen yet but would probably be a key card or credit card swipe. She added there would be Parking Enforcement Officers walking through the garage to make sure people were parking correctly.

Ms. Rossillon thought the new design was really interesting. The materials were so much more interesting than the original idea – even the part she didn't like on top of the stairway, because it was a dark color, it was so sharp. She thought the spandrel/transom bands were a little deep but the use of glass was a great concept and the amount of brick was what she hoped. She appreciated what they had done.

Mr. Weitzel asked if the cornice would be cast stone and Mr. Kanning said cast concrete. Mr. Weitzel said the sign with white letters with a dark background complemented it. He said he would recommend making the background itself opaque so the only thing that lit up on the sign was the letters themselves, for the ability to see it from a long ways away. Mr. Hayes said laser cut and powder coat. Mr. Kanning said the lettering of "park" would be on both sides.

Ms. Rossillon said the concrete cornice at the Archives was starting to fail after five years. She thought they should take to heart the freeze/thaw situation in the community with how to seal it. Mr. Haynes said they would have what they called a weather seal on it that wasn't waterproofing but it would make the water bead up and that tended to last about ten years and could be reapplied later and that would help a lot with the concrete. Mr. Kanning said this whole structure would be cold with no differential between the warm and cold and that would affect how the concrete performed. They were exploring ways for heat to be in the bathrooms, the mechanical room and the elevator. They would be using the Department of Transportation Highway standards with indestructible stainless steel fixtures and prefinished block on the inside, so they would be bulletproof restrooms, a pressure washer kind of a place.

Mr. Hinick moved to approve the design as presented and said they were pleased with the updated changes made by Collaborative Design Architects and would approve the design as presented. Mr. Weitzel seconded the motion and the voice vote in favor of the motion passed 6-0.

Ms. McCormick thanked them for coming and giving their presentation. She expressed appreciation for how much they took the HPC's previous comments into consideration. She thought the different colors and texture would make for a very rich building and an exciting project.

B. Demolition Review COA – Utility Chases at Travona Mine – Butte-Silver Bow – Tom Malloy

Ms. McCormick summarized the Demolition Review COA that is attached and made a part of these Minutes.

Mr. Malloy said he worked in the Planning Department for Butte-Silver Bow and this was his first time going through HPC. He said they did this at a number of other mine yards. They would not actually open a tunnel, but lift it up with an excavator and break the timbers free and put them back down in the hole where they came from and backfill with available soils. He said the mine yard would be covered with mine yard gravel.

Mr. Malloy said a contractor's forklift had sunk and fallen into the utility tunnel. This mine yard sees little activity, except it is used as a pumping station for the Superfund Groundwater Project. The Bureau of Mines and Geology pulls a water sample out of the Travona shaft at least once a year, as a long term monitoring, and were in there with heavy trucks. The access road into the mine yard goes right over the east-west tunnel and that was why they would like to demolish that portion, as there are several open holes 18" below the surface and rotted timbers collapsed among them. There was no future use for those tunnels that were lined with asbestos that were not going to be rehabilitated. They didn't plan to build over them and when they started to slump they would bring in more gravel to fill them in.

Mr. Malloy said they had done this at the Belmont, the Mt. Con and the Original and now the proposed Travona.

Mr. Malloy said they could leave the first six to ten feet open where you could shine a flashlight down the tunnel and see what it used to look like. A grate would be placed over the entry, so you could look in but not crawl in.

Mr. Hinick said historically, these tunnels served as a function of the mine and didn't have any public access, so his question was why did they want to show the pipes? Ms. McCormick said there

were opportunities for the Travona to have limited public access. She is hoping for bigger tours of the mine yards in the future, which could include the Travona.

Mr. Hinick asked if because of the fact that the hoist house and the dry had been demolished, other than the foundations, had Travona lost its historic value? Ms. McCormick said the mine yard has never been recorded or evaluated, as far as she knows. The only documentation that she could find was in the National Historic Landmark District Nomination which listed the headframe as a contributing structure. A more comprehensive determination of eligibility is needed. She thought that whether they were National Register eligible or not, the concrete foundations were very substantial and helped tell the story of the Travona Mine and she would like to see them protected.

Mr. Gerbrandt said he, Ms. McCormick and Mr. Malloy met at the site before the meeting. The site itself was flat land on a hill and it had a great view of the Summit Valley. He thought that possibly in the future it might be a tourist destination.

Mr. Gerbrandt then referred to the picture with the red lines delineating the chases. He talked about an alternative with the east/west chase left open to where the chain-link fence was located and leaving about ten feet or enough that vehicles wouldn't drive in the vicinity of the yard. Mr. Malloy indicated that could be done.

Mr. Gerbrandt moved that the HPC approve the demolition of a portion of the chases at the Travona as presented in the February 25th COA application with the condition being keeping the east/west chase within the confines of the fence and a portion of the north/south chase at the junction of the two chases. Ms. Petersen seconded the motion.

Mr. Hinick called for a voice vote in favor of the motion and it passed 6-0.

C. Design Review COA – 823 S. Main Street – Micah Sundberg

Ms. McCormick summarized the Design Review COA that is attached and made a part of these Minutes.

Mr. Sundberg planned to leave the existing metal doors on the back since they weren't facing the street. He wasn't sure about the transoms at the back doors, but thought about putting them back.

Mr. Sundberg said the back deck was falling to the ground and he would pull it all off and rebuild as shown on the drawings. He said he also planned to remove the wire and pressure treated wood fence along the front yard. The front stairs would be rebuilt to Code regarding the depth and rise of the steps and height of the railings.

Mr. Sundberg said they were toying with the idea for the flooring at the first-story front porch. It was shot and had a very deep crawl. They may shore it with wood backing and still pour some concrete. He said the building was done settling and was in good shape. There were some additional brick repairs that were minor. He said for the most part, they would try to keep the original look and bring the stairs and handrails up to Code and then they could put those transoms back. He said all of the windows would be Anderson, like they used on all of their projects, and would consist of metal clad wood double-hung on the front and fiberglass composite on the sides. He was really happy with the quality of these windows. They didn't have the movement like vinyls.

Mr. Hinick asked if there would be new footings under the columns – Mr. Sundberg said everything was going to be replaced to Code standards.

Mr. Hinick asked if the brick would be left in its natural state or would it be painted. Mr. Sundberg said no, the brick looked great and he would do minor repairs – structurally, the building was in really good shape, it was the interior that they were shocked at the dilapidated state.

Ms. Rossillon was curious about why he was replacing the cottage windows at all in the front. She was concerned about the loss of the historic fabric, particularly the window pattern in the transom. She was fairly confident that a replica could not be found on the market, so she wanted to talk a little bit about the need for replacement of the cottage windows. Mr. Sundberg said it was more of an "R" value for him and a maintenance issue. He said they hadn't been taken care of in years and were old and the wood casing was not in the best of shape. When he replaced them with Anderson, he would get a double pane insulated window. He said they covered the heat in all of their buildings and that was why he didn't want to deal with the maintenance of it. She then asked, if he would consider an exterior storm. Mr. Sundberg said maybe, he didn't know and hadn't thought about it.

Mr. Hinick said if he was going to replace the transoms with a window unit, having the cottage window echo that design would

make it more cohesive. He had said that one transom still had the faceted glass pieces and the cottage windows were single pane glass windows now. He said if he kept the same basic composition of the windows -- Ms. Rossillon said she felt it was a character defining element of the building.

Mr. Gerbrandt asked Mr. Sundberg, if it would be a deal breaker, if they asked him to leave those cottage windows in the front. Mr. Sundberg said he hadn't given it much thought and didn't know enough about leaving or taking it out and didn't know if they could save it because the major portion of the window was clear glass, so they were basically talking about that upper section and he wondered if he could make it two windows and save that upper section and that way he could replace the lower section with a newer window and maybe have a glass shop make a new frame for the other section and place that in there and that way he could get rid of the rot and the worry and go from there.

Ms. Rossillon liked that a lot but said it wouldn't address the "R" value issue but he would have a lot more double pane on a lot more surface. If he could stipulate to that as part of the COA, she would be pleased. Mr. Sundberg said he thought it was possible and didn't see why you couldn't.

Mr. Hinick asked Mr. Sundberg if the front entrance doors would be solid without light in it and Mr. Sundberg said yes, he would be using the transoms for light.

Mr. Gerbrandt said he really appreciated Mr. Sundberg bring another building back to life. It's a great project.

Ms. Rossillon moved that the HPC approve the 823 S. Main Street project as presented in the February 23rd COA application with the change, as proposed, including saving the upper pane of the cottage windows with one stipulation that any changes to the work plan, including additions or substitutions of materials or design of workmanship from what was presented in the COA, will require Micah Sundberg return to the Historic Preservation Commission to request approval for that change prior to installation. Mr. Gerbrandt seconded the motion.

Mr. Hinick had a question about the upper cottage window configuration, if indeed the lower window didn't necessarily match the replacement window and it had a different depth to it than the existing, that would be something the HPC would like to take a look at, if it was something that was not going to work -- thought Ms.

Rossillon was implying that if something had to change, that they would like to see that. Mr. Hinick said if there was another solution that they could look at to make everyone happy, he thought that would be a requirement.

Mr. Hinick then called for a voice vote in favor of the motion. The motion passed 6-0.

D. Programmatic Agreement (PA) for HUD Program Projects

Ms. McCormick said it was a standard agreement document that was written to comply with Section 106 of the Historic Preservation Act, which required Federal agencies to consider the impact of their undertakings on historic properties.

Ms. McCormick said in this case the Federal agency is HUD. However, HUD has delegated its review responsibilities under Section 106 to Butte-Silver Bow. That's why Butte-Silver Bow is acting as the Federal agency, so she and the HPC have a different relationship when it comes to the PA. She is responsible for writing and administering the PA. Butte-Silver Bow is asking the HPC to be a consulting party on the PA, with the Chairman signing the agreement, and to provide comment. The HPC would not be looking for any recommendations from her but commenting as a discreet body. Butte-Silver Bow has sent consultation letters to SHPO, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the National Park Service and submitted a press release (which has appeared in the Montana Standard and Butte Weekly) asking for public comment on the PA and have published the PA on Butte-Silver Bow's WEB site. The consultation period ends March 11. All comments will be considered, appropriate changes made, and then the PA sent back to SHPO and the other consulting parties.

Mr. Gerbrandt asked what additional responsibilities or duties fell to them. Ms. McCormick said that they would get to comment on and be a party to the Memorandum of Agreements. If there was going to be modifications to the PA, they would be party to that. It will be a better way for the HPC to be kept informed and made a part of the whole 106 process on individual HUD undertakings. They will have a stronger voice.

Mr. Weitzel asked about not being able to serve on the commission because of his craft and employment. Ms. McCormick said professionals on the HPC can work on projects that would be coming to the HPC for review. However, they would have to recuse themselves from discussions and voting. That's standard practice

for HPCs, especially in smaller cities, and how it has always worked in Butte.

Mr. Hinick moved they become consulting parties to this Programmatic Agreement for HUD program projects. Ms. Rossillon seconded the motion and the voice vote in favor of the motion passed 6-0.

Ms. Rossillon wanted to make another motion to encourage the Chief Executive for Butte-Silver Bow to sign the agreement. Mr. Hinick asked if she meant instead of him and Ms. McCormick said no, the HPC would be encouraging the Chief Executive to sign it for Butte-Silver Bow. Mr. Hinick didn't think it had to be part of the motion.

VI. SARTA UPDATE (Mitzi Rossillon)

Ms. Rossillon said since the last meeting, SARTA had gone out for a request for proposals that are due on March 15th. The Committee expects to get at least twenty-five proposals and how many would be Historic Preservation and how many would be Community Development, she didn't know. She said the Committee wanted to be cautious and allow for things other than bricks and mortar and they wanted to cast a wider net. The guidelines still said the preference would be given to bricks and mortar. She said the evaluations would start the following week with awards maybe in May.

Mr. Hinick asked about the \$800,000 that was available and was now toned down to \$125,000. Ms. Rossillon said \$900,000 was available for the History Preservation category but the Authority made a conscious decision to limit that in the first year. Ms. Rossillon said they put \$75,000 for the first year for Historic Preservation projects only and another \$250,000 for Community Enrichment and Economic Development. If all of that was granted this year less other commitments, there would be somewhere over \$800,000 left for the next ten years. Mr. Hinick said this wasn't going to all be released at once.

Ms. Rossillon said the Authority would make the budget decision every year but right now in their deliberations the Board of Investments had roughly a 3½% interest on money they invested and SARTA, as a general rule, would fund the money generated in interest only, so there was never going to be a big lump of \$800,000 except if somebody came up with a wow project, then they could make an appeal for something but right now the limit was \$50,000 for any project unless they had a wow project that could be \$100,000 or \$200,000 but it had to be approved by 2/3 of the

vote of the Authority in order to move forward while others were just a simple majority.

Ms. Rossillon said her term was one year and would expire soon. The HPC could soon expect the need to decide whether she wanted to continue or if somebody else would like to be on the Board and make a recommendation to the Chief Executive. Mr. Hinick asked Ms. McCormick to make a note of that, so they would be involved in making that kind of decision in a timely manner.

VII. STAFF REPORT

A. CLG Grant Application

Ms. McCormick said they commented on a draft at the last meeting. The HPC agreed to provide tentative approval with her making revisions and submitting the revised application to the Chair and Vice-Chair for approval. If they approved, BSB could submit the application to SHPO. The approval was given, the application submitted to SHPO and SHPO has accepted it and sent BSB a new contract to sign. She would send the revised application to them the following day, as she didn't want to make it public until the Minutes of the HPC's February meeting were approved.

B. SARTA Grant – Jacobs House

Ms. McCormick said she was preparing a grant to do some rehabilitation on the Jacobs house and would be involved in some other grants that she would talk about later.

C. Basin Creek Caretaker's House Window Repair/Rebuild Project

Ms. McCormick said Mr. Ryan had put together a cost proposal for Highlands College to repair and/or rebuild the sixteen windows in the Basin Creek Caretaker's house. The cost proposal was submitted to Dave Schultz and he said go for it.

D. West Park Street Corridor Project

Ms. McCormick said this plan was being developed by New Mobility West. It has been through two or three rounds of revisions that mostly revolved around HPO concerns. They have submitted the final, and she is happier with it. She thought a final draft would be available soon. She added it was only a conceptual plan and the MDOT was not tied to implement the plan. MDOT was starting to work on the design.

Mr. Weitzel opposed the project. He would like to see some of the delivery and professional truck drivers have a say, especially with the bump outs they were talking about making it difficult for bigger trucks to get around. He also didn't think putting the trees in the middle of Park Street was a good idea.

Ms. McCormick said she would let HPC members know when there was going to be public presentations on the project. People who came and provided feedback about the project last week at Council last week made a big impression. She encouraged HPC members to come to future presentations and voice their opinions.

VIII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

None

IX. ADJOURNMENT: A motion was made and seconded to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:20 P.M.