

July 6, 2016

**Historic Preservation Commission
Butte Silver Bow Public Archives**

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

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

M I N U T E S

- I. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 5:30 P.M.
- II. ROLL CALL: Roll call was taken and a quorum was established.
- III. READING/APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF JUNE 7, 2016:

Changes were given to amend the Minutes. Bill Ryan moved to approve the June 7, 2016, Minutes with Mitzi Rossillon seconding the motion with the corrections. The motion passed 7-0.

- IV. PUBLIC COMMENT – ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

None

- V. Presentation: Brown's Gulch Road Reconstruction Project
MDT Project Manager, Joe Walsh

Joe Walsh stated the Brown's Gulch project would be by the Dallaserra Ranch and proceed over Bull Run Creek, turn the corner and go around and cross Brown's Gulch Creek. It's about a mile long. The project is Butte-Silver Bow's next secondary priority. Work is still in the preliminary stages. The Highway Department just finished the alignment grade and were tweaking it a little bit.

Mr. Walsh said there were a lot of concerns: safety, environmental and historic properties. Safety probably is the biggest one they were dealing with, as some of the slopes and corners aren't good. The historic properties included two bridges and two buildings, [the original residence at the Galetti Dairy and the Brown's Gulch School.] Access at Pete Dallaserra's property, where the historic dairy is, has never been safe due to the fairly steep grade. He said right now their catch limits were in the

middle of the property. The Brown's Gulch School on the Simon property -- here they are working the alignment away from the creek due to environmental concerns of the wetlands. Right now that building is not quite on but very close to the alignment's centerline.

Mr. Walsh reported that two sections of the Browns Gulch Road have already been rebuilt: the first section up to the dump and the second section from the dump to Pete Dallaserra's place. He said the Dallaserra Ranch was where it began and they would pull back slightly into that tangent section and tie in but by the time they were done with the slopes -- there was a lot of rock that would be blasted and there was hard rock around the corner as well.

Mr. Walsh said they were at the preliminary stages but their historian, Jon Axline, had started the correspondence with some of the Commission and that was where they were at.

Mr. Weitzel said this road, when it came down Brown's Gulch to Pete Dallaserra and then it went up Hail Columbia Gulch and there was a bridge there, he asked if it would be taken out and widened. Mr. Walsh said that was correct, the one over Bull Run Creek and that bridge would be replaced probably with a box. Hail Columbia would come in and tie it in at 90 and have more of a buttonhook at that end because of safety issues there. He said they would go around the corner and then the little rocky knob there, as you got to Brown's Gulch Creek, it was real rocky now but they would be shaving some of that off because of the new bridge and it would be a box as well.

Mr. Weitzel then asked what the purpose of this was. Mr. Walsh said this project was the next priority for Butte-Silver Bow. It is a safety upgrade and the road is very narrow. It's a priority to people who live out there.

Mr. Hinick said the Brown's Gulch School was going towards Otto Simon's old ranch. Mr. Walsh said it was on Ed Simon's ranch. Ed Simon has relocated to Cardwell and sold most of the ranch but not this portion. The Highway Department had already met with him.

Mr. Gerbrandt asked if they planned to move these two buildings. Mr. Walsh didn't believe you could move the original residence at the dairy because it was a stone structure that would probably fall in. The schoolhouse was owned by the property owner, so they would end up dealing directly with the property owner. He said if someone would like to talk with them and try to salvage that building and move it somewhere -- it was made out of stucco and Ms. Rossillon added and log. He thought it was something that someone could approach the property owner about and negotiate that.

Mr. Gerbrandt asked if the HPC would be asked at some point in the future to review the plans, as to how they affected these properties and would they be asked to review a demolition. Ms. McCormick said this project was a Federal undertaking and Mr. Axline told her they were rolling their Section 106 into a NEPHA review, a bigger environmental review. As part of NEPHA/Section 106, the Highway Department is required to solicit public comment and ask interested parties to consult on the undertaking and on the potential for adverse effects to historic properties. She said they hadn't gotten a formal request as of yet and didn't know what stage the NEPHA process was at. The Highway Department, however, had hired a consultant who inventoried properties in the right-of-way. They had recorded among other properties, the Brown's Gulch School and the Galetti Dairy – today's Dallaserra Ranch. The consultant determined that both of those properties were independently eligible for the National Register and SHPO concurred. The HPC will be asked to consult on the undertaking. Additionally, the Highway Department and/or the property owner would also have to come to the HPC for approval of demolition permits for the buildings.

Ms. McCormick further said they were at the beginning of this process. She just wanted to inform the HPC of the undertaking at this meeting, so they could begin to formulate what their comments were going to be. Mr. Axline has already drafted Memorandum of Agreements for the adverse effect for the building demolitions, which called for HABS documentation. He has informally asked them to consult on the MOA's and sign them as a concurring party.

Ms. McCormick said it was a little bit more complicated with the fact that the Montana Preservation Alliance and Butte-Silver Bow had gotten a grant from the National Park Service to do an inventory of historic properties in Brown's Gulch, as part of their under-represented ethnic groups program. She said there was a real ethnic quality to the landscape and to the architecture in the gulch. The MPA has documented about twenty historic properties, including these two properties. She is helping out with BSB's contribution to the project by completing the title work for the twenty properties.

Mr. Gerbrandt said he talked to two property owners who expressed a willingness to accept the school. Ms. McCormick thought there were a lot of families in Brown's Gulch who would hate to see that school go.

Ms. Rossillon asked Mr. Walsh when the scheduled date was for the Draft 4F being prepared for NEPHA review for this project. Mr. Walsh said he started working on it but had a lot to go though and hadn't formalized the

scope yet. They had just finished the alignment grade and were working toward a scope and would get back to her.

Ms. McCormick said they needed the formal document saying this was their Section 106 undertaking asking them to consult, etc. and that was when they would have to have their comments ready. Mr. Walsh said Jon Axline would be directing that.

Ms. Rossillon said the only thing she would add to that was because it was in conflict with wetlands and normally they wouldn't look at wetlands but if they were taking additional wetlands, why couldn't they take additional wetlands across from the school. She said she was telling Mr. Walsh that that was one of the questions that she was going to be asking was about the wetlands. Mr. Walsh said as he had mentioned, there were a lot of other issues with safety probably being the biggest one with environmental, historic and access another big one – Bull Run Creek was running over and you would start getting into those accesses and floodplain and a lot of issues and so it was a complex project.

Mr. Hinick said they wanted to concern themselves with these buildings primarily. He said the wetlands issue was fine but he thought it was sort of beyond their privy. Ms. Rossillon said the whole process involved historic preservation, not necessarily on their scale, but certainly for the Department of Transportation and SHPO to consider alternatives and if they were going to be a consulting party, they should be party to anything that would interfere with or affect alternatives to the alignment that they would present and that was her opinion.

Mr. Gerbrandt would like to see the alignment shifted away from those buildings, if possible, and he knew on the other side of the road there were wetlands to deal with and perhaps there was some compromise that could be made, as far as taking some of the wetlands and leaving the buildings. He said from their point of view with historic preservation, he would like to see that centerline shifted towards the creek. Secondly, he thought the school building should be saved one way or the other and if not left in place, moved somewhere else. He also agreed that the other building, the homestead or the first dairy building was made of stone and starting to crumble already and didn't think it could be moved.

Mr. Walsh said he was sure those comments would be captured as they went through the process.

Ms. McCormick said there would be others, the Montana Preservation Alliance for one, who would be strong advocates of the buildings' preservation. She said there would be a meeting where they would decide among themselves.

Mr. Walsh said he apologized because he didn't really have a lot of information to present but if they wanted some additional things, as they moved forward, he would be happy to come back up.

VI. BOARD ACTIONS
NEW/OLD BUSINESS

A. Design Review COA – 668 S. Montana Street
Josh and Steve Brandsted

Ms. McCormick said the owner was applying for Federal Tax Credits with the assistance of Mark Reavis. They were also seeking a loan from the URA, thus the need for the project to come to the HPC for design review.

Ms. McCormick summarized the COA Application and described the pictures and said this was a rehabilitation of a four-plex on South Montana. Proponents were proposing to restore the cottage windows on the front façade, one at each apartment, and the three historic doors and the transom windows. The double-hung windows on the side and in the back would be replaced with wood double-hung of the same configuration. The front porch, which is no longer intact, will be reconstructed.

Ms. McCormick referred to comments by SHPO's historic architect, Pete Brown on reconstruction of the front porch as per the Federal Tax Credit application. Mr. Brown realized that trying to replicate the porch's original round columns and the turned post balustrades would be a very expensive undertaking. He, along with the reviewers at the National Park Service, agreed the proponents could use square posts for the columns and 2 x 4's for the railings. The posts are to be 4 x 4 posts on square pedestals and have simple capitals. A frieze board is also to be placed at the roof line. Mark Reavis said they would wrap the 4 x 4's with 3/4" boards and the pedestals would have a small little insert face.

Mr. Reavis said the railing height would be a lot higher to meet Code. Ms. McCormick said they wanted that center walk-up staircase to the landing – restoring porches as a key component of walk-ups and wanted that replicated.

Mr. Hinick asked if Ms. McCormick was recommending approval of the COA. Ms. McCormick said yes, she recommended approval with the lower porch to have the same configuration as the original, as depicted in the 1959 photo. There were railings at both the north

and south ends and a center railing in the form of a "T" that essentially divided the porch into two separate spaces. Additionally, she would like to add to her recommendation the use of the frieze board, pedestals and simple capitals as per Pete Brown's recommendations.

Mr. Gerbrandt said he had a couple of comments. He said those spindles, if you went to a turn spindle, what would it cost additionally? Mr. Reavis said they weren't readily available in stock. He said they wanted to keep the price down and had a pretty basic carpenter on site who wanted to keep it simplified using stock. Mr. Gerbrandt asked if it would be \$10,000 or – Mr. Reavis said as simple as they could keep it, so 2 x 2's in a ladder form meeting the spacing that was correct and they would be willing to bring the spindles down the stairway instead of having open 2 x 4's, so they would have consistent spindle work on the lower railings.

Mr. Weitzel talked about apartments across the street -- the tapered pipe or steel tube which was fairly thin and structurally sound. Mr. Reavis said he would be fighting material and the client would like everything to be square, including the primary posts and the balustrades not being turned.

Ms. Rossillon said as a follow-up to the cost, she did some research to find stock spindles. She would be interested to know the price compared to 2 x 2's when they were primed because you would need 42" for Code to have space underneath with a rail on the top. She said they were \$37 apiece and she knew a 2 x 2 was not that. She asked what the estimated cost was for priming and materials for the 2 x 2's. Mr. Reavis said he didn't have that and he only was doing the tax credit application. Josh Brandsted and his dad, who was the contractor on site, had been buying all the materials.

Ms. Rossillon said CPR had three turned and slightly tapered columns and she personally had one, maybe two more that were bigger. They would be short three, if used for this project. These columns wouldn't fit on a pedestal less than probably 9 x 9. She would prefer that and if there was an opportunity, the proponents should be told they're available and asked to consider their use.

Mrs. Stauffer moved to approve this COA with Ms. McCormick's suggestions and additions and with Ms. Rossillon's suggestion to make the owners aware of the offer of round columns to possibly be incorporated into the design. Ms. Petersen seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.

B. Design Review COA – Covellite Theatre

Ms. McCormick said the building was built in the 1890s as the Presbyterian Church. The group putting the Covellite Theatre together received a grant from SARTA to do work on the exterior. She said all SARTA grant projects proposing work on the exterior of historic buildings would be coming to the HPC for review since the grant was a public incentive. SARTA asked particularly for the Covellite to be reviewed by the HPC.

Ms. McCormick introduced Matt Frey, the Covellite's construction supervisor, and Lars Edshammar, the mason and a recent transplant to Butte. She noted Mr. Edshammar had work experience as a mason on the west coast.

Ms. McCormick summarized the project. A big component is masonry repair with the steeples in particularly bad condition. Some roof work and basic stabilization of the wood on the doors and windows was also proposed.

Mr. Frey said they bought the building back in September with the hope of stabilizing it and drumming up some business in the area. Their original mason, who had since passed away, had given them a really solid bid. He had a good idea of what needed to be done but realized they didn't have nine million dollars right off the bat to spend. He had laid out a plan to first wash everything and then apply sealer to keep further bricks from chipping off and eroding away. Then when more money became available, they would replace brick and repair everything. They also got a \$285,000 bid and another guy looked at the building but never returned any calls.

Mr. Frey said that Mr. Edshammar saw problems and was willing to work with them and didn't want \$285,000.

Mr. Frey said they also had a solid bid for repairing the roof. It addressed the steep part of the roof where it met the bell tower. Here there were some leaks coming into the ceiling. The contract proposed building a doghouse to divert the water from the area. Additionally, missing shake shingles would be replaced. Mr. Frey reported his belief that the roof was replaced fully about 1985. They also did extensive gutter work at that time.

Mr. Frey said Mr. Edshammar proposed the use of Lastiseal. He wished they could find something other than the Lastiseal company telling them how remarkable this product is. If everything they said

was true, it would be a miracle type product. He read some forty odd reviews on Amazon which gave Lastiseal four and one-half out of five stars. The negatives were because it was too expensive. Also, that it didn't work well inside of a basement, which wasn't what it was made for. Mr. Edshammar said it would work but they probably didn't apply it correctly or let it dry.

Mr. Frey said all of the reviews were third party. Everybody said that it worked great on porous brick, even on a 112 year old building. The consistent thing was it stopped any erosion, was invisible, looked the same after it dried but penetrated into the brick and solved problems.

Mr. Edshammar said they planned on filling in any major voids to get to the point where they could seal the masonry, so there would absolutely be no water penetration and to stop all the spalling, which was pulling the brick apart. He said they would repoint and retuck and replace some bricks. However, it would be too costly to rebuild everything on this building. Mr. Edshammar further said he had been doing masonry since he was about fourteen years old, and Lastiseal is the best sealer he had worked with. It's not a traditional tile sealer or silicon sealer. Lastiseal actually filled the voids.

Mr. Hinick asked Ms. McCormick's recommendation for this project. She said she hadn't been able to talk with any preservation specialists that had used this product. She called SHPOs in Washington, Oregon and California but couldn't get a hold of the historic architects at any of those offices. Talking with Mr. Edshammar had made her more and more comfortable about its use. He is a very experienced mason and gave every indication that he knew how to handle soft brick. He has reviewed the National Park Service information about repointing and other preservation briefs on masonry, which were used to write up the COA. She said she was maybe going out on a limb, but recommended approval of the COA with the condition that a test patch of Lastiseal be applied and then inspected by the HPO and a subcommittee of the HPC, people who were interested in going and taking a look. This group must approve the test patch before Lastiseal can be used on the rest of the building.

Mr. Hinick asked if they planned to seal the entire building and whether that would preclude any future brick work. Mr. Frey said they would be able to go back and replace bricks and repoint.

Mr. Hinick moved to approve the COA as presented with periodic inspection of tasks by the HPO and a subcommittee of this Commission would go and look at a test patch and approve it at that time. Bill Ryan seconded the motion.

Ms. Rossillon said she was absolutely opposed to Lastiseal because of the guaranteed life of ten to fifteen years and they were talking about a product that they wanted to last forever. She also looked on-line to try and find out about this product and saw a lot of people who had good things to say about it but didn't see anyone in the historic preservation field that had anything whatsoever to say about it. One, it was hideously expensive and was something like \$18 a gallon and she thought the same thing could be accomplished with appropriate pointing and putting in brick. She said this building had been put in the condition it was now, not because there wasn't sealer on it, but because when the mortar started to fail, after it was eighty-five years old, nobody went in there and repointed the bricks. She said when the brick was repointed, it would seal and create a surface that would be able to resist, therefore, she could not vote in favor because of the Lastiseal product.

Mr. Frey said he just wished somebody had done that fifty years ago when it started eroding. He said in the predicament they were in, obviously, they would love to have something that would last forever but obviously, nothing did, if you looked around Butte. He hoped in ten to fifteen years, they would have the money to replace all the brick that needed to be replaced. He said to just get started on that, they wouldn't be able to touch it for the amount of money that they had at this point and they had bricks falling down right on the steps on Broadway where people sat. He said it was only a matter of time before a brick hit somebody in the head.

Mr. Frey said the other option brought to his attention by Mr. Erickson, their former mason, was to take all the steeples off. They hadn't considered that because that would destroy the look of the building but letting the steeples fall down into the street and kill somebody wasn't one either.

Mr. Edshammar asked if Ms. Rossillon had ever used the product. She said no. He offered to do a demonstration to show her fears weren't warranted. He said Lastiseal sinks in four inches and glues the brick back together. The only way to destroy that surface would be to grind off the actual brick. Lastiseal does not make the brick rot, like when it's painted, which has happened a lot here. Brick can still breathe with Lastiseal. The company has a fifteen year

warranty, but in his opinion, it would last over a hundred years unless someone hit it with hydrochloric acid. The mortar they built this town out of had salt in the sand and that was why it is failing.

Ms. Rossillon said her problem was a test spot wasn't going to help her – she could see it and it would look fine but it was the longevity in the product. She said it wasn't the fault of the lack of the sealer that the brick was decomposing. She had a house with exactly the same problem but she didn't have a steeple but she had eroded brick because water was allowed to fall onto the building. She said he was doing a great job and was going to control water that was falling onto the brick and that was absolutely essential and if that would have been done fifty years ago, twenty years ago, there wouldn't be the problem, even without any sealer whatsoever, if the water had been controlled.

Mr. Frey said thirty years ago, it was in the same shape it was in that day. The steeple looked pretty much the same, as when the gutters got fixed. She said her point was that water control was what preserved the brick all over this community.

Mr. Ryan agreed 100% with what Ms. Rossillon was saying but it was tough to reach back in time and make somebody do something that should have been done. He said he would like to see this Lastiseal in person, as they were talking about something that only one person in the room had actually tried. He would like to see what it did. He looked at it more like a stop gap to keep problems from happening with this building while they got enough money to do more brick work in the future. He didn't see the harm in the product. He thought what Mr. Edshammar was trying to tell them was that the product was more of a stabilizer than a sealer.

Mr. Weitzel said he had been experienced with problem brick himself in painting ghost signs in Butte. The worst enemy of all to soft bricks is latex paint. He referred to the Tripp and Dragsted Apartments by Butte High, which was painted with latex paint years ago. The paint kept the moisture behind the brick and then all of a sudden the face of the brick would start to pop off. Once that happened, the brick was gone. He said a long time ago when they used to paint signs, they had a lot of lead in the paint and when they dried, the paint itself was very porous and that allowed the brick to breathe and it would dry. He was interested in the possibility of using Lastiseal on ghost signs but that's something to talk about at a later date.

Mr. Weitzel said he thought this Lastiseal was a stop gap to stop the deterioration at this time. He is all for it.

Mr. Hinick said the motion had been made and seconded and he called for the vote. The motion passed 6-1 (Mitzi Rossillon opposed).

C. Determination of Eligibility – 1354 Evans
James Hicks – Owner

Ms. McCormick said the property owner was proposing a demolition. She said the property was outside the Landmark District and had never been evaluated, so the first thing they had to do was decide if it was National Registry eligible.

Ms. McCormick summarized the photos and the Montana Historic Property Record. She said the neighborhood in which 1354 Evans Avenue is located didn't have the feel of a Historic District. Regarding its eligibility for independent listing, she felt it did not have architectural merit, was not associated with a person or persons that made a significant contribution to the social, cultural, and economic development of Butte, nor could it be tied to an important event. A review of other houses in the 1300 block of Evans supported the finding that the neighborhood is not a Historic District.

Mr. Hinick asked for a motion to concur with the HPO's determination that 1354 Evans Avenue was not eligible to be listed on the National Register. Ms. Rossillon so moved and the motion was seconded by Mr. Ryan and Mr. Gerbrandt. The motion passed 7-0.

Mrs. Stauffer asked if they were building a new house on the property. Ms. McCormick didn't know.

D. GSA Undertaking at Mansfield Federal Building – Ceiling Lights Restoration

Ms. McCormick summarized the pictures and said they were called ceiling lights. These lights consist of three glass block panels that appear in the floor on the second story and would have been visible in the ceiling of first floor. They brought light down into a work area but were later covered with carpet on the second floor and a lowered ceiling on the first floor. The carpet has already been removed from one of the panels. This GSA project proposed to remove the carpet from the other two panels and restore them.

The lowered first floor ceiling will remain, so the panels still won't be visible there. However, the GSA intends to install lights between the ceiling and panels. This will illuminate the panels on the second story floor.

Ms. McCormick said they were doing great work for the most part and thought it was really good to see high quality rehabilitation being done.

Mr. Hinick moved to give the HPC's approval to ceiling light restoration at the Mansfield Federal Courthouse building and Mr. Weitzel seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.

E. Proposed Communications Facility – Butte Country Club

Ms. McCormick said Verizon proposed to place a communication tower on the grounds of the Butte Country Club. She summarized the pictures and showed the location of the proposed tower.

Ms. McCormick said consultants were hired to see if there were historic properties in the area of visual impact. They recorded the Butte Country Club and originally evaluated it as eligible for the National Register. If so, then putting a cell tower in the middle of it would be an adverse effect. She really questioned, however, if the Country Club retained the integrity necessary to be National Register eligible. The golf course certainly was significant, as it was the first golf course in Montana. The buildings at the Country Club, however, are replacements from the 1960s and the area around the course is largely modern neighborhoods. The Country Club no longer has the look and feel that it did when it achieved significance. She thought it had lost integrity. The consultants agreed.

Mr. Hinick said the golf course was initially started in 1899 to the east and south of the original club house. Forty years later when they drained Lake Avoca, they moved and created the golf course where it is today.

Mr. Hinick said he was a member of the Country Club and had been a lifetime member. He said the Country Club building was kind of a travesty. It is all precast concrete "T's" with slough rock. However, the actual golf course itself, because it was 1939, fell within the historic era of Butte-Silver Bow. Ms. McCormick said that was correct.

Mr. Hinick said there were forty other properties that this could impact as well. Ms. McCormick said these were historic age properties that had been recorded but weren't National Register eligible.

Mr. Hinick said from what he understood, this tower was going to look like a tree. Ms. McCormick said it would look like a pine tree and the proponents planned to plant a bunch of pine trees around it. She said they also had to go to zoning for a variance.

Mr. Hinick said the rent the Country Club would receive for the tower was substantial. Someone said they were probably in favor of it and he said they were. He said it would be located northeast of the existing 9th green of the Butte Country Club.

Ms. McCormick said her recommendation would be to concur with the consultant's findings that the Butte Country Club was not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Hinick said having been a member of the Country Club and having celebrated the 100th anniversary, he would contend that it was a historic place. Ms. McCormick said it had a great history and was significant but the Country Club's historic integrity had been compromised by all the modern development around it, by the non-original buildings there now that were built after the property's period of significance. Mr. Hinick said they were talking primarily about the clubhouse and Ms. McCormick said yes. He said the grounds of the Country Club had not really changed, other than they matured.

Mrs. Stauffer said if they were to say it was a historic property or could be contributing, that could interfere with the placement of the cell tower. Mr. Hinick and Ms. McCormick said potentially it could.

Mr. Gerbrandt asked if they saw any future disadvantages to the Country Club, if they determined this not eligible.

Mr. Hinick then recused himself because he was a member of the club. Others didn't think he had to but he didn't want to go on the record one way or the other.

Mr. Ryan so moved that the Butte Country Club was not eligible for listing on the National Historic Register. Mr. Gerbrandt seconded the motion. The vote on the motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Hinick recused himself from the voting).

Ms. McCormick said the proponent had consulted with SHPO, and SHPO concurred that the Country Club wasn't eligible.

VII. STAFF/MEMBER REPORTS

A. Brown's Gulch Title Work Project

Ms. McCormick said she had already made her comments during Mr. Walsh's presentation. Mr. Hinick asked Ms. McCormick if she was being paid separately and she said the County was using her as a contribution.

B. Basin Creek House

Ms. McCormick said they were working diligently to save the Basin Creek House, with the strong support of the Chief Executive. Dave Schultz was working to get the house protected from vandalism.

C. Tour of the West Butte Section House

Mr. Gerbrandt asked if there had been any progress on getting a tour of the buildings from Patriot Rail. Ms. McCormick said she would call Patriot Rail the following day and see if one could be scheduled.

D. Playing Cards

Ms. McCormick said the cards that were handed out were in celebration of the 50th anniversary of the Historic Preservation Act.

VIII. ANOUNCEMENTS

The next HPC meeting would be August 2, 2016.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENT – ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None

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