

Members

Katie Chase, *Chair*
 Vacant, *Vice-Chair*
 Duke York
 Jonah Jensen
 Lysa Schloesser
 James Steel
 Jeff Williams
 Eugene Thorne
 Lauren Flemister

Marshall McClintock, North Slope Ex-Officio

Staff

Reuben McKnight, Historic Preservation Officer
 Lauren Hoogkamer, Historic Preservation Coordinator



MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Commission Planning and Development Services Department

Date: March 23, 2016

Location: 747 Market Street, Tacoma Municipal Building, Room 248

Commission Members in Attendance:

Katie Chase, *Chair*
 Duke York
 Eugene Thorne
 James Steel
 Lysa Schloesser
 Lauren Flemister
 Marshall McClintock

Staff Present:

Lauren Hoogkamer
 Alaria Sacco
 John Griffith

Others Present:

Ben Ferguson
 Linda McCone

Commission Members Absent:

Jonah Jensen, *Vice-Chair*
 Jeff Williams

Chair Katie Chase called the meeting to order at 5:33 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

A. Historic Preservation Intern Introduction

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer introduced Alaria Sacco, the new Historic Preservation intern.

2. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Excusal of Absences
 B. Approval of Minutes: 2/10/16

The minutes of 2/10/16 were reviewed and approved as submitted.

C. Administrative Review:

715 S. 11th St. Street Painting
 1502 S. 5th St. Windows

3. DESIGN REVIEW

A. 1916 Jefferson Ave. (Union Depot/Warehouse)
Façade Improvements

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

Built in 1889, the F. Wild Building is a contributing structure in the Union Depot/Warehouse Historic District. The University of Washington Tacoma is planning a major exterior renovation in the next three to five years, which will come before this Commission. The current application is for a temporary façade improvement, for the portion of the retail space occupied by Ferguson Architecture, which will be in place until the major renovation takes place. The entire storefront, including the aluminum windows and doors, are not original. The storefront is currently painted stucco over a combination of wood framing, masonry, and stucco pilasters. No modifications are proposed for the upper floors. The proposed design includes painting the existing stucco and wood trim black and installing a cedar plank rainscreen over a portion of the storefront. The rainscreen will be installed over wood battens; the rainscreen trim will be black steel plate with a clear coat finish. The

rainscreen is removable. The existing aluminum windows and doors will be retained. The black paint will match the pilasters of the adjacent retail space.

Additionally, there is an existing 8'x4' steel sign box on the storefront. The applicant will be replacing the sign face with a reclaimed wood background with a steel plate that has "FERGUSON" cut out. The sign will include hidden LED lighting and black dimensional lettering with the word "ARCHITECTURE." Sign face changes are typically administratively reviewed.

ACTION REQUESTED

Approval of the above scope of work.

STANDARDS

Union Depot/Warehouse Design Guidelines

D. The following predominant historic building elements shall be recognized as essential to the districts' historic image and used as the basis for design review of proposals for rehabilitation of existing buildings and review of new construction within the districts:

2. Scale. Scale refers to a building's comparative relationship to neighboring buildings and its fit within the districts. The typical four-story building in the districts is 50 feet wide and 100 feet deep. Two such "basic blocks" side by side are proportionally similar to the main section of Union Station and illustrate the scale and size of structural components in the districts.

Scale is also determined by the proportions of the architectural elements within the composition of the individual building facades. Exterior building facades shall be of a scale compatible with surrounding buildings and shall maintain a zero setback from the sidewalk. Window and door proportions, including the size and design of the wood sash and frame floor height, floor shapes, street elevations, and other elements of the building facades, shall relate to the scale of the surrounding buildings.

3. Materials. The predominant building material within the districts is masonry, including brick, granite, and terra cotta. Rehabilitation of existing buildings and construction of infill buildings shall utilize masonry as the predominant building material.

5. Storefront Design. A major character-defining feature of the buildings within the districts is the storefront. The composition of the storefronts is consistent from one building to the next, and serves as a unifying feature of the districts by forming continuity along the street. Preservation of the storefront is essential to the maintenance of the districts' image and character. Rehabilitation of an existing building shall include preservation of the existing storefront or reconstruction of a new storefront which is compatible with the original in scale, size, and material. New construction shall also include storefronts. Street level retail sales and service uses, as described and defined in TMC 13.06, should be strongly considered for ground floor use along Pacific Avenue in order to more effectively implement storefront design.

7. Signs.

(1) All new exterior signs and all changes in the appearance of existing exterior signs require Landmarks Preservation Commission approval. This includes changes in message or colors on pre-existing signs.

(2) If there is a conflict between these standards and the requirements in the City's Sign Code, the more strict requirement shall apply.

b. Location and Size of Signs.

(1) Signs shall not dominate the building facades or obscure their architectural features (arches, transom panels, sills, moldings, cornices, windows, etc.).

(2) The size of signs and individual letters shall be of appropriate scale for pedestrians and slow-moving traffic. Projecting signs shall generally not exceed nine square feet on first floor level.

(3) Signs on adjacent storefronts shall be coordinated in height and proportion. Use of a continuous sign band extending over adjacent shops within the same building is encouraged as a unifying element.

(4) Portable reader board signs located on sidewalks, driveways, or in parking lots are prohibited.

(5) Existing historic wall signs are a contributing element within the district and should be restored or preserved in place. New wall signs shall generally be discouraged.

c. Messages and Lettering Signs.

- (1) Messages shall be simple and brief. The use of pictorial symbols or logos is encouraged.
- (2) Lettering should be of a traditional block or curvilinear style which is easy to read and compatible with the style of the building. No more than two different styles should be used on the same sign.
- (3) Letters shall be carefully formed and properly spaced so as to be neat and uncluttered. Generally, no more than 60 percent of the total sign area shall be occupied by lettering.
- (4) Lettering shall be generally flat or raised.

d. Color.

- (1) Light-colored letters on a dark-colored background are generally required as being more traditional and visually less intrusive in the context of the Union Station District's predominantly red-brick streetscapes.
- (2) Colors shall be chosen to complement, not clash with, the facade color of the building. Signs should normally contain no more than three different colors.

e. Materials and Illumination.

- (1) Use of durable and traditional materials (metal and wood) is strongly encouraged. All new signs shall be prepared in a professional manner.
- (2) In general, illumination shall be external, non-flashing, and non-glare.
- (3) Internal illumination is generally discouraged, but may be appropriate in certain circumstances, such as:
 - (i) Individual back-lit letters silhouetted against a softly illuminated wall.
 - (ii) Individual letters with translucent faces, containing soft lighting elements inside each letter. Metal-faced box signs with cut-out letters and soft-glow fluorescent tubes.
 - (iii) However, such signs are generally suitable only on contemporary buildings.
- (4) Neon signs may be permitted in exceptional cases where they are custom-designed to be compatible with the building's historic and architectural character.

f. Other Stylistic Points.

- (1) The shape of a projecting sign shall be compatible with the period of the building to which it is affixed, and shall harmonize with the lettering and symbols chosen for it.
- (2) Supporting brackets for projecting signs should complement the sign design, and not overwhelm or clash with it. They must be adequately engineered to support the intended load, and generally should conform to a 2:3 vertical-horizontal proportion.
- (3) Screw holes must be drilled at points where the fasteners will enter masonry joints to avoid damaging bricks, etc.

8. Color.

Building colors should contribute to the distinct character of the historic building. Original building colors should be researched and considered in any new color scheme. Whether contrasting or complementary, the colors should reflect the design of the building. Building colors should utilize a limited palette. Colors should be selected to emphasize building form and highlight major features of the building. Color schemes using several colors should be avoided and surfaces which are not historically painted should not be painted.

F. The Landmarks Preservation Commission may, at its discretion, waive mandatory requirements imposed by Section 13.07.290 of this chapter. In determining whether a waiver is appropriate, the Landmarks Preservation Commission shall require an applicant to demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that, because of special circumstances not generally applicable to other property or facilities, including size, shape, design, topography, location, or surroundings, the strict application of those mandatory requirements of Section 13.07.290 would be unnecessary to further the purposes of this chapter. Such waiver shall not exceed the requirements set forth in the underlying zoning district, except where specifically provided for in TMC 13.06A.070.B. (Ord. 27748 Ex. A; passed Oct. 14, 2008; Ord. 27429 § 3; passed Nov. 15, 2005)

ANALYSIS

1. This property is a contributing structure in the Union Depot/Warehouse Historic District and, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for exterior modifications.
2. The scale of the design and proposed elements are appropriate for the building and the district, the new façade emphasizes the storefront.
3. Although not mentioned the guidelines, wood is a material commonly seen in the district. This storefront exterior is also temporary and easily removed.
4. This storefront is not original. The color and materials proposed do connect it with the district.
5. This sign is existing and is compatible in terms of location, size, and material.
6. The new sign lettering is simple and brief.
7. The sign color, material, and lighting are compatible with the building and district guidelines.
8. The proposed paint color emphasizes the storefront and is a common color found in the district.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Mr. Ben Ferguson commented that he was coming to them not only as the architect but also as the tenant for the space. He noted the location in the fourth tenant space of the F Wild Building between the Swiss Hall and the Rock. He commented that their location was the last part of the front of the building that had not been painted or updated in any way. Discussing the façade, he noted that none of the material in the bay was original. The material in bay four was stick frame infill with stucco on the face, while bay three appeared to possibly have masonry behind the gypcrete facing, which was the same facing as bays one and two. There was also currently an aluminum storefront in bay four. Mr. Ferguson reported that they were seeking to do a simple low cost improvement as they were a new business and were trying to make their space look nice. After examining many color options they went with black paint because they felt it worked with the neighborhood best and because black paint was used by the Swiss and the Rock. To make it look nice they would also be adding battens as a rain screen directly onto the face of the wall and then put up three panels of six foot cedar with a thin plate steel trim. He commented that it would show people what they do and make the building look nice until the UW can do a full project in the future. He reviewed that it was all reversible and no damage was being done to the building. Discussing the sign, he reported that they would not be altering the frame of the existing box sign. They would remove the existing faces and build a cedar face down the middle of the sign with standoff architecture letters on both sides. The face would be a piece of plate steel with the word 'Ferguson' cut out. They would also be lighting the wood behind it at night.

Commissioner Steel asked why the cedar panels weren't across both bays or centered on one bay. Mr. Ferguson responded that it was due to cost considerations as the cedar panels were the most expensive component of the proposal. It was noted that that wood was equal in width to one of the bays, that they currently only occupied one bay, that they hoped to expand to the adjacent bay within six months, and the positioning of the wood allowed them to claim both bays with one move. Mr. Ferguson commented that he was intrigued by how historic buildings become a history of all of the interactions that have happened and they were not trying to erase what was there, but were trying to make it look nicer with as small of an interaction as possible while showing a bit of craft and detail.

Commissioner York commented that the cedar seemed to be more for injecting life into Ferguson Architecture than for complementing the building. Mr. Ferguson responded that it would contrast with the building, adding that in the design standards from the Secretary of Interior, new work should look new and new pieces on a building should contrast. He commented that if they were doing a full renovation of the building, it is not what they would be proposing, but they did not have the time, budget, or authority as they were only a tenant. He reiterated that it was all reversible and commented that a neighboring tenant had only painted the façade, which is what they would be doing if the cedar panels were not approved. Mr. Ferguson noted that there is very little information at the Northwest Room on the history of the building, and that the most interesting part of the space was the inside of the building. He discussed three tall arches discovered on the interior of the building which appear to have been the original front entrance of the building prior to the construction of the retaining wall that holds up Market Street. He commented that they had been looking at the upstairs of the building and it was pretty clear that the windows on ground floor of the Market Street side were second story windows that happen to be on the ground floor as a result of the building having been buried.

Mr. Ferguson noted mix of different types of windows with some windows being aluminum and some being vinyl. Commissioner Thorne asked if the window arrangement for the storefront would remain how it is currently. Mr. Ferguson confirmed that the proposed window arrangement made no changes from the current configuration.

Commissioner Steel commented that even though the cedar rain screen was temporary and the façade was not original, it was important that it be compatible with the bay layout of the building. He commented that the sign and paint was great, but shifting the cedar to span two bays and not the full length of the storefront was not compatible with the style of the building. Mr. Ferguson asked if Commissioner Steel would be okay with the proposal if they had cedar from the end of bay four to the beginning of bay three. Commissioner Steel responded that he would be. Commissioner Steel commented that the era of architecture is not about dynamic shifting of forms which is what compatibility is about in terms of the aesthetic of the building. He commented that in the images it didn't appear purposefully shifted, but incomplete and temporary.

Commissioner Schloesser asked what the substrate was on the façade that would be painted black. Mr. Ferguson responded that it was stucco on the left and gypcrete on the right. He noted that the substrate where the cedar was proposed was wood on the opening of bay four with brick likely above where the transom line would have been. He reported that he had not been able to find any exterior photos from prior to 1970.

Commissioner Schloesser asked if they had considered not using the cedar panels. Mr. Ferguson responded that they had experimented with many different color treatments and trims, but none of the iterations were what he wanted to project. He noted that the inside space included a lot of reclaimed wood and steel and that the cedar planks reflected that. Commissioner Schloesser asked if they had done a mock up with a dark color across the façade. Mr. Ferguson responded that they had looked at many colors, but there were no details on the building to highlight. He noted that the building was a mix of materials from different time periods and that it could be argued that the proposed façade is somewhat appropriate.

Commissioner Schloesser noted the different wall treatments on each side of the bay, asking if there was a dimensional difference that would require the cedar board to stick out. Mr. Ferguson responded that the back of the cedar would be flush with the pilaster and would project out several inches.

Commissioner Steel commented that by covering the pilaster with the cedar they were bridging across what is the defining structural organization of the building. Mr. Ferguson noted that there were no bays on the second and third floor and there was nothing structural inside the building reflecting that organization. He commented that the building lacked the order typical of historic buildings.

Commissioner Schloesser commented that the bottom line was that if they were considering the façade, it did not matter what was behind the pilaster. She questioned what the return to the door was with the cedar rain screen present. Mr. Ferguson responded that it would stop short and a little bit of the wall would be exposed.

Ms. Hoogkamer asked the Commissioners to clarify that they were considering as options just painting the façade black or reconfiguring the rain screen so that it respects the divisions of the bay. Chair Chase and Commissioner Steel confirmed that those options were being discussed. Commissioner Steel commented that he didn't want to get into an architectural critique and that the feedback reflected the how they generally discuss the district guidelines when reviewing other projects. He added that it did not matter if it was temporary or not, as they did not know how long it would be. Mr. Ferguson asked if it would change their opinion if they shifted the one of the cedar boards so that the pilaster was visible. Commissioner Steel responded it would need to extend the full length. Mr. Ferguson responded that he couldn't afford to do the whole thing, so they were either using the proposed amount of wood or going with paint only. He asked if it would be better if they only expressed only one bay with the cedar and left the other bay black. Chair Chase expressed concern that they were getting into a design by committee situation and that someone should make a motion to move forward and be respectful of everyone's time. Ms. Hoogkamer noted that they had discussed just the paint and asked if that would be preferred over reconfiguring the cedar. Mr. Ferguson responded that he felt the building looked much better with the cedar than with just the black paint. Commissioner Thorne asked if they could use different colors to differentiate the bays. Mr. Ferguson responded that he liked their neighbors color the best, but did not want people to think they were all the same business. He commented that it was a tough building and that the proposal made it look much better than it does presently. He requested that the Commission allow them to do what they are trying to do.

Commissioners concurred that there were no objections to the proposed sign.

There was a motion.

"I move to approve the application for 1916 Jefferson Avenue in the Union Depot/Warehouse District for the alterations to the existing sign and the painting of the façade."

Motion: Steel

Second: Thorne

The motion was approved five to one with Commissioner Flemister voting against.

Mr. Marshall McClintock commented that while the motion was approving the sign and the painting, it did not prevent the applicant returning with another design.

B. 811 North I
Windows

Ms. Lauren Hoogkamer read the staff report.

BACKGROUND

Built in 1926, this property is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. The applicant is proposing replacing the original, second floor dormer windows, on the front façade, with a new custom window in a matching style and trim, the existing frame will be retained. The new window trim would match the downstairs windows. The applicant has provided information on three window options: Jeldwen wood windows, Milgard Essence fiberglass windows, and Marvin aluminum clad windows; however, the proposal is only for the Jeldwen wood windows, which are also the more affordable option. The applicant has been asked to use exterior muntins to simulate the divided lites. The applicant has been advised by two contractors that repair is not feasible. The applicant was not able to acquire a bid for repair, as the companies contacted did not respond. The existing center post is rotting on the bottom. The existing windows are deteriorated and no longer close; the window latch pulled out of the casement window and damaged the sash. The existing windows are single-pane, and the applicant would like double-paned for insulation purposes. The applicant has proposed two options for the replacement wood windows. The first option is three separate wood windows—a center 45x29 picture window with two 24x29 casement windows. The second option is for one wood window, this would be designed to replicate the look of a center window with two side casement windows. The second option is more affordable and preferred by the applicant. The front façade of this home is heavily covered by foliage.

ACTION REQUESTED

Approval of the above scope of work.

STANDARDS

Design Guidelines for the North Slope Special Review District: Windows

1. **Preserve Existing Historic Windows.** Existing historic windows in good working order should be maintained on historic homes in the district. The existing wood windows exhibit craftsmanship and carpentry methods in use at the time that the neighborhood was developed. New manufactured windows, even those made of wood, generally do not exhibit these characteristics.
2. **Repair Original Windows Where Possible.** Original wood windows that are in disrepair should be repaired if feasible. The feasibility of different approaches depends on the conditions, estimated cost, and total project scope. Examples of substandard conditions that do not necessarily warrant replacement include: failed glazing compound, broken glass panes, windows painted shut, deteriorated paint surface (interior or exterior) and loose joinery. These conditions alone do not justify window replacement.

Repair of loose or cracked glazing, loose joinery or stuck sashes may be suitable for a carpenter or handyperson. Significant rot, deterioration, or reconstruction of failed joints may require the services of a window restoration company. If information is needed regarding vendors that provide these services, please contact the Historic Preservation Office.

3. **Replace windows with a close visual and material match.** When repairing original windows is not feasible, replacement may be considered.
- Where replacement is desired, the new windows should match the old windows in design and other details, and, where possible, materials.
 - Certain window products, such as composite clad windows, closely replicate original appearance and therefore may be appropriate. This should be demonstrated to the Commission with material samples and product specification sheets.
 - Changing the configuration, style or pattern of original windows is not encouraged, generally (for example, adding a highly styled divided light window where none existed before, or adding an architecturally incompatible pattern, such as a Prairie style gridded window to a English Cottage house).
 - Vinyl windows are not an acceptable replacement for existing historic windows.

Depending on specific project needs, replacement windows may include:

- Sash replacement kits. These utilize the existing window frame (opening) and trim, but replace the existing sashes and substitute a vinyl or plastic track for the rope and pulley system. Sash replacement kits require that the existing window opening be plumb and square to work properly, but unlike insert windows, do not reduce the size of the glazed area of the window or require shimming and additional trim.
 - An insert window is a fully contained window system (frame and sashes) that is "inserted" into an existing opening. Because insert windows must accommodate a new window frame within the existing opening, the sashes and glazed area of an insert window will be slightly smaller than the original window sashes. Additional trim must be added to cover the seams between the insert frame and the original window. However, for window openings that are no longer plumb, the insert frame allows the new sashes to operate smoothly.
4. **Non-historic existing windows do not require "upgrading."** Sometimes the original windows were replaced prior to the formation of the historic district, and now must be replaced again. Although it is highly encouraged, there is no requirement to "upgrade" a non-historic window to a historically appropriate wood window. For example, a vinyl replacement window may be an acceptable replacement for a non-historic aluminum horizontal slider window, especially if the historic configuration (vertically operated sash) is restored.
5. **New Window Openings/Changing Window Openings**
- Enlargement or changes to the configurations of existing window openings is to be avoided on the primary elevation(s) of a historic building within the district. In specific cases, such as an egress requirement, this may not be avoidable, but steps should be taken to minimize the visual impact.
 - Changes to window configurations on secondary (side and rear) elevations in order to accommodate interior remodeling are not discouraged, provided that character defining elements, such as a projecting bay window in the dining room, are not affected. A typical example of this type of change might be to reconfigure a kitchen window on the side of a home to accommodate base cabinets
 - In general, openings on buildings in the historic district are vertically oriented and are aligned along the same height as the headers and transoms of other windows and doors, and may engage the fascia or belly band that runs above the window course. This pattern should be maintained for new windows.
 - Window size and orientation is a function of architectural style and construction technique. Scale, placement, symmetry or asymmetry, contribute to and reflect the historic and architectural character of a building.
6. **Sustainability and thermal retrofitting.**
- a. Window replacement is often the least cost effective way to improve thermal efficiency. Insulation of walls, sealing of gaps and insulation of switch plates, lights, and windows, as well as upgrades to the heating system all have a higher return on investment and are consistent with preservation of the character of a historic home.
 - b. Properly maintained and weather stripped historic windows generally will improve comfort by reducing drafts.
 - c. The energy invested in the manufacture of a new window and the cost of its purchase and installation may not be offset by the gains in thermal efficiency for 40 to 80 years, whereas unnecessary removal and disposal of a 100 year old window wastes old growth fir and contributes to the waste stream.

d. If thermal retrofitting is proposed as a rationale for window replacement, the owner should also furnish information that shows:

- The above systematic steps have been taken to improve the performance of the whole house.
- That the original windows, properly weather stripped and with a storm window added, is not a feasible solution to improve thermal efficiency.
- Minimal retrofit, such as replacing only the sash or glass with thermal paned glass, is not possible.
- Steps to be taken to salvage the historic windows either on site or to an appropriate architectural salvage company.

ANALYSIS

1. This property is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District and, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for exterior modifications.
2. The applicant was not able to secure a bid for repair, but has contacted several contractors and provided multiple options for replacement, which are consistent with the district design guidelines. The applicant has provided information on the cost and feasibility of the proposed options.
3. The proposed replacement material is wood, which is preferred in the district design guidelines. The new window configuration, design, and trim will closely match the existing windows.
4. The applicant is open to selling the original windows for possible reuse offsite.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Ms. Linda McCone commented that the center picture window was secured in the frame by two hook and eyes and the two casement windows had an old fashioned brass fitting, but were also each secured by a hook and eye. She reported that since one of the hooks had pulled out of the wood due to rot, they had gotten through the winter by allowing a crack in the window for airflow. Ms. McCone noted that she had contacted 5 different businesses that did window repair, including one that did a walkthrough, and had not been able to get an estimate for repair. She noted that she had informed all those contacted for a repair estimate that the windows would have to be wood and that she had a low budget.

Commissioner Steel commented that the proximity of the windows to the roof and exposure to rain might have played a role in the deterioration of the windows.

Chair Chase noted that there were two configuration options. Ms. McCone clarified that the options were for three separate windows or a single window, which would both be essentially the same in appearance and function.

Mr. Marshall McClintock commented that he could not find any photos, but the windows were likely original to the period given the hardware used. He commented that he would support the proposal for the wood window option, but that aluminum cladding might be more appropriate for the sake of longevity. Commissioner York concurred that the aluminum cladding option might be preferable. Ms. McCone responded that the aluminum clad window was significantly more expensive, but the fiberglass clad option would cost the same as the proposed wood window option.

There was a motion.

"I move that this motion be approved as written by the Landmarks Preservation Commission for all three options presented."

Motion: York

Second: Flemister

The motion was approved.

4. PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOARD BUSINESS

A. Events and Activities Updates

Ms. Hoogkamer provided an update on the following events and activities:

1. CLG Commissioner Workshop Recap

2. Wood Windows Workshop (1pm-4pm @ Earthwise Tacoma, April 9th)
3. Historic Preservation Month, May 2016
 - a) Historic Homes Tour with Tacoma Historical Society(April 30th –May 1st)
 - b) Proclamation (5pm @ City Council, May 3rd)
 - c) Historic Preservation Month Kick Off: Historic Tacoma's Coloring Contest of Tacoma Iconic Buildings (7pm @ 1120 Creative House, May 6th)
 - d) Amazing Preservation Race (11am @ UWT, May 14th)
 - e) City of Destiny Poetry Slam: Lincoln District Edition (6pm @ Lincoln High School, May 20th)
 - f) Awards Ceremony (1pm-3pm @ The Swiss, May 22nd)
 - g) Midcentury Modern Ride—Formerly Known as the Tweed Ride (10:30am @ Point Defiance Park, May 28st)
 - h) History Speaks: "Eyes of the Totem Rediscovered" (12pm @ WSHM, May 31st)
 - i) Film Screening: Eyes of the Totem (3pm @ WSHM, June 4th)
4. Neighborhood History Walks with the Councilmembers, June-July 2016 TBD

B. Historic Preservation Awards

Ms. Hoogkamer reviewed the nominations from the previous year and asked if the Commissioners wished to modify any of the categories or the nomination process. Commissioner would be voting on the nominations received on April 27th. Chair Chase commented that it would be good to keep the categories consistent. Commissioners concurred to retain the categories from the previous year.

5. CHAIR COMMENTS

There were no comments from the Chair.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:32 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:



Reuben McKnight
Historic Preservation Officer

