

Members

Mark McIntire, *Chair*
Ross Buffington, *Vice Chair*
Phillip Hill
Ken House
Imad Al Janabi, PhD.
Fred King
Megan Luce
Ha Pham
Pamela Sundell
Caroline T. Swope, PhD.

Kathryn Longwell, North Slope Ex-Officio

Staff

Reuben McKnight, Historic Preservation Officer



MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Commission Community and Economic Development Department

Date: February 25, 2009

LPC38/09

Location: 728 St. Helens, Tacoma Municipal Bldg North, Room 16

Commission Members in Attendance:

Ross Buffington
Phillip Hill
Ken House
Imad Al Janabi, PhD.
Fred King
Mark McIntire
Ha Pham
Pamela Sundell
Caroline T. Swope, PhD.

Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight

Commission Members Excused:

Megan Luce

Others Present:

Eric Jacobsen, Elizabeth Jacobsen, Derek de Ville,
Milt Tremblay, Jane Barker, Kathryn Vogt,
Andrea Tull, John Barline

Vice Chair Ross Buffington called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. He welcomed new Commissioners Ha Pham and Pamela Sundell. Commissioner Sundell provided information on her background as an architect.

1. Election of Chair

Vice Chair Buffington offered time for the candidates, Commissioners Swope and McIntire as well as himself, to introduce themselves to the Commission.

Vice Chair Buffington also reported that he resided in the Wedge Neighborhood and had recently asked Mr. McKnight to review with the City Attorney any potential conflicts of interest as the proposal for the Wedge Historic District status was currently considered by the Commission. He further stated that it was found that he would not be eligible for any tax incentives and, after the consultation with the City, he concluded there would be no conflict of interest.

Vice Chair Buffington asked that all ballots be returned to Mr. McKnight.

Mr. McKnight reported that the election of Chair would be the first order of business as according to the Commission's bylaws. Mr. McKnight counted the written ballots and reported Commissioner Mark McIntire was elected to the position of Chair.

2. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Excusal of Absences

Commissioner Luce was excused.

B. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of November 12 and December 10, 2008, were approved.

3. DESIGN REVIEW

A. 702 North I Street

Mr. McKnight reported on the background of the proposal: Built in 1902, this Tudor home is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. The current project was an interior remodel that included the addition of two 14.5" X 30.5" vented skylights, which would match the existing dark brown composition roof color. The skylights would be located approximately five feet from the ridge to the top of the skylight. The west facing roof skylight would be six feet to the center of the dormers and the east facing 10 feet to the back and 14 feet to front dormers. The skylight was approximately five inches in depth from the roof surface.

The North Slope Historic District and Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation were offered for consideration:

North Slope Historic District Guideline Number 8, Additional Construction. Goal: *Sensitively locate additions, penthouses, buildings systems equipment or roof-mounted structures to allow the architectural and historical qualities of the contributing building to be dominant. While additions to contributing buildings in historic districts are not discouraged, they should be located to conceal them from view from the public right-of-way. Some new additions, such as the reconstruction of missing porches or the addition of dormers in the roof may need to be located on the front facade of the building. When an addition is proposed for the front of the building, appropriate and sensitive designs for such modifications should follow the guidelines for scale, massing, rhythm and materials.*

Secretary of Interior's Standard Number 9: *New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*

Staff provided the following analysis:

1. This 1902 house is historically significant as a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District. As part of the North Slope it is listed on the Tacoma, Washington and National Registers of Historic Places.
2. The Landmarks Preservation Commission has jurisdiction to review and approve, or not approve, changes to this building per TMC 13.07.095, prior to those changes being made, by virtue of its status as a City Landmark.
3. The house was going through an interior remodel; the two new skylights would add light and air to that floor of the house.
4. Each dimension of the skylight was 14.5" X 30.5", which minimized the opening on the roof. In addition, the roof form and essential appearance is not adversely affected, thus it appeared to meet Secretary of Interior's Standard number 9, specifically for, "...*exterior alterations...shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property...*"
5. The skylights would sit about five inches above the roof surface, so they would be visible. However, the visibility would be reduced because the location was behind the dormers on the two side elevations and the frame color matched the dark brown roof color. Thus, the proposal appeared to meet North Slope Historic District guideline number 8, for Additional Construction,

specifically states, *“Sensitively locate additions, penthouses, buildings systems equipment or roof-mounted structures to allow the architectural and historical qualities of the contributing building to be dominant...”*

Staff recommended adoption of the above as findings and recommended approval to the Commission.

Mr. Jacobsen added that their overall goal was to preserve the historic windows and protect the integrity of the home.

Commissioner Longwell noted more concern with the skylight on the east elevation which was very visible from the street while driving.

Vice Chair Buffington asked if light or ventilation was the purpose for adding the skylights. Mr. Jacobsen responded that the skylights were primarily for ventilation and safety since the original windows were very low near the floor which presented more access to their small children.

There was discussion on the possibility of adding two skylights on the west, the existing windows operability; clarification on the photo simulation that showed the proposed locations of the skylights and, it was noted, that the east skylight was for a bathroom.

There was a motion:

“I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, adopt the above analysis as findings and approve the installation of skylights, noting the project’s compliance with North Slope Historic District guideline number 8, as in the proposal submitted for the property, at 702 North I Street”.

MOTION: King

SECOND: Hill

Vice Chair Buffington stated that he was not in favor of the motion because the proposed skylights were visible; the proposal failed to meet Secretary of Interior’s Standard number 9, specifically for *“...destroying materials...”* and altering the historic character of the residence. Commissioner Longwell agreed with Vice Chair Buffington. Commissioner Sundell expressed the invasiveness of skylights on the historic structure.

MOTION: Failed: (7 opposed; 2 yea)

Mr. McKnight summarized the discussion by the Commission, which follows: 1) East skylight was more visible; 2) west and east skylights were both visible; 3) perhaps there were alternatives to address the proposal; and 4) visibility was from the pedestrian view and/or from the street while driving. He suggested the Commission discuss the proposal for sensitively locating the skylights; the potential for adversely altering the building, and ways to address these issues; and if not, consider providing guidance to the applicants.

There was discussion on the proposed skylights’ visibility on the east and west sides of the house, the potential visibility from the sidewalk as a pedestrian and driver, and the code requirement for bathroom ventilation which was located on the west side.

Mrs. Jacobsen talked about their work on specific improvements, including the purpose for the current proposal, to the historic house since their ownership, and described their family’s commitment to the North Slope Historic District community.

Mr. McKnight discussed the intent of the Staff Report and asked the Commission to consider discussing each of the areas where there may be disagreement with Staff’s recommendation. He talked about Staff’s review of proposals by using the North Slope Historic District guidelines which were written to anticipate changes for modern use. He noted that the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation

were used by Staff and not the Preservation Standards. He stated the basis of the North Slope Historic District Guideline number 8, Additional Construction, does not suggest that buildings should not change, but the addition of features should be reviewed for sensitive location; specifically, in this case, consideration of the skylights on the roof and the measure of care taken for the location of those items. Further, he said that Staff looked at the balance of the project's proposal. In addition, Staff considered the visibility of the proposed skylights but the Design Guideline suggested concealment from the public right of way; it would be difficult to conceal the skylights however, Staff recommended the basis of that guideline was met. Mr. McKnight suggested this finding was disputed by the Commission.

Commissioner Ha Pham stated that safety and comfort were very valid considerations; she talked about whether the visibility would be reduced if the skylights were installed at a lower level from the ridge.

Chair McIntire asked consideration of the roof as a defining feature. Commissioner Swope responded that the roof's massing was a defining characteristic on the Tudor home; she concurred the proposed west elevation skylight was not as visible as the one proposed on the east elevation.

Commissioner Hill offered consideration of the size of the entire roof compared with the smaller percentage of the proposed skylights' size. He also noted the installation of a roof ventilation cap requirement for the proposed bathroom on the east elevation.

Commissioner King requested reconsideration of the previous motion, which follows:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, adopt the above analysis as findings and approve the installation of skylights, noting the project's compliance with North Slope Historic District guideline number 8, as in the proposal submitted for the property, at 702 North I Street".

MOTION: King

SECOND: Hill

MOTION: Carried: (6 yea; 3 opposed)

Mr. McKnight stated that a written decision would be forthcoming within a few days.

B. 1722 Pacific Avenue (Russell T. Joy Building)

Mr. McKnight presented the Staff Report: Constructed in 1892, the Russell T. Joy Building is a contributing structure within the Union Depot/Warehouse Historic District which is also listed on the Tacoma and National Registers of Historic Places. According to the Historic Inventory Report, various wholesale and retail firms occupied the building over the years, the building is now vacant. The current proposal is to renovate the building for the purpose of meeting educational and faculty needs at the University of Washington Tacoma campus.

There are three phases in the project which are included for review in the current proposal:

Phase 1 includes interior demolition and abatement and exterior/interior masonry restoration. The street level exterior plywood walls and windows will be removed at Pacific and Commerce.

Phase 2 includes roof and interior structural demolition. In conjunction with the structural demolition, the new structural work will be installed.

Phase 3 includes removal of existing double hung wood window systems and replacement with aluminum clad wood window systems (pending review of the Condition Assessment Report) and installation of Mechanical Engineering and Plumbing and interior systems as well as site work.

Detail was submitted on the plan sheets: LM 002, 003, 004, 004A and 005.

A description of the proposal follows:

1. Pacific Avenue

- a. Restoration of masonry wall: Phase I: restored/preserved as much as possible; clean, repoint mortar joints and replace damaged bricks with salvaged bricks from interior demo
- b. Removal of 1st floor plywood walls and windows (*nonhistoric* windows): Phase I
- c. Aluminum Storefront System on street level: Phase 3
- d. Install 32 Aluminum Clad Wood windows – upper levels: Phase 3

2. Commerce Street

- a. Restoration of masonry wall (E): Phase I (masonry restoration as described above)
- b. Construction of stair tower clad in COR-TEN steel, curtain wall system height
- c. Aluminum Storefront System (w/6 louvers in openings) on street level: Phase 3
- d. Install 2 Aluminum Louvers in window openings on level 2
- e. Painted Metal Downspout
- f. Install 12 Alum Clad Wood windows –2nd story: Phase 3

3. Detail Items

Roof: See Commerce elevation LM 004 sheet (Phase 2)

- a. Install new rooftop ladder as shown on LM 004
- b. Installation of mechanical equipment
- c. Install skylight at main stair

Existing Loading Dock

- a. Remove original loading dock & replace with raised pedestrian pathway (with stairs & ramps) and canopy (west side-Commerce) [Note: As shown in LM 004 & LM 005 sheets]
- b. Cast in place loading platform, LM 004 sheet
- c. Install painted metal guardrail, LM 005 sheet
- d. Install painted steel canopy support, LM 005 sheet

Notes:

1. Phase 3, Pending Item: Current proposal is to remove the double hung wood windows and replace with aluminum wood clad windows as shown; new windows will have profiles to match existing windows. It is pending review of Condition Assessment Report.
2. Existing advertising signs painted on the masonry will be refurbished and preserved.
3. Mandated by State of Washington: to achieve LEED Silver Rating. This is being planned through its sustainable building design practices, innovative mechanical plumbing systems. In addition, one proposal is to increase thermal performance by installing new window systems including aluminum storefront systems and aluminum wood clad windows (see Note 1).

Union Depot/Warehouse Design Guidelines and Secretary of Interior's Standards were enclosed for consideration:

Staff provided the following analysis:

1. The Landmarks Preservation Commission has jurisdiction to review and approve, or not approve, changes to buildings per TMC 13.07.095, prior to those changes being made, by virtue of its status as a City Landmark.
2. Applicable guidelines for consideration of this application include: TMC 13.07.270 for building design and streetscape improvement review in the Union Depot-Warehouse Historic District.

3. The review on the interior portion of the building, which is being renovated, is exempt according to Union Depot-Warehouse District guidelines, specifically for, "*Interior alterations to existing properties, unless those modifications affect the exterior appearance of the structure*".
4. The exterior masonry restoration and preservation will include cleaning, repointing mortar joints and as necessary replacement of damaged bricks with salvaged brick from the interior demolition. The repair and replacement in kind plan meets *Secretary of Interior's Standard #7*, which states, "*Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used*" and meets Standard #6: "*Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*"
5. The removal of existing non-historic first floor walls and windows, which covers the street level Pacific Avenue storefronts, does not appear to change the number of original storefront sections between the brick pilasters, nor remove any historically significant original material, thus meeting SOI's Standard No. 2: "*The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*"
6. The Union Station-Warehouse District guideline #5 for Storefront Design states, "*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 a 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.*"
7. The storefronts are clearly not intended to read as historic reproductions, but as compatible new storefronts. Therefore, the Standard that applies is not #6, regarding repair versus replacement, but #9, which states in part that the new construction "*... will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment,*" and #10, "*New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*"
8. The new storefronts are contemporary in overall design, but appear to generally conform to the scale of the original storefront configuration, with the exception of the transom area, locations of the entry doors, and dimensions of the stiles and rails of the new storefront system. Specifically, historic photographs indicate that the transom windows historically were divided into smaller individual panes of glass. The dimensions of the members of the original storefronts were much narrower than that proposed, although without design details, it is difficult to determine how much narrower.
9. The Commission recommends maintaining the transom configuration as shown in historic photographs, centering the entry doors, and opting for the narrowest possible storefront member dimensions would likely meet the Design Guidelines #5 and Standard #9, regarding scale and proportion.
10. Because the addition of a new aluminum storefront system does not remove historic material nor alter the original storefront openings between the brick pilasters, it is reversible and meets Standard # 10.
11. SOI Standard #6, which states, "*Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new*

feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence,” applies to the proposed replacement of the original wood windows.

12. The replacement of original windows in the Union Station Historic District with aluminum clad windows has been previously approved by the Commission for the University campus.
13. The applicant states that the purpose of the aluminum clad wood windows' replacement plan is part of the requirement of the State of Washington for achieving a LEED Silver Rating. The new window system is one of the measures to increase thermal performance of the building.
14. It is not clear from the application materials that alternative approaches, such as retention of the windows and installation of interior storm panels, would not meet the stated objectives of the applicant.
15. The applicant also has indicated that a condition assessment is being conducted for the original windows.
16. The replacement of the loading dock with a raised pedestrian pathway includes a cast in place loading platform, stairs, ramps, painted metal guardrails, and painted steel canopy with steel supports, which will provide for a safe and modern use of the building. The loading dock was an existing feature that was part of the warehouse architectural style which will be retained by installing a similar platform accessible with stairs and ramps. The pathway with stairs and ramps meets SOI's Standard #9, specifically for, *"... The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment."*
17. The canopy addition appears to meet the Union Station-Warehouse District Guideline #6 for Awnings, specifically, for *"Awnings were traditional additions to the facades of buildings within the districts and shall be encouraged within the districts as a functional exterior feature. All awnings shall be compatible with the historic character of the buildings and shall be based in design upon historic counterparts"*. In addition, it appears that the canopy is similar to other canopies approved for other University buildings within the Union Station-Warehouse District.
18. The addition of a new stair tower clad in COR-TEN steel with a curtain wall system on the Commerce elevation is a new addition that is applicable to Standards #9 and #10.
19. This new feature is located on the rear of the building to minimize views and is designed to provide secondary egress. The massing is separated physically from the building, clearly differentiating the structure from the original building, and minimizing physical impacts, thus meeting both of the above standards.
20. The additions to the roof include the rooftop ladder, mechanical equipment, and a skylight. These will be installed set back from the Pacific parapet against the party wall of the adjacent building to minimize view impacts. They will not be visible from the Pacific Avenue side of the building and will not affect the character defining features of the building, meeting Standard #10.
21. The existing advertising signs on the masonry wall will be refurbished and preserved, which meets Union Station-Warehouse District Guideline #7, Signs, b, Location and Size of Signs, specifically for *"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"*
22. The application did not include proposals for new signage nor lighting. These elements will be submitted in a separate design review application.

23. Staff requested that the applicant provide information on materials for such items as the doors, cladding on the mechanical equipment room, and canopy, and the height of the stair tower.

Staff recommended adoption of the above as preliminary findings and deferred recommendation on action.

Mr. de Ville introduced the project confirming that the Joy Building was the focus of the specific application and continued with the presentation on the Pacific Avenue elevation proposal.

There was clarification that the PowerPoint elevation drawings presented were different than enclosed with the Commissioner packet materials as well as clarification on the University-City agreement for retaining some retail activity on the Pacific street level elevation.

Mr. de Ville continued by discussing the proposed windows and sun-shade system; continued use of the historic industrial appearance with the walkway, loading dock and tower for public gathering spaces; entry locations included a main building recessed entrance on Pacific Avenue, aluminum storefront system, and the consideration of metal materials for utility systems. He stated the intent for the windows was to retain the opening size but additional evaluation was being conducted for further clarification.

He stated the proposal included the repointing and replacement of damaged brick but a structural engineer report was being completed for review on the need for an anchoring system; the copings and roof would be removed allowing for demolition; the plywood and windows on both Pacific and Commerce would be removed. The windows would be either rebuilt or replaced; if replaced, the aluminum clad system would match the existing, fixed in place; he described the process including the removal of the sashes, insertion of windows over the top; and applying a new inoperable window internally to retain the profile from the exterior.

Mr. Tremblay clarified that the windows on the upper two levels on Pacific would be removed but the assessment study for repair or replacement was not completed as of this date; the Commerce elevation windows would be removed and were proposed for replacement in this proposal. He said the assessment study did not include the Commerce elevation window because they were mostly missing.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, approve Phase 1 for demolition, abatement and masonry restoration and Phase 2 for structural and roof demolition and installation of new structural systems, for property at the Russell T. Joy Building".

MOTION: Hill

SECOND: Sundell

Mr. McKnight confirmed that the mechanical systems, storefront system, new windows and louvers will be a part of the Phase 3 review.

Ms. Barker summarized the submittal schedule: Package 1 for permit in March; structural and roof in late May; and building permit in early September.

MOTION: Carried

4. BOARD BUSINESS/PRESERVATION PLANNING

A. Wedge Neighborhood Report

Mr. McKnight reviewed the Wedge Staff Report describing the application process status, the areas proposed for inclusion within a historic district boundary, and summarized previous considerations and feedback received on the proposal.

Commissioner Swope suggested a walking tour to get a sense of the proposed Historic District areas.

Mr. McKnight described a conservation district, which has historical character but not at the level of concentration as within a historic district; conservation areas would have design review but the rules were more customized per the purpose of the specific needs in the buffer area of a Historic District.

Vice Chair Buffington recommended scheduling a walking tour at the next Architectural Review Committee meeting, which would be on Wednesday, March 4, 2009. Mr. McKnight stated the meeting announcement would be issued as a public notice.

Ms. Tull asked for clarification on consideration for requests on opting out of the proposal and stated that MultiCare was interested in hearing more of the community's preferences for boundaries. She also noted that the Staff Report's Figure 3, Proposed Working Boundaries, did not show the apartment building that was zoned Hospital / Medical.

Mr. McKnight responded that previous decisions on boundaries along I Street at Division were reversed during the 1996 update of the North Slope Historic District; the decision on the written request was made at the Planning Commission or City Council level.

Mr. Barline was introduced as legal counsel for MultiCare, who commented on retaining the Proposed Working Boundaries, shown in Figure 3, that omitted the properties owned by MultiCare. He added: MultiCare was in favor of the Historic District proposal; their interest was to be sensitive to development projects at the east boundary and to work with residents. He noted the SEPA rules, WAC 197.11.444 and 197.11.930, Section 13, had existing review processes in place for historic and cultural preservation. He also discussed the concern with review on buildings or parking lots which had no historic character within a Historic District boundary; he further stated the definition of conservation districts were concerned with the protection of historic properties. He ended by stating that MultiCare would be interested in working on guidelines, if this was the direction taken by the Commission, and emphasized creating guidelines that were not regressive or additional zoning.

Vice Chair Buffington stated that MultiCare does not own residential property in the Hospital Medical Zone but owned four residential properties in the R2 Zone. He and Commissioner House asked MultiCare representatives why the residential properties should be excluded from the Historic District as the agency stated its support of the Historic District.

Ms. Tull responded that MultiCare had no plans to demolish these residential properties, adding there were challenges because of considerations such as ADA regulations. She stated that the purpose of Hospital Medical Zoning was for hospital planning for the future; some of the previous ideas suggested for use were not well received by the community, noting the work to find uses for the building such as rental property or administrative staff.

Vice Chair Buffington referenced community support of adaptive reuse but opposition to a previous MultiCare recommendation to tear down the property at 417 South M Street; he added there would be further discussion as the Commission considered the boundary.

Mr. Barline called attention to the impact of the eastern boundary-line to property owners, which would primarily be MultiCare, and offered that the reason for exclusion (from a Historic District) was to maintain flexibility for potential growth and development.

There was brief discussion on conservation districts, buffers, and future purchases of nearby property.

Commissioner Hill emphasized the perspective of availing the Commission as a public tool for the long-term future versus an onerous body of rules and regulations.

Mr. McKnight offered information on the development of the alternatives and maps, which were not generated by Staff as a proposal, but as an approach to the various discussion points made by the Commission. He added, it would be difficult rationale to conclude the use of a conservation district as written in the City code, and application as an overlay to hospital properties located on L Street, noting the modern construction. He talked about addressing boundary edge treatment through master planning documents; he added that the district, as proposed, did not include design review on any non historic residential properties; however, in the study area, he stated there were a couple of non-residential historic properties.

He ended by stating that the master plan environmental review approach may be how the hospital district interfaced with the residential area, and it may be a potential issue considered by the Planning Commission, which could be recommended as a proposed Historic District concern by the Commission.

Ms. Tull stated MultiCare's appreciation for the discussion with the Commission and supported the Staff Report's recommendation for the boundaries.

B. Preservation Planning Report

Mr. McKnight reported on the proposal to the City Council on February 3rd regarding how to use the appropriation for the purpose of Historic Preservation and Archaeological Protection Plans. The development of a Historic Preservation Element for the Comprehensive Plan will address many other issues, such as code enforcement on the regulatory side, mixed use, historic district formation, housing, and capital facilities. The work program includes review of existing policies and alignment with the comprehensive plan and code; in addition, council requested enforcement considerations, delisting procedure language in code, and other items. The Archaeological portion includes the development of a predictive modeling process. A work committee will be established that includes Commission representation. In addition to the Church Properties Request For Proposals that was sent out, there will be RFPs on the comprehensive plan update for the historic preservation related policies and archaeological modeling.

C. Preservation Month Report

It was agreed to postpone the preservation month reports.

5. Correspondence

The Historic Tacoma Letter of Support was signed by Chair McIntire.

The letters requested at the previous Commission meeting were discussed, noting the need for a couple of edits and the letter of appreciation to former Chair Roger Johnson would be prepared for the next Commission meeting.

Mr. McKnight reported on the recent letter received from the U.S. General Services Administration. He addressed the letter's content about the recent AC installation at Tacoma Union Station that did not receive proper approval and detailed the method of installation and the correction for future approvals. He also stated his current concern for rot because of the inappropriate installation. The Commission recommended Mr. McKnight contact the GSA to request the removal and proper re-installation with repair to the wood window sash.

Mr. McKnight reported on the announcement requesting nominations to the Washington Trust 2009 Most Endangered List.

Commissioner Swope asked Mr. McKnight to contact the owner regarding the three metal conduits on the primary façade of the Walker Building.

The meeting adjourned at 7:32 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:

Reuben McKnight
Historic Preservation Officer