



HISTORIC RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMITTEE - SPECIAL MEETING DRAFT MINUTES

March 20, 2024 at 12:00 PM

City Hall Conf. Room 224/Zoom Webinar

<https://juneau.zoom.us/j/89661475855?pwd=xluomaMmfFgcoltM6l8wiqvt3arp2.1>

or 1-719-359-4580 Meeting ID: 896 6147 5855 Passcode: 506100

I. CALL TO ORDER

- a. Vice Chair Crossley called the meeting to order at 12:02PM

II. ROLL CALL

- a. Present: Vice Chair Shannon Crossley, Doreen Lorenz, Steve Winker, Gary Gillette, Chuck Smythe, and Jerrick Hope-Lang
- b. Absent: Zane Jones, Eric Moots and Donald Harris

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

- a. Mr. Gillette made a motion to approve the agenda as is. Ms. Lorenz seconded that motion. The motion passed unanimously.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- a. March 6, 2024 Minutes
 - i. Mr. Gillette made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Winker seconded that motion. The motion passed unanimously.

V. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

- a. There was no public participation on non-agenda items.

VI. AGENDA TOPICS

- a. New Business
 - i. Telephone Hill Existing Structures Condition Report
 1. Mr. Gillette stated that he doesn't believe this was an actual inspection and shouldn't be labeled as such. He appreciates that RESPEC noted they didn't perform inspections for any hazardous materials.

Ms. Lorenz and Ms. Crossley both noted that on the summary of the report, RESPEC states that the buildings in the survey do not benefit from any modern building requirements. Both board members agreed that this does not apply because modern building requirements relate to modern building materials, and since these houses were built with older building materials and therefore, they did not need to meet modern building codes. Mr. Gillette shared similar sentiment. Ms. Lorenz stated she was confused where this phrasing even came from, as it's not typically put on a Structural Report for Historical Structures.

Ms. Crossley commented that several times throughout this report it is stated that due to suspected mold and other factors, it is not economically feasible for CBJ to own these buildings. She stated that this is not inherently true since after treatment they may be able to sell the building for more. Mr. Gillette added that environmentally, the best place to keep these hazards is in the building it's currently in and entrap it there.

Mr. Gillette made a motion to submit comments of HRAC's review to staff and the assembly and recommend the contractors to revise their reports, this agenda item and the other agenda items for this meeting included, with these comments in consideration. Ms. Lorenz seconded that motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Crossley stated she felt the report didn't give any specific information and had a lack of information to make the statements it made.

HRAC went through the structures and brought up specific comments on the report's statements on each. The report stated that many of the structures had poor attic insulation which HRAC noted was not a fair assessment, as many historical homes had this as a feature to increase the building's longevity.

Mr. Winker stated that more research must be done on the Webster home to make the comments that the report makes. The historical timeline of events presented in the report does not necessarily match the believed history of the structure.

ii. Cultural Resource Desktop Assessment

1. HRAC discussed with staff what were the actual determinations made by SHPO for the different properties and what that means for each. Mr. Hope-Lang stated that for HRAC to make any determination a real Section 106 report would have to be done. Ms. Crossley and Ms. Lorenz expressed confusion on why the report was released at this stage of the process, as it does not meet a Section 106.

The general consensus of HRAC for this report was that it was lacking in

iii. Updated Site & Structure Survey

1. Ms. Lorenz suggested striking the second last name from the building names for the purpose of discussion. Ms. Crossley agreed. Ms. Crossley expressed confusion over who wrote the report, because the architectural aspects are grossly lacking. Mr. Smythe stated that the report should have evaluated the level of historic significance and the report did

not do that. In addition, he states that the report is not sufficient argument for historical significance by going off of the 1984 survey of Telephone Hill.

Ms. Crossley stated this report was an updated of a report that was never finalized, and now this report is being decided as finalized by the consultants with incorrect information.

Mr. Hope-Lang asked about the feasibility of the Friends of Telephone Hill or residents of Telephone Hill applying for the CLG grant on their own, if the city does not want to finish that review. There was some discussion that it likely would not be feasible unless there was a industry professional living on Telephone Hill.

Mr. Gillette made a comment about the table on page 34 of the report that it made a comment on the Webster house that it was altered beyond architectural significance, especially if that comment is based on a report done 50 years ago. Ms. Crossley added that if the report is going off of the 1984 report, those alterations would now be historically significant.

Mr. Winker commented that the report frequently showcases photographs that seem to be biased against the homes of Telephone Hill and that it does not actually provide evidence to substantiate those claims.

Ms. Lorenz expressed concern that this report sets a dangerous precedent for, since the state many of these buildings are in match other buildings in Juneau.

Ms. Crossley will write a letter of our comments to send to staff.

VII. STAFF REPORTS

- a. There were no staff reports.

VIII. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

- a. There were no. committee member comments or questions.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

- a. Ms. Lorenz motioned to adjourn at 1:38 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Eric Moots.