Hybrid Meeting of the
National Register Review Committee
Minutes (To be approved by Committee on 1/19/2023)
August 18, 2022
10:00 AM – 1:21 PM
3760 Highland Drive, Millcreek, UT 84106

Committee Members Present	**SHPO Staff Present**
Anne Oliver (left at 11:48am) Rob White Susan Crook Anya Grahn Ella Olsen Kenny Wintch (left at 1:00pm) David Richardson	Chris Merritt Cory Jensen Amber Anderson Alena Franco Elizabeth Hora Derinna Kopp Meghan Banton Jansen Bennett Skylar Schulzke Tyson Lewis Deborah Miller Matt Podolinsky Covi King
Public	**Other State Staff**
Robyn MacDuff Angie Abram Susan Yadeski	Bryan Nalder, AG

DRAFT

- Welcome/Meeting Start: 10:01am
    - Elizabeth Hora, SHPO staff, is running the zoom meeting and served as technical support.
    - Chris Merritt, State Historic Preservation Officer started the meeting as this is the first-ever meeting of the National Register Review Committee and there is yet not a chair.
    - Merritt thanked all of the committee members who have agreed to serve in this new capacity.
    - Merritt also noted that due to the very full agenda there will not be time for a staff introduction roundtable for those SHPO staff on the Zoom call, but acknowledged their presence.
    - Merritt also introduced Bryan Nalder, the Committee's Attorney General representation.
- Introductions
    - Merritt asked all Board Members to introduce themselves, Kenny Wintch joined at 10:10am due to technical difficulties.
- Vote for Chair:
    - Merritt introduced the topic of the committee needing a chair and asked for volunteers. Only David Richardson offered himself as a candidate.
    - **Rob White moved to nominate Richardson for Chair, Anya Grahn seconded (Merritt asks for a roll call vote, motion passes unanimous with Richardson abstaining. (White, aye; Wintch, aye; Olsen, aye; Crook, aye; Oliver, aye; Grahn, aye; Richardson abstain)**
    - Richardson thanks everyone for the vote, and took over running the agenda at this point.
- Adoption of the Electronic Meeting Policy
    - Richardson asks Nalder to discuss the Electronic Meeting Policy.
    - Nalder asked Merritt to bring up the Electronic Meeting Policy, and discussed at a high level the details of this policy to allow for a hybrid Committee Meeting.
    - **Susan Crook moved to approve adoption of the Electronic Meeting Policy with Anya Granh, second. Merritt completed a roll call vote, and motion passes unanimous. (White, aye; Wintch, aye; Olsen, aye; Crook, aye; Oliver, aye; Grahn, aye; Richardson aye)**
- OPMA Training
    - Richardson turned this item to Bryan Nalder of the Attorney General's Office to provide a training on the Open and Public Meetings Act.
    - Nalder and Merritt provided a Power Point to Committee of OPM and is posted on Public Meeting Notice.
- NRHP Committee Training/Discussion, led by Cory Jensen (NRHP Coordinator)
    - Presentation was given via a Power Point, and that presentation is provided on the Public Notice Website.
    - What is the National Register of Historic Places?
    - Why nominate? Education of the public, promote preservation, and financial incentives.
    - Does listing limit the Owner's Rights? The National Register is honorific, listing does not restrict private property rights unless there is a local ordinances by municipality.

DRAFT

- What is the process for listing? Nomination draft goes to SHPO for initial review and if meets professional judgement standards by SHPO staff then goes to NRHP Review Committee. Notification of building owner, local elected officials, and local preservation commission. Present nomination for approval to Committee. If approved, final version is forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register and they have 45 days to review. Entire process takes approximately 5-6 months. Those properties nominated on federal lands do not have to have Review Committee approval, though SHPO asks for review of a copy by the Office and committee members.
- Requirements for listing should be at least 50 years old, with a caveat, must retain historical integrity and must be significant.
- Levels of Significance range from National, State or Local. Most nominations in the country are locally significant. Very few are Nationally significant in Utah, and most of these in the state are National Historic Landmarks.
    - Anne asks if Topaz Internment Camp is a National Historic Landmark, Cory affirmed that it is. Cory explained that the Landmarks are complicated and take a long time to list.
- Historical integrity. The National Register is not a beauty contest, as the integrity is based on the reflection of the period of significance. Many properties are nominated for a person or an event, not purely for architectural style. Properties under architectural nomination may not be high architecture but for other factors.
    - Susan Crook notes that Architecture also represents Landscape Architecture as well, Cory affirms.
- Seven Aspects of Integrity, such as location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.
- National Register criteria consists of four, A for association with significant events, B for association with persons, C for a variety of architecture or style, or D for scientific information and generally applies to archaeology.
- National Register criteria considerations include a religious property (can't be listed just because something is a church), a property moved from its original location, a birthplace or grave of a historical figure, a cemetery, a reconstructed building, a commemorative property, or a property that has achieved significance under 50 years old.
- Period of Significance is the time in which the property held its historic significance. Not just from the time the building was constructed to 50 years ago, but more based on the historical events or architecture being discussed. Property must possess historical integrity for the period of significance.
- Cory asks if there are any questions? Richardson thanks Cory for the presentation and asks for a copy of the presentation for the Committee. Also thanks Cory for noting that just because something is listed on the National Register does not prevent demolition

- National Register Nomination Reviews
    - Cory also notes that Committee members should provide substantive comments in the meeting, but technical and grammar can be provided in written form solely. Committee members were asked to put their comments in a written form and provide to the National Register Coordinator (Cory) before the meeting.
    - <u>Gerrard House in Taylorsville (presented by Cory).</u>

DRAFT

- A 1906 central block with projecting bay house. One of the more eclectic homes in Taylorsville from the Victorian Period. Other buildings have been moved to this property and are considered non-contributing except for one pump house. Being nominated under only NRHP Criteria C for Architecture under local level of significance. Cory sharing maps and photos of the Gerrard House. Very few alterations or additions to the building. Very little of the woodwork has been painted, which is unusual for a house of this period.
- Cory notes that Susan Yadeskie from Taylorsville joined the meeting
- Richardson asked to go back to the map of the property. He asks if he is correct that the nomination includes the entire property, including 14 non-contributing buildings. Richardson, what was the rationale for non-contributing. Cory responds that it is because they were all moved and outside the period of significance. He notes that they do add to the setting as agricultural properties.
- Anne Oliver asks why it wasn't nominated under Criteria A. Cory responds that the significance was not there during the review. Anne continues that there are lingering some typos as it does say A in a couple places, and those comments are in the sheet.
- Richardson notes that there is a hand raised in the audience.
- Susan Crook notes that she had problem that the relocated buildings adding to integrity of setting. It doesn't make sense the comment that these non-contributing buildings add to setting. Cory notes that he will address that comment.
- Susan Yadeskie from Taylorsville joined. She notes that the schoolhouse on the property is an original structure from the 1860s, the blacksmith shop and equipment is related to the owners, the playhouse was built by one of the property owners. These are significant to the community but not necessary to the home. Cory asks when did the Heritage Center open, Susan replies 18 years.
- Richardson asks to entertain a motion to move forward this nomination with a positive recommendation with the edits and amendments as discussed.
    - Anne asks how to handle the written comments in the motion. Richardson notes that the motion should address that.
- Anne Oliver makes a motion to forward a positive recommendation for the Gerrard House and including minor adjustments made by the SHPO and the Committee. Ella Olsen seconds.
    - **Merritt conducted a Roll Call vote and motion passes unanimous. (White, aye; Wintch, aye; Olsen, aye; Crook, aye; Oliver, aye; Grahn, aye; Richardson aye)**

o <u>Helper Historic District (Presented by Cory)</u>

- Helper Historic District was originally nominated in 1979, and only covered 110 buildings. The SHPO surveyed Helper recently to ensure that a new nomination captured any changes in integrity that would affect. The nomination expands the boundaries significantly. Helper Historic District is eligible under Criteria A and C, with areas of significance for architecture, transportation, commerce, entertainment/recreation, ethnic heritage, and social history. Significant at the

DRAFT

local level, and period of significance from 1896-1968. Encompasses 250 acres including the existing commercial district and adjoining neighborhoods.

- David Richardson asks for discussion.
    - Ella Olsen asks what the community gets out of expanding their historic district. She notes that the original and this new nomination overlay basically the same area. Why are they seeking it? Using those same percentages any neighborhood could meet a historic district bar (such as Sugar House).
        - Cory responds that yes the history is the same as the original nomination, but the area did expand the boundary in this nomination. The community usually asks to do these expansions for historic tourism or financial incentives. Some communities even use these nominations as a development tool, and individuals can take advantage of tax credits by this new or revised listing. As far as Sugar House, it is not currently nominated though it certainly can be. It does take money through a survey and a listing.
        - Susan Crook asks to respond to Ella's questions. There is a revolving loan program at Preservation Utah and the public can apply to do restoration work. It is important to update these nominations periodically as there are properties that are now over 50 years old that perhaps were not identified or nominated originally.
        - Cory adds that many communities are Certified Local Governments through the SHPO and additional grants.
    - Angie Abram (Public) raised her hand and completed the Helper Historic District Nomination that is being presented. What makes this nomination interesting is that so many of the residential properties are actually company houses, that while not pretty are unique. Cory thanks Angie for that comment. Susan Crook also notes that it is unusual to have this concentration of intact buildings, and is a wonderful example of the company town. Richardson notes like Copperton.
    - Ella Olsen appreciates the NRHP training and how it overlays with the public's ability to do work to their homes after listing.
    - Anne Oliver asks Angie Abram if she had been able to research much on other aspects of home building in Helper that tie to different ethnic groups. Angie noted that there are some homes that do appear perhaps Italian, but not enough to identify as significant itself. Anne responds that some of the outbuildings might reflect different foodways or activities. Angie also notes that she didn't complete the survey herself, hence why perhaps it wasn't as identifiable.

DRAFT

        - Anne Oliver asks a second question, that she didn't see a discussion of integrity in the nomination as many are covered in siding, etc. Cory responds that is easy to address that comment and will be clarified in the final draft.
        - Richardson asks if there are photos of each property? This was an in-house SHPO survey, Cory notes, so no such photos.
    - Richardson asks for a motion
        - Rob White moves to forward the nomination with a positive recommendation to the Keeper of the National Register, Kenny Wintch (seconded). (Cory notes that all edits will be included in the nomination before going forward).
        - **Merritt conducted a Roll Call vote and motion passes unanimous (White, aye; Wintch, aye; Olsen, aye; Crook, aye; Oliver, aye; Grahn, aye; Richardson aye)**
- Anne Oliver left meeting at 11:48am

- Hole-in-the-Rock Trail Traditional Cultural Property (Presented by Cory)
    - Cory notes this is a federal nomination and does not require Board approval to be sent to the Keeper. The original trail was nominated in the 1980s to the National Register.
    - Being nominated as additional documentation and a Traditional Cultural Property. Oftentimes a Traditional Cultural Property is related to Native American culture and religion, but is not restricted to that. This is being nominated for its association with the Mormon pioneers finding a path from the Cedar City area to the southeastern Utah (Bluff) area. This trail is still being actively used today by members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints for handcart treks.
    - National Park Service hired an ethnographer to complete an ethnography initially and it expanded to a National Register listing.
    - Expanding the areas of significance and adding status of TCP, but not expanding the boundary.
    - 26 contributing elements including the trail, and other elements.
    - Cory asks if there were any comments
        - Richardson asked why there were no photos. Cory mentions that this was last minute with no photos from the Bureau of Land Management.
        - Cory updated the link to the updated nomination with photos a few weeks before the meeting and shared with committee.
    - Susan Crook asks about increased use along and if this ties to any Section 106 undertakings.
    - Merritt explains the background
    - Kenny Wintch notes that he is excited by this nomination and hopes there are many more to come.
    - **Richardson notes that there is no action required on this nomination as it is federal property. No vote needed.**
- Natural Bridges National Monument Visitor Center, San Juan County (Presented by Cory)

DRAFT

- Cory notes that this is another federal nomination with no action needed.
- This is one of the few Mission 66 Visitor Center facilities in Utah, and is local level of significance, under Criteria A & C, and period of significance 1966-1968.
- Associated with Multiple Property Submission for "National Park Service Mission 66 Era Resources"
- David Richardson asks if there are committee comments?
    - Susan Crook asks for more information on the siting of the property, and suggests that be added in the nomination. SHPO will provide these to the National Park Service.
    - Ella asks that the nomination reads that it was originally applied and then denied. Cory responds that we have not responded. Anya Grahn notes that the nomination notes that the layout is original but many of the buildings are non-historic.
- **Richardson notes that there is no action needed from the Committee, but Cory will provide the comments to the federal agency that is nominating.**

- Spencer Homestead, Sandy, Salt Lake County (Presented by Cory)
    - Cory recognizes Robyn MacDuff from the community is in attendance.
    - Nomination itself has been handled by several different individuals over the time. This was a difficult nomination overall.
    - Nominated under Criteria A for Exploration/Settlement and Agriculture/Subsistence, and for Criteria D. Built in 1893 with several periods of additions. Period of Significance is 1893-1970. Property encompasses over 5 ½ acres to take into account the agricultural extent. Being listed in Criteria D due to the connections to relatively unique aspects of Salt Lake County history as an investment farm, and underrepresented pattern of local history.
    - Richardson recognizes and asks Robyn MacDuff to speak
        - Robyn MacDuff thanks Cory for the help on this, and notes that this started in 2018 to get the property listed to the National Register of Historic Places. She has lived in this house from 1976-1992, and during that time the County was hoping to demolish the property and she convinced them not to. Long effort to get this house protection and recognition.
    - Ella wonders if there are any intentions to expose more of the historic fabric that has been covered with additions or siding.
        - Robyn responds has the historic photos of the porch. County is using the building at this time, and the Manager of the Park has an office in the building. She notes that the County met with the SHPO and consultants to discuss the alterations.
    - Susan Crook asks if there is a plan underway on this property that would meet the Secretary of Interior's Standards.
        - Robyn notes she is not an expert in this field but she is willing to make sure that any suggestions or plans make happen.
        - Susan follows up that the County should do that.

DRAFT

- Susan notes that the nomination should be more as the property type of the "Site" instead of a "Building" on the form given the archaeology and the landscape.
    - Cory responds that he had a discussion with the National Register reviewer, and it actually should have been "Site", but the form has an error and will fix that, and thanks Susan.
- Kenny Wintch notes that his questions are mirrored in Susan's comments, with an exception he notes that there is no map showing the location of the archaeological features (dumps and privy).
    - Cory responds that map needs to be edited to show those, given that the map is out of date.
    - Robyn notes that in the 1977 County Tax Assessment they show where the outhouse is and also the barn.
    - Susan notes that there should be one more careful reading of the text and graphics so that everything correlates correctly.
- Richardson asks for a motion to forward this to the Keeper of the National Register with changes as noted in discussion.
    - **Anya motions as stated, Kenny seconds. Merritt does a Roll Call vote and motion passes unanimously with Anne Oliver absent. (White, aye; Wintch, aye; Olsen, aye; Crook, aye; Oliver, absent; Grahn, aye; Richardson, aye)**

- <u>Spring City Historic District, Sanpete County (Cory Presented)</u>
    - This is an updated documentation of an older existing nomination. This new survey evaluated over 400 buildings, though the number of contributing buildings declined since the original nomination period due to loss of integrity.
    - Overall character of the District has been maintained since the 1980s period nomination.
    - Period of significance for this updated documentation is 1859-1972, under Criteria A and C, for areas of significance of exploration/settlement, agriculture, community planning/development, and architecture and at the local level.
    - Richardson asks if there are anyone representing this nomination, there were none.
    - Richardson opens to committee discussion:
        - Ella wonders if these contributing building owners are made aware of the nomination and how does the tax credit process.
            - Cory responds that he sends out notifications to all affected property owners. Oftentimes the local community will handle mailing, but the federal regulations only require a public notice in the newspaper. For this nomination SHPO put an advertisement in the newspaper. Another notification will go out when a decision is reached on this nomination.
        - Susan Crook notes that there was a little description of the historic fences and other landscape features and is unique aspect to highlight a

DRAFT

bit more. Also she notes that barns are an important facet of this area and community, and many have been loss.

- Kenny Wintch departed at 1pm.
- Richardson has asked for a motion.
    - **Crook motions to forward this nomination with a positive recommendation to the Keeper of the National Register of Historic Places. Rob White second. Merritt completes a roll call vote, motion passes unanimous (Oliver and Wintch absent). (White, aye; Wintch, absent; Olsen, aye; Crook, aye; Oliver, absent; Grahn, aye; Richardson aye)**

- <u>William Hawk Cabin (Cory Presented)</u>
    - Richardson recuses himself for voting on this nomination as this was one of his projects for his private company.
    - Cory notes that is an additional documentation for an existing nomination due to the fact that the property had moved since its initial nomination. Hence this nomination is Criteria Consideration B for moved property. National Register significance criteria is under A, B and C for areas of significance Exploration/Settlement and Architecture, for level of significance as local.
        - Cory asks Richardson to add. Richardson noted some landscape changes including an irrigation ditch that was used to cool milk in a concrete trough. Many of the features of the buildings were fabricated including doors and windows and even the sill log.
    - With Richardson recusing himself, Rob White stands in to ask for a motion.
        - Susan Crook congratulates Richardson on the project.
        - **Susan Crook moves to forward this additional documentation to the Keeper of the National Register of Historic Places with a positive recommendation, Anya seconds. Merritt leads a roll call vote and motion passes with 4 ayes, 2 absent (Oliver and Wintch), and one abstention, Richardson. (White, aye; Wintch, absent; Olsen, aye; Crook, aye; Oliver, absent; Grahn, aye; Richardson abstain)**

- Discussion of Next Meeting
    - Merritt suggests next meeting data tentatively planned for the third Thursday of Janaury, or January 19th at 10am.
    - Cory notes that the plan is to have three Review Committee meetings a year.
    - No concerns from Committee on the January date or the three meetings a year.
- Crook asks Cory if the form for evaluation of the National Register nominations could be improved to be editable. Cory acknowledges.
- Merritt thanks all committee members for their service and looks forward to working with them in the future.
- **Richardson moves to Adjourn, Susan seconds, committee adjourns at 1:21pm.**

DRAFT