

**TUMWATER HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING
September 20, 2018 Page 1**

CONVENE: 6:34 p.m.

PRESENT: Chair David Shipley and Commissioners Dave Nicandri, Marnie Slakey, Alex Rossiter, Renee Radcliff Sinclair, and Don Trosper.

Staff: Parks and Recreation Director Chuck Denney, Public Works Director Jay Eaton, Communications Manager Ann Cook, and Recording Secretary Valerie Gow.

Others: Mayor Pete Kmet and James Cary, Cardinal Architecture.

CHANGES TO AGENDA: An updated staff report was distributed to the Commission for item A under *ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION: Historic Brewery Tower Renovation Project – Phase: Schematic Design Review and Certificate of Appropriateness.*

MOTION: **Commissioner Nicandri moved, seconded by Commissioner Slakey, to approve the agenda as amended. Motion carried unanimously.**

**APPROVAL OF
MINUTES: AUGUST
16, 2018:**

MOTION: **Commissioner Rossiter moved, seconded by Commissioner Trosper, to approve the minutes of August 16, 2018 as published. Motion carried unanimously.**

PUBLIC COMMENT: There were no public comments.

**ITEMS FOR
CONSIDERATION:**

HISTORIC BREWERY TOWER RENOVATION PROJECT – PHASE 1: SCHEMATIC DESIGN REVIEW AND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS: Manager Cook introduced James Cary with Cardinal Architecture. The briefing will cover the construction methodology and a request for approval or recommendation for any revisions, as well as a recommendation for a subsequent review by the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) to ensure the project meets the standards established by the Secretary of Interior. At the October meeting, the Commission will consider action for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the project in order to receive a building permit from the City.

Mr. Cary reminded Commissioners of the previous review outlining the as-built conditions of the tower, some of the challenges facing the building with weather, lack of roofs, and masonry conditions. The briefing reintroduces some of the same topics as an introduction to the repairs proposed for the project.

TUMWATER HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING
September 20, 2018 Page 2

The Olympia Tumwater Foundation provided many historical photographs of the historic brewery building that serve as a resource for the next phase of work for developing a schematic design as part of the project's documentation. Schematic design defines the scope followed by the next step of design development, which takes the broad scope, fine tunes the details, and identifies missing elements. The third phase of design produces construction drawings for completion of repairs.

Cardinal Architecture is using the limited but detailed construction drawings prepared for the brewery in 1905. In addition to elevation drawings, detailed mechanical drawings were available of the unique gravity brewing operation of the brewery, which required the tower.

Mr. Cary described the unique building's cornice and gutter systems, which helped preserve the building over time. Historic photographs assisted in identifying the location of downspouts and cornice bracket spacing. The top roof is copper with a copper cornice constructed differently than the cornices in the areas of the flat roofs on the lower floors. The copper roof and cornices are in good condition. Existing material on the roof will be retained and repaired in areas where necessary, as the 100-year copper roof is still performing well.

The team was able to locate portions of the lower story cornice on the ground enabling the team to determine how the cornice was constructed. Cornices were constructed from sheet metal, painted, and installed below the roof structure in a bracketed fashion. When asphalt on the roof began failing, cornices fell as the wooden brackets began to rot.

Mr. Cary displayed another historic photograph depicting workers installing the copper roof. The photo provides more details of the cornice work below, sheet metal work, and the location of downspouts. The team spent time reviewing the photos to identify spacing and how elements were originally constructed.

Although masonry damage exists, much of the masonry remains intact and is in good condition. Stone work at the bottom of the building is in good condition with some cracks. Mortar work at the bottom of the building was replaced at some point. Some portions were painted, which can be removed and restored to original masonry mortar. Mr. Cary distributed a sample of original masonry mortar. The mortar produced in 1905 is most likely lime-based. At the base of the building, the application method was a flush mortar joint. Intact areas are in very good condition. A sample of the mortar was shipped to a lab in Texas for analysis to produce findings on compression strength, as lime-based mortars are typically softer than today's mortar. The intent is to match the same compression strength, as well as the proper composition to match existing mortar.

TUMWATER HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING
September 20, 2018 Page 3

Upper stories of the building have areas where masonry bricks dislodged and fell or are loose. Most of the cornice work is in good condition and intact. However, birds have nested in some areas, which will require repair.

The drawings reflect the original construction included a triple white masonry wall at the top of the building. Roof framing revealed some bricks intentionally removed to create pockets along the top of the wall where it connects to the roof. Roof framing was then added and nested within the pockets with steel set in mortar and a strap nailed to the frame to secure the roof system. Asphalt roofing was installed on the roof with sheathing used that was common at that time. As the asphalt roof failed, water leaked and infiltrated onto the rafters and into the wall cavity. As water froze and thawed over the years, mortar degraded and disappeared, rafters failed, brackets failed because of rot, and the entire system collapsed and fell to the ground.

Historic reconstruction techniques are not planned because construction elements are lacking to reliably roof the sections and prevent water infiltration. The lack of constructability at the top means it cannot reliably be restored to its original configuration to prevent water infiltration and meet current structural building codes. Consequently, a much stronger attachment is required for the roof to meet current structural building codes. If the roof and supporting system had remained intact, rosettes and straps could be used to tie all the components together, as well as the masonry to the roof structure. Alternatively, the proposal is rebuilding the roof by using a new technique of strapping all components together without using the pockets.

Mr. Cary reviewed details of the headwall, the high side of the roofs where rafters are pocketed into the three-wide brick wall and secured with a strap. Although the straps are useful, they are insufficient to keep all components in place, especially when moisture infiltrated the walls.

Chair Shipley asked about the condition of the roof located some distance away from the corner of the building that had deteriorated. Mr. Cary replied that very little existing roofing remains except for some roof structures. Mr. Cary shared photographs of the shoring recently constructed as part of the temporary protection project. Existing rafters can be viewed that are pocketed into the brick wall. However, masonry is also missing in some areas.

Mr. Cary described the methodology for restoring the roof system and cornices. The team will review documentation to assist in recreating the cornice elements for new construction. The plan is to replace masonry using the same technique and rebuilding an existing wall with new

TUMWATER HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING
September 20, 2018 Page 4

masonry to a specific level. A bolt system will be used to connect and support rafters and roof framing to the masonry wall. Steel brackets and rosettes will be used to anchor the cornice and gutter work on the exterior wall. Although, the proposal is a deviation from the original construction, the construction technique can be engineered and verified and it would be hidden from view behind the replacement cornice. Within the interior, the construction would be visible as an historical rosette or within the roof structure above. The team plans to re-create the gutter and the deep cornice work projecting from the building to resemble the historic elements as depicted in the historic photographs. The cornices are an important part of the composition of the building and perform an important function in protecting masonry. Restoration of the cornice system will protect new installed masonry.

Mr. Cary reported the new membrane roof would serve as the umbrella for the building. Masonry located under the umbrella will be protected and remain dry. However, all masonry installed on load-bearing walls tended to absorb moisture from the inside from the prior brewing process and from the outside from weather. There are no methods to provide a waterproof seal on exterior walls.

Mr. Cary addressed questions asked about the type of flashing material. Mr. Cary said the top roof is copper with copper brackets. The drawings indicate that the lower brackets and cornice work were supposed to be copper as well; however copper was not used and steel was used instead. The team needs to consider the same issue during renovation. Budget likely drove the decision to use steel rather than copper. To re-create the original, the team could use painted metal, but would prefer using copper as well, but the decision is dependent upon budget. Moving forward, either option could be pursued based on history and documentation. The team will bid the project with two options.

Mayor Kmet asked how to prevent corrosion from occurring from electromagnetic activity when two different metals are used. Mr. Cary replied that stainless steel does not react well with copper and in those circumstances, corrosion that could take years, occurs in six weeks because of galvanic corrosion. Construction techniques are available to address the issue, such as wrapping and encasing the support metal to keep the two metals separate.

Commissioner Nicandri asked about the option of coating copper with lead. Mr. Cary advised that the practice was an historic technique. However, for this project, the method would be to either coat the underlying steel bracket or separate the metals using washers.

Mr. Cary reviewed photographs of the copper roof, which will be cleaned and repaired. Recent photographs of the roof reveal remnants of an old

TUMWATER HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING
September 20, 2018 Page 5

flag pole, and an opening in the roof for a trap door likely used to lower and raise the flag.

Mr. Cary reviewed a series of demolition drawings, schematic design drawings, and building sections reflecting the location of temporary roofs and existing conditions as part of the scope, which also depict areas of heavy erosion, masonry degradation, and large cracks.

Chair Shipley inquired about the notation depicting the removal of a light fixture and the timing when the fixture was added to the building for security. Mr. Cary replied that the light fixture was essentially a surface conduit that was added to the building later. The scope includes removal of the fixture from the building. Another building element was designed as a wood mast with two cables with a light fixture suspended over the brewhouse sign. He is unsure when the light was added to the building. Some of the historic photographs include the fixture, which will require some additional research as the light has been removed and salvaged.

Mr. Cary reviewed new drawings of the new roof frame, rafters, and ties to existing masonry at the edges. New roof systems will tie directly to new framing and be part of the diaphragm holding the building together in the future. Drone photos reveal that the existing copper roof is largely intact with some pieces loose, which will be either replaced or repaired. The flag pole would likely be part of a future phase of work.

Mr. Cary reviewed and described drawings depicting the new roof structures, earlier drawings depicting the assembly process for new cornice elements, and drawings of the new building elevations. The consultant team is assessing the amount of masonry to be repaired and replaced and the mortar work required on the building. The team is working with its cost estimator to assist in preparing estimates on the total project cost. The north elevation of the building will include masonry replacement where there has been extensive damage. Masonry at the top of walls will be replaced that is either missing or damaged by water. A downspout located on the west wall of the tower was damaged by water creating a dark stain likely caused from accumulation of organic material. The area has missing mortar. Replacement of masonry in those areas will likely be necessary to preserve the long-term health of the building.

Mr. Cary distributed samples of new bricks produced by Mutual Materials. Brick color is determined by the firing method. Historic photographs depict variation of brick color on the exterior walls of the building. The original bricks were produced in Chehalis. The team will strive to create a similar variety of colors by using new bricks.

Commissioner Trosper inquired as to how the new bricks would be blended with existing bricks. Mr. Cary replied that there are several

TUMWATER HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING
September 20, 2018 Page 6

techniques. One method is whitewashing to age the bricks to improve the aesthetics between old and new bricks. The project includes cleaning the building using a simple cleaning technique to remove efflorescence. Over time, new bricks will age and efflorescence will return to improve the aesthetics of blended bricks, although the new will always be distinguished from the old. That approach of keeping a distinction between new and old is a traditional approach for restoration of an historic building. However, striving to obtain similar materials and employing similar techniques is the desired outcome for the project.

Commissioner Slakey referred to references of an elevator during Phase 3. She asked whether the restoration of the elevator would provide ADA access to the building or whether renovation of the historic structure provides the possibility for a waiver of ADA requirements. Mr. Cary replied that a building code review is scheduled for the building for several different future use scenarios. As part of the review, accessibility will be addressed, as well as the Energy Code. During a building code review of historic structures, it is possible to address how the code applies to preserve historic features of a building. The existing elevator would never be ADA accessible, as well as the stairs. The process for ensuring public accessibility to the building will be an interesting process in terms of producing a building that can function in 2018 while maintaining historic features.

Chair Shipley commented that sometimes mistakes have occurred in the renovation of historic structures in terms of using wrong methods or wrong materials. He asked how the Commission could be assured that the consultant team has the experience and expertise to ensure the plans and methods are the best way to restore the structure. Mr. Cary conceded that not everyone can work on historic buildings, as it requires art as well as skill, and a level of logic that many of his colleagues lack. Assessing the need to rebuild a corner of the building is a major move. At this point, he is unsure if that would be the right decision. It is possible to repair and reinforce the building with steel internally to preserve the building's internal skeleton as part of the seismic retrofit. However, he does have some doubt pertaining to the method for addressing that section of the building to ensure renovation is successful. The structural engineer has worked with the consultant team for 20 years on other similar historic structures. The engineer has a construction background and does not recommend repair techniques that cannot be successfully completed. Cardinal Architecture has developed a good team. Following the meeting, a letter depicting the details of the project for meeting the guidelines of the Secretary of Interior will be prepared explaining the proposed actions and the logic relative to the standards. Most importantly, no harm would occur to the building; however, it also would not be possible to restore the building from its current state of condition without taking some bold actions.

TUMWATER HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING
September 20, 2018 Page 7

Chair Shipley cited several local historic renovations that made it very difficult to distinguish between the old and new structure. He conveyed appreciation for efforts to blend new brick with original brick, but also acknowledged that new brick would be distinguishable from original brick.

Commissioner Rossiter remarked that he believes the highest and best modern practices for restoration requirements appear to be achieved. Restoring the flag pole and light earlier in the project could assist in building and confirming some excitement about the progress occurring to restore the structure. It could serve to demonstrate unity to community. He favors approval of the proposal schematic design.

Manager Cook reported the requested action is approval of the schematic design as presented and a recommendation to forward the schematic design to the State Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation for its review.

Commissioner Sinclair asked whether the plan for the seismic retrofit would be included in the package forwarded to the State Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation. Mr. Cary cited the steps of the building renovation. Currently, Project 2 is underway. Project 3 includes the seismic retrofit. It is likely rosettes will be added to the exterior of the building, which are large washers that bind the masonry to the interior structure. The interior structure will change as a steel frame will be added and bolted to the masonry structure to maintain strength of the structure if seismic activity occurs. That work is not included in this scope of work. The project scope includes specific steps because of the funding cycle.

Commissioner Rossiter asked about the answer to Commissioner Sinclair's previous question surrounding soil samples and whether the foundation sits on bedrock. Manager Cook replied that soil sampling and seismic work are included in the next phase of the project, which is scheduled to begin in summer 2019. The Commission will receive a similar schematic presentation for the next phase of work. Soil sampling will include a review by the Squaxin Island Indian Tribe beginning July 1, 2019 contingent on receiving the heritage grant.

Commissioner Sinclair said she wants to ensure that any seismic work completed does not jeopardize national register listing of the structure. Manager Cook advised that the Commission's review and the State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation's review would ensure the proposed work would not jeopardize the historic preservation standing of the structure. The state team reviewing the City's grant application for the next funding cycle, conveyed that the building is at a critical juncture and that the ranking was higher because seismic work is in the next phase of work and because of the deterioration of the building. The team was also very pleased with the community support for the emergency repairs.

TUMWATER HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING
September 20, 2018 Page 8

Chair Shipley expressed appreciation for the information from staff and the architect. The photographs have been helpful as well.

MOTION:

Commissioner Rossiter moved, seconded by Commissioner Slakey, to approve the schematic design as presented and forward to the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation for review. Motion carried unanimously.

**WASHINGTON
STATE LIBRARY
AND ARCHIVES
FACILITY
(BRIGHTON PARK
GRANGE PROJECT):**

Patrick McDonald, Office of the Secretary of State (OSOS), emphasized that the briefing would be a preliminary discussion on a proposal for a new library and archives building with a focus on the former Brighton Park Grange.

The proposal combines four facilities into one facility. Today, historic documents are stored in two buildings in Tumwater that are below standards for archival document storage. The State Library is housed in a 49,000 square foot privately-owned office building in Tumwater. The building is not designed as a library. Most of the collections are inaccessible. A majority of the collection is located on the first floor. The remaining building is used for office space.

The Dolliver Building houses the OSOS Corporations Division. The building was constructed in 1915 as a U.S. Post Office. The state assumed ownership in 2000 and converted the use for the Corporations Division. Today, the building lacks sufficient space to accommodate employees because of the structure and historic configuration. Many employees work in the basement, in the attic, and under eaves. Of the building's 17,000 square feet, only 8,500 square feet is usable space.

The Elections Division Building was constructed in 1965 as the first Washington State Employee Credit Union. The OSOS occupied the building after the 2001 Nisqually Earthquake. The building is the smallest and most expensive building per square foot. The building is leased from a private developer and maintenance of the building is not optimal with major ongoing issues.

The proposed new building would house the four divisions. The OSOS is moving away from a heritage center concept on the General Administration Building site as it lacks sufficient space and retrofitting the building would be too expensive. In 2016, a predesign process was reinitiated identifying three sites. One of the sites was the site of the State Printer in Tumwater. One third of the building houses state records. During the predesign, the Department of Enterprise Services asked OSOS not to pursue the site. After seeking approval from the Legislature to reopen the predesign process for other sites, OSOS considered sites of sufficient size that would meet standards and accessibility. Numerous sites

TUMWATER HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING
September 20, 2018 Page 9

were considered in addition to the site located at the NE corner of Linderson and Tumwater Boulevard, the former Texaco tank farm. Reports verify that approximately 7.5 feet of dirt was removed from the site. The site has since been replanted. Twenty-four wells are located on the site for continuous monitoring. The site also does not house any Mazama Pocket gophers. The site satisfies requirements for space and accessibility and could serve as a doorway to Tumwater.

After several visits to the grange building near the Linderson site, Mr. McDonald contacted Grange Master Ron Nelson to learn more about the building. He was provided with information about the historic building. He and Secretary of State Kim Wyman discussed ways to preserve and tie the building to the new building while enabling the building to function as a grange. He also spoke to grange officials about the concept and the ability to preserve the grange. The state would not own the grange but the arrangement would involve a long-term lease with the State Grange Association. The State Grange has asked OSOS to assist in preservation of the building and enabling ongoing access. The condition of the building is not good. The foundation has deteriorated to such an extent that the structure sits on logs that have been reinforced. The building has its own septic system and it is located on a wetland creating structural issues that are not necessarily insurmountable, but could be corrected at some cost.

Mr. McDonald shared that he learned the cost of two construction trailers for the new building would be approximately \$300,000. The discussion for renovating the grange building was generated after that discussion as the building could be used in lieu of the construction trailers.

Part of the renovation process would add a concrete foundation. The building's dance floor in the main part of the building was added in 1946, which likely is constructed of asbestos-based cork. The center part of the building is in the worst condition.

Mr. McDonald shared that he also discovered some information that is contrary to historical information, as he has access to historical newspapers. All historical reports reflected the largest section of the building as the schoolhouse, which doesn't fit with the configuration of the building. The Brighton Park School used the building from 1897 to 1917. The largest class in 1914 had 21 students.

Mr. McDonald identified the location of the grange building on an original map obtained from the State Archives. Approximately, 35 feet away from the schoolhouse was a small grange building, which burned down. When the school closed, the grange took over the schoolhouse and built a new grange building. Archival documents speak to an open house in 1919. In 1942, the United State Army Air Corps directed the removal of the buildings, as they were located at the end of the runway. The military

TUMWATER HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING
September 20, 2018 Page 10

purchased the property and moved the structures in 1942 to its current location off 73rd Avenue. When the buildings were moved, a decision was made to place the schoolhouse in an east/west direction and the grange in a north/south direction at the rear of the schoolhouse.

Mr. McDonald shared additional historical information on the relocation of the schoolhouse and grange, and today's location of Capitol Boulevard and Old Highway 99. In 1918, the Brighton Park Grange built a grange hall in the community area next to the school. However, the grange building burned soon after it was built. The grange then purchased the school with plans to build a new grange hall.

Conversation ensued on the location of Old Highway 99 during that period. Commissioner Nicandri pointed out that the information opens a window to the notion that at some point in the history of Tumwater, Capitol Boulevard and Old Highway 99 (Pacific Coast Highway) did not align. Using a 1910 map from the archives, Mr. McDonald identified the location of Old Highway 99 where it turns and follows the railroad tracks. At that time, Old Highway 99 was only a plan and not constructed until later. Mr. McDonald said when the Pacific Coast Highway was constructed, it was next to or within the alignment of the abandoned railroad tracks (Northern Pacific Railroad). He offered to provide additional information in subsequent briefings to include some map overlays.

Mr. McDonald said the proposal is not seeking funds from the Legislature. The Legislature provided funds for the architect. As the OSOS has a number of fees it levies to customers, one of the filing fees will be used to fund the building. Support from the City of Tumwater has been excellent. The Port is also working closely with OSOS. Next steps include more discussions with the architect about the plans for the grange building, which the Commission will review.

Commissioner Nicandri asked whether the new proposal includes a museum. Mr. McDonald advised that the proposal does not include a museum because of cost. However, the size of the parcel would likely include expansion for the archives. The proposal for the grange includes repairing the building and maintaining its historical character. The current location of the building on the site is questionable, especially with respect to the center connection, which is not connected to the roofs of the schoolhouse or the grange. It is likely the center section would be removed. The architect is also recommending removing the kitchen and placing it somewhere else in the building to afford two conference rooms. Another option is placement configuration for the schoolhouse. Many options will be explored with the architect and presented to the Commission. Additionally, the Port of Olympia has asked for the retention of the adjacent forested area. The proposal for rear access to the new building for loading and off-loading of materials would be from the grange

**TUMWATER HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING
September 20, 2018 Page 11**

with the main entrance located off Linderson Way.

Mr. McDonald advised that the Commission would receive another in-depth briefing in the next several months.

Chair Shipley inquired about the square footage of the school and the grange. Mr. McDonald said he would follow-up with the information on the square footage of the building.

Mr. McDonald shared information in response questions regarding adjacent ownerships, future expansion for the site, and future uses surrounding the site.

Commissioner Nicandri asked Mr. McDonald to provide maps of an early urban county road map or an early state map designating the alignment of Pacific Coast Highway (Old Highway 99) through the City. Mr. McDonald demonstrated how to access historic maps through the online state archives system.

**HENDERSON HOUSE
MUSEUM NAME
CHANGE:**

Chair Shipley shared that he reviewed the attachment on the brief history of Henderson House and was surprised at the short time many of the residents were connected to the house:

- 4 years – Naumann
- 12 years – Rohrbeck
- 7 years – Jenkins
- 6 years – Sloan
- 4 years – Unoccupied
- 35 years - Henderson

MOTION:

Commissioner Nicandri moved, seconded by Commissioner Slakey, to recommend the City Council change the name of the Henderson House to the Brewmaster's House.

Commissioner Nicandri asked Commissioner Trospen whether the house was built by Naumann or whether the brewery built the house for Naumann. Commissioner Trospen said it appeared that the brewery hired a builder to construct the house as he located the name of the contractor, who at that time, was just beginning work in the architectural/building arena and charged the brewery less for the house than he would have normally charged to help promote his name and business.

Commissioner Nicandri added the house was referred to as the Henderson House because of Jim Brown's association with the Henderson's when he encouraged the City to purchase the house from the Henderson's.

