



The City of Seattle

Pike Place Market Historical Commission

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649 Seattle WA 98124-4649
Street Address: 700 5th Ave Suite 1700

MINUTES

MHC 146/09

Wednesday, August 26, 2009

4:30 p.m.

PDA Meeting Room, 85 Pike Street, Room 500

COMMISSIONERS

Colleen Bowman

Valerie Bystrom

David Guthrie

Joanne Herron

Donald Horn

Spencer Howard

Karin Link

Sara Patton

Stephanie Pure

Alex Rolluda

Sharron Shinbo

Susan Zuege

STAFF

Heather McAuliffe

Melinda Bloom

4:35 p.m. Chair Sara Patton called the meeting to order and reminded Commissioners to report any ex parte contact or conflict of interest.

082609.1 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF USE APPROVAL

082609.11 PDA – Temporary Down Under Daystalls

Temporary use application for 1501 Pike Place #320 (former Old Friends space) through September 30, 2009. To be used for daystall temporary storage and cooperative retail for up to eight vendors.

Staff Report: Ms. McAuliffe explained the temporary use application for 1501 Pike Place #320 (former Old Friends space) through September 30, 2009. To be used for daystall temporary storage and cooperative retail for up to eight vendors. The space is Zone 1, below street level, Food a-e & Retail a-b uses permitted. Former use was Retail a. New use would be Retail c. Space is 660 square feet. All crafts are handmade by the vendors. PDA manages assignment of vendors under Daystall rules.

Exhibits reviewed included a site plan and photos. Guidelines that applied to this application included 1.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.7 and 2.9.

URC report: Ms. McAuliffe said that the Committee cited guidelines 1.3, 2.4 Zone 1; 2.5.4c, 2.7.2 b, c & d and 2.9, and recommended approval.

John Turnbull and Cecilia Hall, PDA, explained the attempt to keep retail going during the construction and noted heavy construction will begin in one month.

Public Comment:

Heather McAuliffe noted that she had emailed public comment from Patrick Kerr, a Market business owner, to the Commission.

Patrick Kerr was present. He explained the importance of the daystall space to his business and reported that when the craftspeople were housed there it helped his sales. He supported the application and explained it would help to keep his floor activated and vital.

Commission Discussion:

Ms. Zuege cited 1.3 and noted the importance of walk-by traffic.

Action: Ms. Shinbo made a motion to adopt a resolution approving the application as presented.

MM/SC/SS/KL

12:0:0 Motion carried.

082609.12 Café Campagne/Market Feast – Temporary Alley Closure
Temporary use application to close Post Alley between Pine and Stewart Streets to vehicular traffic from 3 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. on Saturday, September 12, 2009 for Market Feast.

Withdrawn.

082609.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF DESIGN APPROVAL

082609.21 PDA – Corner Market directory signs

Approval for two building directory signs.

Staff Report: Ms. McAuliffe explained the application for approval for two building directory signs. Exhibits reviewed included a site plan, photos, and color sample. Guideline that applied to this application was 3.6.

DRC Report: Ms. McAuliffe said the Committee cited guidelines 3.6.1, 3.6.1, 3.6.3, 3.6.6 a (2) and recommended approval.

Applicant/Landlord Comment: Cecilia Hall and John Turnbull noted the change was prompted by needing to add a new tenant to the group directory.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Commission Discussion: Commissioners determined they had enough information to make a decision.

Action: Ms. Herron made a motion to adopt a resolution to approve the application as presented.

MM/SC/JH/AR

12:0:0

082609.22

Ashkalon Coffee

1501 Pike Place #329, Fairley Building

Install furnishings, equipment and signage.

Staff Report: Ms. McAuliffe explained the application to install furnishings, equipment and signage. Exhibits reviewed included: site plan, photos, proposed floor plan, catalog cuts and renderings. Guidelines that applied to this application included 3.1, 3.4 and 3.6.

DRC Report: Ms. McAuliffe said the Committee cited guidelines 3.1, 3.4.1 a, 3.4.3 a, b & e, 3.6.1, 3.6.2, 3.6.3 & 3.6.6 a (2) and recommended approval.

Applicant/Landlord Comment: Abdul Elkahlout went over the proposed elements – the sign on the front door and the menu/chalkboard. He explained that there would be no alteration to the colors inside the space. He proposed to add a refrigerator and the oven would be placed toward the back wall and not be visible to passers-by. He provided photos of the proposed standard wood tables. He said the signage at the stairway would be compatible with other wood hanging signage in the area and there will be a logo on the front door. He provided multiple photos of what the signage will look like.

Landlord Comment:

John Turnbull said there was food service in this space at one time and he supported the application. He said this application has not been through full PDA review at this point.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Commission Discussion:

Mr. Guthrie referred to the site plan and asked about the area behind the blue wall. He also asked about the window treatments and cited 3.2.5 which states that windows shall not be obscured.

Mr. Elkahlout state he had no objection to leaving the windows uncovered so public can see inside.

Action: Ms. Herron made a motion to adopt a resolution to approve the application as presented.

MM/SC/JH/ST.P

12:0:0 Motion carried.

082609.23

Phase One Market Renovations

Final design approval for: 1) visible elements of new fluid coolers to be installed on PC-1 site; 2) HVAC system to be installed in DownUnder.

Staff Report: Ms. McAuliffe explained the request for final design approval for: 1) visible elements of new fluid coolers to be installed on PC-1 site; 2) HVAC system to be installed in DownUnder. Exhibits reviewed included plans and photos. Guidelines that applied to this application included 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3.

Applicant Comment:

Duncan Thieme, SRG, explained the central plant system that is proposed. The fluid coolers take in warm water and cool it. They are large pieces of equipment sited in the most discreet place they could find – just north of the parking garage. They negotiated with the City for an easement which came with conditions; those conditions were incorporated into their design. He proposed a concrete wall around the enclosure that has a chain link fence around it. He pointed out the excavated area coming down to two stories below the garage. The top of the wall follows the grade and has a 6’ tall chain link fence on top. They used materials that are already used on the garage.

Carol Binder, PDA Executive Director, said the design was in the original packet of drawings and the changes being presented are that this has been lowered into the hill so it is not so visible.

Mr. Rolluda went over the DRC report with regard to the cooling unit and fence and said the Committee cited guidelines: 3.1 – “Market buildings although humble and anonymous in character are an example of intriguing, dramatic architectural space servicing and adjusting to the varied and varying characteristic marketing activities”; 3.1.2 - “assure that the character of the Market is preserved and that the architectural, cultural, economic and historical qualities of the District are maintained”; 3.2.7 – “additions to historic buildings or structures shall be prohibited unless the Commission determines that extenuating circumstances

justify otherwise”; 3.2.8 – “Rooftop features, antennas, satellite dishes, cooling towers, HVAC and other equipment must be sized and placed to minimize impacts on public views”; and cited 3.3 – Energy Technology – “Advanced technology in mechanical and electrical systems is recognized as a contemporary improvement” and recommended approval.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Commission Discussion:

In response to clarifying questions Mr. Thieme explained the openings between the existing parking garage and the cooling units will remain open the way they are. He went on to say they vetted the noise issue thoroughly with local residents and said the cooling system meets current City codes.

Ms. Binder noted it is less noise than the ambient noise in the surrounding area and less noise than heat pumps and existing equipment. In response to question about the trails she explained it would have no impact on the trails – there would still be pedestrian access.

Ms. Link stated it was straightforward.

Action: Ms. Bystrom made a motion to adopt a resolution to accept this portion of the application as presented.

MM/SC/VB/AR

12:0:0 Motion carried.

Mr. Thieme went on to explain the addition of the HVAC system to the DownUnder. He said ventilation in the Downunder space is not meeting code nor is it serving the tenants. He said there would be two handlers on the roof providing air down shafts and through diffusers into the space. He said this proposal is an extension of what is there. He said the naturally vented portions of the building will remain naturally vented. He said they will be adding ductwork and showed on the plans what is existing and what is proposed.

Mr. Thieme said a mechanical room is proposed where they will create hot and cold water that will be accessible to tenants via fan coil unit and proceeded to explain how the system would work. He went on to explain four pipes shown in various locations on the renderings is part of this heating/cooling delivery system. He said on the 3rd level they changed the duct size. He passed out updated renderings and explained that the initial proposal had the duct coming down the middle but they have now pushed it off to one side.

Mr. Rolluda said the DRC looked at 3.1, “assure that the character of the Market is preserved...” 3.2.1 “significant architectural elements of buildings and structures must not be altered, disguised or concealed”; 3.2.15 “Interior systems of conduit, ductwork, HVAC, sprinklers, and plumbing pipes should be exposed,

except when required otherwise by code. Timber columns and beams should not be concealed;" 3.3, Energy Technology and recommended approval and as Mr. Thieme has noted, the DRC suggested a different location for the ductwork on level 3. He said there had been question about an air handling unit – how far it was going to impose on a critical space.

Ms. Link said it was on level 5 and noted views at gridlines, north 30, west 40-50 looking north – page 14

Mr. Thieme said it is on the drawings on N145- BOU – 7'0" - the same height as the door.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Commission Discussion:

Ms. Pure said that one option seemed to block signage.

Mr. Thieme said he hoped it wouldn't be an issue – that the store won't be there and that the Commission just approved a different use for that space. A sign would be worked in for a new tenant if necessary.

Ms. Bystrom said there is a big difference in having a rectangular duct go above or under the roundup and asked for clarification on which it would be. She said on the lower left photo it is shown above the round up and on the right hand photo is below.

Mr. Horn said it is the same and that he went and looked at it and the drawings don't correspond to what is going on.

Mr. Thieme said it goes under and that the drawing on the bottom left is a mistake.

Mr. Guthrie asked about the clearance height between the floor and the bottom of the ductwork.

Laila Kinnunen from SRG clarified that it would be about 8'. She said the bottom of the light fixture is 100" and in either scenario the duct would be either 8" or 10" deep. The bottom of the false beam is 100".

Mr. Thieme said it was 7'6" clearance.

Ms. Bystrom asked if the false beam is just holding the lights up.

Mr. Thieme confirmed that it was and said the duct will be directly beyond the beam. The beam will remain exactly where it is – they don't want to disturb things that don't need to be disturbed.

Ms. Bystrom noted that the beam obstructs one of the hanging lights and that when one looks along the hall one thing the eye follows are the lamps. She wondered why the false beam was so low and had assumed it was structural.

Mr. Horn said the height there is 97” rather than 100”. He visited the space and noted several things on the drawing that don’t show up. He did not think the Commission should be approving this on the basis of a flat drawing because it impacts the visual character of the hallways, the historic openness of walking through the retail space. He said this is the most obvious example – in one place the duct goes under the existing duct, in another place it goes over and yet another where it shows it coming straight forward when right beyond that is a concrete wall.

Mr. Thieme said it connects to an existing louver.

Mr. Horn disagreed and said there is a solid concrete beam and pointed out on the drawing – page 6, Leland North Ramp looking south. Mr. Horn asked where the duct goes.

Mr. Thieme said their plan has existing concrete beams for reference only on mechanical plan and the duct stops short of that (page M-153). He said that perhaps their rendering is a little misleading; short of actually modeling the space and doing 3-D models, it is difficult to accurately create these views.

Mr. Horn said there is a lot of detail that doesn’t show up on a flat plan. He pointed out on page 14, the existing fan coil unit – as long as it is lower than the existing one which is about 7’ and that nothing is coming lower – need to have specific places pointed out. He noted the four pipes running beside that and next to the Polish Pottery there is a place where the existing beam is only 67” and the pipes have to run under that. If they run beside, it runs right through by the windows of the tenant and he didn’t know how one would repair or change the windows for that space. He noted that these types of details – the new ductwork work or piping is either lower than what is existing or conflicts with windows, lights or signs - those need to be called out for the Commission. He said there are a lot of assumptions that all this will be taken care of and the guidelines are there to be assured that they will be. He said with regard to the Guidelines – the character of the Market, visual intrusion into the space, architectural character – are all being impacted. The lower things get the more it is like a basement, the more it will discourage visitors from coming to those spaces and the more it will cut down on business in general. He advised of the need to be aware of where the conflicts are so they can be reviewed.

Ms. Shinbo said she agreed that intrusion of any large duct work might change the character of the space but because she knew the ductwork is necessary the question is what is the best placement of the ductwork and the dimensioning of it. She said she was relying on Mr. Thieme to find the best solution and that she

heard him at the DRC last week say that he had several groups of people looking at this issue. She asked him how long he has been working on this project.

Mr. Thieme responded he had been working on it for three years.

Ms. Shinbo said she knew he knew the details of it and while she wasn't sure how to address Mr. Horn's specific concerns about the placement but that she knew it was absolutely necessary based on what she has heard from Mr. Thieme.

Mr. Thieme said they believe they have found the best balance with regard to preserving access to signage.

Mr. Howard said this might be handled by the DRC that there are specific areas identified and the DRC can go with the Design Team to look at those individually rather than on a plan and to see firsthand what is going.

Mr. Horn asked what CFM was being designed for and what the basis for the size is.

Mr. Thieme said the engineers have worked hard to keep the ducts as small as possible and the CFM at each register is indicated on the plans.

Mr. Horn said it was mentioned that it did not meet code.

Mr. Thieme said it doesn't meet code now and their intention is to bring it to code.

Ms. Patton noted it sounds like there are questions that might be cleared up by a visit by the DRC to the actual space and asked the Design Team if they would be available to show the DRC the areas in question.

Mr. Thieme said they get involved in the specifics of where they are going and the people who do architectural drawings know there is the design process and then there is the shop drawing process. He said they are launching into that process now with their contractors and will know what the detail is as they coordinate things through – exactly how they propose to fabricate and install these things. He said he didn't know if there was a way that process in with the historic review process. He said he would prefer not to have to put this sort of thing into this building at all but this was one of their goals – from the tenant and the code perspective.

Mr. Horn said it is a renovation to improve ventilation but it should be improving the HVAC system. If all they are doing is patchworking new equipment lower and lower into the existing system, then it is not really improving the existing system. He said there may be solutions in redoing parts of the existing duct work as well so they don't have to intrude lower into the space.

Mr. Thieme said they are improving the entire system. The rooftop air handler is being replaced with better, more efficient equipment. Their engineers studied the

existing shaft and ductwork to see what was sized appropriately to serve the code. He said that there will be some demolition to replace portions that weren't suitable. He said that demolition has been reviewed before. He said they aren't patchworking the system. He said they are changing the entire head end of the system and found that the ventilation shafts and basic supply ductwork were appropriately sized for this facility. He said they are compromising a little with accepting some higher velocities than they would probably do and it seemed appropriate in this case. He said he didn't think the character of the Market will suffer for it.

Ms. Link asked how far off the ground the fan coil unit on level 5 is.

Mr. Thieme said 7'.

Ms. Link said she thought this was a bit of an improvement on what had been there.

Ms. McAuliffe said that procedurally, if the Commission has questions that remain on exact placement, the application could be approved on the condition that the DRC has final review.

Ms. Bystrom said as a non-architectural member, and looking up as she comes into the Market, she is amazed by how much is going on. She said a certain amount of messiness is OK but she said lowering is an issue especially in the DownUnder.

Ms. Link made a motion to adopt a resolution approving this application with the condition it be brought back to the DRC for final review and approval.

MM/SC/KL/SH 11:1:0 Motion carried. Mr. Horn opposed.

082609.4 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

July 8, 2009

Ms. Shinbo made a motion to approve the minutes as amended.

MM/SC/SS/SH 10:0:2 Minutes approved as amended. Ms. Pure and Mr. Horn abstained.

July 22, 2009

Ms. Herron made a motion to approve the minutes as amended.

MM/SC/JH/KL 9:0:3 Minutes approved as amended. Ms. Pure, Ms. Bystrom and Mr. Horn abstained.

082609.5 REPORT OF THE CHAIR

082609.6 REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

The Use Review Committees had nothing to report.

Ms. McAuliffe noted the Design Review Committee will provide their report as part of the briefing.

Ms. Patton explained the Guideline Revisions Committee has done a lot of work and noted there are a lot of areas in the guidelines that look at economic concerns. She asked what the criteria for those guidelines are and noted that more research is needed. She provided Michigan Society for Historical Preservation Office's procedural questions that they recommend asking when their commission is looking at these types of questions and noted that they are not substantive. She is hoping to find more substantive criteria and said they are looking at two major sources: the Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings which are incorporated into MHC guidelines; and the National Parks Service Preservation Briefs. She said they found that the Standards for Rehabilitation carefully noted into every section that dealt with rehabilitation something to the order of: if using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible then a compatible substitute material may be considered". She said "technical" is one issue but "economically feasible" was what they had hoped to find more information on. She said the standards do not go further in explaining what "economic feasibility" is.

Ms. McAuliffe noted that all Commissioners have the Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings and that the phrase is at the end of each section. She said it is the same as in the introductory paragraph of Guideline 3.9.

Ms. Patton said they went through the National Parks Service Preservation Briefs to find specific criteria. While they don't think they found anything that was specific, they found three briefs that seemed to have more information thought Commission members should have copies of those three briefs: 1. Conserving Energy in Historic Buildings; 2. Repair of Historic Wood Windows; and 3. The Use of Substitute Materials on Historic Building Exteriors. She said they are not suggesting that we go into an analysis now but commend them to the Commission for looking at as we try to come to a better understanding of what "economically feasible" means. She reported that the Committee asked the DRC for any literature or sources that help the Commission to understand "technical and economic feasibility" and to take it up at their next meeting.

Ms. Link said they are technical briefs so the question of economics doesn't really come into play.

Ms. Patton said that any technical, academic info that would give advice to a Commission that is trying to apply that kind of a rule. The GRC hopes to complete this task and then move back into the guideline revision process and look at the Victor Steinbrueck Park changes because issues keep coming up.

082609.7
082609.8

STAFF REPORT
NEW BUSINESS

082609.81 PDA Briefing – Phase One Renovations
John Turnbull

Briefing on scheduled activity and construction impacts expected August 2009 – May 2010: DownUnder, new central plant, Leland elevator, change in Western Avenue loading dock and Hillclimb.

John Turnbull provided an overview of the project scope and noted that after Labor Day, inside work will begin. He said the project objectives are extra handicapped accessibility and seismic improvements. He explained the phase timeline: Phase 1 (Hillclimb, windows and Leland elevator) occurs 2009 -2010; Phase 2 (Sanitary Triangle Corner Market) occurs 2010 – 2022; and Phase 3 (Economy Market and Soames Dunn Building) is set for 2011 – 2012. He went over work that has already occurred and said they are working from the bottom up. He said there will be “work-arounds” to accommodate businesses and residents and hours for construction in the building have been set: work outside of retail spaces will be done 7:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.; inside will be done from 4:00 a.m. to noon. He explained they have planned a 3 week hiatus around Christmas – last two weeks of December and the first week in January. He explained they are adjusting the schedule the last two weeks of February and are anticipating large crowds the Vancouver Olympics will bring to the area.

He elaborated on their tenant notification system with weekly coordination meetings, twice monthly drop in building meetings, and he has regular meetings with construction and project management staff. He advised that they will begin digging up the sidewalk on Western next week to put in the new sewer lines which will include vacating those spaces. He noted that on Level 3 of the Fairley and Leland buildings the pre-school has already been moved in. He went over on the drawing upcoming work on Level 3 and Level 4. He pointed out where elevator will go on Level 4 and noted which tenants will be impacted and proceeded to review planned work on the Mezzanine level. He explained that most work in the Main Arcade will not be visible and went over the new elevator lobby. He explained that all horizontal plumbing will be replaced.

He proceeded to go over changes to Western Avenue and said there are two empty spaces there now which they will be leased out in the future and a transformer room that will be dismantled and will be available for new use. He said the Daycare will be on the second floor and went over the design impacts of the outdoor play area. There will be a new doorway cut in. He said they are trying to work in some mechanical ventilation into soffits. He said the windows contain asbestos and lead and also need sun shading and insect screens. Louvers will be added in the ceiling soffits. He talked about the repair of the windows on Western. He said that once the preschool is out of their space (and others in that area) the area will have to be revisioned or repurposed. He noted the possibility of reversing the stairs. He said the Market Galbee space may be impacted to gain more space for the elevator lobby.

Commission members appreciated the overview and timelines provided.

Before commencing the next briefing Ms. Zuege updated the Commission on the Market Info Booth and explained she visited the booth and said she was provided with a great overview and history of the Market and she felt assured the Market was being promoted.

082609.82 Commission Discussion – Fairley/Leland west façade windows application

Commission will discuss new information submitted by the PDA at July 22, 2009 Commission meeting.

Ms. McAuliffe provided photos of the current windows.

Colleen Bowman left at 6:23 p.m.

Mr. Rolluda directed Commissioners to the handout (available in DON file) and proceeded to go over the DRC Summary. See handout for verbage; following are comments made during the meeting.

3. Ms. Link stated that many DRC members agreed that “they should be inspected one to two times a year” was excessive.

4. Mr. Guthrie said the DRC expressed concern that an assumed maintenance schedule was provided for wood but not for aluminum clad nor for the refurbishment of existing windows. He said the Committee thought there wasn’t enough back up information.

5. Mr. Rolluda noted the lack of back up information.

10. Mr. Rolluda noted it wasn’t explained.

13. Mr. Rolluda said Quantum Window center pivot windows are at the Corner Market.

Ms. Patton asked if these had been presented to the PDA and what the next step would be.

Ms. McAuliffe said they had not, that they had been provided to the Commission. She noted that she had just provided copies to members of the PDA and its design team at today’s meeting.

Ms. Shinbo said that knowing it hasn’t been presented to the PDA and that it sounds like the life cycle cost analysis is so important to evaluate the options, she asked if the DRC would have recommendations for specific information so the Commission wouldn’t send the PDA a big question with no specifics. She asked what specific

information the Commission would need to have sufficient life cycle cost analysis information before it.

Mr. Horn said the life cycle analysis is not the most important thing; the most important thing is “what is the right preservation decision for the Market and do the windows need to be preserved and, if they were to be replaced what would be the proper replacement option?”

Mr. Howard said the description of what “refurbished” entails would be helpful to understand for the existing wood windows, what would fall under that category and if that option were to go forward what tasks are associated with that. He said detailed background information would be helpful and being able to compare the tasks and the frequency of those tasks.

Ms. Patton asked for more information on those issues that are primarily background for life cycle analysis.

Mr. Howard agreed and said Turner Construction, which prepared the analysis, should have that background information.

Mr. Guthrie said the Committee’s major concern is the same assumed comparable maintenance regimen for each type they are trying to compare. He noted the importance of comparing apples to apples if different materials are explored. He noted the appropriateness of Mr. Horn’s comment on replacing windows appropriately is the main concern.

Ms. Shinbo said replacing the windows appropriately is a concern but said the Commission can take into economic consideration. She said because this task is very expensive and because prior to new Commissioners coming to the committee they have received much information and recommended DRC take one more pass at specifically identifying those questions that Mr. Howard started to address and prepare those questions in written form.

Ms. McAuliffe noted that not all DRC members would be in attendance next week and recommended that the DRC forward to her any additional questions.

Ms. Bystrom said in all Commission member packets is the Park Preservation Brief on wood window and recommended reading it. She said their implicit argument throughout is that maintaining the wood window is highly cost effective. She said they don’t give numbers but she said it is an interesting discussion about preserving historic windows.

Ms. Patton said a number of questions the DRC has raised fall into kinds of questions the guideline revision committee suggested coming out of the Michigan State Historical Office: those of economic hardship noting the contradictory and conflicting information. She noted a series of questions: is information sufficient, is it relevant, is it competent, is it credible, and is it consistent. She said they are

procedural rather than substantive questions but a lot of the questions DRC was raising do relate to that.

Discussion ensued about whether or not this was also a use issue; Ms. Patton explained that the windows application is a design application, and that it is under the jurisdiction of the Design Review Committee. She said that use questions are handled separately.

Mr. Howard cited 2.5, priority of uses in the Market zone, speaking to the relevancy of functions and said that a use that is not necessarily ideal for that location is driving the change.

Ms. Shinbo noted the new Commission members and explained that there are a lot of questions and the PDA is spending a lot of time and cost to respond to MHC questions and she appreciated that. With regard to DRC submitting their questions to Ms. McAuliffe she suggested that Mr. Howard and Mr. Rolluda group the questions in a way that makes sense rather than having ungrouped questions. She said this first list is somewhat ungrouped although there are related issues.

Ms. Patton said this should be left in the jurisdiction of the Design Review Committee.

Ms. Shinbo said she said she didn't want Ms. McAuliffe to be burdened with fifty questions.

Mr. Horn said the windows were installed in 1979 and were not historic so a preservation brief would not apply here. He said the more relevant ones are the use of substitute materials and energy efficiency. He said economic feasibility is not the decision of the MHC. He said the Commission decides the solution and it is up to the owner to decide what they can do. He said the Commission's responsibility is "what is the proper solution for preservation of the character and qualities of the Market".

Ms. Patton said the Guideline Review Committee has been looking more deeply into this and pointed out 3.9, the last paragraph before starting 3.9.1, "The following standards shall be applied by the Commission in evaluating changes in design including rehabilitation projects, taking into consideration economic and technically feasibility" and noted it is the phrase we do not have any ability to ignore. She said the Commission is specifically enjoined by this paragraph to take that into consideration.

Mr. Horn said there are a lot of questions in general about what should be next. He said if he were the PDA he would look at what it would take to rehabilitate what is there; it is the most sustainable solution. He asked what it would take to add weather stripping to the edges and to seal it in some ways that when the windows are closed there is no air coming through the edges, and painting. He suggested doing that to one window and see what it takes and then if there is a proposed alternative,

installing one of those to compare the two. He said it looks like center pivot windows in the old historic photos so it must be a center pivot window. He said there are no examples in the history of the building of awning windows there so it is an inappropriate solution. He said safety concerns can be addressed – he suggested bars, plexi-glass so there is no safety issue for children. He said all the windows should have some sort of a stop to them and they may have when they were originally installed but with the cheap replacements that were installed in 1979 they didn't do that. He suggested using a window that more closely matches the center pivot of the 1920s. He said there are some in the Market and said they should be used as a model and not the ones that were installed in 1979 that do not match what was there previously.

Mr. Howard cited 3.1.1, *“Within the District it is generally better to preserve than to repair, better to repair than to restore, better to restore than construct”*.

Mr. Guthrie left at 6:50 p.m.

Carol Binder, PDA, handed out responses to the questions regarding more detailed cost. She provided the Quantum limited warranty on their windows and a summary of a discussion with them about the pivot style.

Mr. Horn asked if other window manufacturers had been approached.

Ms. Binder didn't know but thought they had done the best job in replacement windows.

Ms. Patton said the DRC came up with comments and questions that relate to the presentation from the PDA. DRC will take these questions and new information and come up with final set of questions and comments to send to the PDA.

Mr. Rolluda said the DRC reviewed the PDA handouts.

Mr. Horn stated that refurbishment of existing windows is listed as the most expensive option and usually it is the least expensive option and said he wasn't sure where they came up with those costs.

Ms. Binder said it is because of the asbestos in the mastic that has to be taken out of the caulking and having other windows put in while that is being done. She said they need to hire a hazmat contractor to do that.

Mr. Horn noted he hadn't seen mastic on the windows.

Joe Paar said it is in the putty. He said they have a high cost of working in tenant spaces because they can't shut them down.

Mr. Horn said it would be better to show that as a separate line item because it is not associated with the window.

6:55 pm.

Meeting adjourned.
MM/SC/SP/KL

10:0:0

Respectfully submitted,

Heather McAuliffe
Commission Coordinator