



# Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 10/13/11 TIME 4:40m

SERVED BY [Signature]

RECEIVED BY [Signature]

## ARCHAEOLOGICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

THURSDAY, October 20, 2011 – 4:30 pm.

CITY COUNCILORS' CONFERENCE ROOM

CITY HALL, 200 LINCOLN AVENUE

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

September 15, 2011

October 6, 2011

E. ACTIONS ITEMS

1. Case#AR-16-11. Reconnaissance Report prepared for the School of Advanced Research, 660, 666 and 679 Garcia Street, Santa Fe, comprising approximately eight acres within the River & Trails District. Requested by Stephen S. Post, Office of Archaeological Studies, Museum of New Mexico, for the School of Advanced Research.

F. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

G. COMMUNICATIONS

H. MATTERS FROM THE COMMITTEE

I. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

J. ADJOURNMENT

For more information regarding cases on this agenda, please call the Planning Division at 955-6605. Interpreters for the hearing impaired are available through the City Clerk's office at 966-6520, upon five (5) days notice.

SUMMARY INDEX  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE  
October 20, 2011

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>ACTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL	Quorum	1
APPROVAL OF AGENDA	Approved [amended]	2
APPROVAL OF MINUTES: SEPTEMBER 15, 2011 <del>AND OCTOBER 6, 2011</del>	Approved [amended]	2
<u>ACTION ITEMS</u>		
CASE #AR-16-11. RECONNAISSANCE REPORT PREPARED FOR THE SCHOOL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH, 660, 666 AND 679 GARCIA STREET, SANTA FE, COMPROMISING APPROXIMATELY EIGHT ACRES WITHIN THE RIVER & TRAILS DISTRICT. REQUESTED BY STEPHEN S. POST, OFFICE OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL STUDIES, MUSEUM OF NEW MEXICO, FOR THE SCHOOL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH	Approved w/ editorial changes	2-12
ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS	Information/discussion	12
COMMUNICATIONS	Information/discussion	12-13
MATTERS FROM THE COMMITTEE	Information/discussion	13
BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR	Information/discussion	13-14
ADJOURNMENT		14

**MINUTES OF THE  
CITY OF SANTA FE  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE  
City Councilors Conference Room  
October 20, 2011**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

A meeting of the Archaeological Review Committee was called to order by Jeremy Kulisheck, Chair, at approximately 4:30 p.m., on October 20, 2011, in the City Councilors Conference Room, City Hall, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

**B. ROLL CALL**

**Members Present**

Jeremy Kulisheck, Chair  
Gary Funkhouser  
James Edward Ivey

**Members Excused**

David Eck  
Tess Monahan, Vice-Chair

**Others Present**

John Murphey, Land Use Department  
Melessia Helberg, Stenographer

**Others Present**

David Rasch, Staff Liaison  
Melessia Helberg, Stenographer

There was a quorum of the membership in attendance.

**NOTE: All items in the Committee packet for all agenda items are incorporated herewith to these minutes by reference; and the original Committee packet is on file in, and may be obtained from, the Historic Planning Division.**

### **C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Chair Kulisheck said approval of the minutes for the meeting of October 6, 2011, should be removed from the agenda, since the minutes didn't go out with the packet.

**MOTION:** Jake Ivey moved, seconded by Gary Funkhouser, to approve the Agenda as amended.

**VOTE:** The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

### **D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: SEPTEMBER 15, 2011 ~~AND OCTOBER 6, 2011~~**

The following corrections were made to the minutes of September 15, 2011:

Page 3, paragraph 5, correct as follows: "...relating to AOS OAS."

Page 4, paragraph 4, correct as follows: Change "femeral" to "ephemeral."

Page 16, paragraph 4, line 2 under "Jake Ivey," correct as follows: "...and this is the...."

**MOTION:** Jake Ivey moved, seconded by Gary Funkhouser, to approve the minutes of the meeting of September 15, 2011, as corrected.

**VOTE:** The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

### **E. ACTION ITEMS**

1. **CASE #AR-16-11. RECONNAISSANCE REPORT PREPARED FOR THE SCHOOL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH, 660, 666 AND 679 GARCIA STREET, SANTA FE, COMPROMISING APPROXIMATELY EIGHT ACRES WITHIN THE RIVER & TRAILS DISTRICT. REQUESTED BY STEPHEN S. POST, OFFICE OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL STUDIES, MUSEUM OF NEW MEXICO, FOR THE SCHOOL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH. (DAVID RASCH)**

Mr. Post introduced John Kantner and Sharon Tyson, noting Mr. Kantner is a member of the Historical Design Review Board.

Mr. Post said he received some review notes from Mr. Kantner after submitting the report. He said Mr. Kantner offered the following corrections:

Paragraph 1, page iii, as follows: "The study was completed in advance of new construction of a maintenance plaza and ~~Administration Building~~ in the..." He said there are no plans to construct a new administration building.

Paragraph 5, page iii, last sentence as follows: "It is recommended that features 4 2 and 3 be placed..."

Paragraph 2 on page 59 should be corrected to refer to "A.E. White" instead of "W.E. White."

Paragraph 2 on page 71, should refer to "5.568 acres" instead of "4,568 acres."

On pages 73-74 he neglected to mention that the King residence, which is located at 666 Garcia, was built in the 1990's and it wasn't shown on Figure 44. He said he needs to make note that the King Residence was built at that time and to add it to Figure 44. The King residence should show up near the south boundary of the SAR campus property in that drawing.

Mr. Post said their intention was not to rehash the information which is provided in the publications about the SAR history that exists, but to present a more specific document as well as a management document that addresses some of the archaeological, architectural and historical aspects of the 8 acre campus. He said the study is presented in advance of the master plan, noting there are plans for the construction of 4 different areas on the campus. He said he found this particular project challenging because of the nature of the built environment, as well as the history of the property and the significance of the people who were involved with the property. He said it also was interesting because the School for Advanced Research is one of the primary archaeological research institutes in the world, as well as an important landmark in southeast Santa Fe. He also found it interesting because he worked there in the 1980's. He found the archaeological resources challenging, particularly the ruts and swales which had been identified previously on the adjacent property and he tried to treat those as fairly as possible.

### **Commentary by the Board**

#### **Gary Funkhouser**

Mr. Funkhouser asked Mr. Post to explain the reason special consideration was given to LA 171240, the trash, refuse area.

Mr. Post said there seemed to be sufficient surface artifacts and sufficient variety in the artifacts to suggest that the deposit may retain more information than he was able to gather from his initial survey. He doesn't believe there is great integrity to the subsurface deposits which may exist. However, as an assemblage, the frequencies may be much larger and greater than those observed on the surface.

Mr. Funkhouser how you control non-random disturbance.

Mr. Post said you don't, and because they didn't put in test sets, it is difficult for him to assess how much depth there may be, given the setting and that it's fairly churned up.

Mr. Funkhouser said his question was the degree of disturbance.

Mr. Post said it is a pretty ugly landscape, and has the terrace on it as well. He felt there was the potential for 2-5 times the artifacts he saw on the surface.

Mr. Funkhouser asked if the distribution of types would be similar.

Mr. Post said he tried to point out that the distribution of artifact types was somewhat unusual for the run of the mill, artifact concentration in southeast Santa Fe, with the larger canning jar rims, the dishware/tableware which seemed to represent a new economic era in southeast Santa Fe, which you wouldn't see at the typical household in southeast Santa Fe prior to 1900. Mr. Post said this assemblage as well as the other assemblages were less significant and had less to offer. He thinks the assemblage may come in the transition time between 1910 and 1930, which is important in terms of the history of the SAR campus, where you see the change from the Garcia family and other residents to the White sisters residence.

Mr. Funkhouser said in his mind, this is a tough call to make.

Mr. Post said he believes the subsurface deposits will continue to be reworked through time, and SAR wants to try to maintain it as suggested in the cultural easement language.

Mr. Funkhouser asked about LA 171241, which are the Lambert corral and stables, and asked if the entire thing will be in the easement.

Mr. Post said the corral and pens are within the easement, but the house is not.

Chair Kulisheck said the confusing language on page 97, is, "While used as a working stable from the early 1930s to the 1950s, the corrals continued to mark the intersection..." He said he used the word "stables" to describe the "corrals."

Mr. Post, responding to Mr. Ivey, said he never suggests that the house was part of the site, but perhaps he could have been more clear. His intention is to restrict it to the corrals and fence.

Chair Kulisheck said he believes some wordsmithing would alleviate confusion by the reader.

Mr. Funkhouser said Mr. Post defines the stables as part of the site.

Mr. Post said perhaps he should say, "While used as a working stable corral and pen from the....," and delete the word "stable" which seems to be the confusion.

Mr. Funkhouser said his confusion was recommending the entire site by number, and that the stables are included as a part of the site.

Mr. Post said that isn't correct. He said the corral does not include the stable, and the stable is separate.

Mr. Post said in Figure 16 on page 46, the corral is shown in solid outline, the former stables are shown in dash outline. He said he doesn't want to create a parallel site limit to the fence, which would be separate from the fence itself. He asked for suggestions to make it very clear that the former stables are in this illustration, because he thinks that would help.

Chair Kulisheck said it would help, not so much in the illustration, but in the description of the site and the language of it. He suggested a note that the stables themselves aren't included in the site – perhaps in parenthesis.

Mr. Ivey said the last figure we saw that shows this, is the one that shows the whole property, including the house and the stables.

Chair Kulisheck said you necessarily have to discuss the stables to discuss the pen and corral, and it could introduce confusion to the reader, and suggested Mr. Post could insert a sentence saying, "This is only the pen. The stables are a standing architectural structure and not archaeological, and thus not part of the archaeological site."

Mr. Post suggested adding, "The stables as they stand today are excluded from the site."

Chair Kulisheck agreed.

## **Jake Ivey**

Mr. Ivey noted a typographical error on page 63, right column, paragraph 2, which should be corrected as follows: "Elizabeth became intrigued with the Hodge's work..."

Mr. Ivey noted paragraph 3, right column, page 75, says, "The changes to the Lambert property have not strongly affected its historic character when viewed from the streets....The fence and corrals, still visible from the street..." He said this paragraph leads him to believe that Mr. Post's later assessment included the buildings which were converted to housing property, and the reason we had that impression to begin with, which clearly is not the case. However, as the Chair said, to counteract that impression left by this discussion, Mr. Post needs to make a bit more of a twist to the statement to make it sharply clear that it includes nothing other than the original corrals and enclosures.

Mr. Ivey said he has no further comment.

## **Chair Kulisheck**

Chair Kulisheck said this is an extraordinary report and reflects both OAS's concern as well as his client's [SAR] concerns as well. He believes this will be an incredibly valuable document on a whole host of levels.

Chair Kulisheck said he has several concerns, and would like one clarification before proceeding to those. He said on page 21, there is an extended discussion of David Snow's study of the Howells property, commenting his interpretation is important to what Mr. Post does on this property. He asked which of "the Snow 1995's in the bibliography is this. I figured it wasn't the one that's the Canyon Road report, but I couldn't tell which of the other two it is."

Mr. Post said it isn't included in the reference site, he will add it, and it will become D.

Chair Kulisheck said he would like an additional clarification on LA 171240, the large trash scatter. He said, like Mr. Funkhouser, he was concerned about this property, given its marginal nature, and whether it warranted placing this kind of encumbrance on the proponent in creating this easement. He said M. Post has partially convinced him it might be worth imposing this encumbrance. He asked Mr. Post if he believes excavation will meaningfully increase the class diversity in the assemblage and thus be worthwhile – he believes there is more underneath the ground in terms of diversity than what there is on the surface.



Mr. Post said he believes the Chair agrees this site is a bit of a conundrum anyway. He said we could just say it's been recorded and noted and that's probably enough information, given its setting and the fact that it's been pretty heavily disturbed. He said if the Committee recommends going in this direction, he probably would accept that. He said, "I'm on the fence and I readily admit that, and I don't want the client to be unnecessarily hamstrung by trying to protect something that is not of marginal value, but perhaps difficult to assess value. Having said that, a couple of the aspects of the assemblage that I thought were intriguing were the fact that I saw almost no metal and no Native American ceramics on the surface. As I noted in the report, the absence of Native American ceramics is somewhat interesting to me because of the work I've done in other areas of town and also the work we've done in the southeast part of town where typically we find a couple pieces of [inaudible] series ceramics, or late 19<sup>th</sup> or early 20<sup>th</sup> century pottery. "

Mr. Post continued, "Certainly Dave Snow, on the Howell site found more than you might expect to find anywhere in southeast Santa Fe. I think some of the find or the material he was running into was fairly unusual for what is typically recorded here. Whether or not those two absences are enough to say, you know, there still may be greater variety underneath the surface. You know. That's kind of what I was looking at. I'm seeing a lot of glass and a fair amount of tableware. Where's the rest of the stuff. Where are the nails, where is the construction maintenance debris you might typically find in a setting like that. Where are the canned goods. Where are some of the other personal items I would expect to see, given the nature of the assemblage since it appears to be a household deposit. I don't know if everybody agrees with that assessment or not, but it seemed like it was household to me. So, it's those absences that make me wonder if there isn't more is buried that isn't just along the surface."

Chair Kulisheck said then what Mr. Post is saying, in a nutshell, is that he believes it is worth putting a shovel into this in the future.

Mr. Post said it could be, noting it isn't what he or Ron Winters typically record as surface scatters in other settings in southeast Santa Fe.

Chair Kulisheck said Mr. Post has increased his comfort level, in terms of establishing the easement.

Chair Kulisheck said another easement issue relates to Sites 171238 and 171239, which are the retention dams, erosion control features. He asked if there were other historic landscape or engineering features which were on the land that were intact.

Mr. Post said there were none that were in isolation. The rest of the "landscape" features are integrated into larger scale aspects of the built environment, such as the basalt terracing he described along the east bank of the Arroyo Tenorio. He said there were other aspects of the built

environment which are integrated into the campus and are part of the architectural context. He said the 3 retention dams are not, and are separate from that architectural context, and the reason he singled those out.

Chair Kulisheck said he has a philosophical concern as well as a related practical concern. He said his philosophical concern is that he doesn't consider these features as archaeological. He considers them in-use, engineering features, and although they are isolated from the rest of the landscape, probably by necessity because of what they do and how they function, he doesn't consider them archaeological. He said the definition of cultural remains defines what is archaeological under the ordinance, and it is broad enough that you could fit almost anything into that – the common sense, laymen's definition, in the context of what makes sense in this City where we have an ordinance and a process for evaluating historic buildings and associated features and landscaping and engineering feature, with a process for evaluating archaeological remains. He reiterated these retention dams to him are not archaeological under the Ordinance, but rather are in-use architectural and engineering features and are not appropriate to be classified as archaeological.

Chair Kulisheck said this doesn't mean he doesn't believe they aren't historically significant, and believes they probably are. He said if this were a State or federal undertaking we would have this discussion because State and federal law doesn't distinguish between these types of features. It is either a historic property or it is not. In this case, under City Ordinance, there is a distinction between archaeological remains, cultural archaeological and historic buildings and other types of historic features that are in use and are functioning. He said he believes these items fit into that category, which leads him to his more practical concern. He said because these features are well built and functioning, if they are to need maintenance or experience failure, the encumbrance of the archaeological easement can create unnecessary difficulties to the property owner. He said the Historic Ordinance and Ordinance governing those kinds of structures would be more appropriate for any work to be done on those in the future, in terms of evaluating what needs to be done. He reiterated his interpretation that these features are not archaeological and it is inappropriate to put them into an archaeological easement.

Mr. Post said there are a number of different issues "packed into what you just said as I understand it." He said one is regarding retention dams on the southeast side, commenting he knows of multiple sites consisting of retention dams, especially gabian structures which have been reported as LAs.

Chair Kulisheck said he has an objection to those as archaeological properties.

Mr. Post said he has recorded those, whether or not the Chair objected. He said those are CCC dams with strong historical significance and historical associations which influenced his decision.

Mr. Post said another thing which influenced his decision, is, in the past, in coming before this Committee, in the absence of what he felt was clear direction in ordinance, the State law has been relied on to provide guidance to determine a path to take, a significance, or eligibility, etc. He said he was using some of the State guidelines to deal with these kinds of situations. It was his intention to call attention to these features because they are isolated from the rest of the environment. He did not intend to create a situation which would hamstringing the landowner by the need to maintain, rebuild. However, by putting it in an easement it would remind the owners in the future to treat them sensitively, if they're not part of an H-Board review or an assessment of the built environment. He said in the cultural preservation easement language they allow for maintenance of the features, and it can be document and repaired or rebuilt.

Chair Kulisheck asked where that language is found in the report.

Mr. Post said it is on page 99, for LA 171239, "No alteration of the rock retention dam shall occur without explicit approval of the City of Santa Fe. Construction plans detailing any alteration will be submitted to the City of Santa Fe for approval. During construction, a photographic and written log will be kept of the activities. Final photos and a copy of the lot will be submitted to the City of Santa Fe for its files. Ground disturbance related to gardening or landscape maintenance is allowed within the limits of the easement."

Mr. Post said this is the first time he's tried to put something like this together, and if the City wants to require a SAR, he would certainly go long with that. He was just trying to put together a brief plan as to how to treat these resources should they need some attention.

Mr. Post asked if this Committee objects to these being LA's, and if it does, how would you like him to treat them. He asked if they are LA's, shall we note them as such so they can be managed in terms of place and space. He said we might remove the easement with the idea that the SAR would maintain the features as it saw necessary through time, expecting that they would be good stewards.

Chair Kulisheck said Mr. Post has gotten to the nub of the problem. We have a variety of features in some place, acequias in particular, where we have, particularly, engineering features which are not buildings and what we truly imagine to be an archaeological property. He said the nub of the problem is how to get these properties under an inclusive statute, such as CPA and CPPA or NHPA, which would be granted consideration. He asked how we get these features protected under the City Ordinance, which is a larger issue for him. He said in this respect, he is

sympathetic to Mr. Post's perspective, and Mr. Post is right to try to find a way to take historically significant features which have retained their historic integrity and ensure they receive the level of protection which doesn't seem to be offered under City Ordinance governing Historic Districts.

Chair Kulisheck asked Mr. Kantner whether features such as these are ever on the H-Board's radar, or do they escape its radar.

Mr. Kantner said the H-Board hasn't looked at these, and he would think it would be more appropriate for consideration by this Committee.

Mr. Rasch said he believes it is more appropriately under the purview of this Committee, commenting this could be something to discuss with the Land Use Department and the City Attorney – whether the H-Board has jurisdiction over these kinds of structures. He said in his opinion, it probably doesn't, and it is more appropriately under this Committee's jurisdiction. He said they have assigned historic status to walls and they could assign an historic status to this feature, but the H-Board has no standard as to how to preserve it. He said there are building standards. He thinks it could be put on the City's list of historic structures.

Chair Kulisheck said it sounds like that is an unlikely proposition. He said, given the discussion, he has become sympathetic to Mr. Post's desire to put them into an easement. He said he is assuaged somewhat by the language in the report which gives the owner quite a bit of leeway if they need to repair, alter or even remove the structures. He said his feeling is that this is indicative of an inherent shortcoming of the ordinances governing historic properties. However, he is not going to recommend that these structures be sacrificed to that shortcoming. He believes we should slightly, inappropriately, apply the archaeological ordinance to these structures to provide protection and recognition to them, even though they are not archaeological.

Mr. Post said he submitted these recommendations after consulting with Mr. Kantner, and discussions about how they relate to the SAR campus in general. He said he doesn't want there to be a perception that he, in some way, ramrodded these features into a status which provides greater protection than they deserve. He asked Mr. Kantner if his opinion has changed after this discussion.

Mr. Kantner said as a representative of the property owner, as well as being an archaeologist, he felt somewhat torn in some of his discussions with Mr. Post, not so much about the check-dams, but about the scatters discussed earlier. He said two things come to mind. One is that SAR wants to be good stewards of these projects, and these features, including the check-dams, which are something which need to be highlighted as worthy of protection. Secondly, both

the check-dams and the scatter are fortuitously in places where we would never have plans to develop. The check-dams are in a waterway, and the scatter is on the edge of a steep dropoff. He said he weighed all these things in considering these recommendations and believe this is a good way to go.

Mr. Kantner said he and Mr. Post talked about the language of the easement, and that it needs to provide for the ability to move, repair, etc., these features. He said, "All that being said, I think we're okay moving forward as proposed."

Chair Kulisheck spoke about the eligibility of the swales/ruts. He appreciates the level of effort that went into that evaluation, and that they went out on a limb and had the fortitude to make the determinations they did, commenting he believes they are correct. He said it is important for the City and under the Ordinance to make the distinction between swales which truly are representative of the Santa Fe Trail, and other features which are the result of area traffic and not significantly related to what the Ordinance has asked us to preserve and protect. He said Mr. Post's experience with roads is growing exponentially with every report. He said the features are on the edge of the property and wouldn't have been impacted if the easements had been created. However, he believes those easements would have been an unnecessary encumbrance on the owner. He thinks this is absolutely the right decision.

Mr. Funkhouser said if the NIAF form is to be included, it should be included right after the title page – between that and the table of contents.

Mr. Post said he diverges from that format because he thinks it takes away from the quality of the document presentation, commenting it could be included as an appendix and he could recommend that.

Chair Kulisheck said because the NIAF post-dates any of our external policies or guidance for constructing reports, we have no rule for that. He said his personal preference is to have it as a cover page for the entire report. He said it can be in the front or in the back, but not within the document itself, someplace where it can be separated easily from the report itself. He said putting it at the back for now is fine, unless and until this Committee or the City might prescribe otherwise.

Mr. Post asked if this is a request to add the NIAF as an appendix to this document.

Chair Kulisheck said that is perfectly fine.

Mr. Murphey said he and Mr. Rasch discussed this, and staff is expecting this to come back for an H-Board Review. He said he has comments in regard to the architectural overview in the ACPI forms, but those aren't germane to this audience, and they can provide those separately to Mr. Post, now or later.

Chair Kulisheck said as the Chair of this Committee, he would prefer for staff to submit those separately.

Mr. Post asked Mr. Murphey to send a letter to him with his comments, and they will look at addressing the comments, either now, or as part of an H-Board submittal.

Mr. Murphey said on page 72, Martha White's date of death is in 1937 and that needs to be included on pages 63 and 72.

**MOTION:** Jake Ivey moved, seconded by Gary Funkhouser, with respect to Case #AR-16-11, to approve the request for approval of a Reconnaissance Report prepared for the School of Advanced Research, 660, 666 and 679 Garcia Street, comprising approximately right acres within the River and Trails District, requested by Stephen S. Post, Office of Archaeological Studies, Museum of New Mexico for the School of Advanced Research, with the aforementioned editorial changes.

**VOTE:** The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

## **F. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

Chair Kulisheck asked Mr. Rasch what became of the request for copies of the External Policies for the Committee.

Mr. Rasch said he needs to find those and deliver them with the next Committee packet.

## **G. COMMUNICATIONS**

Mr. Rasch introduced new staff person John Murphey, who has a Master's in Historic Preservation. He said Mr. Murphey previously worked with the State Historic Preservation Division and the National Parks Service.

Mr. Murphey said he once served as a member of the Archaeological Review Committee.

Chair Kulisheck welcomed him on behalf of the Committee, and said we look forward to working with him and what his being here will bring to the Committee and the process of archaeological review.

## **H. MATTERS FROM THE COMMITTEE**

Gary Funkhouser said his term on the Board expired in June 2011.

Mr. Rasch asked him to submit a letter requesting reappointment, and the Department Director will see that it gets to the Mayor.

Mr. Rasch said Gary has had difficulty delivering the Committee packet to Mr. Ivey a couple of times.

Mr. Ivey said, since Gary won't be able to get up the road to deliver the packet during the winter anyway, he would like to request, in the alternative, that his packet be delivered to the receptionist at Quail Run who sits just inside the main door of the main building. He said if there is no one there, he can just leave it on the desk, because they will be back in a very few minutes.

Mr. Rasch said this shouldn't be a problem since Gary is in a City vehicle, and asked Mr. Ivey to send him an email in this regard.

Mr. Ivey said he has been watching the excavation of the Drury properties behind the church, and trying to help them make some sense out of it, commenting there should be a report within a year. He said it should be an interesting discussion. He said it looks like it was at least as well done as the previous testing, so it should be a fascinating report and a fascinating discussion.

## **I. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR**

Mr. Post reported that they have completed their work at Drury for the time being, and the excavations were back filled today. He expects there will be a preliminary report in December to describe the results. He agrees with Mr. Ivey that the excavations were fairly successful. However, they were disappointed they couldn't confirm that the room/vault was strictly related to the parochia. He said the expanded dimensions they were able to document for the cobble roadway/road bed are equally as exciting. He believes the work was well worth the effort and Mr. Drury was fairly excited about the findings.

Mr. Ivey said he believes it is significant that there is another swath of land where we know the Church "isn't in, unless there was severe blasting done in the process of building all the other buildings." He said it is unfortunate that there was not a big fat adobe wall with plaster and paint.

Mr. Post said, secondly, the OAS has been subcontracted through a PNM contractor to conduct archaeological monitoring of electrical/improvements on Palace Avenue and Otero Street. He asked if they have been before this Committee.

Chair Kulisheck said he did come before the Committee.

Mr. Post said they will start that work early next month. He said David Reynolds is the lead contractor. He said there might be 60 ft. of ROW which is on private land, but the remainder of the project at Washington Avenue and Palace Avenue is on City land, and they look forward to the results. Mr. Post said there are two more phased projects anticipated downtown, and they expect to be doing that work as well. He said they are submitting a monitoring plan to the State, and on approval, everything will be ready to move forward and they will be out there working.

Chair Kulisheck asked that when the monitoring report is submitted to this Committee for recommendation to the State, that they attach a copy of the monitoring proposal. He said that is something we don't review, and sometimes the Committee can be in the dark on how a particular methodology was decided. He said this will provide a level of clarity for the Committee.

Mr. Post said it is no problem and he will see this is done.

## **J. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** Jake Ivey moved, seconded by Gary Funkhouser, to adjourn the meeting.

**VOTE:** The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote, and the meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:45 pm.

---

**Jeremy Kulisheck, Chair**



*Melessia Helberg*  
**Melessia Helberg, Stenographer**