

Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission

March 25, 2008, Room 317

Staff: Carol Ahlgren

Planning Supervisor: Jack Byers

Date of Appeal: April 24, 2008

Chair Larsen: We will move forward to our public hearing. This evening we have four items on the public hearing agenda and one informational item. We'll move forward in order, Item number 1: 25 West Island Avenue and 201 Island Avenue East, St. Anthony Falls Historic District, Nicollet Island Sub-district. We have, we're pleased to get the review of the work plan for the archaeological data recovery for the Eastman residence at the DeLaSalle athletic high school facility. Carol ...

Staff Ahlgren: Good evening, Chair Larsen and commissioners. You should have received from Diana, our clerk, two letters that arrived recently and after your packets had been mailed. One of them is from the National Park Service Superintendent of the Mississippi National River Recreation Area and the other is from the National Trust for Historic Preservation. And they had some comments about the archeology mitigation plan. To remind everyone what this is about, as if we perhaps don't know already, this concerns the previously approved construction of an athletic facility on Nicollet Island which, as you know, is in the St. Anthony Falls Historic District, and is part of that National Park Service unit, Mississippi Recreational River Area, and is in the St. Anthony Falls District which is a local district, a National Register District in the State of Minnesota. We're showing here where the facility will be built. This is DeLaSalle High School, that's the Hennepin Avenue bridge, and I should note that since the last time that we met, this will never appear this bright because as we know turf was rejected by City Council, so it's never going to look like that. Anyway, but that's the overview to show you where this particular project is going to go. And the reason we are here tonight is the approval that you gave in March, or a condition of the second revised plan for the facility, required that archaeological investigation be conducted and a mitigation plan be developed. On October 23, the commission heard the initial plan for what was being discovered and how that would be dealt with. That was a condition of approval and we're here tonight to look at this plan that has been submitted to me. To refresh your memory, this is Grove Street, which will be vacated. The October plan identified two target areas and that's of particular note. This is the Target Area One, which is near the railroad tracks. This is Target Area Two, this is superimposed on an 1880s map, but DeLaSalle High School is right in here and Target Area Two is the area where the greatest depth will occur because of the construction. They will be going down approximately 6 feet and as we knew from the previously submitted plans that there was a very strong likelihood that they would in fact uncover archaeological resources namely the Eastman house. The other two things to keep in mind, or the other thing to keep in mind, is that Target Area One is located with the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board land, or land that's owned by all of us and there are requirements therefore under the Minnesota Archaeological Field Act that those potential archaeological

resources be identified and that the State Archeologist is called in to look at them for the mitigation plan. Target Area Two is exclusively on private property, it is owned by DeLaSalle, so those same requirements for the State Archeologist and the dispensation of the resources do not apply to this private holding, so that's something to keep in mind. And the other thing is that Target Area One, the archeologist only has to go the depth of what the construction would be. So, this area which had some really potentially interesting properties, several houses along here and out buildings, the field as constructed will only go to the level of three feet, so therefore it did not uncover any archaeological resources. But in Target Area Two, we did in fact uncover the Eastman foundations. To show you historically what that looked like, this is page C-25 in your packet, this is the Eastman house. We're looking at it from the railroad side, and here were the other houses near the railroad tracks. Those have been in project area 2, the Eastman house was in project area 1. And here's another view of that, this is page C-25, this is showing the island in 1867, and there's the Eastman house, so its really very architecturally prominent. This is page C-26 in your handout and this is showing again those Target Areas 1 and 2 and some of the other houses that would have been there but also what is there now, or what was there subsequent to the historic period. The Twin Cities Tile and Marble Company, so that presumably may have obliterated some resources. The tennis courts that were built, as I understand it, on fill, and that's in Target Area 1, and then the Eastman house which is Target Area 2. I believe our conditions said something along the lines of upon completion of field work that this plan would come back and present what mitigation, so that's what we're asking for your comments on tonight. In December 2007, the initial trenching, as we call it, was done. The test excavation, whatever, so in Target Area 1, one trench was dug in this area cutting into the backs perhaps of some of those outbuildings and houses. The tennis courts, as we noted from our October plan, those will be monitored by an archeologist when those are excavated to see if there are any materials there, but its again been determined that that's possibly unlikely. In Target Area 2, this is where we hit pay dirt (that's my only joke) because we knew based on the previous work that had been done, that there was a very high likelihood of discovering the Eastman mansion, or what was left of it, the foundations. So there were five trenches dug in this area, crosswise, and heading ... I guess that's my final illustration. The Eastman foundations have been determined to be eligible to be listed on the National Register under Criterion B, for their association with the Eastman family and under Criterion D for their potential ability to yield additional information. One of the things that I thought was stated very well on the report that you received was that this gives us the opportunity to learn about, I don't know how to say it, someone from that economic background. We do have information on other houses from this time period perhaps, but they were not of this scale and not the same background. It's kind of interesting too that there is really not much, things written about the Eastman house, but as far as photographs and that sort of documentary evidence we don't have, so the archeology can supplement that record. They also discovered as you will note in the report, evidence of landscape features. We saw in some earlier version there was a circular driveway and pathway, so those types of features will be examined as well. What you have tonight then is the plan to mitigate how the field work will be conducted, how the artifacts that are found will be processed, how it will be mapped, and how the data recovery ...

Chair Larsen: Excuse me, please let the record show that Amy Ollendorf has arrived.

Staff Ahlgren: So the work plan that you have before you is calling for additional field work to more thoroughly excavate those remains of the Eastman house and the exterior features such as the landscape and if there are any trash pits as we call them and they have a detailed schedule and a plan for how these items will be, research objectives, mapping the analysis, and reporting. So I am recommending that you approve this plan and to go over my findings, and I should note that Dr. Terrell is here to answer any questions if you have specific questions about the actual archeology aspect of it. So, we've noted that this is located within the historic district, I'm going over my findings now in an abbreviated ... this was a condition of approval for the athletic facility to be constructed, and Two Pines fulfills all the federal requirements for archeology. You did approve the initial plan on October 23, 2007. There have been features that have been determined to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion B and D and this plan before you does meet the Federal, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Archaeology, such as number 6, the documentations assessed against the statement objectives, and the work plan also meets Secretary of the Interior Standard number 4, they are going to provide a technical report. The work plan, this is finding number 8, it exceeds that standard, they will do one public presentation within a year of the completion of the field work. This will be in addition to the public open house and they will write an article for a professional journal. Finding number 9, I note that Target Area 2, which are on the private property, are not under those requirements of the Minnesota Archeology Act, but they are not subject – whatever is discovered in Target Area 2 is not subject to the requirements of finding a repository. Staff recommendations:

1. The final report will be subject to review and approval by CPED Preservation Planning staff and will be presented to the HPC as an informational item.
2. The public open house will be scheduled in conjunction with CPED Preservation Planning staff and will be properly noticed.
3. The applicant is encouraged to work with CPED Preservation Planning staff to locate an appropriate public repository for dispensation of recovered artifacts

So that is my report for tonight. If you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

Commissioner Selchow: I have one. Ms. Ahlgren, can you explain to us all being that the entire island is part, is on the National Register, are the artifacts considered a contributing element?

Staff Ahlgren: Chair Larsen, Commissioners: I may have to defer to Dr. Terrell but it's my understanding, just kind of my gut feeling in terms of working in preservation is that artifacts themselves, typically collections, are not eligible for the Register. The foundation itself as a site, that would be considered being eligible. And that brings us to the heartbreak of archeology. You end up destroying the site in getting information. Yes, those foundations are eligible and probably whatever else is over here if there's stuff there that would be eligible as well, but an actual "bag" of collections - that would typically not be eligible for the National Register.

Commissioner Selchow: Being an artifact that was actually buried, or a foundation that was buried, it's not specifically would not have been called out in the National Registration nomination for the site, or does that not preclude it from being included?

Staff Ahlgren: Could you repeat the question please.

Commissioner Selchow: Being it is basically an unknown entity, it would not have been identified within the nomination, specifically, however being it is within the property limits does it still fall within, and I understand I'm asking you about National Register status versus local, but ...

Staff Ahlgren: Chair Larsen, Commissioner Selchow, that is a very good question. My feeling is still that no, as an artifact itself it's value is when it is in that site in place. The recordation is to mitigate the fact that it will be removed and destroyed, I mean the site will be destroyed. I had one more thing to add too, in one of the two letters that you received, that was something that was brought up by I believe the National Park Service letter, that individual, Paul Lebowitz and staff John Anfinson, are suggesting, or not suggesting but stating that they believe this site should also be considered eligible for the National Register under Criterion A for its association with the Mill district which does have a lot of archaeological features and that's in fact one of the areas of significance for the St. Anthony Falls District are those Mill ruins. So they are saying this is a component of that.

Chair Larsen: As a follow-up, who makes such a determination? Are we the ones that would indicate that we felt that it met Criterion A or is it up to Two Pines to tell us that it does or doesn't?

Staff Ahlgren: Chair Larsen and Commissioners, I believe that that is, and I defer to Dr. Byers, but I believe that is a recommendation that you could make, but they would also make it as qualified professional archeologists. They would make that recommendation and I suppose you could concur with it or not.

Staff Byers: Mr. Chair and Commissioners, the item before you is the archeology plan, the field plan, the item before you is not whether or not what is found is or isn't National Register eligible. That's a determination that's made through professional recommendations, by the consultant, the archeologist Two Pines, and it's something that's under the jurisdiction of the State Archeologist. So, they make that determination and that the mitigation will be the follow through for what that means and how to proceed and as you know there will be another meeting at the site with the Commission and with the general public to update on that, but that's not the item before you tonight.

Chair Larsen: Thank you. Commissioner Crippen:

Commissioner Crippen: Looking forward, past this report, I'm wondering about whether we'll see again any plans or information about potential public interpretation of information that's found through this archaeological work. I don't think it necessarily would be in this report, per

se, but the National Trust letter was referring to previous amendments that we had passed that talked about plaques or what have you and I'm wondering is that something we should be thinking about tonight or is this coming back to us again where we would have a chance to comment on that?

Staff Ahlgren: Chair Larsen, Commissioner Crippen, yes, I noticed that in the letter too although I, like you, got it fairly recently. I believe that one of the earlier approvals for this entire project, maybe the one in March 2007, I believe that there was a condition that this signage would be approved by the Preservation Design staff, but not by the Commission as I recall. So I do think that said, there will be opportunity for public information, and as I mentioned in my findings I think they are exceeding the requirements of the conditions that we put on them in terms of getting the information to the public.

Chair Larsen: Ok, if there are no other questions ... yes, Commissioner Anderson.

Commissioner Anderson: I understand there are still some Eastman family people living in the area, at least part time. Have they been consulted, will they have any input in the plan?

Staff Ahlgren: Chair Larsen, Commissioner Anderson, I may defer to Dr. Terrell with that. I believe that the consultants did contact the Eastman family that are still living here. I believe that one descendant is living in Minnetonka, so perhaps she could address that.

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Ollendorf.

Commissioner Ollendorf: Hi. I wouldn't be doing my job if I didn't have something to ask, so I'm going to ask. This is up the archaeological alley ... we, as the commissioners, had directed the, as part of the approval process, a mitigation plan and I'm wondering if staff had talked with the consultants and the proposer about avoidance as a possibility, because I'm just picking up on the theme of the National Park Service letter and the National Trust letter. Because it is a topic that's kind of missing from the paper trail. Just wondered about that process.

Staff Ahlgren: Chair Larsen, Commissioner Ollendorf: Well, the way I looked at it was that the project has been approved and we also approved the plan, well, you did, in October, for them to go ahead with this so we knew that these, very likely that these resources would be found and that they would be destroyed by the construction of this field. So this is our mitigation plan, and that probably didn't answer your question, did it. To avoid would be to not build this, and its been approved.

Commissioner Ollendorf: There's often one line of thinking would be that all or nothing line of approach, but the other is a redesign on the same plot but still to avoid the eligible resource. I know that's a tight squeeze down there, but ...

Chair Larsen: I think that's not under our purview at this time. Alright, if there are no other questions we'll move forward to the public hearing then. If there is anybody who wishes to speak for or against this application please step forward. Don't all jump at once.

Michelle Terrell: Chair Larsen, Commissioners, I'm Michelle Terrell with Two Pines Resource Group. I'd be glad to answer any questions about our findings from December or our proposal for the mitigation plan. First off, I'd like to address Commissioner Anderson's question about the Eastmans. There are descendants of the Eastmans. They are related to John Eastman, the brother of William Eastman, and there is actually a descendant of William who is alive as well. I have been in contact with the family and have invited them to come out when we are doing our field work, so that would be a good opportunity for them. Are there any questions?

Chair Larsen: Can you comment on, just briefly, the issue of Criterion A and whether or not you see that as an option in moving forward.

Dr. Terrell: Archaeological sites are typically eligible under Criterion A and/or D. In this case, I did not recommend A because the association is events or a trajectory of events, a series of events. I thought that this particular structure did not have a clear and strong association with one singular event or a trajectory, but the Parks Service letter does make a good case for how A could be seen within the larger context of the District. That being said, it doesn't necessarily change our approach to the archaeological resources. To add Criterion A, it is usually mitigated through some more interpretation, some additional historical documentation perhaps, but it doesn't change how we actually do the field work in the ground.

Chair Larsen: Are there any questions? Commissioner Ollendorf.

Commissioner Ollendorf: The question about artifact storage, exhibition, whatever, can you talk about that at all and which way you see that going in the larger framework of interpretation for the public into the future?

Dr. Terrell: I would have to defer to my client. The artifacts will be the property of DeLaSalle and at their discretion for how to, whether to curate or how to interpret them or display them.

Commissioner Ollendorf: But so far you haven't had any discussions you could share with us?

Dr. Terrell: Nothing specific.

Commissioner Ollendorf: Is that, well I guess I can ask later when we're talking among ourselves ... and then, since Nicollet Island is a sub-district of the National Register District, what has been the process with Section 106, negotiating with the SHPO and the National Park Service?

Dr. Terrell: You've seen the National Park Service's comment. SHPO was approached and has deferred to the HPC, that was their feeling about this project so its in your court.

Chair Larsen: Ok, anybody else who wishes to speak for or against?

Bob Roscoe: Good evening, Chair Larsen and Commissioners, my name is Bob Roscoe and I'm a former HPC commissioner from 1980-2001. During that time I think Commissioner Anderson may remember that the commission saw archeologists speak before the commission about Nicollet Island issues a number of times, so this isn't anything new in that regard. But what I'd like to point out here, first of all show the graphic that Carol Ahlgren showed, that I think the position that could be made here, and I think, John Derrius, this is a great opportunity here for DeLaSalle. You have an opportunity to take very important parts of history that shouldn't be covered up or destroyed and do what's been done with Mill Ruins Park. You really have an opportunity here to do an open air archaeological excavation and presentation of these foundations. It's an extension of a Mill Ruins Park on Nicollet Island. I think there's a great opportunity for that. So what do you do about the football field? Well, there's alternatives. I'm showing here where DeLaSalle is and where Boom Island is nearby.

Chair Larsen: Mr. Roscoe, I do appreciate these comments but if you would keep them directed to the matter at hand which is the actual mitigation plan. We've been through this a number of times and we're here just to discuss the mitigation plan.

Bob Roscoe: Chair Larsen, I'd like to point out that there are alternative sites to this, so that this would be the better way of doing mitigation, by using the foundations, the archaeological foundations.

Chair Larsen: However, the City Council has approved the plan to move forward for the field, so it will happen and we are looking just at the ...

Bob Roscoe: I know, I know, but this is a great opportunity and DeLaSalle teaches history.

Chair Larsen: Is there anybody else that wishes to speak?

Edna Brazaitis: Yes, Chair Larsen and Commissioners, my name is Edna Brazaitis, and I'm really excited to be here today. I really appreciate the work that Twin Pines has done in uncovering these wonderful resources. This gives us a great opportunity to figure out what do we do? Without going into alternatives, I think there was one question raised which was avoidance. There is another, there are two plans. One plan filled and the other plan leveled. Excavated. And the first plan, which was the approved plan, this is the DeLaitre House and this is the Rea/Seacombe House and this is the footprint of the seating structure. It does not impact either of those. So it does not excavate and it does not impact that structure. However, the approved plan two, which is the one that cuts, the seating structure is longer and it is going to have footings and those footings will impact, I believe, the DeLaitre House and the Rea/Seacombe House, so there is some impact on that. I guess what I feel is there is a lot of, mitigation is creative process. There is lots of different ways to mitigate and even your ordinance talks about doing things such as the salvage and preservation of specified building materials, architectural details, etc. So what kind of opportunities do we have here? This is the chance where we might want to revisit and look at the design and say is there some way that we can mitigate this loss of this significant contributing element to this historic district and where are they? First let's look at opportunities for DeLaSalle. As you can see, this is the second plan.

Chair Larsen: I hate to interrupt again but I think we're getting off track again.

Edna Brazaitis I think that you can look at mitigation and if I could go off track for just a tiny second, ok?

Chair Larsen: A tiny second, but we really are here to consider just the Two Pines plan, not any more, not moving the facility ...

Edna Brazaitis I'm not talking about moving the facility, ok. I'm not talking about moving the facility at all. I'm talking about what we could do to salvage the architectural materials that we are finding at this site and reusing them in the plan. Ok? I was just thinking that right now we have faux stone retaining walls. What are we finding at this site? We are finding limestone retaining walls. We have a free material there that could be recycled here and here, there is a lot of stone here. In that way, we could be incorporating part of the historic fabric into the design of this facility. When I thought about what does this kind of remind me of, and a lot of you probably know about the Tribune Tower in Chicago, that's incorporated like a hundred different famous buildings within its walls, and this way I could think wouldn't this be a great thing for DeLaSalle to have this facility that incorporates this sense of history around if using this reclaimed material that is there on the site. So I guess that's where I'm going for this. For the Park Board, they actually have a plan for limestone block gathering area around a quarry. This is part of the plan, so there is actually in the master plan there would be the opportunity to take some of this material and recover it and put it into the park. So I'm trying to say, can we be a little more clever here. Are there areas on the Park Board site, could we incorporate some of the things that are being recovered and incorporate it for the public. When I look through what kinds of things we were seeing, we were seeing limestone walks and pathways. Should this be a limestone path or walkway? There is a cobblestone courtyard. Wouldn't this be wonderful if we reclaimed the cobblestone and put, use that, as the courtyard. And there is a possibility of the way the drive is constructed that there may be a fountain. Could we incorporate these architectural elements into this? I do believe this is within your purview of your ordinance and your ability to be able to encourage this kind of creative mitigation and I don't know, I guess one of the questions I had is whether you have enough time to think things through or have enough information, especially about the Park Board site. And the Park Board site, some of the recovery and investigation was hampered because there is the asphalt tennis court over the property and under the agreement with the Park Board Michelle really didn't have the right to go under that and explore it now. I do have also, just to add a little bit to this, is we consulted with Dr. Ronald Shermer and Ronald Shermer, like everyone else we talked about, he's a professor or archeology at Mankato State. He's very complimentary of Twin Pines. But he does say that as far as the Park Board property, he really feels there should be further work. He said the amount of work that was done was comparatively limited given the total amount of land being impacted. It was understandable given that it appears the tennis courts cover the better portion of the area. Second, even though the Two Pines report clearly states that the plan depth of excavation for the stadium project will not reach below historic debris unrelated to the area's archaeological significance, that judgment assumes that the excavation will not in fact be deeper than planned. We all know that things don't go as planned, so I would suggest that this area being carefully monitored

during construction to assure that potentially important intact archaeological deposits are not inadvertently disturbed. And I guess I would look to Dr. Ollendorf maybe for some help in making sure that findings would address that. He concludes that he respects the work of Dr. Terrell and the work of Two Pines and I believe it was in full keeping with the project's scope of the work. At the same time I recommend that if the higher elevation of the school's property are to be leveled, that the entire area to be leveled be carefully monitored during scraping to continuously assess whether unexpected archaeological deposits exist and are being encountered. There are many lessons learned from similar situations where despite through and good faith work, site remnants were encountered during work even in what seemed to be the most unlikely places. The last comment, and this goes to your first question, I agree with Dr. Anfinson, that the Eastman site should be considered eligible under Criterion A, B, and D. Thank you for your time, and hopefully I didn't go too far off but I really think that this is a wonderful opportunity for you.

Chair Larsen: Thank you.

Arlene Fried: I live in Minneapolis, I do not live on the Island. I'm just going to read an excerpt from the letter that came from the National Trust for Historic Preservation signed by Christina Morris. I'll just read an excerpt. We have a portion highlighted here:

“Considering the significance of the resources (considered eligible for designation on the National Register under Criteria B and D); their potential to provide new information about the Eastman family, their residence and grounds, and their lifestyle; and the potential for these materials to provide a new set of comparative data that could further define the history of Nicollet and the St. Anthony Falls Historic District, we would strongly encourage the consideration (of) an alternative plan for this site, or a reworking of the earlier proposals ... for this project, that would not require extensive excavation of up to 6 feet, which would result in the destruction of important archaeological data.”

Chair Larsen: Is there anyone else who wishes to speak either for or against this application?

Chris Stellar: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Chris Stellar, I live at 95 West Island Avenue. I've been an interpretive guide giving historic tours of St. Anthony Falls in Minneapolis for the Minnesota Historical Society, the HPC, and last fall the National Trust. As you consider mitigation for the archaeological, for the excavation necessary to build plan B, I do want to emphasize what previous speakers have said, that we do have an approved plan A. Approved by the City Council, just like plan B, that does not require the same level of excavation. I also want to point out that plan A or plan B, they're both temporary developments. I want you to consider this while you're thinking about mitigation because what we're mitigating is the permanent destruction of National Register level historic resources in the historic district that you are charged with protecting. Why is this a temporary project? This project lies or overlaps the planned Northeast Corridor transit line. This is the line showing the crossing alongside the existing tracks, not on the existing tracks. It's not Northstar commuter rail, it's Northeast Corridor transit line. It could either be a bus way or a light rail line. This shows the field and you can see that here are the existing tracks, very close to the field already. But the light rail line

would go on the field side, it would go through the end zone. This is the environmental impact study for the Northeast Corridor rail line. There's some interesting names in here. On the first page we have John Darris. Further on Diane Hofstede speaks in favor of this light rail line. Is it just a plan? No. Here are two bridges on the east side. This one shows the extra span when these bridges were rebuilt and the extra span for the light rail line was included. This wall can be broken out, the space is there. That's true up and down the line. It's true you reviewed bridges, this commission reviewed bridges, in the warehouse district and I believe also in the St. Anthony Falls district at First Street, Second Street, and Washington Avenue. I went down to the bridge department, the engineering drawings clearly show this is First Street, future LRT. This is Second Street, future LRT. Interesting, the bridge department staff told me that the faux stone wall was completed so that when this is knocked out it will match the other side. This is not pretend stuff. This is the one that's closest to the site, future transportation corridor, this is the Nicollet Street Bridge. A little closer view shows the extra span here. This is probably square foot by square foot, as expensive a room as you can get in this area even including condos. A great expense went into building this. Here is really a good view, you see the tennis courts, you know the field is coming out very close to the existing tracks and I'm telling you this opening can be knocked out. There's the door. It's not just a plan, we're putting money into this stuff. Tomorrow, March 26, Hennepin County will begin rebuilding the Main Street Northeast Bridge. This is just the next bridge down on this same rail line. Here's the play on the future LRT corridor.

Chair Larsen: Can you indicate how that ties back to this?

Chris Stellar: How it ties back? Sure, this ties back to this because I want you to consider that this is permanent removal and destruction of National Register level historic resources for a temporary project. Now you might think why would a developer put four million dollars, risk four million dollars, on a project that's temporary that's going to have a train coming through it. Well they didn't risk it. In January they renegotiated their contract with the Minneapolis Park Board. If for any reason this stadium has to go away, the Minneapolis Park Board shall construct an athletic facility for use by DeLaSalle. They are indemnified. No risk. John Darris knows very well that this train could come through. There's a new county sales tax funding new rail lines, and yet we're putting up, I don't care if they put up the stadium but we're talking about digging down when we don't need to because we have another plan that wouldn't dig down. And I just ask you as a Commission charged with protecting the resources of this national historic district to consider the temporary nature and the alternatives of this project. Thank you.

Chair Larsen: Thank you, is there anyone else who wishes to speak for or against this project?

Dr. Terrell: Chair Larsen, Commissioners, I'd just like to address some of the questions that were raised by the comments. The monitoring plan, the work plans before you, do call for the development of a monitoring plan that will take place during grading of the archaeological site, so we will monitor removal of the tennis courts. There will be an archaeologist on hand to monitor all of the grading because we all know that there are things that we just can't cover everything that's out there. So in case there are any things that we overlooked there will be an archaeologist on hand while site grading takes place. Also I did put a little buffer in there that

one target area over on the Park Board land, that impact in that area is only two feet deep. I went three feet in an area that's already partially graded down and we didn't get beyond impacts from the Tile and Marble Company. They had obviously done some grading out there while they were on that site. Again, we will cover that area through monitoring as well. Secondly, the depth of impact between plan A and B, the Eastman mansion resources were encountered between three and a half and four and a half feet below the current surface of the field and my understanding is if I recall from the Plan A, which is what we based our initial assessment on, these resources would be taken out through either plan A or B. Then lastly, the National Trust letter does mention that the offices of the archaeologist that they'd like to see them be involved in this process and continue to be involved. And I just want to let you know that this plan also was sent to them as a courtesy even though they no longer have any resources on their parcel. They are being kept in communication regarding this project. Thank you.

Chair Larsen: Thank you. Is there anybody else that wishes to speak for or against this project? Alright, then I'm going to close the public hearing. Commissioners, do you have any questions? Yes, you can ask a question again.

Commissioner Ollendorf: I wanted to ask you some more questions before you sat down. Protocol prevailed. So, to follow up on that, that was one of my questions, I saw that you had cc'd Scott Anfinson? The State Archaeologist, did you receive any reply at all from him? I'm just scanning the crowd and he's not here, so ...

Dr. Terrell: No

Commissioner Ollendorf: Ok, and sorry this is not very coherent, I've got notes scribbled here and there. Into the technical details of your report, in the work plan page four you're talking about a general artifacts scatter by the 23rd/25th Grove Street residence, the Rea/Secombe residence? And basically you were talking about why you didn't think that those deposits were eligible for the National Register. If I understood it correctly when I read further down, the deposits are also below what's going to be impacted by the construction?

Dr. Terrell: Yes, everything that we assessed out there would be within the construction zone.

Commissioner Ollendorf: Ok, so that included ...

Dr. Terrell: Yes

Commissioner Ollendorf: Ok, then I misread that. So, I'm sure because archaeological sites are often eligible under Criterion D under the National Register you also considered the research potential of the artifacts scatter because I was interested elsewhere in there you said what was included in that refuse was domestic debris discarded by the occupants of the house. So you felt secure that it related to the house's occupation, which is ...

Dr. Terrell: Correct

Commissioner Ollendorf: Which is kind of a step up from we don't know how that stuff got there.

Dr. Terrell: But that particular property is a side-by-side duplex and it was, both sides were occupied by various families over the course of its history, so we could not link, we could only say that they were occupants of the house but occupants from which period or which family we cannot say because there is not stratified deposits there.

Commissioner Ollendorf: It still seems to me that there would be research potential there in terms of a socio-economic comparison between occupants of a mansion over a period of time versus occupants of a non-mansion over an equally long period of time.

Dr. Terrell: Right, but we have much better examples in Minneapolis of stratified working class deposits that we could use for a comparative sample. Again, the house was also occupied through the 1940s so we have an extensive time period where that house was occupied and typically surface scatters like this would not be considered eligible.

Commissioner Ollendorf: Ok, let's see what else. Page 12 you are talking about less stable material such as faunal materials, faunal remains ... I'm just wondering since it didn't elaborate in the work plan if you have a plan to analyze any food remains such as faunal remains and so forth, again in terms of getting at some of these socio-economic ...

Dr. Terrell: Yes, we certainly do look for different types of remains and different cuts of meat and that sort of thing.

Commissioner Ollendorf: Ok, the other thing was given the public interest in this and for at least half of its use time, the new stadium will be open to the public to use through the Park Board. It seems to me that the public dissemination of the information is a little bit, it could be strengthened a bit, and I don't know if that's within our purview to insist on it or kind of leave it discretionary, but one public presentation and one professional journal article obviously there's not a lot of public that would be wanting to read the professional journal article, but those of us ... some of us are interested in it, but things like the National Trust letter talked about interpretive plaques and whatnot, but I'm thinking more of brochures and whatnot. Something tangible, like a booklet, something that could be distributed by the Park Board or DeLaSalle. Somebody misses the one opportunity for a public presentation then, oh well.

Dr. Terrell: We are certainly open to suggestions on that.

Commissioner Ollendorf: I just had one other comment. The other thing too was to just point out the value of going through these steps. On one hand the archaeologist side of me is excited that we are actually going to have a data recovery project in the City of Minneapolis rather than a salvage; on the other hand I don't like to see sites or other resources getting destroyed. That said, just by having your testing done, you found things that were not in historic record.

Dr. Terrell: Yes

Commissioner Ollendorf: I don't think that really jumps out of the page unless somebody like me reads through it word for word.

Dr. Terrell: I can give a quick example that everybody can grasp. I brought a couple pictures. This is, the upper picture is some of the debris outside of the house. The house burned in 1926 and was subsequently demolished. In the middle of that picture is a brick that appears to be red. The Eastman mansion is described in literature as a red brick house, but in fact it is a yellow brick house painted red. So, it was made with local yellow brick and, but in keeping with New England attitudes about red brick homes, it's painted red. So we are already learning little clues about the Eastman home. The bottom picture is a trench, that's the floor within the crawl space beneath the Eastman home. It's, people might be picturing substantial foundations and things but we have intact remnants of this home but we're not talking surviving walls of any substance. We have foundations out there. I just kind of wanted to illustrate a little bit about what we have.

Chair Larsen: Thank you very much. Commissioners, you have other questions? Sorry, Michelle, we have other questions here. Commissioner Crippen.

Commissioner Crippen: Sorry, I was interested in Ms. Brazaitis' comments about potentially reusing some of these materials and I was wondering if you had an opinion. I notice on a quick review of your report that the Rea/Seacombe houses don't have a lot of physical integrity to what you are finding there. Would you say that the Eastman house does, well my first question is would there be enough material there to be used for other construction projects such as she is describing and second would that be appropriate in your opinion or is it more appropriate to catalogue and document these artifacts and keep them in that state rather than in a rebuilt state.

Dr. Terrell: Typically what we see with reuse of architectural elements is something substantial. Until we get in there and open the area up, I did not see anything to this point, we have limestone, some limestone walkways and we have some crushed limestone for the drive and that sort of thing. Nothing that you could really grasp as something that could be reused in an architectural sense but there may be items out there and we'll certainly set those aside. But at this time we're mostly talking about small pieces of glass, nails, that sort of thing. Not a lot that you could really use for that sort of purpose.

Chair Larsen: Alright, any other questions, thoughts? What is the pleasure of the commission?

Commissioner Ollendorf: I think this is a great opportunity for DeLaSalle and the Park Board to partner and involve the public as much as possible in this. If not the actual excavation itself, then at least afterward disseminating the information to the public and I think at the very least we have to strengthen the staff recommendations in that regard in terms of at least after the fact, disseminating the information and likewise what to do with these artifacts on private land. If we have any ability to determine the outcomes, now seems to be the only window of opportunity to do that.

Chair Larsen: We don't.

Commissioner Ollendorf: We don't?

Chair Larsen: I mean I would agree with you, I think we've been opposed to this project at every step in terms of the motions that we've made and we've been overturned by the city. So, I think our record is clear where we stand, however we're at an opportunity to take what is before us and to make the most of it. And I think what we're looking at here is not where else can we move it or what else can we do but to look at what are we going to find, hopefully, and potentially, and take that and use all of our public persuasion to DeLaSalle to say hey, you have an incredible resource before you and I'm sure as they've done with other things they will make the most of it. And we will be watching to see what they do do with it. And that is to make it, to disseminate it as much as possible, to show it off as much as possible, to reuse it as much as possible, display it as much as possible, and to do what is right. Our commission has limited powers in determining what they can do, but at the same time we have the ability to impress upon them our wishes and the desires of other members of the community to "do the right thing." Are there any other comments?

Commissioner Kelley: Well, as was pointed out before, the project has been approved over our original votes and it was also pointed out, and I didn't hear anyone contradict it, that this report, this mitigation plan, goes beyond what was originally required, so I'm very inclined to say let's go ahead and approve this. There's been some other good ideas brought up, I really like the reuse one, but nothing in the mitigation plans precludes that, it seems like that would be a nice idea that would be thrown out that we don't affect one way or the other through our votes, so I would move that we adopt staff findings and approve this mitigation plan.

Chair Larsen: Ok, is there a second?

Commissioner Anderson: I'll second it.

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Anderson, thank you. Is there any discussion more than what we've had already?

Commissioner Ollendorf: I would have to respectfully vote nay on the motion as it stands unless there is perhaps some willingness to be open to a friendly amendment. Just again, along the lines of strengthening the terminology in terms of what we would like to see rather than just say we're powerless and can't do anything.

Chair Larsen: What would you propose?

Commissioner Ollendorf: Something to do with Number three, the applicant is encouraged to work is how it reads now, I would say the applicant will work with CPED Preservation staff. Again, maybe that's overstepping our authority, but that's kind of what I'd like to see.

Chair Larsen: Are you suggesting adding?

Commissioner Ollendorf: Number 3, changing it from ... I guess it's page 5, and then maybe adding a fourth recommendation acknowledging there is already a monitoring plan that is being planned, it's kind of buried in the mitigation plan, but basically putting a fourth recommendation that would say something to the effect that the monitoring plan will be preapproved by CPED prior to construction.

Chair Larsen: Alright, that's a motion?

Commissioner Ollendorf: Again, about the open house we can leave that at is but we could also say something like we would encourage looking with CPED staff at other opportunities to disseminate information to the public.

Chair Larsen: I'm not sure we want to involve CPED staff too much

Commissioner Ollendorf: True ...

Chair Larsen: I'd like them to focus on the task at hand.

Commissioner Kelley: Do any of these throw a lot of additional cost onto the applicant? The monitor plan approved by CPED, I mean there'll be a monitored plan anyway right, in fact it's already in there ...

Chair Larsen: Right, I guess my question is there is already a monitoring plan.

Commissioner Ollendorf: But it's not stated that it would be subject to, oh well here it says developed in consultation with ... no, it just says prior to commencement of archaeological monitoring a data recovery plan will be developed in consultation with CPED, which is what we're looking at now. So it doesn't talk anywhere in that paragraph of monitoring the timing or any involvement of CPED or us in the planning. I mean I'm happy to look at another plan.

Chair Larsen: Ms. Ahlgren? Quick question for you ... do you feel that you could be of benefit in reviewing a monitoring plan or would you be deferring basically solely to the Two Pines if they came to you with such a plan?

Staff Ahlgren: Chair Larsen, Commissioners, Dr. Terrell and I have discussed having meeting out on the site with the State Archaeologist, although, as we note, this is not quite within his legal or legislative domain or requirements, and I'm hoping to do that prior to the public open house which we will be working on. Given the weather, I haven't gone out there to look, I mean I'll do anything for this job but if it's 20 below I don't want to go look at a trench.

Chair Larsen: I guess my question is more directly if we make a recommendation that the monitoring plan be reviewed by CPED planning staff are we going to know what that mitigation plan is and is that going to have any further impact, are we going to bring anything to bear on that, so than rather than just deferring to Two Pines Resource Group to develop that?

Staff Ahlgren: Chair Larsen, I would have to defer to Two Pines in terms of the monitoring. I am not an archaeologist.

Chair Larsen: I guess that's, thank you, that's my concern that the more we try to add to it the less we're ...

(unintelligible)

Chair Larsen: Yes, that's correct. We are approving a monitoring plan, the question is what is that monitoring plan and that's what we're debating at the moment. I'm not sure we're really gaining anything by that, I don't really want to mess up the works.

Commissioner Kelley: Suppose that we make the changes that were recommended to number 3 and skip number 4, would that get a yes vote?

Commissioner Ollendorf: I have confidence in the work the Two Pines does, but I just kind of have a reluctance because it seems that it is a public entity's jurisdiction to have the resources to debate colors or window sashes ad nauseam and this is a relevant issue.

Commissioner Kelley: I remember from the October hearing that when this same thing came up with respect to disposition of relics that were found on private land, DeLaSalle indicated an openness in the way of public commitment to donating them to the historical society, even though there is a cost involved, I think it was something like \$500 a crate or something like that, and that sounded actually very reasonable to me at the time. Now we haven't heard again on that subject but given that we can't compel the disposition of these relics I think that what we have here in the architectural, I'm sorry the archaeological mitigation plan seems pretty good to me. A layman's opinion, but ...

Chair Larsen: I'm just concerned about the will, because I honestly believe that we do not have the authority to tell them where to put it. We can apply as much pressure as we can, but short of saying yes or no, and I don't really think that gets us anywhere. Do you want to stick with your amendment and see where it goes, the friendly amendment?

Commissioner Ollendorf: I guess I'll pass.

Chair Larsen: Ok.

Commissioner Anderson: Does the amendment stand that Mr. Kelley ...

Chair Larsen: At this point we have no amendments.

Commissioner Kelley: Actually I motioned for all three as written.

Commissioner Anderson: And I'm the second?

Chair Larsen: Yes, you are. We'll call the question. All those in favor, we'll call the role. We'll go down ... Commissioner Lee?

Commissioner Lee: Aye

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Crippen?

Commissioner Crippen: Aye

Commissioner Anderson: Aye

Chair Larsen: Aye

Commissioner Lemmon: Aye

Commissioner Kelley: Aye

Commissioner Ollendorf: Aye

Chair Larsen: Great, that motion carries. We have adopted the work plan for the archaeological data recovery of the William Eastman residence. Thank you all for your continued interest.