



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649, Seattle WA 98124-4649

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 911/17

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
City Hall
600 4th Avenue
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room
Wednesday, December 20, 2017 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker
Kathleen Durham
Garrett Hodgins
Robert Ketcherside
Jordon Kiel
Kristen Johnson
Nicole McKernan
Julianne Patterson

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Russell Coney
Steven Treffers

Chair Jordan Kiel called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

122017.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

October 4, 2017
Deferred.

122017.2 SPECIAL TAX VALUATION

122017.21 Fort Lawton

4010 Washington Ave W

Ms. Sodt reported that submitted costs were \$484,691.30; eligible costs were \$483,373.40. Work was performed in conformance with Certificate of Approval issued by the Landmarks Preservation Board.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: 4010 Washington Ave W, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; that this property has been substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application; and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.

MM/SC/GH/JP 7:0:0 Motion carried.

4012 Washington Ave W

Ms. Sodt reported that submitted costs were \$558, 209.38; eligible costs were \$484,567.62. Work performed in conformance with Certificate of Approval issued by the Landmarks Preservation Board.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: 4010 Washington Ave W, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; that this property has been substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application; and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.

MM/SC/GH/JP 7:0:0 Motion carried.

4210 Washington Ave W

Ms. Sodt reported that submitted costs were \$418,313.30 ; eligible costs were \$413,066.90. Work performed in conformance with Certificate of Approval issued by the Landmarks Preservation Board.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: 4210 Washington Ave W, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; that this property has been substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application; and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.

MM/SC/GH/JP 7:0:0 Motion carried.

4212 Washington Ave W

Ms. Sodt reported that submitted costs were \$427,158.48; eligible costs were \$424,636.60. Work was performed in conformance with Certificate of Approval issued by the Landmarks Preservation Board.

Ms. McKernan arrived at 3:44 pm.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: 4212 Washington Ave W, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; that this property has been substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application; and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.

MM/SC/GH/JP 7:0:1 Motion carried. Ms. McKernan abstained.

4216 Washington Ave W

Ms. Sodt reported that submitted costs were \$508, 951.63; eligible costs were \$458, 303.50. Work performed in conformance with Certificate of Approval issued by the Landmarks Preservation Board.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: 4216 Washington Ave W, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; that this property has been substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application; and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.

MM/SC/GH/JP 8:0:0 Motion carried.

122017.22 Campbell Building
4554 California Avenue SW

Ms. Doherty reported that submitted and eligible costs were \$226,977. Work for designated portions of the property was performed in conformance with a Certificate of Approval issued by the Landmarks Preservation Board. She explained that the board reviewed and approved the awning and signage, the rest of it was determined to be in-kind repair or maintenance: new boiler,

plumbing, sewer line repair, tuckpointing, repairs of brick, re-caulking windows, new membrane roof and roof hatch, painting at Cupcake Royale.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: Campbell Building, 4554 California Avenue SW, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; that this property has been substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application; and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.

MM/SC/DB/RK 8:0:0 Motion carried.

122017.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

122017.31 Columbia City Landmark District
3811 S. Ferdinand St.
Proposed signage

Ms. Sordt explained the proposed installation of a painted, wooden business sign with vinyl decal. The edges of the sign will be painted black. The 44" w x 24" h sign will be suspended from the soffit. Exhibits included plans, photographs and samples. The Pierson Apartment Building was constructed in 1908. It is a contributing building within the Columbia City National Register District. On December 4, 2017 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. The Committee discussed the method of attachment and supported the proposal to match the attachment and hardware of the Pure Alchemy sign, to the east. Committee members recommended approval of the proposal.

Applicant Comment:

Mary Gutierrez, Curious Finds, provided material samples and photos of front of building to show scale. Responding to clarifying questions she explained that existing hooks will be re-used if they are sturdy enough; if not they will use new ones like what is used next door. She said they will patch and paint, if necessary.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

The board agreed that the scale and color make sense.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signs at 3811 S. Ferdinand St., as proposed

This action is based on the following:

The proposed sign meets the following sections of the District ordinance, the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards:

Guidelines/Specific

11. Signs.

All signs on or hanging from buildings or windows, or applied to windows, are subject to review and approval by the Review Committee and Board. Sign applications will be evaluated according to the overall impact, size, shape, texture, lettering style, method of attachment, color, and lighting in relation to the use of the building, the building and street where the sign will be located, and the other signs and other buildings in the District. The primary reference will be to the average pedestrian's eye-level view, although views into or down the street from adjacent buildings will be an integral feature of any review.

The regulations in Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 23.55 (Signs) and the following guidelines shall apply to signs in the District. The provisions of these guidelines apply to at least the following: (1) any sign located out-of-doors; (2) indoor signs located within three feet of a window and visible from the street, sidewalk or other public place; and (3) "place of business" identification signs.

The intent of sign regulations is to ensure that signs relate physically and visually to their location; that signs reflect the character and unique nature of the business; that signs do not hide, damage, or obstruct the architectural elements of the building; that signs be oriented toward and promote a pedestrian environment; and that the products or services offered be the focus, rather than the signs.

a. Window Signs and Hanging Signs.

Generally, painted or vinyl letters in storefront windows and single-faced, flat surfaced painted wood signs are preferred. Extruded aluminum or plastics are discouraged and may not be allowed. Window signs shall not cover a large portion of the window so as to be out of scale with the window, storefront, or facade.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards #9 and 10

MM/SC/DB/JP 8:0:0 Motion carried.

122017.4 NOMINATION

122017.41 P.J. Sullivan House

1632 15th Avenue

Ms. Doherty passed out the property owner's photos and noted that two additional letters of public comment were received that day via email. She distributed hardcopies to the board members.

Applicant Presentation: made by Jim Castanes and Jordan Cowhig.

Jim Castanes said the house was built in 1898 and has both heritage and integrity. He read from a letter submitted by Marvin Anderson, (in DON file) which states the house appears to have been the first single family residence designed by Josenhans & Allen and shows their mastery of the Queen Anne style. He said the house is well-composed and carefully-resolved, and that the Sullivan house is an outstanding example of the Queen Anne style, and an outstanding work of the designers Timotheus Josenhans & Norris Allan. He said this is one of the few residences by the firm that survives today. He said it is an easily identifiable building in the neighborhood and a reminder of a time when streetcars encouraged relocation from the city center to new neighborhoods.

Mr. Castanes reported that Patrick Sullivan owned Queen City Boiler Works which was destroyed in the Great Fire of 1889; the company was almost wiped out. The Gold Rush brought lots of work and Sullivan invested in this property with the money he made. He reported that Josenhans & Allan worked together 15 years; the Sullivan House was one of their first single family residences. He said the firm designed Parrington Hall at University of Washington; the Marion Building; the Polson residence. He said they embraced the Queen Anne Style and featured turrets.

He noted significant events in the City: 1887 cable rail; 1889 Great Fire; 1890 cable, rail, Madison rail; 1897 Gold Rush; 1898 P. J. Sullivan House; 1901 Pike Regrade. He provided context of the house in the neighborhood and conducted a 'virtual' walk around the house.

Ms. Durham asked about changes made to the building.

Mr. Castanes responded, saying that an outside staircase was added, glazing was added behind columns to enclose porch, gable face changed, windows replaced, corner column missing.

Ms. Patterson asked when the shake siding was installed.

Mr. Castanes didn't know but said that other sides may have old growth cedar siding. He said that although the window sashes are not original, some trim is original, and all original openings remain.

Ms. Barker noted that the front entry stair treads are gone but the cheek walls are still there.

Mr. Castanes said just the treads are gone; if you put treads in and take out the porch's glass enclosure, it would be like the original.

Ms. Patterson asked if any leaded glass windows remain.

Ms. Castanes said no.

Ms. Barker asked at what point does restoration trigger fire code and sprinklers.

Ms. Doherty said that a proposed substantial alteration could trigger it.

Ms. Barker asked if landmark designation would allow a waiver.

Ms. Doherty said there is potential relief from some aspects of the building code and energy code for Landmarks when historic fabric is being preserved.

Mr. Hodgins asked about the neighborhood context when the house was built and if there are other homes the same age in the area.

Mr. Castanes said the Gaslight Inn was built in the teens. He said that other houses are later than that.

Mr. Ketcherside asked if he reviewed any maps – fire or real estate – to see this house in its historic context.

Mr. Castanes said no, there was not much around on maps.

Owner Presentation:

Peter Triandaflou explained the house is owned by an estate; he is the attorney for the estate. He said he was attending the meeting voluntarily, and was not being paid. He said the property is on the market and the realtor is in the audience.

Ann Thorson, executor of the estate, reported that positive public comments were based on seeing decades-old pictures on the realtor's website. She said she has heard opinions of people who know the house, 300 people who live and work in Capitol Hill. She opposed nomination and said the house is dilapidated, a mess, an eyesore, and many want it torn down. She read from some of the comments from her petition (in DON file). She said that Josenhans and Allan designed 15 buildings and none of them are landmarks; three have been torn down and others, such as the Marion and Drexel are in excellent condition and provide example of architect's work, but are not landmarks. She noted the property at 103 Highland Drive, the Polson House. She said that is a nice house and is not landmarked, so

why this one? She said the subject house is not in the city's survey and inventory database. She said 37 houses surveyed in Capitol Hill are in her handout to the Board, these are not landmarks. She said this house is not mentioned in the survey. She went through numbers of houses listed as good or outstanding, and said that other houses provide better examples than the subject property.

She said the house has no integrity. A new door was added; the porch was enclosed in two sections; all windows have been replaced; steps have been removed; shingles have been replaced; interior has been gutted; and there was fire damage in 1955. She said her aunt owned it since 1968; there have been no important events, no well-known persons or activities associated with the house. She said the rents there are low and there is no money to repair it, which is why it is dilapidated. She researched the history and said there is nothing. She said the house is not in the survey and there is no reason it should be listed. She said her handyman estimated it would be over \$1,000,000 to bring it back to minimally acceptable condition. She said she had no expectation other than to see it demolished for development. She said insurance documentation shows the rundown condition of the house, and said it is not qualified for a preferred home policy. She said it is an eyesore in the neighborhood and preservation is not warranted. She read an email from Ellen Mirro (the Johnson Partnership) noting the house is in poor condition and has problem with integrity.

Ms. Thorson said she tried to market the house for restoration and received two offers; one withdrew, and one declined because the house was not feasible for restoration. She said she does not have the money to bring it back and the City won't give her money to do that. She said that if it becomes a landmark it would stand dilapidated until it collapsed. She said animal charities will benefit from the sale of the house. She read a selection of comments from her petition about the house: Steve from the Gaslight Inn said it does not meet the requirements to be a landmark. She said that Eileen called it an eyesore, Sue said it is falling down, Ralph said it is an eyesore, Kurt said it is falling down, Pam said to create something more sympathetic to the surroundings; tear it down, not significant structure, not a landmark, eyesore, dump, eyesore, not suitable for landmark, etc.

She said her aunt loved Seattle and wanted what would benefit the City. She said they should develop and tax the land; provide high density living, benefit animal charities. She said to remove it from the neighborhood, or cheapen the process – it will stand until it collapses. She said it is impossible to understand how this was nominated. She said Jim Castanes (the applicant) does not want the property to be developed, that he wants to preserve his view, and said Mr. Castanes has asked the handyman to trim the existing trees for this reason.

Mr. Triandafilou provided a handout with landmarked properties in close vicinity and said they are exceptional properties: Gaslight Inn, 1907, Cooper House, 1904, Galbraith House, 1904. He said there are a large number of old properties – homes and commercial properties, many in the vicinity and many in the Queen

Anne Style. He said this property is not deserving of landmark status, it is in poor condition and has had significant alterations, and the inside is totally altered. He said that two structures were torn down – Weatherford, built in 1904, passed nomination but was not designated and now there is an apartment building there; 1523 E. Madison made the survey and it was torn down and now there is an apartment building there. He said this house is not worthy of landmark status and it was not nominated by the owner. He said the firm that designed this house also built the Polson House which is intact inside and out, and is on the survey yet not a landmark.

Ms. Thorson said that Mr. Castenes lives in the adjacent building and wants to preserve his view. She said 806 14th Ave E. is a better example of the Queen Anne style. She said there are other better examples of Queen Anne styles, hundreds of Queen Anne properties in good shape; this house is not deserving.

Ms. Barker noted the difficulty of being the executor of an estate.

Ms. Thorson said her aunt died in 2010.

Mr. Hodgins asked what Ms. Thorson meant by saying she is a preservationist.

Ms. Thorson said she believes there are buildings that should be preserved.

Ms. Hodgins asked about “bracing” on the back of the building.

Ms. Thorson said her handyman built it as a means to access the roof and gutters for maintenance.

Public Comment:

Marvin Anderson submitted a letter (in DON file). He explained that he worked on the renovation/rehabilitation of the Polson House. He said he documented 70 buildings by Josenhans & Allen and over half of them have been demolished. He said there were an important architectural firm, one of ten in the city directory at the time; this was their first house. He said it is a great example of the Queen Anne style and one of the few remaining houses; this and the Polson house. He said a bigger house was torn down; this was one of the early houses in the neighborhood.

Erin Blakeney said she lives around the corner. She said she has admired the house, and it has much potential. She toured the house and had it inspected; she couldn't afford it – the pricing was set for a developer and she couldn't get financing. She said the asking price is \$2.2 million. She said the house is unique and was one of the first large houses in the neighborhood. She said the house is in better shape than Ms. Thorson says it is; it needs the roof replaced and restoration of the exterior. She said the glass enclosure on the porch has actually protected

the siding on the front of the house. She said there are five apartment units in the house; four are rented and provide affordable housing. She said the house should be preserved and restored, and another structure can likely be built on the lot. She said that universally there is a lot of love and support for the house. She sympathized with the seller and noted the fiduciary responsibility. She said you can't replace and rebuild this house. She asked that it should be protected and not sold to the highest bidder.

Chris Joyce, Sea Shepherds, explained their mission and said they are one of the beneficiaries of the property sale, and need the funds. He said he grew up in an old house and appreciates preservation. He said this one doesn't meet the standards.

Steve Hall, Friends of Belltown, said it is an interesting building. He said that condition is not the same as integrity. He said the house was built in 1898 and reminds him of the Wayne Apartments in Belltown; Criterion C was met there. He supported nomination. He said the windows were changed but that is reversible.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, said she met with Ms. Thorson. She said she understands the situation and noted it is a difficult job to be executor. She said there is a difference between condition, "eyesore", "rat trap", and integrity. She noted Erin Blakeney's comments and her desire to buy the house, and Marvin Anderson's letter about the architects. She said that Historic Seattle owns a Josenhans & Allen building. She said Historic Seattle has purchased dilapidated houses; they rehabilitated them and provided affordable housing. She said on one property they have a preservation easement which stated that if designated as a landmark the easement would be removed; clarifying that is the only reason they haven't sought landmark designation. She said there are so few of these types of houses left; there are only 15 left. She said this is the oldest, and has some integrity issues. She thanked the applicant.

Devon Reed said she is a frequent guest at the property and that she opposes nomination. She said the house is not in great shape and the interior is not historic. She said the building is covered with blackberries and she expects it to be torn down.

Ms. Thorson said she had talked to many people – over 300 – who live in the neighborhood and have to live with it. She said there is no love or support for this house. No one supported nomination; all opposed it. It should be taken down.

Board Discussion:

Ms. McKernan said the condition is suffering but the architectural integrity is undeniable. She said it is exemplary pre-1900 Queen Ann architecture. She said

it has distinct visible characteristics of the style. She said there are so few extant examples of work by Josenhans & Allen. She supported nomination

Ms. Doherty explained that the city's database is a collection of numerous survey projects that have occurred over time. It is not comprehensive inventory of the entire city.

Ms. McKernan said it is hard to compare the subject property to 806 14th Avenue which has been restored and this one has not.

Mr. Ketcherside said the board has to follow strict guidelines and the Ordinance, and set aside comments outside their purview. He supported nomination and said there is a difference between condition and integrity although condition can get so bad that it becomes an integrity issue. He said he wanted more information from both parties about things affecting integrity. He said for nomination/designation the board considers the worthiness of the building and not the burden on the owner, or benefits of public, outcomes of property, safety, or motivation for nomination. He said the board doesn't consider if this is the most worthy property. He said a majority of properties considered are endangered. He said rarely is it clear. He commended Marvin Anderson's letter and appreciated the early research on the architects. He said there are so many important architects in history and there is not a lot of information on them. He said much history is available digitally; he said new research is needed. He said he wanted more information about the development of the immediate neighborhood and surrounding area and how it relates to the time of construction. He noted the construction of the Madison Cable car, construction, growth, panic, Gold Rush, etc. He said good review will include real estate maps and fire insurance maps which have outlines of buildings. He said early profiteers of the Gold Rush made money and built homes. He supported nomination, noting criteria D and possibly E, noting Mr. Anderson's letter. He did not support including the interior. He was interested to know if the house was included in other historic surveys.

Ms. Barker supported nomination. She said Mr. Joyce was lucky to live on the east coast where there are very old houses; they are lucky the house was saved. She said Sullivan was proud of the money they made. She said the bones of the house are there. She said the asymmetry is classic Queen Anne, as are the turret and wrap around porch; she said it is all evident. She supported nomination and seconded Mr. Ketcherside's request for further research.

Ms. Johnson echoed Mr. Ketcherside's comments; she said buildings come to nomination in lots of ways. She said board members have to put blinders on and review the building as it is. She said the changes are reversible but significant, and said she was struggling with the integrity issue.

Ms. Durham said she does not take the decision lightly, and explained this is a two-step process to gain more information and clarification. She said the board is

here to consider the standards and whether the house meets them. She questioned if the house embodies the Queen Anne style and noted there are significant deterioration concerns; she said none are irreversible. She said the bones and essence are Queen Anne and she cannot set that aside. She noted the age and rarity of the pre-1900 house and said it is important to consider.

Ms. Patterson supported nomination and said it meets Criterion D. She said it embodies the Queen Anne style. She noted the difference between integrity and condition. She noted the porch has been enclosed, shingle siding added, missing leaded glass windows. She said it has the Queen Anne character – asymmetrical façade, dominant front façade, gables, turrets, round and pyramidal shape. She said there are integrity issues but the major character defining elements are still there.

Mr. Hodgins supported nomination, but said the challenge is integrity. He said he has questions in line with Mr. Ketcherside's. He said an 1898 house is a rarity. He said knowing what else be left in the neighborhood from that era is important. He said the evolution of the Queen Anne style house in Seattle would be good to know.

Mr. Kiel did not support nomination. He said the forms are there, but it doesn't have integrity.

Mr. Ketcherside noted the reversibility of the changes.

Mr. Kiel said the grandeur of the house is lost, and he noted the porch enclosure and loss of windows. He said in its current condition there is no integrity.

Board members said they need to go look at the property.

Ms. Doherty said that you can see three sides of the house from the right-of-way.

Ms. Thorson said the Board members can walk up to the house and look at it, she wants them to see it.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the P.J. Sullivan House at 1632 15th Avenue for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the site and the exterior of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for February 7, 2018; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle

MM/SC/RK/DB 6:2:0 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel and Ms. Johnson opposed.

122017.5 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

122017.52 Sheridan Apartments
2011 Fifth Avenue
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt explained the request for a four-month extension for the Sheridan Apartments and the Griffin Building.

Public Comment:

Steve Hall, Friends of Historic Belltown, said they submitted comment about tower spacing as it relates to the landmarks.

Mr. Kiel asked if there is precedence for combined review.

Ms. Sodt said that other development is happening at the same time so that is considered.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Sheridan apartments, 2011 Fifth Avenue, for four months.

MM/SC/DB/JP 8:0:0 Motion carried.

122017.53 Griffin Building
2005 Fifth Avenue
Request for extension

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Griffin Building, 2005 Fifth Avenue, for four months.

MM/SC/DB/JP 8:0:0 Motion carried.

122017.51 Galbraith House
1729 17th Avenue

Ms. Doherty explained that the Galbraith House is located at 1729 17th Avenue (17th and East Howell). The property was designated in 2005, including the site and the exterior of the house.

She directed the Board members to the staff memo which outlined in detail all that had transpired since the designation, including the recent due diligence performed by the City Historic Preservation Officer, the Landmarks Board Coordinator, and a subcommittee of Board members including the appointed representatives for Finance and Real Estate, and the two Architects.

She said that the analysis reflected numerous scenarios to rehabilitate the house, and looked at additional development opportunities on the landmarked parcel, including relocating the house closer to the corner to maximize the developable footprint beside and behind the house. She said that the initial data was submitted by the property owner's representatives, and was later supplemented by additional research through consultation of the Landmarks staff with other parties, and the individual analysis provided by members of the subcommittee.

An assessment was made of the factors to be considered in SMC 25.12.590, and it was determined that no development scenario could yield a rate of return necessary to attract capital for investment.

Ms. Doherty said that the Landmarks staff recommends that no controls be imposed on the Galbraith House, and directed them to the signed agreement.

Mr. Hodgins explained that he looked at the submitted financial information and considered the same scenarios, but used current construction numbers and a current market value for the property. He said that a "no controls" scenario was the only one that could attract outside capital.

Mr. Kiel agreed with Mr. Hodgins' conclusion; it is unfortunate.

Ms. Johnson said it is challenging to achieve a reasonable rate of return.

Public Comment:

Steve Hall, Friends of Historic Belltown, said he is afraid it will happen in Belltown. He said historic resources are important; EIS should be considered and SEPA may apply.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, said it is not easy and most are not happy with this. She said it is a dangerous precedent. She said there are so few properties. She said with current market value, the same thing will happen. She said the building was designated in 2005 and it boggles her mind that the process has taken this long. She did not support the recommendation for no controls.

Action: I move to approve the Controls and Incentives agreement for the Galbraith House, 1729 17th Avenue.

MM/SC/GH/KJ 7:1:0 Motion carried. Ms. Barker opposed.

122017.6 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator