APPROVED

BOARD OF STATE HISTORY MEETING
January 21, 2016
Rio Grande Depot, Board Room, 300 S. Rio Grande Street, Salt Lake City

ATTENDANCE:
Dina Blaes
Deanne Matheny
Rob White
Patty Timbimboo-Madsen
Steve Barth
David Rich Lewis
Ken Gallacher
John D'Arcy
Steve Olsen
David Richardson

EXCUSED:
Yvette Donosso

DEPARTMENT OF HERITAGE AND ARTS:
Julie Fisher
Brian Somers
Jill Flygare
Jim Grover

PUBLIC:
Julie Wilks
Courtney Winsviess
Alex Case
Mallie Himble
Michaela Oktay
Amy Thompson
Kirk Huffaker
Angie Abram
Jeff Siversen
Ebelina Valadez

DIVISION OF STATE HISTORY STAFF:
Brad Westwood
Kevin Fayles
Jed Rogers
Holly George
Chris Merritt
Cory Jensen
Alycia Aldrich

Roger Roper
Lori Hunsaker
Arie Leeflang
Christina Epperson
Doug Misner

ATTORNEY GENERALS OFFICE:
Thom Roberts

WELCOME
Dina Blaes called the meeting to order and welcomed the Board members in attendance and thanked them for their service and invited them to get some lunch. She informed the Board members of some general housekeeping items for the Rio Grande Depot and the meeting.

Dina introduced Brad Westwood, Director, Utah State History to conduct the Division of State History's quarterly program accomplishments PowerPoint presentation. Brad thanked Dina and recognized her as Chair at her first Board meeting serving in this capacity.

NOVEMBER 2105 – JANUARY 2016 STATE HISTORY PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS
Brad Westwood presented administration's quarterly accomplishments. He then introduced the Division's Program Coordinators to present their program's quarterly accomplishments. Roger Roper, Chris Merritt, Doug Misner, Holly George, and Kevin Fayles briefed the Board on the great work their programs were able to achieve during the last quarter.

ACTION ITEMS

APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 29, 2015 BOARD OF STATE HISTORY MEETING MINUTES
Dina Blaes noted a correction needed to the last paragraph; type appears to be missing and should be added. Rob White made a motion to approve the October 29, 2015 Board of State History meeting minutes, with the correction noted. John D'Arcy seconded the motion and it passed with unanimous vote.

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES TRAINING
Cory Jensen presented training on the process required to remove a historic property from the National Register. He also provided a link to a National Park Service training website that walks through a historic building.

APPROVAL OF NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS
Cory Jensen presented the following National Register of Historic Places request for removal and nominations:

Hotel Albert – Request for Removal
Due to the demolition of the hotel, Cory informed the Board that the State Historic Preservation Office is requesting the Hotel Albert's National Register of Historic Places designation be removed from the Register.

No motion is needed, presented for board member's information.

Smoot Dairy Farmhouse – tabled from October 29th Board of State History Retreat, due to eligible additional significance criteria
Significance Summary:
The Smoot Dairy Farmhouse, constructed in 1936, is a 1½-story Tudor Revival-style brick cottage. The farmhouse is locally significant under Criterion A in the area of Agriculture as the only surviving building associated with the Smoot Dairy. Although the period of historic significance begins in 1936, when the house was constructed, the history of the property begins in 1935, when the Smoot family obtained the land and transferred a herd of dairy cows to Centerville. Until a devastating fire in 1963, the Smoot Dairy was one of the largest privately owned dairy farms in Utah. The farmhouse, which also served as an office, was one of only two buildings to survive the fire. Within a year of the fire, with aid from their Centerville neighbors, the Smoot family built the most modern dairy operation in the state. The period of significance ends in 1964 with the phoenix-like rise of the Smoot Dairy. During the historic period, the Smoot Dairy sold milk on site and made deliveries to an estimated 2,000 households in Centerville and the surrounding communities. The Smoot Dairy provided dairy products to numerous restaurants and hotels in the larger cities of the Wasatch Front, and was the regional dairy provider for United Airlines for thirty-two years. In addition, Edgar Smoot raised prizewinning pure-bred Jersey stock on loan to breeders throughout the western United States. The farmhouse is the only extant historic resource representing the Smoot family's important contributions to the Centerville community.

The Smoot Dairy Farmhouse is also locally significant under Criterion C in the area of Architecture as a rare example of an English Tudor Revival-style period cottage with a dual purpose of residence and office associated with the Smoot Dairy. The property meets the registration requirements of the Multiple Property Submission, *Historic Resources of Centerville, Davis County, Utah,* under the associated historic context "City Development, 1911-1940s."The Smoot Dairy Farmhouse represents a small number of English-style period cottages built in Centerville during the style's height of popularity for rural farmhouses in the mid-1930s. The Smoot Farmhouse has many of the character defining features of a Tudor Revival-style cottage: asymmetrical façade, steeply pitched roof, casement windows, and polychromatic brick. However, the property primarily derives its architectural significance in its design as the public face of the Smoot Dairy property, with a wide façade along the main transportation route and a unique walkout basement that connected the house-office to the working dairy. The Smoot Dairy Farmhouse has good historic integrity and is a contributing resource in its north Centerville neighborhood.

Board members discussed the nomination.

David Richardson made a motion to send a letter of support for the Smoot Dairy Farmhouse to the National Register of Historic Places. Steve Barth seconded the motion and it passed with unanimous support.

Hovenweep National Monument – Non-voting review
Cory informed the Board that when a National Monument is created, it is automatically listed on the National Register of Historic Places. This is a non-voting review for support of the submission of additional documentation.
Significance Summary:
The Hovenweep National Monument Archeological District is eligible for nomination at the national level of significance under Criteria A, C and D in the areas of Exploration/Settlement, Religion, Architecture, Prehistoric Archeology, Historic Aboriginal Archeology, and Historic Non-Aboriginal Archeology. The District also is nominated by implementing Criteria Consideration A: Religious Properties since many of the prehistoric structures were religious-use resources that hold significant historic and architectural affiliation. Regional contexts contain information that supports this nomination, specifically those prepared by the Colorado Council of Professional Archeologists: *Colorado Prehistory: A Context for the Southern Colorado River Basin* (Lipe, Varien, and Wilshusen 1999), and *Colorado History: A Context for Historical Archaeology* (Church et al. 2007). Another document that was useful in preparing this nomination is the historical overview of the Canyons of the Ancients National Monument (Horn 2004).

The historic resources in Colorado meet the registration requirements outlined in the *Great Pueblo Period of the McElmo Drainage Unit, A.D. 1075-1300* National Register of Historic Places MPDF.

The first period of significance for Hovenweep spans from the Archaic through ancestral Puebloan Pueblo III period (roughly 6,000 B.C. to A.D. 1290). This period of significance represents the on-going and persistent human adaptation to slightly changing climatic conditions on Cajon Mesa and within the McElmo Drainage Unit. Evidence has been found at Hovenweep that people have used or occupied the land multiple times during this period of significance in a variety of ways, utilizing mobile hunting and gathering strategies at times, and employing a horticultural and agricultural strategy at other times.

The second period of significance is A.D. 1874, when photographer W.H. Jackson first publicly used the term Hovenweep (a Ute word), to 1962, when the current boundary of Hovenweep was established, thus ending a period of time when multiple ethnic groups used the land to raise livestock. The period that spans 1290 to 1874 A.D. is not being considered as part of the Period of Significance because use of Hovenweep during this period of time cannot be adequately supported. Aboriginal Ute and Navajo were establishing habitation and grazing grounds in the Hovenweep area prior to and during this second period of significance. This lifeway and struggle for boundaries was further complicated by the arrival of Euro-American ranchers and settlers. Hovenweep contains multiple sites that include features (e.g. burnt

hogans, sweat lodges, ephemeral brush structures, and brush corrals), artifacts (historic tin and glass items), and inscriptions suggesting use of the area by herders representative of all of these ethnic groups. As Wilshusen and Towner state (1999:353-369), the post-Puebloan occupation period represents a time of cultural groups expanding into an "empty" landscape, with resultant competition and political and social change. Ultimately, the land was withdrawn from grazing by all of these cultural groups and was set aside as a protected archeological resource. Historic inscriptions found at the site, and as stated above, the public use of the term "Hovenweep" by 1874 A.D., was the basis for setting the beginning of the second period of significance at 1874 A.D. Hovenweep National Monument was established in 1923, and the period from 1923 through 1962 represents a period of time when grazing of the land was gradually phased out and the land was managed under the principles established by the NPS 1916 Organic Act. Hence, the second period of significance concludes at the year 1962 A.D.

Rob White made a motion to support the submission of additional documentation of the Hovenweep National Monument to the National Register of Historic Places. Steve Barth seconded, and all members were in support.

Warehouse District - Boundary Increase and Additional Documentation
Significance Summary:
The original Warehouse District was listed on the National Register in 1982 and included 16 buildings with a somewhat undefined period of significance from approximately 1890 to 1927. The original district boundary encompasses a roughly 1-block area straddling 200 South between 300 West and 400 West in Salt Lake City. Of the 16 buildings in the original district, 15 were determined to be contributing resources, and one was listed as a non-contributing resource. As noted previously, the additional information presented in this boundary increase nomination documents that the previously identified non-contributing resource (358 West 200 South) has been demolished, and that two of the previously listed contributing resources—357 West 200 South and 380 West 200 South—are now considered non-contributing resources due to significant physical alteration subsequent to the listing of the original district. The new boundaries are roughly bounded by I-15, 50 South, West Temple Street, 300 West, and 1000 South.

The areas of significance for the existing/original district are not well-defined in the MRA record that served as the basis for the original Warehouse District listing, nor does the MRA establish any defined contexts for the district. The MRA, which described several potential small districts, notes the areas of significance for the MRA itself as architecture, commerce, industry, politics/government, religion, transportation, and "other" without specifically identifying the relevant themes for the Warehouse District. However, the MRA describes the original Warehouse District as being significant as "a well-preserved cluster of warehouse buildings that convey a sense of the impact of the coming of the railroad in Salt Lake City." This statement effectively indicates the district was considered eligible for listing under Criteria A and C. The additional information provided here for the boundary increase more clearly defines the areas of significance applicable to both the existing district and the additional properties within the

expanded boundary. It also expands the period of significance for the expanded district from the original ca. 1890 to 1927 to 1869 to 1966.

The Warehouse District Boundary Increase is also significant under Criteria A and C. As noted, the period of significance for the expanded district is extended from the relatively narrow period represented by the original district and begins in 1869 with the completion of the Transcontinental Railroad, which greatly influenced the development of the area, and ends in 1966, the current end of the historical period (i.e., 50 years ago). Under Criterion A, the district has local significance in the areas of Social History, Commerce, Industry, and Transportation for the direct association of the district with the railroad industry and the commercial and residential development it spurred along the west side of Salt Lake City. With the completion of the Transcontinental Railroad came an immediate proliferation of other mainlines and spur lines to connect the communities and industrial centers of the West to the rest of the nation. Two of these mainline systems—the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad (D&RGW) and the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR)—extended through what was, at the time, the western fringe of Salt Lake City. Shortly after, the D&RGW established regional maintenance shops and a rail yard for their Utah subdivision in the west Salt Lake City area, in the heart of the Warehouse District Boundary Increase. The UPRR also established a rail yard just beyond the northern edge of the district. The railroad mainlines are included in the district as contributing archaeological resources. The presence of the shops and yards drew many immigrants to the area in search of work. A large number of these immigrants had countries of origin that were quite different from the predominant northern European ancestry of Salt Lake City's earliest settlers. The ethnic minority immigrants settled on the west side of the city, near the rail yard and maintenance shops in which they labored. The neighborhood became one of the largest and most diverse ethnic enclaves in the city. A web of railroad spur lines appeared in the area as commercial interests took advantage of the proximity of the mainline railroads to establish manufacturing and distribution (warehouse) sites with easy and immediate rail access to both regional and national markets. Although the manner of transporting industrial goods and freight shifted in the years after World War II and the rise of long-haul trucking, manufacturing and distribution remained a major land use in the district. Railroading also retains its influence on the development and use of the area with a commuter rail hub and rail yards still present within the district.

The district is also significant at the local level under Criterion C for its architectural integrity and its reflection of the four major periods of development influenced by the railroad industry and its role in the economy of the area. The building stock of the area represents both high-style and vernacular architectural trends in Utah and stands as a testament to the economic differences of the commercial interests that could invest in architect-designed buildings and the laborers who could not. It also reflects the largely utilitarian nature of the freight and distribution industry, where investments in ornate architecture yielded to functional efficiency. As a collective body of architectural resources, the buildings of the district illustrate the shifting focus of the area from an initially balanced distribution of both residential and commercial/industrial properties to one of predominantly commercial/industrial uses. Small, isolated pockets of historical dwellings are scattered throughout the central and northern

portions of the district, while the southern portion of the district is the only area to have retained its historical dwellings in any large concentration. Additionally, the relatively large number of historical warehouse buildings compared to other areas of Salt Lake City lends a unique composition to the architectural make-up of the district and lend the district its name.

Board members discussed the nomination and the differences between local and historic districts.

Rob White made a motion to send a letter of support for the Warehouse District to the National Register of Historic Places. David Richardson seconded the motion. John D'Arcy opposed the motion. The motion passed with majority vote.

Roberta Sugden House
Statement of Significance:
The Roberta Sugden House, constructed in 1955, is a one-story International Style modern residence located in Salt Lake City, Utah. The building has statewide significance under Criterion C in the area of Architecture for its unique and distinctive design and association with prominent Salt Lake City architect John W. Sugden III. The property also contains a John Sugden-designed studio/apartment built in 1964 and occupied by John Sugden between 1964 and 1969. The period of significance dates from construction in 1955 through 1969, when Roberta Sugden sold the house and John Sugden moved from the studio. The Roberta Sugden House is an excellent and rare example of a mid-century International Style residential design in Utah. The Sugden House has the horizontality, minimal and visible structural components, glazed curtain walls and modern interior elements that closely reflect the influence of the International Style of architecture and found in architect Philip Johnson's Glass House (1949) and Mies van der Rohe's Farnsworth House (1951).

John Sugden designed eighteen residences during his architectural career. He designed only two residences which so strongly reflect the Miesian ideal of simplified forms and transparent boundaries: the Sugden House and the Dev Jennings House. The Sugden House is one of his earliest and is the best known residential example in the state of early modernist expression of structure and space. John Sugden was one of only a few Salt Lake City architects who designed International Style-influenced buildings. He was one of three Salt Lake architects who practiced modern International Style residential architecture, and was the architect whose residences most closely reflected Miesian-influenced International Style residential design.

Architect John Sugden III was born in 1922 in Chicago, Illinois. John grew up in Salt Lake City, Utah, served in World War II, attended architecture school and worked for prominent architect Mies van der Rohe and city and regional planner Ludwig Hilberseimer. John graduated with B.S. and M.S. degrees in Architecture from Illinois Institute of Technology in 1950 and 1952 respectively. In 1952, John Sugden returned to Salt Lake City and began practicing and later teaching architecture. John Sugden's residential and commercial architecture was almost exclusively based on the International Modern Style and the architecture of Mies van der Rohe.

John Sugden has been identified as one of the founding "Salt Lake Seven" modern architects by Salt Lake Modern and the Utah Heritage Foundation.

David Richardson made a motion to send a letter of support for the Roberta Sugden house to the National Register of Historic Places. John D'Arcy seconded the motion and it passed with unanimous support.

Dina thanked the members of the public in attendance today for the National Register Nominations for their time and efforts in preparing these nominations.

Due to time constraints with presenter's schedules, the following discussion items were moved up in the agenda.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

PROPOSED CENTER FOR HISTORY, HERITAGE AND ARTS

Dina Blaes introduced Executive Director Julie Fisher and Deputy Director Brian Somers. Brad Westwood gave a briefing on the history of the proposed Center for History, Heritage and Arts and informed the Board that a steering committee has been established under the direction of the Department of Heritage and Arts. The committee is working to assemble all the aspects, and determining appropriate consulting work that will need to be undertaken for this facility. Brad appreciates the Board's support and expertise for this important project.

Julie Fisher informed the Board that Brad and DHA are also working in partnership with the new Director of the Division of Arts and Museums, Gay Cookson. Her experience with fundraising and arts will be very beneficial to this project. She hopes you notice that the name of the proposed facility has been changed to the Center, versus the Museum, after the valuable feedback from several Board members. She encouraged Board members to continue to send their input.

Brian Somers informed the Board that he has been working closely with the RDA and making good progress. They will be starting road construction this summer and are close to concluding the land trades between the State and DHA. He shared their street proposals with the Board and how the proposed Center would fit into the area. Two parcels are under contract and a third is in process to be put out for RFP.

With the limited time allotted on the agenda for this item, Dina Blaes asked Julie and Brian if they would provide further information on the proposed Center at the next meeting. This agenda item will be included on the next agenda and given more time.

BUDGET BRIEFING FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF HERITAGE AND ARTS

Dina Blaes commented that she has received several requests from Board members requesting information on the Division's budgets. Jill Flygare, DHA Financial Officer and Jim Grover, DHA Assistant Financial Operator were asked by Dina and Brad to provide a briefing to the Board regarding the Division's budgets, transparency and accountability. This briefing was asked to be given at the 30,000 foot level, with information on additional resources available if Board members want to know more.

Jill thanked Dina and the Board for the opportunity to speak to the Board regarding DHA and State History's budgets. She informed the Board that DHA is only .2% of the state's FY 16 budget of $14.1 billion dollars. DHA's FY 16 budget is $27.8 million dollars for all of the Divisions under the Department. State History's FY 16 budget is $3.2 million, including federal funds. Funds are appropriated by the legislature and determined what they can be spent for. They cannot be moved around. Funds are classified as general fund, federal funds, and dedicated credits. The majority of funds for State History are general fund, then federal funds, which are even more restricted and have to be reported back to federal government. Most of State History's expenses are for personnel. Current expenses are 17% of the Division's budget and include office supplies, computers, phones, fleet vehicles, postage and other operating expenses.

Jim Grover discussed the budget process and cycle that they undertake each year. Budget preparation is done internally in the fall. If asking for any funds above the base budget, a very robust case must be to the Governor's Office. The Governor's Office begins their budget process in November. In December DAH receives the Governor's budget, which is all that we can ask to be appropriated by the Legislature. In January we have the opportunity to defend our base budget appropriations to the Legislature. We are then given an additional opportunity to come back and respond and testify to our budget needs. In the Spring and Summer the budget is implemented and a review operations and creation of case studies is done.

Julie commented that last year, the Legislature was asking us to contemplate a 2% cut to our base budget. They met with our Business Economics Appropriations Committee yesterday and fortunately that is not the case this year, however there is less one-time funding this year, and virtually no increased on-going base funds that will be available to request.

Dina informed the Board that the budget process is defined by Statue. Jill and Jim provided handouts to the Board with the information they have discussed today, and additional financial resources that Board members may want to access. Dina inquired if there have been any significant changes in funding requests or funding of projects requested in this year's budgets? Jim responded that there is nothing significant. Julie commented that the Governor's Office and the Legislature has tasked state agencies with doing a lot of internal prospective, by

looking at existing resources and making sure we are using them as efficiently as possible. Dina reminded the Board that this is policy making Board and we need to be mindful of budget processes as we establish any division policies. Brian Somers informed the Board that the creation of the proposed Center for History, Heritage and Arts will need to follow budget processes, not only for the building of the Center, but for sustaining it, including personnel.

ACTION ITEMS CONTINUED

DATA ACCESS POLICY

It was decided to postpone the review and approval of the Data Access policy until further internal considerations can be held with staff and the Attorney General's Office. It will be presented at next meeting.

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES DUE FOR FIVE YEAR REVIEW

Alycia Aldrich presented R455-6, State Register for Historic Resources and Archaeological Sites, and R455-9, Board of State History as the Cultural Sites Review Committee Review Board to the Board. The Division of Administrative Rules requires each Division Administrative Rule to be reviewed every five years for any comments received and justification to be continued. Division staff and administration have reviewed both rules and find they are both needed and should be continued. All statues cited in the rules are active. The Board reviewed both rules.

David Richardson made a motion to renew R455-6, State Register for Historic Resources and Archaeological Sites, and R455-9, Board of State History as the Cultural Sites Review Committee Review Board. Steve Barth seconded the motion, and it passed with unanimous support.

TRAINING AND EDUCATION POLICY

Dina Blaes announced Lori Hunsaker's departure from State History tomorrow. The division is sorry to see her go, but pleased we get this opportunity today to wish her well in her future Archaeologist position with the Bureau of Land Management.

Lori presented the division's new Training and Education policy to the Board. The policy solidifies what the division does in terms of education and put it into a more firmly mandated role for State History and establishes processes for each program's educational efforts. She gave a briefing on the establishment in 2013-14 of the Utah History Day program and other educational programs the Division undertakes. This policy will help protect the division and give them more opportunities to evaluate partnership potentials and outreach and help build the education efforts of state history and maximize state resources. It was one of the division's 2015 strategic goals. The Board thanked Lori for her great work on this policy.

David Richardson made a motion to approve the Training and Education policy. John D'Arcy seconded the motion, and it passed with unanimous support.

Brad Westwood also thanked Lori for her tremendous service to State History and the State.

DISCUSSION ITEMS CONTINUED

STATE HISTORY FUNDRAISING

Brad Westwood and Kevin Fayles briefed the Board on the Division's fundraising efforts and the authority by with the Utah State Historical Society has to raise funds, and the Legislative requirements for fundraising. A fundraising plan is currently being developed and will be sent to Board members in the next month for their review. The plan contains two tracks; the first is to explore the Center for History, Heritage and Arts; and the second is for the division's outreach events, including the Utah State Historical Society's *Utah Historical Quarterly* May 13th educational symposium, the division's annual conference, other regional *UHQ* events, Preservation and Archaeology Month, and other division program events. The Board was encouraged to assist and support these fundraising efforts. A Friends of State History group was suggested, especially to support the building of the proposed Center for History, Heritage and Arts. Brad commented that that fundraising committee would be run through DHA, not the Historical Society. Brad also briefed the Board on the Legislative requirements the Division and Department have to follow. If too successful on general fundraising, the Legislature could cut the Division's general base budget funding. Fundraising should have a specific project mission and not ongoing and carefully considered in how we present it to the Legislature.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COMMITTEES, BOARD AND CHAIRPERSONS

Brad Westwood provided a history of the Board of State History and the numerous of duties of the Board. Board Chairs have previously appointed committees to interact, research and provide recommendations to the Division and the Board for the final vetting and approval. Dina Blaes has proposed changes to the committees established in 2015. There is a need to build broader community support and having committees also offers some of that. The Open Meeting Act requirements require final approval at Board meetings from any action items recommended by a committee. Brad reviewed the proposed committees and their duties. While the Board Chair approves the committees, we want to have the Board's support and their committee membership. We hope that these committees will also help make the large amount of Board meeting agenda items more efficient by their prior review and recommendations. Please send the names of any other individuals you would recommend for the committees. Dina and/or Brad will be contacting each member in the next month to discuss their committee(s) membership.

FELLOWS AND HONORARY LIFE MEMBERS PROCESS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2106
Jed Rogers provided a briefing on the Board's responsibility to nominate, review and approve the Historical Society's Fellows and Honorary Life Members. He reviewed the process established last year for nominations. March 15th is the nomination deadline. Please be sure to include a cover letter endorsing the individual and supporting documentation, like a CV. Jed will then do additional research on the nominee, and then the Major Planning, Gifts and Awards committee will meet to review the nomination and make a recommendation at the April Board meeting. The final Board approval vote will be done at the July Board meeting. A suggestion was received to invite Fellows to propose new Fellow nominees. We should also examine how we can better utilize past Board members.

UPDATE ITEMS

2016 OUTREACH AND EVENTS TO INCLUDE BOARD MEMBERS
Kevin Fayles reviewed the Division's 2016 events. The Division is very lean, and most of the staff are specialists in their own areas. We need the Board's support in order to make these events successful. The next event is Utah History Day, on January 28th. Please come and support the division. You can request a personal visit with legislators by writing a request with the Green Coats outside of the Senate and House Chambers. Dina provided 2016 Legislative guides to Board members. Another event that will be held soon is Night at the Museum on February 16th. Board members are welcome to bring the families and tour never before seen artifacts in the basement of the Rio Grande. Other division events in the next few months are also listed in your handout and would also benefit from your support.

COMMUNICATION
Kevin reviewed the big picture of the Division's communication goals, including updating our website, refining our monthly key indicators to better tell our impacts, redefining communication plans for each program, identifying our audiences and objectives, and strengthening our social media accounts, and preparing press releases for important division events, projects, etc. An updated Division Communications plan will be presented at an upcoming meeting. If you would like to receive the Division's press released, please send an email to Kevin.

OTHER BUSINESS
Annual Board members disclosure forms need to be completed by each Board member and sent to Alycia Aldrich, for forwarding to DHA and the Attorney General's Office.

ADJOURNED at 2:55 p.m.

NEXT MEETING: April 21, 2016