The Texas Historical Commission (THC or Commission) convened a Courthouse Advisory Committee (Committee) that met in April and May 2023 to examine specific aspects of the Texas Historic Courthouse Preservation Program (THCPP). Approaching its 25-year anniversary, the program has attracted more than 140 participants and awarded more than $360 million to counties to fund the full restorations of 78 courthouses and provide smaller grants to assist with emergency and planning projects. During Round XII grant application evaluations in 2022, the Commission’s Architecture Committee members expressed concern that seven of the eleven emergency applications were for work on fully restored courthouses and in nearly all cases, the scopes of work described in their grant applications were to address design flaws or poor-quality construction during their full restoration projects. Based upon these concerns, the Commission appointed the Committee on February 1, 2023. The goal of the Committee’s effort was to advise the Commission on improving construction quality to limit the number of courthouses returning for funding following their full restorations, examine the priorities of the THCPP by identifying buildings eligible for grant funding, and refine its grant project selection process. County judges and commissioners, facilities managers, a representative from the Texas Association of Counties, THC commissioners, preservation architects, and contractors comprised the Committee. The Committee met virtually on April 4 and April 12, 2023 to discuss the topics and make initial recommendations on how to address concerns, and on May 24, 2023 to finalize the Committee’s recommendations. Committee members reviewed and approved final revisions to draft recommendations by email.

In preparation for the Committee meetings, staff developed an in-depth survey, and all seventeen members responded. The survey comprehensively covered the Committee’s topics and solicited feedback on how to improve construction quality and reduce the number of returning applicants, how to assess and fund returning applicants, how to improve courthouse stewardship post-restoration, funding eligibility and scoring criteria considerations. Results from the survey were shared with the Committee at the beginning of the first two meetings and used to clarify the most important topics for discussion by the Committee. Staff prepared a background presentation for each meeting to educate the committee members on aspects of the program related to the pertinent topics.

At the initial Committee meeting, staff presented background on the THCPP Statute and Rules, recommendations from the last time the Courthouse Advisory Committee was convened in 2018, the types of funding offered through the program, how grant applications are evaluated and scored, and generally how grant-funded planning and construction projects are managed. The topics discussed at the April 4 Committee meeting were Construction Quality and Evaluating and Funding Returning Applicants. At the April 12 meeting, the Committee discussed potential changes to the Scoring Criteria and when Auxiliary Buildings are eligible for THCPP funding. At each of the first two meetings, Committee members were assigned to one of three breakout rooms. Each issue was deliberated by the three groups with a staff member reporting out feedback and insights from each group to the full Committee, identifying consensus and divergence for each topic.

This report provides the Committee’s recommendations, insights, and guidance to the Commission and outlines the actions necessary to implement the recommendations. This report represents the Committee’s efforts and includes specific recommendations for the THCPP grant project selection and award process. For each topic or area of interest, recommendations are listed in conjunction with any related impacts and
necessary actions. The Commission may choose to act on these recommendations and direct changes to THCPP program policy, implement changes to administrative rules in the Texas Administrative Code or, less likely, seek statutory amendments to the Texas Government Code. Alternatively, the Commission may choose not to act on one or more of the committee’s recommendations.

**Returning Applicants**

Applicants with grant-funded fully restored courthouses may return to request additional funding for a variety of reasons: to complete a scope of work that was eliminated from their original full restoration project, due to an unanticipated emergency, or to repair or remedy defective work not properly undertaken during the original full restoration. At times, an agreement is formed between the county and the THC to allow a relatively large scope of work or a specific element of the originally proposed project as described in the grant application to be removed from the full restoration prior to the Funding Agreement. This may occur if the county’s consultants determine the work to be currently unnecessary, such as a roof replacement when the roof remains in serviceable condition. Scope removed from a project due to value engineering after the Funding Agreement is signed should not affect the completeness of a project. Fully restored courthouses experience emergencies at a lesser rate than non-restored courthouses but may experience a sudden emergency due to a weather event, for example. Most of the fully restored courthouses that return for emergency grants are to address issues that develop following their full restoration. In some cases, urgent issues may develop due to deferred maintenance, but more often, the issues directly relate to poor construction quality either due to a deviation from the project design by the contractor or an error or omission in the architect’s design. The Committee explored construction quality and how to assess and fund applications from returning applicants.

**Construction Quality**

Only five years into the program, the THC noticed fully restored courthouses falling into disrepair and created the Texas Historic Courthouse Stewardship Program to educate counties and their facility managers on the importance of maintenance and provide annual training on maintenance strategies and tools. Despite those efforts, fully restored courthouses continue to fall into severe disrepair, sometimes only a few years following completion of their project. In Round VIII (2014), a quarter of applicants had returned to request additional funding to repair issues that developed following their previous full restoration projects. And in Round XII (2022), seven of the eleven emergency grant applications were those returning for funding to remediate, reconstruct, or repair building issues due to poor construction quality, related to either design flaws or deviation from the construction documents by the contractor. In addition to construction quality issues, counties have also returned to request funding for unforeseen emergencies.

The survey results indicated that the most important factors in determining the quality of construction at the end of a full restoration project are an experienced contractor and quality construction documents prepared by the architect. During deliberations in the breakout rooms, Committee members nearly unanimously agreed that in addition to those two factors, counties need more education about the construction process. Educational topics should include the full restoration planning and construction process, how to hire professionals and contractors, what to consider including in their contracts, the types of delivery methods, and what important steps to take to insure ongoing preservation of their courthouse. Counties also need more support regularly monitoring construction since the architectural consultant is typically only visiting the site twice a month, and the expertise of most county employees is insufficient to oversee a large construction project. Committee members agreed that an owner’s representative who looks out for the best interest of the county and the courthouse would substantially improve the quality of construction and the efficiency of the process.
Committee Recommendation #1
Educate Counties about Planning, Construction, and Post-Construction Considerations

a) Provide and require pre-application training for participating counties to be eligible for a THCPP grant. Include information about 1) the grant application and evaluation process, 2) the importance of budgeting and planning for cyclical maintenance immediately upon completion of the project, 3) the historic designation and nomination process, and 4) other pre-application considerations.
b) Provide training to counties on hiring an architectural professional and what to consider in their contract for architectural plans & specifications and construction administration.
c) Provide training on different project delivery methods, how to hire a contractor, and what to consider in their contract for construction.
d) Provide post-construction training that directs counties to maintain communication with their architect and contractor, undertake a one-year warranty inspection with the full team, and ensure all issues are appropriately addressed.

Possible Action by THC:

i) Prepare pre-application and post-restoration training modules for counties.
ii) Require county representatives attend pre-application training as a prerequisite for applying for a THCPP grant. Require county representatives attend post-restoration training as a condition of the grant funding agreement.
iii) Supplement staff-prepared training by hiring a professional consultant to prepare digital training modules and written materials related to:
   1) hiring a professional architectural consultant, owner’s representative, and contractor, including establishing and evaluating qualifications;
   2) what to consider when entering into contracts for planning, construction, and project management, including types of project delivery methods for construction;
   3) what to expect during the construction process; and
   4) the roles and responsibilities of the project participants before, during, and after construction.
iv) Develop a list of typical considerations or standard conditions for contract documents, tailored to the needs of historic courthouses and the expectations of the THCPP.

Committee Recommendation #2
Require an Owner’s Representative to Monitor the Construction Project

a) Require counties undergoing a grant-funded full restoration to hire an owner’s representative to monitor construction for at least a minimum number of hours per week. The THC will provide minimum and preferred qualifications based upon professional guidance, and allowable fees. Counties may use a county employee who meets the minimum qualifications and can devote sufficient time to act on behalf of the county undertaking its responsibility to engage in project management, coordination, facilitation, oversight, and monitoring during the design, procurement, and construction phases of a project.

Possible Action by THC:

i) Develop a list of minimum and preferred qualifications, minimum time commitment, and clear roles and responsibilities for an owner’s representative.
ii) Change the THCPP Grant Manual to require that counties hire or employ an owner’s representative to review the full restoration architectural plans and specifications before the project goes to bid and monitor their grant-funded full restoration construction project. Encourage counties to bring on an owner’s representative during project design.
iii) Change the THCPP Grant Application materials to include a line item for an owner’s representative in the grant application budget and funding request, and make this an eligible expense for reimbursement or in-kind contribution credit toward a grant recipient’s match. Encourage counties to employ a qualified staff member, to continue in the capacity of courthouse steward following completion of the grant-funded project.

iv) Evaluate the allowable architectural and engineering fees to ensure they align with industry standards. Consider the fiscal impact of implementing committee recommendations #5.b and 5.c in determining the overall amount of allowable fees.

Evaluating and Funding Grant Applications from Returning Applicants

The 2018 Courthouse Advisory Committee recommended that the focus of the THCPP continue to be to fund as many full restoration projects as possible, over emergency, planning, and other alternative projects. It also recommended considering funding for returning applicants with previously restored courthouses with emergency scopes of work and redefined emergency as “caused by a catastrophic event, a recently discovered condition that threatens the building with imminent and severe damage or critical repairs needed to correct accelerating damage from long-term deferred maintenance”. Since 2018, the program has seen applicants returning to fund work that might not rise to the level of emergency but if not addressed will eventually lead to issues that endanger preservation of the courthouse. While awarding grants to fund work that was already funded and completed during a full restoration drains money from program participants still awaiting full restoration grants, the 2023 Courthouse Advisory Committee recognized that not funding urgent repairs on fully restored courthouses threatens courthouse preservation and the state and local investments in the original project. The Committee nearly unanimously agreed that counties with fully restored courthouses should be eligible for additional grant funding to address issues on their courthouse, whether due to an unforeseen emergency, to remedy construction quality issues from their original full restoration project, or for other potentially legitimate reasons. Survey results and discussions in the breakout rooms indicate that the Committee expects counties experiencing issues following a full restoration project to pursue some form of remedy with the parties involved; however, determining fault can be complicated, and full litigation would not necessarily result in the best outcome for the county or the courthouse.

Currently, THCPP offers applicants three types of competitive grants for planning, full restoration, and emergency projects. For awarding these three competitive grants, the THCPP uses a standard application for full restoration grants that also includes a request for a planning grant to develop architectural plans and specifications for a future full restoration construction project and one for emergency applicants that need to address urgent issues that endanger the courthouse itself or its users. The THCPP also offers out-of-cycle emergency grants and supplemental grants that are both awarded by the Commission during a quarterly meeting outside of the biannual grant cycles. To request an emergency grant out-of-cycle or a supplemental grant, a county must submit a letter to the Commission’s Executive Director, describing the need for funding, the urgency of the request and providing a cost estimate for the work. Supplemental awards typically address unforeseen conditions that arise or substantial cost overruns on ongoing construction projects, but may also address some scopes of work that were unintentionally omitted on a completed full restoration project.

The Committee expressed concern over comparing returning applicants to applicants that had not yet received a full restoration grant. Instead, returning applicants with fully restored courthouses should receive funds through a competitive process, with fourteen of the twenty-one scoring criteria used to evaluate the application, removing Full Restoration, Overmatch, County Records, County Support, Local Support, Local Resources, and Plans and Specifications, since these categories demonstrate support for or apply to full restoration proposals. The fourteen categories important to consider for returning applicants are listed below. Mock scoresheets were developed using the new Returning Applicants Criteria and applied to the Round XII
returning applicants, which illustrate the most urgent projects would rise to the top using the new system. Endangerment and County Revenue varied most among returning applicants and therefore typically would determine which projects are funded more than all other categories. The committee recommends that all returning applicants, including those seeking emergency funding, be evaluated using this selective set of scoring criteria.

Several Committee members noted the importance of regular, cyclical maintenance and pointed out that the poorest counties may not have the resources to fund cyclical maintenance, which costs on average 1 to 4% of the overall value of the building, annually. In all three breakout rooms, members offered substantial support for the THCPP providing seed funding for maintenance endowments to support the poorest counties in preserving historic courthouses and protecting the state’s investment.

**Committee Recommendation #3**

*Require Counties to Pursue Administrative Remedies with Contractor and/or Architect Before Requesting THCPP Grant Funding*

1. Require counties returning for funding first to pursue repairs under warranty or administrative remedies with their contractor and/or architect if the scope of work is to correct poor-quality construction during the original full restoration project.

**Possible Action by THC:**

1. Establish by THCPP Policy a requirement that counties present evidence that demonstrates their pursuit of administrative remedies before requesting funding to address scopes of work related to issues during the full restoration project, either due to contractors or subcontractors not following the architectural plans & specifications as designed or due to errors and omissions by the architect.
2. Seek legal advice on the liability of various parties in developing the policy requirements.
3. Consider adding provisions in 13 Tex. Admin. Code § 12.7 to require repayment of grant for repairs to poor-quality construction if funds are later recovered through litigation.

**Committee Recommendation #4**

*Evaluate all Returning Applicants on a Separate Application and Scoring System*

1. Establish a new scoring system for awarding competitive grants to returning applicants with a fully restored courthouse.
2. Recommend the Commission consider a balance of awards among the grant types, prioritized in the order of full restoration, emergency, returning applicants, and planning grants.

**Possible Action by THC:**

1. Establish by Policy a selective set of fourteen scoring criteria excerpted from the 21 standard scoring criteria to evaluate candidates proposing limited scopes of work on previously restored courthouses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Age (with changes)</td>
<td>7. Current Use (with changes)</td>
<td>12. THCPP Deed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Endangerment</td>
<td>10. Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ii) Change the THCPP Grant Application materials to add a description of the program’s funding priorities, with an emphasis on full restoration grants as the highest priority. Ensure the application materials clearly describe the types of projects that are eligible or ineligible for grant funding, with a focus on parameters for returning applicants as a new grant category.

iii) Consider emergency and returning applicants for funding in each future grant round, and identify those projects with the clearest endangerment issues through the scoring process for prioritization for funding.

Committee Recommendation #5
Support Courthouse Maintenance Following Full Restoration

a) Continue to promote and provide stewardship training to counties, with an emphasis on encouraging regular and ongoing participation.
b) Require architectural consultant to provide a thorough Cyclical Maintenance Plan for counties as part of the grant Completion Report.
c) Require one-year warranty inspection of the courthouse with THCPP Reviewer, architectural consultant, contractor, and county representative.
d) Restore THCPP Stewardship staff position.

Possible Action by THC:

i) Change the Construction Grant Manual to require a more detailed cyclical maintenance plan that includes maintenance schedules and tasks for all aspects of the building as part of the Completion Report. Provide the Historic Courthouse Maintenance Handbook in multiple formats to facilitate its use as a foundational document in preparing cyclical maintenance plans.

ii) Change the Construction Grant Manual to require, rather than recommend, a one-year warranty inspection by including a warranty inspection report as part of the close out documents required before the final 10% of the grant balance is released as final reimbursement to the county.

iii) In a future legislative session, request an employee (one Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)) for the Courthouse Preservation Program team to restore the staff position, eliminated in 2011, whose sole function was to support courthouse stewardship by visiting fully restored courthouses to conduct conditions assessments and provide reports of issues to address, provide technical assistance to counties and craft annual stewardship training for county judges, commissioners and facility managers.

THCPP Grant Application Scoring

Until the addition of the County Revenue scoring criterion following recommendations by the 2018 Courthouse Advisory Committee, the same 21 scoring criteria have been used for non-emergency applicants since the inception of the THCPP.

Current Use “Vacancy” Score

The THCPP grant application scoring criteria (13 Tex. Admin. Code §12.9(c)) call for an evaluation of the building’s use as a functioning courthouse, both before and after the project’s completion. Current statutory language permits grant funding to be used for properties that no longer function as a county courthouse but requires that functioning courthouses receive funding priority (Texas Government Code, Chapter 442, Section 442.0081(d)(1)(B)(i)). This is accomplished through the scoring criteria and weights assigned to each. Two criteria pertain to building use, providing an opportunity to allocate 0, 10, or 20 points for a courthouse that is used for court or administrative functions at the time of application (Current Use) and 0, 6, or 10 points for proposals that include court and administrative functions in the completed projects (Future Use). It
should be noted that grants are often selected based upon a difference in just one or two points, so 20 points is a significant point range.

The Committee determined that the Current Use scoring criteria penalizes applicants with courthouses vacated due to conditions out of their control that affect either the safety of building users or the accessibility of the building. Furthermore, the Committee determined that applicants may continue using an unsafe or inaccessible building to earn critical points in the Current Use category. Flipping the number of points allocated for Current Use and Future Use would place more emphasis on whether the project results in a functioning courthouse rather than on whether the building is being used as a courthouse at the time of application. This means that the points allocated in the category of Current Use should be 0, 6, and 10, and points allocated in the category of Future Use should be 0, 10 or 20. Additionally, counties vacating their courthouse due to unavoidable risks to building users such as issues affecting life, safety or welfare of the building users or the county itself should be awarded an intermediary score of 6 points rather than 0 points in the category of Current Use. Program staff created a mockup scoresheet and applied it to Round XII applicants. In the mock scenario, staff considered the Comanche County Courthouse as if it were vacated, since that county has been occupying its courthouse to maintain a competitive score, despite the building being considered inaccessible with a notice from the Department of Justice to cease use. The newly proposed scoring for these two categories meant that courthouses that are vacant or potentially vacant, due to life safety or accessibility issues, were impacted minimally by their current vacancy in terms of their overall score and competitiveness for funding. Making the proposed changes to the scoring system in the categories of Current Use and Future Use seeks to distinguish between counties that vacate their building by choice or to prepare for as-yet unfunded construction from those counties that vacate their courthouse due to issues that require them to leave the building.

**Committee Recommendation #6**

**Reconsider the Current Use “Vacancy” Score as it Applies to Courthouses Vacated Due to Hazardous Conditions or Inaccessibility**

a) Assign higher points in the category of Future Use and reduce the number of points allocated for Current Use to emphasize the building’s use as a courthouse following completion of the project rather than its use at the time of application.

b) Limit the penalty for counties that vacate their courthouse due to hazardous conditions or inaccessibility by awarding an intermediary score rather than 0.

**Possible Action by THC:**

i) By policy, assign 0, 10, or 20 points to the category of Future Use and 0, 6, or 10 points to the category of Current Use.

ii) Establish by policy a protocol for counties to demonstrate the necessity of vacating their courthouse. Allocate 6 points to counties that can demonstrate a requirement to vacate their courthouse due to hazardous conditions or inaccessibility.

**Age Score**

The Texas Government Code, Chapter 442, Section 442.0081(d)(1)(B)(ii) requires that the THCPP prioritizes funding for courthouses built before 1875. When the THC established the original scoring criteria, it expanded the Statute’s intention by creating three additional age ranges, assigning significantly more points to older courthouses than newer ones. The THCPP currently considers the following criteria when awarding points in the Age of a Courthouse category:
• 20 Points: Pre-1875
• 15 Points: 1875 to 1899
• 10 Points: 1900 to 1925
• 5 Points: After 1925

The Committee nearly unanimously agreed that the age of a courthouse is not as important as its architectural significance and its level of endangerment, and that emphasis on a courthouse’s age as a deciding factor should align more closely with the intent of the Statute. If the overall points assigned to the age categories are reduced significantly and the age ranges simplified to pre-1875, 1876 to 1899, and post-1900, this reduces the significance of the age of a courthouse and allows other more important categories to determine funding, while continuing to comply with the intent of the Statute.

**Committee Recommendation #7**

Reduce the Emphasis on the Age of a Courthouse in the Scoring Systems

a) Minimize the impact of a courthouse’s age when considering applicants for funding, and allow other more significant categories to become more prominent in determining funding.

**Possible Action by THC:**

i) By policy, change the age ranges in the standard, emergency, and returning applicant scoring systems and assign points as follows:

- Pre-1875: 6 points
- 1876–1899: 4 points
- 1900 or later: 2 points

ii) By policy, consider the presence of later modifications and the identified restoration period in assigning the age score.

**New Scoring Category to Reward an Applicant’s Dedication**

The number of applicants each round demonstrates the level of interest in and need for the program. Currently there is no incentive for applicants with unsuccessful applications to reapply in the next round, particularly if their application scored significantly below the successful applications. Applicants often lose interest after a few rounds of rejected grant applications. Once counties stop applying, they may not participate again for many years, or they may never participate again. Awarding a single point each time an applicant applies could encourage commitment from applicants and higher application rates each cycle.

Survey results indicated considerable support for adding a Longevity criterion to the THCPP standard scoring criteria and awarding points retroactively; therefore, the proposed addition to the scoring criteria was not discussed in the meetings.
Committee Recommendation #8  
Provide an Incentive for Applicants to Encourage Them to Continue Applying, Despite an Unsuccessful Application  
a) Add a new category to the standard scoring system, and assign points based on the number of cycles that applicant submitted a grant application for a full restoration.  
b) Award points retroactively.  

Possible Action by THC:  
i) Revise 13 Tex. Admin. Code § 12.9 (c) to add a scoring category in consideration for counties continuing to apply for funding.  
ii) Establish by Policy the number of points awarded in the scoring criterion as follows:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Applications</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial application:</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2 prior applications:</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–4 prior applications:</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–6 prior applications:</td>
<td>3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7–9 prior applications:</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ prior applications:</td>
<td>5 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Auxiliary Buildings and Funding Eligibility  
The law that created the grant program states that “the commission may grant or loan money to a county or municipality that owns a historic courthouse, for the purpose of preserving or restoring the courthouse” and “a county or municipality that owns a historic courthouse may apply to the commission for a grant or loan for a historic courthouse project”. The current definition of courthouse, historic courthouse, and historic courthouse project do not provide a clear definition of what building(s) on the courthouse square are eligible for THCPP funding.  
The THCPP has funded historically attached annexes and additions as part of an overall restoration of the primary courthouse. The Committee considered and provided clarification on when it is appropriate to fund an auxiliary building and recommends a clearer definition in the Texas Administrative Code. The Committee indicated that historic buildings constructed for the purpose of expanding the courthouse functions that were historically attached to the primary courthouse should be eligible for THCPP grant funding as part of an overall restoration of the courthouse complex. While the question received a range of answers, many Committee members were opposed to considering freestanding buildings on the square until all courthouses seeking funding are fully restored.  

Committee Recommendation #9  
Clarify funding eligibility for auxiliary historic buildings on the courthouse square.  
a) Provide clearer definitions of Courthouse and Historic Courthouse so that THCPP funding is awarded to eligible buildings as outlined in the Statute.  

Possible Action by THC:  
i) Revise 13 Tex. Admin. Code § 12.5 to provide a clearer definition of Courthouse and Historic Courthouse to align with the intention of the Statute that grants fund the preservation of buildings that serve or have served as the county courthouse:
Courthouse:
- **Current Definition:** (4) Courthouse. Means the principal building(s) which houses county government offices and courts and its (their) surrounding site(s) (typically the courthouse square).
- **Proposed Definition:** (4) Courthouse. Means the principal building which serves as the primary seat of government of the county in which it is located, and its surrounding site (typically the courthouse square). The courthouse includes additions or annexes physically attached to the building that were constructed for the purpose of expanding the functions of the courthouse, but it does not include other freestanding buildings on the site.

Historic Courthouse:
- **Current Definition:** (5) Historic courthouse. Means a county courthouse or building that previously served as a county courthouse that is at least 50 years old prior to the date of application, with the initial date of service defined as the date of the first official commissioners court meeting in the building.
- **Proposed Definition:** (5) Historic courthouse. Means a building that currently or previously served as a county courthouse, as defined in paragraph (4), and which entered service as a courthouse at least 50 years prior to the due date of the grant application, using the first commissioners court meeting as its first date of service. A historic courthouse may include additions or annexes physically attached to the courthouse for at least 50 years prior to the due date of the grant application.

ii) For clarity, add definitions for Full Restoration and Restoration Period to 13 Tex. Admin. Code § 12.5:
- **Full restoration:** Means a construction grant to undertake a project to restore a courthouse to its appearance at an agreed upon restoration period, which includes removing additions and alterations from later periods and reconstructing features missing from the restoration period. This treatment applies to the site, exterior of the courthouse, and interior public spaces such as the corridors, stairways, and courtrooms. Secondary spaces may be preserved or rehabilitated rather than restored. Additions or attached annexes must be removed if they post-date the selected restoration period. Retention or removal of site features from outside of the restoration period may be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.
- **Restoration period:** Means the date selected for the purpose of defining the full restoration of a courthouse, representing the most significant time in the courthouse’s history. Selection of the restoration period must be justified based on documentary and physical evidence and surviving integrity of historic materials from that period, and it must be described in the master plan for the restoration project. The restoration period represents a time when the building in its entirety exhibited a cohesive architectural style exemplifying the work of an architect or a period when the building experienced a significant historical event.
2023 Courthouse Advisory Committee Members

The members of this Advisory Committee have expertise in areas related to county government, the courthouse grant and maintenance programs, Texas courthouses, historic preservation and/or grant administration.

Elected County Officials

These county judges and commissioners have direct relevant experience with one or more of the topics under discussion by the Committee.

1. Mike Braddock, County Judge, Lynn County, Tahoka
2. Stephanie Davis, County Judge, Comanche County, Comanche
3. Joy Fuchs, former Commissioner, Washington County, Brenham
4. Leward LaFleur, County Judge, Marion County, Jefferson
5. L.D. Williamson, former County Judge, Red River County, Clarksville

Texas Association of Counties Representative

The Texas Association of Counties understands the risks associated with counties’ facilities and that quality construction and a fully restored courthouse substantially lower a county’s risk. Former County Judge Kim Halfmann has experience representing the needs of counties as the liaison for the Texas Association of Counties as well as experience supervising a large construction project after actively managing the restoration and rehabilitation of the Glasscock County Courthouse while their County Judge.

6. Kim Halfmann, County Relations Officer, Texas Association of Counties

Facility Managers

These facility managers have longstanding experience maintaining a fully restored courthouse and some have experience with post-restoration issues with their buildings.

7. Mike Head, former Facilities Manager, Potter County, Amarillo
8. Ricky Kerr, Facilities Manager, Cooke County, Gainesville
9. Rene Montalvo, Facilities Manager, Karnes County, Karnes City

THC Commissioners/Former Commissioners

Laurie Limbacher and Donna Carter both have experience evaluating, scoring, and funding THCPP grant applications and observing fully restored courthouses returning for supplemental and emergency funding.

10. Laurie Limbacher, Architect and Current Chair, Architecture Committee, Texas Historical Commission, Austin
11. Earl Broussard, Landscape Architect, Architecture Committee, Texas Historical Commission, Austin
12. Donna Carter, Architect and Former Chair, Architecture Committee, Texas Historical Commission, Austin

Architects

These architects have experience working in the field of historic preservation and two have direct experience with the full restoration of courthouses through the THCPP.

13. Hugo Gardea, Preservation Architect, General Services Administration, Fort Worth
14. Stan Graves, Preservation Architect, Architexas, Austin and Former Director of the Division of Architecture and the Texas Historic Courthouse Preservation Program
15. Karl Komatsu, Preservation Architect, Komatsu Architecture, Fort Worth
Contractors

Both contractors have substantial experience as general and sub-contractors on THCPP grant-funded full restorations of historic courthouses.

16. Alan Odom, Contractor, Premier Commercial Group, and Subcontractor, Premier Metalwerks, Haltom City
17. Curt Stoddard, Contractor, JC Stoddard Construction, San Antonio

THC Staff

Mark Wolfe, State Historic Preservation Officer – Executive Director, Texas Historical Commission
Elizabeth Brummett, Deputy SHPO – Director, Division of Architecture
Susan Tietz, AIA – Architect and Coordinator, Courthouse Preservation Program
James Malanaphy, AIA – Architect and Reviewer, Courthouse Preservation Program
Eva Osborne, AIA – Architect and Reviewer, Courthouse Preservation Program
Donye Reese – Specialist, Courthouse Preservation Program
Tania Salgado – Reviewer, Courthouse Preservation Program
Dan Valenzuela – Architect and Reviewer, Courthouse Preservation Program