



CLARK COUNTY

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Public Service Center
1300 Franklin St., 6th Floor
Vancouver, WA
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/historic

MEETING NOTES

Wednesday, March 4, 2020 – 5:30 p.m.

6th Floor Hearing Room, 1300 Franklin St., Vancouver, WA

These are summary, not verbatim, minutes. Audio recordings are available on the Historic Preservation Commission’s page at www.clark.wa.gov/community-planning/historic-preservation-commission.

Members Present:	Sean Denniston, Alex Gall, Andy Gregg, Michelle Kapitanovich, Roch Manley, and Donald Trost
Members Absent:	Julie Bohn
Staff Present:	Sharon Lumbantobing (Clark County), Mark Person, and Jan Bader (City of Vancouver)
Guests:	Greg Griffith, Stephanie Jolivette, Keith Jones, Jason Nortz, Greg Turner, Dennis Wardlaw, Holly Chamberlain

- Roll Call & Introductions:** Commission members and staff introduced themselves.
- Approval of the Meeting Minutes from February 5, 2020.** Gregg made a motion to approve the minutes and Kapitanovich seconded. Meeting minutes were approved unanimously.
- CCHM Speaker Series on August 6 with HPC Panel** – any interest? Donald Trost and Sean Denniston are willing to be on the panel, and Andy Gregg (if reappointed in June).
- CLG Grant application/topic selection** – The HPC voted to focus the grant application on a survey of unreinforced masonry buildings and retrofitting cultural and historic resources to minimize damage from a disaster event. Online public accessibility of the inventory should be considered. Alex made a motion and Kapitanovich seconded it. The motion passed unanimously.
- Upcoming conferences:**

Unreinforced Masonry, Seattle, May 27-28: Julie Bohn plans to attend.

NACP, Tacoma, July 22-26: Julie Bohn, Michelle Kapitanovich, and Andy Gregg (if reappointed). The three new members appointed to the HPC should be encouraged to attend this.



6. Training on the SEPA Process for Historic Preservation – Dennis Wardlaw delivered a presentation and was requested by the HPC to provide his written notes from the presentation.

Questions:

Q: How should planners integrate DAHP into the SEPA process? SEPA is very focused on archaeology and not the built environment, and DAHP doesn't receive the SEPA checklist until very late in the process.

A: DAHP does not have a way for planners to engage earlier, but encourages communication with DAHP early and often on the proposed project or the SEPA Checklist.

Q: Are there any jurisdictions in the state that consult with DAHP or DOE earlier than the SEPA process?

A: Dennis can think of any jurisdictions off hand. It varies from one jurisdiction to the next.

Q: What can planners learn if they access the public side of Wisaard?

A: Planners can learn about the archaeological sensitivity to the area, especially if a development is going in. Stephanie Jolivette's work load is high reviewing projects throughout the state and she gets two weeks to process each request. DAHP doesn't have enough staffing to do more reviews. 6700 SEPA reviews conducted last year with one full-time staff. The bottom line is risk management and making people aware of the issues and potential risks of damaging cultural resources.

Q: If a development is included in the downtown Vancouver EIS as a Planned Action, does it come to DAHP for review?

A: DAHP's involvement occurs at the time of development of the EIS and the supplemental EIS. Any contact with DAHP during the time of development that comes under the Planned Action would only occur on a courtesy basis. Nicholas Vann provided comments on Phase I to the City of Vancouver.

Q: The SEPA process is well defined for archaeology in Clark County and Vancouver. But SEPA Checklist item #13 doesn't adequately fit the built environment into the process. We are seeing a lot of demolitions of buildings over 50 years old occurring in the county. The HPC has been trying to flag historic structures before they are demolished. Where does the built environment fit into the SEPA review process in item #13? SEPA states that if SEPA wasn't required when the structure was built, then SEPA isn't required to demolish. Single family homes are exempt from SEPA. So historic buildings can be demolished without SEPA review.

A: The built environment is probably one of the more challenging parts of SEPA review as there are a lot of exemptions. The SEPA Checklist Item #13 should be revised to account for the built environment. DAHP is aware of what the HPC is saying and every jurisdiction is facing this issue.

Q: Can a jurisdiction add questions to the SEPA Checklist, for example, to add questions to item #13 pertaining to the built environment?

A: DAHP did not know the answer to that.

Denniston stated that the SEPA requires the checklist questions as a minimum and a jurisdiction can add questions and be more stringent than the state law.

Q: if there is a substantial change to a project, it doesn't trigger redoing the SEPA, but it may require a reevaluation. Are there any standards on how much change would require more mitigation or does it come down to the discretion of the planner?

A: It does come down to the discretion of the planner. DAHP's comments are based on the info available at the time of the review, but if new information becomes available, DAHP expects notification and to be able to revise its comments and review accordingly. Projects change frequently and sometimes substantially.

Q: It's not that Planned Actions of Sub Area reviews are exempt from SEPA. The Planned Action is the SEPA process (it's an alternate compliance path).

A: I would agree with that statement. But DAHP would like to review specific aspects of proposals under Planned Action as they become more clear and closer to development. The Planned Action in the City of Vancouver is 13 years old. That is a long time for a Planned Action. The city has changed a lot and it's not all accounted for in the EIS.

Bader stated that the city is in the process of redoing its Planned Action.

Q: To clarify, the city prepared an EIS for the subarea and DAHP's role is to provide comments. The city can accept the comments and make changes or not. The City has the authority to carry out the plan.

A: Correct.

Q: So in terms of the built environment, is it correct to say that DAHP is an advisory role, and not regulatory role (like it has with archaeological sites which are protected by state law)?

A: Correct. DAHP is providing comments on the project through SEPA checklist. Our comments are just comments and recommendations. The applicant can do what it wants to, except with regard to archaeological sites which are protected by law.

7. **Washington State Heritage Preservation Plan 2020-2025** – Greg Griffith gave a presentation and passed out a handout of the draft State Preservation Plan, and asked the HPC to provide comments/input by email or phone or by inviting him back to an HPC meeting. Griffith will send an electronic version of the draft State Preservation Plan for the HPC to provide comment.
8. **Public Comment:** No public comment
9. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned 8:00 p.m.