MEETING NOTES
Wednesday, August 7, 2019 - 6:00 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members Present:</th>
<th>Julie Bohn, Sean Denniston, Alex Gall, Michelle Kapitanovich, Roch Manley, and Donald Trost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members Absent (Excused):</td>
<td>Andy Gregg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Present:</td>
<td>Jacqui Kamp and Sharon Lumbantobing (Clark County) and Mark Person (City of Vancouver)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guests:</td>
<td>Nathan Reynolds (Cultural Resource Director/Cowlitz Tribe), Holly Chamberlain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. **Roll Call & Introductions:** Commission members, staff, and guests introduced themselves.

II. **Approval of the Meeting Minutes from July 2, 2019.** Trost made a motion to approve the minutes and Kapitanovich seconded. Meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

III. **Update from the Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH) committee:** Gall made a motion to move Intangible Cultural Heritage Update to the top of the agenda. Trost seconded the motion. All approved.

Gall gave an update on the July 31 ICH committee meeting. Lumbantobing prepared a SOW for the ICH committee, an NAPC session proposal on ICH, and a powerpoint on ICH. The committee is to provide edits to Lumbantobing on the NACP proposal on ICH by Aug 9, on the ICH SOW by August 21, and on the ICH powerpoint before the Sep 11 ICH committee meeting. Gall, Gregg, and Bohn will do outreach to the tribes and prune dryers and compile a contact list. Next ICH committee meeting is Sept 11.

Nathan Reynolds is the interim Cultural Resources Director of the Cowlitz Tribe. Reynolds stated that he is an environmental historian and has worked for the Cowlitz Tribe for 14 years.
focusing on habitat restoration for species that are culturally important to the Cowlitz people, huckleberry restoration project, fisheries research, oak woodlands management (food and cultural resources that are of high value to the Cowlitz people). Reynolds has been leading the Cultural Resources Department for the Cowlitz tribe for the past one and half years. He has been focusing on intangible cultural resources and the landscape, including places of spirituality, places of cultural use, places of resource gathering. He co-authored the nomination to list Mt. St. Helens on the National Register of Historic Places as a traditional cultural property for the Cowlitz people. Mt. St. Helens is only the 23rd traditional cultural property to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places out of a list of 80,000 places.

Gall stated that the HPC wants to gauge interest of the communities in the county that might be receptive to be listed on the ICH register. The ICH committee is looking into whether: 1) to list only current practices or also include historical practices that are no longer in practice or include practices that are only practiced by 1-2 people, 2) whether to include cultural landscapes, and 3) whether to include ICH that is unique to Clark County or that can also be found outside the county. Gall asked Reynolds to discuss what the Cowlitz tribe might consider an ICH that they might want to list.

Reynolds shared that Clark County is a fascinating landscape. We think of the county as a wilderness. But when Euro-Americans arrived here, there were thriving indigenous people already living here in villages up and down the Columbia River, some with up to 1000 people living in it, with villages one mile apart all along the river. Clark County probably had a population of 20,000 (seasonal fluctuations) at that time. In the interior of the county, there was an assembly of prairie habitats that were very important for food resources for the tribes, like camas roots and oak savannahs that had acorns, which were an important carbohydrate resource. These habitats were broadly spread across the landscape 12,000 years ago and then diminished in abundance about 6,000 years ago. The prairies, which are still remnant in Clark County, were maintained and persisted because of thousands of years of tribal burning practices to keep trees out and maintained roots on the landscape for generations and generations. They are only present today as evidence of pre-contact land management. The roads that you know as Mill Plain and Fourth Plain were Hudson’s Bay Company roads from the fort to the mills that they established. These were plains because they were open, grassy areas. These prairies were very important and rapidly claimed and settled by settlers because they didn’t have to do all the stump removal. Even the Governor of the Hudson’s Bay Company saw the advantage of the prairies and the abundant roots that grew there, but didn’t recognize that the prairies and roots were stewarded by the tribes for generations. A camas prairie is important to pre-contact tribes, but it’s also important to the patterns of settlement in our county, road infrastructure, and our lifeways now. The area northwest of Lacamas Lake is set aside by the WA State Department of Natural Resources as an important conservation area. These places still affect our planning and development and landscape now for both the tribes and all the people that have come to live in this landscape in the intervening time. There are other examples I can share, but this is one resource that is tied to a landscape and tied to a species.

Trost asked what makes the prairie an intangible resource as it seems like a tangible resource. Gall replied that it may have to do with the cultural resources, knowledge, and skills that have to
do with prairie management. The ICH committee is trying to define whether cultural landscapes should be considered as ICH or as tangible resource. The National Park Service defines landscapes as ICH.

Reynolds stated that the camas prairies are valuable as cultural resources, but are also environmentally valuable because they are habitat for rare species and are identified by WA Fish and Wildlife Department as “habitats of concern”. They are in your zoning codes and management plans already. From the tribe’s perspective, the persistence of camas is very important. The ICH is related to the ability to harvest camas at that site, to cook it in a traditional way, to do the ceremonial practices associated with that harvest, and then have that available as a food resources. The practices that occur in the landscape are the intangible part. The practices can’t occur without that landscape.

Reynolds gave another example from Prune Hill, which no longer has any prune orchards. It has all been developed and the prune landscape and orchards has become intangible. There is prune farming and drying heritage that exists, but the landscape has become intangible.

Gall stated that the ICH committee is working on defining what are the benefits of listing on an ICH register? It could be recording/documenting and possible revival or maintaining the practice. The ICH committee is working on ICH definitions and what would be included in ICH and what are the benefits of being listed.

Manley stated that it sounds like preservation of cultural aspects that were lost and it’s similar to the demolition and the disappearance of the built environment. Gall stated that the emphasis of ICH is around the “living” cultural aspects, not the built environment. The ICH register is to raise awareness and give voice to communities which have not been included and recognized. The Cowlitz are experiencing a cultural resurgence with federal recognition. The practice of peeled cedars is on the rise. This indicates that this traditional practice is still happening.

Reynolds talked about the Endangered Species Act listing of smelt (eulachon). The Cowlitz tribe was interested in listing smelt as an endangered because its population had diminished. The tribal elders said that if the fish goes extinct then my grandfather’s fishing spot means nothing anymore. The way to harvest vine maple to make the hoops on the fishing nets doesn’t mean anything anymore. The way to weave nettle fibers into the nets doesn’t mean anything anymore. If the fish goes extinct, the material and intangible culture heritage (the practices of smoking the fish, preparing the nets) that is reflected in a place (the harvesting or fishing places) disappears. This is an example of ICH that is tied to species rather than place. Reynolds stated he would be happy to engage and have more discussions with the HPC and ICH committee and that the Cowlitz tribe would be interested to participate in the county’s ICH efforts.

IV. Public Hearing: Clark County Historic Code Update 40.250.030

Gall opened the public hearing and asked if any HPC members have any conflict of interest. None were stated.
Kamp gave a summary of this proposal to amend the Clark County Unified Development Code CPZ2019-00028 (Update to Title 40.250.030) pertaining to Historic Preservation. Clark County has interlocal government agreements with 7 cities in the county that need to be updated to reflect updates that the county made in 2018. Clark County and the City of Vancouver are both Certified Local Governments designated by the state and have from the beginning decided to have a joint city/county historic preservation program. The City of Vancouver requested that consideration be given to amend the current code for the commission appointment process to allow the city to appoint two of the seven positions on the Historic Preservation Commission, as they do with all other Joint City-County advisory boards and commissions. This appointment process will streamline the HPC appointment process. This appointment process change requires updating the county’s historic preservation code (40.250.030) to increase the number of commissioners to seven with two being appointed by the city and five by the county. Another code change being proposed is to update the appeals process to state that the appeals process for properties in any of the cities/town would follow the process as outlined in the intergovernmental agreement and/or city code. Trost suggested an edit on the second to the last sentence on page 2. We will update the code to make that change moving forward. Kamp walked through the changes to the code.

Gall asked if the HPC has questions for staff. Manley asked about Page 3 b, if the city needs to be mentioned. Kamp stated that the city will make their own code update to match this section.

The Chair opened the floor to public comment. Chamberlain stated that she endorses these changes as they reflect current circumstances. She is glad to see community support and funding for historic preservation. Reynolds stated that the Cowlitz tribe supports these changes and that the Cowlitz Tribe would appreciate participating in the work of the HPC once it appoints its historic preservation officer.

Public comment was closed.

The HPC deliberated:
- Trost appreciated that his previous edits were incorporated and thanked staff for the report.
- Kapitanovich appreciated the streamlining of the process for the applicants.
- Manley appreciated the staff’s work.
- Bohn supports the staff report.

Manley made a motion to approve the staff recommendation with edits. Kapitanovich seconded the motion. The HPC unanimously approved the staff recommendation for the proposed code changes.

Kamp gave an overview of the next steps in the process.
Manley asked when the City of Vancouver would update their code. Kamp replied that Jan Bader can better answer that next month but that the city is planning to update its historic code.

The public hearing was closed.

V. New Business

VI. Old Business and Updates

• Finalize letter to new owners of historic properties: Gall requested that the HPC members provided written edits to Lumbantobing who will finalize the letter with the HPC Chair.
• NAPC Forum 2020 Call for Proposals for Sessions (due Sept 6). The HPC members gave input on each of the three proposals.
• Demolition Study Final Report: Next Steps. The Demo committee will work through the options and come back to the HPC with some recommendations in the next meeting. Trost suggested a graded approach. Not every property over age 50 will warrant the same level of documentation, delay, etc. There should be a range of alternatives rather than a single option. HPC members who are not on the demo committee will email their suggestions to Gall and then the committee will take that into consideration and make a presentation at the next HPC meeting.
• Bohn asked if current property owners on the CCHR have a group or FB page to exchange information. Current CCHR property owners could be advisors/mentors/resource person to other property owners. Staff could create a resource list. Current CCHR property owners could also serve as historic preservation ambassadors (list of historic owners willing to talk to others).
• Bohn asked if Clark County does historic home tours? Kamp stated that the commission has done it in the past, but not in the past few years. The county is looking into doing a Public Benefit Rating System and one of the point values is for opening a historic property for a public tour. The Clark County Historic Society and Museum (CCHM) does neighborhood walks of historic buildings and just received an HPG grant to purchase a van for historic tours. The HPC could discuss with CCHM if they would be interested in organizing interior tours of historic properties and the HPC could be a co-sponsor.

VII. Public Comment:

Chamberlain wants to remind everyone about the deadline for applying for heritage cemeteries and heritage barn grants. The deadline is Oct 23. More info is on the DAHP website.

Kamp received a call from Rob Freed regarding the protection/stabilization of the Hillborn structures at Whipple Creek Park asking if the HPC is aware of this. It’s a volunteer driven activity. Volunteers want to work on stabilizing and protecting the resources. The Hillborn structures are not on the CCHR. The HPC might want to consider getting the structures on the CCHR or sending an HPC member to see the buildings to get a better understanding of their condition and what the volunteers are doing.

VIII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.