

Minutes
Mason County Historic Preservation Commission
July 8th, 2021
via Zoom Hybrid
415 N. 6th Street
Shelton, WA 98584

Members Present: Ed Huber, Micah Sanders, Jann Goodpaster, Dave Dally

Absent: Steve Rose, Wayne Nicholson

County Staff: Michael MacSems and Nikita Huckabey-Cox

I. **Call to Order**

Roll Call – Mr. Hubert called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm

Review and Approve Minutes from June 10th, 2021 – Mr. Hubert made a motion to accept the minutes from June 10th as written. Motion was seconded by Mr. Sanders. All in favor, motion carried.

Correspondence – Summer Issue of Colombia.

II. **New Business**

Announcements/Check In – No new announcements.

NAPC Webinars - Ms. Goodpaster inquired about upcoming NAPC Webinars. Ms. Goodpaster and Mr. MacSems discussed what these entailed, and it was decided to carry over this discussion to the August meeting, as there should be more information about the Webinars available at that time.

Other (if any) – None.

III. **Old Business**

Jones Family Cemetery Discussion (if any) – Ms. Goodpaster asked if she would need to go and look at the Cemetery. Mr. Huber stated that after all the forms are submitted, that someone would need to survey the property, possibly an Archaeologist, but that Ms. Goodpaster could look at it as well. Ms. Goodpaster states that she is ready to proceed and will have the forms ready by the next meeting. Mr. MacSems says there must be a formal public hearing advertised about adding the cemetery to the County Historic Registry but does not feel they are ready at this time, and suggested an internal look be taken at the next meeting before proceeding to a hearing.

Historic Preservation Plan and FY DAHP Grant Update – Mr. Huber states he has looked through the Grant application and its requirements and was looking into a plan

on how best to proceed. Mr. Huber spoke of possibly breaking this up into different grant application years depending on how that looked cost-wise. Mr. Huber states he has a good idea for the process of this form, and that it is very straightforward. Background information on the county will need to be provided. This info will be brought together with a proposal that details the requirements. Then a date would be set for responses for a bid request after advertising for a contractor for the project. Mr. Huber went on to state that this advertising can be done in the paper or through DAHP, where it would be placed in the DAHP monthly newsletter. Once bids have been received, they will be evaluated for reasonability of costs. Once this was completed, an internal cost would be estimated either in whole or in two parts. Mr. Huber recommended that this be done as a complete process and suggested getting help from someone who has done this before as more complex projects can be costly but would provide what is wanted in a historic preservation plan. Mr. Huber continued, saying that once a basic cost estimate is put together it can then go out to bid, then be refined, and that this is an ongoing and changing process.

Mr. Huber would like to finalize what is wanted in this plan and would like to do so at the next meeting. Examples will be brought together for what a Historic Preservation Plan consists of. He would like to make sure certain needs are met without becoming overly complex. He would like, at the next meeting, to look over and discuss the plan and identify what they would like accomplished and refine it. Mr. Huber would like HPC members to come forward with what they would like done, so that the HPC can form a draft and the request for a bid can be made, as these are requirements for the grant.

Mr. MacSems inquired about putting a cost limit on the grant, Mr. Huber explained the county has put dollar limits on similar grants in the past. If this can be done here, Mr. Huber explains it would save some time. Mr. Huber does state that one of the questions he has for the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) is if they will approve the cost of the package. Mr. MacSems states that he is sure they will, but that the process can take at least a month. Mr. Huber would like the bid advertised by September-October, then have the BOCC approve it. Mr. MacSems states that he does not know if this is done before the RFP or after. Mr. Huber says he is also unsure.

Mr. Sanders interjects and states that while he is familiar with State proposals and not County proposals, he is skeptical about putting an upper limit on the grant proposal. Mr. Sanders says that he has observed this this may lead to inflated bids/prices. Mr. Sanders continues, stating that there is a possibility there could be few to no bids if the stated limit is too low and suggests not doing so. He suggests letting people bid normally, without the limit. Mr. Huber says there should be an internal number, and while Mr. Sanders agrees, he states this number should not be advertised, as leaving things open is more effective. Mr. Huber states that he is new to this side of things (contractee) and praises Mr. Sanders for bringing his advice to the table. Mr. Huber has asked that everyone get an idea on numbers, and then a decision will be made on which way to advertise via a vote at the next meeting.

Mr. Dally asks why we are doing this process, as we are requesting a grant, and this needs a plan before submitting the request. Mr. Huber answers that it does not need to be a detailed plan, but that internally it is consistent with state elements. He states there is some flexibility but is “more or less the same” from what he has seen. Mr. Sanders then asks if there is a plan to move forward if the grant is not approved. Mr. Huber responds, stating that the grant is the plan going forward and would like to go to a contractor in creating a draft for the project. Mr. Sanders again asks for clarification on whether or not there is a plan should the grant not be approved. Mr. Huber clarifies those discussions have always included the grant, and that the DAHP cycle is geared in such a way that it allows for outside contractors. Mr. Huber asks if Mr. Sanders has an alternative. Mr. Sanders states that he does not but was seeking clarification due to previous notes lacking this information. Mr. Sanders also asks if there are other grants should this one not come through.

Mr. Huber says that he thinks that in the background there is some funding that could be made available within the budget to be used supplementally, but that the budget would need to be looked at during the time the project is being done. Mr. Huber says he is not familiar enough with the numbers to know for certain, but that this should be discussed. Mr. Sanders proposes that goals are made clear before going for a contractor or the grant so that things are outlined well beforehand, and volunteers himself if someone is needed to investigate other opportunities and more limited scope projects if the DAHP grant does not come through. He states that he does not feel there is a sturdy enough idea of what to do to begin voting on how to proceed. Mr. Huber agrees with Mr. Sanders about needing to have a planning talk about projects for the grant. Mr. Huber acknowledges that he thinks they are not there yet but wanted to lay out a timeframe. Mr. Sanders states that he would like to discuss this today if there is time, however Mr. Huber says that this is to happen after it is submitted to a vote.

Ms. Goodpaster interjects that she has reviewed notes from previous meetings, and states that this must be broken down into tasks and that this would not be done in the initial timeframe. She states that it was decided to start planning for the 2023-24 grant cycle. She states there is money to put into the project if the grant is not approved, and that there is time to look for consultants before starting on the next set of grants. She states that in January, she sent out a scope for a possible RFP and that Russ Sackett had dropped that into another format. Ms. Goodpaster offered to send these documents as to not have the board start from scratch again. Her document came from pulling RFPs from other counties that have developed plans. She continues, stating that that first part is hiring someone to get the plan and then find money to implement this plan. She states that this is step one. Both must be accomplished to get the plan.

Mr. Huber feels that they were to develop a goal with a contractor and identify elements of the plan with them. Ms. Goodpaster is asked to forward her copy of the plans created by Mr. Sackett and herself. She agrees so that everyone can look into it.

Ms. Goodpaster states that as a committee it is their job to keep things moving. Mr. Sanders then states that as a new member he would like to see a scoping document and plan for what they would like to have happen, with different plans in case the funding is not completed. Mr. Huber says he will discuss these things at the next meeting and thanks Ms. Goodpaster for the emails she has forwarded as they are great starting points. Mr. Sanders agrees.

Mason County Historic House/Place of Interest Plaque Program (If any) - Ms.

Goodpaster reports that she has an update and says that she has tried to identify people who will look at what is written and find anyone willing to be more active with this. Ms. Goodpaster tried to pull together a list of historic preservation-oriented non-profits in the county. She has currently spoken with Sue Stanly of the Matlock Historical Society as well as the McReevy House, and that she has found Boathouse in Allyn. Mr. MacSems interjects that that is the North Bay Historic Society and believes the contact for this is Bonnie Knight. Ms. Goodpaster asked if this is also covered Belfair. Mr. MacSems stated he does not know of any historic preservation groups active in Belfair area.

Ms. Goodpaster stated there are four groups that she knows of that can be contacted regarding the plaques, including the Mason County Historical Society. She asks if anyone knows of anything else within the county, all members present say they do not. Ms. Goodpaster states that the next step is to report to the committee with the people who she has contacted to go over the plan. She states that plans to have this discussion should be after next week but cannot promise that at this meeting will be before the August meeting. She will report on her progress.

Other (if any) – None.

Other Commission Discussion

Financial Statement – Mr. Huber asked if everyone had looked over the financial statement and if there are any questions regarding it. No one has any questions. Ms. Goodpaster does state that it appears increased funds are holding from recording fees. Mr. Huber agrees and states the funding looks good.

Mr. MacSems stated that at the August meeting the MCHPC needs to draft their 2022 budget.

Mr. Huber moved to approve the Financial Statement as presented, Mr. Sanders seconded. All in favor, motion carried.

Other (if any) - Ms. Goodpaster informed the meeting that at the Lodging Tax meeting, Racheal Hanson – Who runs the magazine Fjord and does most of the advertising for Mason County – has proposed a visitor interpretive center that may

include a historical section. Money has been granted to Ms. Hanson to conduct a study in order to find a good location for the center. Ms. Goodpaster and Mr. Dally are following this closely. This information will be added to New Business come fall.

IV. Next Meeting August 12th, 2021,

V. Adjournment

At 2:46p Mr. Huber made a motion to adjourn. Motion seconded by Ms. Goodpaster. All in favor, meeting adjourned.