

CITY OF PULLMAN  
**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**  
Special Meeting Minutes  
March 26, 2012

The City of Pullman Historic Preservation Commission held a special meeting at 7:30 p.m. on Monday, March 26, 2012, in Council Chambers, City Hall, 325 SE Paradise, Pullman, Washington with Chair John Anderson presiding.

ROLL CALL: Present: Anderson, Hornback, Munch-Rotolo, Root, Warnick  
Excused: Handy  
Staff: Dickinson, Radtke, Lane

ANDERSON                      Opened the meeting at 7:30 p.m. and called roll.

MOTION Munch-Rotolo moved to accept the minutes for the Regular Meeting of March 12, 2012 as prepared by staff. Seconded by Root and passed unanimously.

## REGULAR BUSINESS

Proposed CLG grant application	Radtke presented the completed FY 2013 grand application for review before it is presented to the City Council on April 10 <sup>th</sup> .
--------------------------------	--

Discussion	Hornback asked why the grant is only requesting \$4500 when the total projected cost to complete the task is \$14,500. Dickinson explained that there is a better chance of being awarded the grant if requesting the smaller amount with a commitment from consultants to donate their services. Root stated the total cost of the project is \$14,500 and with \$10,000 matching funds the grant is structured to complete the task at hand.
------------	--

HORNBACK                      Asked how the \$10,000 soft match is calculated and if Root had provided figures for time and personnel. Anderson stated he did not see a budget listed in the grant application and he thought the Dept of Interior would require one. Root explained that he has the figures for hours and rate of pay available but had inadvertently left them out of the grant proposal.

DISCUSSION Radtke explained that the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) recommended accepting soft match money if it is available. Hornback asked if there was an understanding that Root's firm would be awarded the project. Root stated that there was no such understanding, and there are enough people in town willing to donate their time and resources, and therefore saving tax payers money.

WARNICK

Said he felt the project was a great opportunity for a local firm and asked what would happen if the grant was awarded and the soft money did not come through. He expressed concern about whether the rest of the commission would be qualified to complete the task. Root asked if the HPC was unable to find someone to match the soft money as part of the grant, would they have to return the funding to DAHP. Anderson said he thought that the money would have to be returned in that case.

HORNBACK

Asked if less money would be available for subsequent years if a precedent is set by asking for so little amount this first year. She asked if more money was requested the first year whether it could make the project bigger or help with additional funding if volunteers were not available. Hornback asked if the HPC would be applying for grants on a yearly basis. Radtke stated that, according to DAHP, grants are based on a year to year allocation and not on previous awards and that if soft match money was available it was advisable to take advantage of it.

DISCUSSION

Warnick asked if the grant requested \$7,000 would the amount of soft match change accordingly, if it was in direct proportion to the budget. Warnick read that the local government share must equal at least 40% but Radtke confirmed this requirement has been suspended for the current grant cycle. Warnick also asked if the commission were to ask for \$9000 would they then be able to survey 100 properties. Root stated that he felt that that large of a project would reduce the likelihood of the offer of soft match money. Munch-Rotolo said she felt it was too late to restructure the scope of the project to include 100 properties. She said that, as written, the grant was a modest project that would help establish confidence in the HPC and gain work experience. Root also said that, as written, the project is of fairly good size with the standard level of recording already demonstrated on sample property Dexter Street previously discussed. Warnick said he felt 50 properties was a good size but asked if HPC requested more funding could they do a better job. Root explained that grant applications are merit based and that estimated figures would be 150 hours to inventory 50 buildings. He said that field workers could be paid \$25 per hour.

DISCUSSION

Warnick asked if it was likely for a Ph.D. student to be seeking employment for only 2 weeks. Root and Munch-Rotolo both stated that they felt there would be no shortage of students willing to participate in this type of project. Dickinson stated that who will do the work has not been determined and that it will be an open, competitive opportunity, even with the soft match as part of the grant. Warnick asked if those hired would be considered employed by the city or the contractor awarded the job. Root said if the project is sent out to bid and awarded to a contractor then they would be employed by the contractor. Dickinson said this would need to be clarified. Anderson

stated he had similar question regarding the administration of the project and asked if the city would award \$4500 to somebody to conduct the project and then in turn require \$10,414 in soft match. Dickinson confirmed that this is the way the grant is structured.

HORNBAC

Hornback asked which portion is the city contributing and Dickinson answered zero hard-match. Hornback asked if the city's portion is part of the soft-match listed in the grant and how much time is estimated to be contributed. Dickinson estimated the city's contribution to be 10% but this figure has not yet been calculated into the grant amounts.

DISCUSSION

Hornback asked about the project description on page two, second paragraph. She said the description does not list addresses or provide a map showing the location of the project and boundaries other than "centered on Maple Street adjacent to the College Hill Historic District." Root agreed that if there is not enough room to include a map then the proposal should be specific and suggested that the description include block numbers on specific street names, example being the 200, 300, 400 and 500 blocks of Maple. Radtke stated he could add this to the project.

HORNBAC

Stated that the grant proposes two options as contingencies if full funding is not available. She asked what criteria would be used to determine the most important properties to inventory if the project was scaled back. Radtke said that the city would rely on expertise and feedback from DAHP and commission members. Root stated that such a statement is a required element of the grant proposal should full funding not be available. Anderson said that the language was sufficient for contingencies.

HORNBAC

Suggested that more accurate terminology be used in the last paragraph of the project description or replace it with the alternate paragraph she provided. Hornback said that if you look at the historic properties altered in the Maple Street area, it is not accurate to say that many buildings have been demolished. Hornback said that this paragraph contains strong language and that more details should be given instead of general information. Hornback said that two properties have been demolished in the survey area; one at 320 Whitman and one taken down across from Greystone Church. Munch-Rotolo said she doesn't think it strengthens the application to go into precisely the details of what has been demolished. Hornback suggested not using such strong language as "considerable pressure," "substantially compromise" and "demolition of many historic buildings." Anderson said he thought this language should be left in the paragraph and Root agreed. Root stated that having one to two buildings demolished in the proposed study area is substantial.

- WARNICK Said he favors the idea of using the phrase “preservation bridge” (between the College Hill Historic District and the Greystone Church) that was discussed at the last regular HPC meeting. Warnick stated he favored leaving in the phrases “substantially” and “considerable” but quantifying them with actual statistics to strengthen the grant application. Anderson suggested taking out the sentence beginning with “Modern infill has led...” and replacing it with the sentence from the paragraph Hornback provided beginning with “The proposed Maple Street study area...”
- RADTKE Asked for confirmation of the proposed changes to the grant as written. Commissioners agreed that the noted contingencies should be retained but that “preservation bridge” should be added to the narrative. Radtke confirmed that a short description and addresses of the properties included in the grant would be added as well as the hours and salary figures into the budget. Dickinson confirmed that the last sentence in the project description would be retained.
- DISCUSSION Root asked if the timeline could be moved up to notify residents of when survey work would begin. Dickinson confirmed that this was possible and Anderson said the schedule for project completion seems reasonable.
- JOHN CHAPMAN  
405 NW North St  
Pullman, WA 99163 Said he thought the project description was misleading. Chapman stated that the buildings that have been demolished in this area were small and did not have historical merit. He stated that it is not cost effective to tear down a \$300,000 house and build multi-family housing given what the rents are in Pullman. Anderson stated that the HPC wanted to conduct the survey to see what’s there before houses are torn down. Chapman felt it was misleading to say that this survey needed to be completed soon because of pressure from developers.
- EILEEN MACOLL  
1165 S. Grand Ave #58  
Pullman, WA 99163 Asked that detailed budget numbers be included in the grant application. Macoll said that definitions were still needed for what constitutes a historic property, building or neighborhood. Root said the terms are defined in the CLG legislation. Macoll said that this survey was only one requirement for providing information necessary to list individual properties on the Pullman Register of Historic Places. Root stated that this survey would, in fact, provide all of the information necessary to list a property on the local register.
- ANDERSON Confirmed that a detailed budget and suggested revisions will be provided for the upcoming City Council meeting.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

May 14 – no objections noted  
June 11 – no objections noted  
July 9 – Hornback not able to attend

MOTION

Munch-Rotolo moved to adjourn the meeting. Warnick seconded and passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

ATTEST:

---

Chair

---

Planning Director

---

Secretary