



## **Cultural Resource Advisory Group Meeting Draft Meeting Notes**

**Team Leader:** Elizabeth Dubreuil (PSE), (425) 462-3609, [elizabeth.dubreuil@pse.com](mailto:elizabeth.dubreuil@pse.com).

### **PRESENT**

Elizabeth Dubreuil and Dave Magnuson (Puget Sound Energy), Danielle Storey (USACE), Nick Vann (DAHP), Heather Miller and Matthew Sneddon, (HRA), Chris Miss, (SWCA), Jeroldine Hallberg and Carol Fabrick (Town of Concrete), and Candace Wilson (Facilitator, PDSA Consulting).

**DECISIONS:** None today

**NEXT MEETING:** April 17, 2013

**FUTURE 2013 MEETING DATES:** Regular meetings will most likely be held quarterly, but field trips and other meetings may occur when needed.

### **JANUARY 30 AGENDA**

#### **LUNCH**

1. Safety Moment
2. Decisions Required at Today's Meeting: None
3. Project Updates/Discussions: Baker Club House (includes walk through)
4. Walk through of Lower Baker Compound

#### **SNACKS & DRINKS**

5. Discussion – Lower Baker Compound Proposal
6. Project Updates/Discussions, continued
  - 2013 projects
  - MOA (Gulper, Spawning Beaches, LB Dam)
  - Swift Creek Campground
  - Burpee Hill
7. Decisions for next meeting?
8. Evaluate Meeting, set location and agenda for next meeting (May 15 or June 19)

### **PREVIOUS - STILL RELEVANT - ACTION ITEMS**

- Kara: Check with Dan (PM for the GI) to see if September is an appropriate timeframe for them to give a presentation to the CRAG on the GI and coordinate with Elizabeth accordingly. **Ongoing**
- Elizabeth: Proceed with curation of collections at the Burke with Burke and NWAA. **Ongoing.**

CRAG members met at the Lower Baker Visitor's Center at 11 am. Heather gave a brief overview of the Lower Baker Compound proposal. The goal for this year is to come to agreement on a concept for design of this project, with the idea the project will be scheduled into a five-year plan.

Elizabeth outlined a brief history of the Baker Club House as far as it is known.

### **SAFETY MOMENT**

Elizabeth distributed protective gear (hard hats, goggles, and vests) to attendees and reminded everyone to keep on the lookout for moving vehicles and tripping hazards while on the construction site.

## **PROJECT UPDATES/DISCUSSIONS**

### Lower Baker Compound

Heather and Elizabeth described what is known of the operations of the Washington Portland Cement Company (and its successors) on the Lower Baker site and pointed out contributing and noncontributing resources and features that will be changed according to the draft proposal. Chris described opportunities for geotechnical research. Matt outlined a couple of approaches: 1) make the areas visually separate with the use of berms and trees; 2) create “passive” or “soft” boundaries so that the current operation is visible and reminiscent of the extent of the historic operation.

There was some discussion about moving current activities out of the historic area, segregating them better for safety reasons.

Nick and Jeroldine spoke in favor of Option 2. Since this was always an industrial area, maybe sight lines are not important. Nick commented that the new building being proposed is massive and will be a big impact to the feeling of the district. Is it better to have it be big like the previous complex or to subdue it to preserve historic integrity? From the Club House, the view would be similar to what once was.

There was some discussion of options for interpretation, such as an easement from the railway to give a better view of the area, hiking trails, a virtual game of being a concrete operator, viewfinder views of then and now, smart phone apps, etc.

The sacking house and sky bridge have been evaluated and determined to be safety and health hazards. They cannot be seen by the public, and do not provide usable space. Nick commented that money needed to stabilize these buildings would be taken from the potential Club House restoration. The current proposal calls for these buildings to be demolished.

Elizabeth talked about some of the considerations for appropriate documentation, 3D laser scanning, traditional HABS-HAER? Other?

Elizabeth suggested that a possible win/win resolution for the other buildings would be to let them stand and degrade in place. They could be visible, but fencing or other obstacles could be used to keep them off-limits. This solution would allow buildings and remnants to remain in place, but there would be an understanding that PSE would allow them to be neglected in place.

Matt shared that his brief internet research indicated there may be no historic cement sites like this one in the U.S. There are a couple of sites with remnants or artifacts that have been incorporated into parks. Most cement sites keep going, so old buildings have been replaced with new ones along the way, and there is little left of the original process. Matt commented that anything PSE did here could be vanguard of cement works interpretation. There could be an opportunity for unique interpretation here.

## **LUNCH**

Attendees enjoyed a tailgate party lunch in the parking lot of the Visitor Center.

## **PROJECT UPDATES/DISCUSSIONS, CONTINUED**

### Baker Club House

Flashlights were distributed, and the group toured the Club House. Elizabeth described the recent restoration work done to the Club House as well as possible use of the facility as a Visitor Center and office complex. There was some discussion of the view of the contributing resources from the Club House and things that will need to be

considered, such as removal of the pole barn, neighbors on both sides (one residence is a Craftsman “cottage” still owned by PSE and PSE’s other historic district), parking, entry, and handicap accommodation.

Nick suggested adding parking for the rear to minimize site impacts on the main (north) side of the club house. Because access to the rear via streets could be limited by ongoing plant operations, an alternative access route could be provided on the east side of the club house using permeable pavers to a) lessen the impact of site development/paving and b) limit vehicular access long the property line in order to avoid disturbing the neighbors.

Carol commented that she would like to see the building restored and used for the public. Nick asked about tax credits. Elizabeth has already begun research, and it would require that a National Register registration form be completed. It would be best to nominate the building as individually eligible to get tax credits for work on it. PSE accounting says it is feasible, and the 20% tax credits would help with the Restoration plan. Rhoda Lawrence estimated 7 years ago that restoration would cost approximately \$1.2M. Based on the interpretation done under the Snoqualmie license, interpretation could cost \$.5–1M, and that would not be eligible for tax credits. There is money under the license for education, and it could be used on this project. PSE would design the project to fit the budget, and work could be phased. For PSE to comply, it would need a Memorandum of Agreement signed between FERC and the Washington DAHP. .

## **ADJOURNMENT**

As several CRAG members were unable to attend this meeting, it was decided to postpone the remaining agenda for a future meeting.

**DECISIONS FOR NEXT MEETING: None known**

**FUTURE MEETINGS: April 17, 10 am – 2 pm, PSE Skagit Center, Burlington**

## **AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING**

### **Draft Agenda for April 17, 2013**

1. Safety Moment
2. Review notes / agenda / action items from January 16 and January 30, 2013 meetings
3. Review recent BRCC meeting activities, licensing updates
4. Decisions Required at Today’s Meeting: None
5. Project Updates
  - 2013 projects
  - MOA (Gulper, Spawning Beaches, LB Dam)
  - Draft DAHP Level II
  - Swift Creek Campground
  - Burpee Hill
  - Baker Club House

### **LUNCH**

5. Project Updates, continued
6. Decisions for next meeting?
7. Evaluate Meeting, set location and agenda for next meeting