



CITY OF  
**TUMWATER**

## HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA

Online via Zoom and In Person at  
Tumwater Fire Department  
Headquarters, Training Room, 311 Israel  
Rd. SW, Tumwater, WA 98501

Thursday, March 20, 2025  
6:30 PM

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Changes to Agenda
4. Approval of Minutes
  - a. Historic Preservation Commission Meeting 04/18/2024
5. Public Comment
6. Historic Trails and Roadways
7. 2025 Department Projects
8. Next Meeting Date - 04/17/2025
9. Adjourn

### **Meeting Information**

The public are welcome to attend in person, by telephone or online via Zoom.

### **Watch Online**

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88997100672?pwd=KZNt9kPj4JPPbBplabRmRS4uZS3ZBL.1>

### **Listen by Telephone**

Call (253) 215-8782, listen for the prompts and enter the Webinar ID 889 9710 0672 and Passcode 379201.

### **Public Comment**

The public may submit comments by sending an email to [sklein@ci.tumwater.wa.us](mailto:sklein@ci.tumwater.wa.us), no later than 4:00 p.m. the day of the meeting. Comments are submitted directly to the Commission members and will not be read individually into the record of the meeting.

### **Post Meeting**

Video of this meeting will be recorded and posted on our City Meeting page: <https://tumwater-wa.municodemeetings.com>.

### **Accommodations**

The City of Tumwater takes pride in ensuring that people with disabilities are able to take part in, and

benefit from, the range of public programs, services, and activities offered by the City. To request an accommodation or alternate format of communication, please contact the City's ADA Coordinator directly, call (360) 754-4129 or email [ADACoordinator@ci.tumwater.wa.us](mailto:ADACoordinator@ci.tumwater.wa.us). For vision or hearing impaired services, please contact the Washington State Relay Services at 7-1-1 or 1-(800)-833-6384.

**TUMWATER HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF HYBRID MEETING  
April 18, 2024 Page 1**

**CONVENE:** 6:30 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Chair David Shipley and Commissioners Dave Nicandri, Renee Radcliff Sinclair, and Don Trosper.

Excused: Commissioners Alex Rossiter and Marnie Slakey.

Staff: City Administrator Lisa Parks, Parks and Recreation Director Chuck Denney, Recreation Manager Todd Anderson, and Volunteer Coordinator Brianna Feller.

Others: Councilmember Leatta Dahlhoff and Kevin McFarland, Sound Urban Forestry.

**CHANGES TO AGENDA:** The agenda was revised to add a briefing on the Old Highway 99 historic signs and a potential U.S. 101 historic sign.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES: MARCH 21, 2024:** Minutes of the March 21, 2024 meeting were delayed.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** Chair Shipley reviewed the format for offering public comment either in-person or virtually.

**Beowulf Brower** said he is a US certified arborist with a Bachelor’s degree in forestry. His comments pertain to the Davis-Meeker oak tree. The Commission is tasked with safeguarding the heritage of Tumwater by fostering the restoration of historic sites and resolving conflicts between preservation and development. Based on those duties, he implored the Commission to retain the oak tree on the Historic Register. The historic importance of the tree is not up for debate because the tree predates not only the register, but also the country by more than a century. The tree has been a landmark since the time of covered wagons traversing what is now Old Highway 99 and remains so today. It is a living history and part of the past that can be touched. Buildings can be rebuilt and refurbished but the tree cannot. The claim is that this vessel of history is a risk to the public. As he has demonstrated in a lengthy analysis submitted to the Commission, the risk posed by the tree was exaggerated in a series of mistakes made during the assessment. The City’s arborist report cannot be used to justify the removal of the tree because of the volume and seriousness of the errors it contains. Further, as proven in the analysis and attached emails, a public records disclosure from the Washington State Insurance Administration shows no evidence that there was any recommendation made by the agency despite the City Attorney referring to the tree as very dead in an email to the agency months after the arborist report was submitted and available for review. He visited the oak tree earlier in the day and new leaf growth should be visible in several weeks. The Commission holds the

**TUMWATER HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF HYBRID MEETING  
April 18, 2024 Page 2**

power to demand better. He recommends retaining the tree on the registry and request, in the interest of preservation, a neutral third party assessment by experts. An assessment by a third party would provide clear guidance on the steps needed to retain the tree. In the interim, if the tree is retained on the registry, mulching would be an inexpensive way to set a precedent for protecting the tree. In his professional opinion, many arboricultural methods would lower the risk of failure to a tolerable level. Using them would allow future generations to touch a piece of the past. Other arborists will testify including some who have worked to preserve the tree for years. All of them have more experience and are better qualified than him. He implored the Commission to consider their advice.

**Ray Gleason, 6226 Cedar Flats Road, Olympia**, displayed a plaque he received from the City in 2010 for his work on preserving the oak tree. There were no efforts by the City of Tumwater to preserve the tree. He witnessed a semi-truck hitting the canopy of the tree on Old Highway 99. He spoke to a person working at the State Patrol hanger, who assisted him as a flagger as he lifted the tree canopy to provide clearance over the highway. The City was not involved in that effort. On February 21, 2023, he spoke to a member of the Council regarding a compromised Douglas fir tree in Pioneer Park near several historical headstones including some of the Bush family. Although not related to the Davis-Meeker oak tree, it is indirectly related because of the relevance, as the fir tree that failed and hit several tombstones. He addressed his concerns regarding the fir tree with the City of Tumwater about the tree's potential failure. The City's arborist inspected the tree and elected not to remove the tree.

**Neil Wolbert** said he opened a business in Olympia in the 1960s. One thing unique about his company is his work with trees. Nothing is as important as the oak tree. In his opinion, the tree is worth saving. He has deep feelings about it and worked on the tree with Rob Lloyd, who is an arborist and one of the best. He does not want to minimize others but he worked alongside him just to learn about trees. The oak tree was a big job. He and his company volunteered time to preserve the health of the tree, which influenced other arborists to contribute time with some from Tacoma bringing an entire team to work most of a day removing small pieces of deadwood from the tree. Many others worked on the tree and not all were arborists but they all recognized the importance of the 400-year old masterpiece that sits alongside the road. It is more than just a tree to him when he first traveled through the area in the 60s. When the road was moved, the tree was not considered and even though it was protected with a barrier, three feet of soil had been placed around the base of the tree, which is detrimental to a tree. The tree had a decay pocket in its trunk that he and others excavated. Mr. Lloyd was able to enter into the cavity to clean and remove decayed wood and treat the tree.

**Janine Gates** said she and her family care deeply about the tree and its

**TUMWATER HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF HYBRID MEETING  
April 18, 2024 Page 3**

future. She was able to watch the last meeting, which was refreshing to see the Commission not rubber stamp the limited direction provided by staff. She appreciated Commissioner Nicandri thinking outside the box and recommendation to save acorns. During his comments, she was reminded of the callousness shown to the 200-year old Medicine Creek Treaty tree in the Nisqually delta. In 1854, the treaty was signed under a Douglas fir tree, and in the 1960s, six lanes of Interstate 5 were constructed across the delta burying the tree, which was very unfortunate. In 1975, seedlings from the tree were collected and given to area tribes. The tree has since died but there was foresight to plant seedlings from the tree. She has not heard any similar consideration or outreach to area tribes and would like to see outreach initiated.

**Mik Miazio** said he lives in Shelton and works at Millersylvania State Park. He is a certified arborist and a certified tree risk assessor and has worked in the region for the last 10 years. He is originally from Poland and completed his arborist education in New York City. Poland is one of the last countries in Europe that has oak trees older than 1,000 years. Those trees did not reach such an old age without assistance and help to include props, cabling systems, or bracing. Mulching and other measures are also necessary. It is important to remember the oak tree is a living thing and similar to humans, older humans often need more assistance. The tree is living history, is a monument, and defines the community. Most old growth in developed areas has been removed for a variety of reasons ranging from profit, blocking development, or it is deemed unfeasible to maintain. Other issues such as roads, infrastructure, and buildings can be adjusted or moved to accommodate the tree because once the tree is lost it is lost forever. In terms of risk assessment, the oak tree does not pose imminent risk. Imminent risk results from trees collapsing or losing branches after exposure to a wind event. That type of situation threatens the oak tree; however, it is possible to explore options for preserving the tree. The City should research other areas with oak trees, such as Poland or Great Britain and obtain information on how to retain oaks. It is up to the community to protect the tree.

**Teresa** said she is in favor of pursuing whatever it takes to save the tree.

**Ester** said she also supports saving the tree because when she considers history, there is nothing more striking than the tree. She remembers when she first moved to the area and saw the tree the first time. It was wondrous. The tree is an iconic landmark that she cannot imagine the City would not save. She was so concerned about the tree being destroyed that she collected three acorns and planted them in a field near her home just to ensure some survive. The tree is beautiful and it is not possible to re-create the creation. The City has something that is a blessing and gift and worth preserving. She hopes the City spends as much as required to save the tree.

**TUMWATER HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF HYBRID MEETING  
April 18, 2024 Page 4**

**Sue Danver** said she is hopeful the City will save the tree. One of the suggestions of a compromise by removing 15 feet of the tree overall would be a misfortune. She reviewed Mr. Browers' report and supports his recommendation for a neutral third party assessment of the tree, as there could be some incorrect decisions in the matrix within the arborist's report. The tree is a symbol of Tumwater and the City of yesteryear and the tree should be preserved as long as possible. She is hopeful that removal of the tree is not connected to the potential growth of the airport. She is concerned about the growth of the airport so close to the City and hopes the tree and its health are not connected to the growth of the airport. The tree is very beautiful and is beneficial for wildlife. As a birder, the deciduous tree provides more insects for smaller birds. Deciduous trees support more wildlife, and for that reason she would like the tree protected.

**Jeff Foster** reiterated comments he submitted previously in a letter. He does believe there isn't any imminent reason for removing the tree. He has similar sentiments regarding the magnificence of the tree and what it represents historically to Tumwater. He is also appreciative that although there is rot within the interior of the tree, the analysis of the location of the rot at the base of the tree suggests there is sufficient sound wood to support the tree. Until the rot crosses a threshold, failure of the entire tree is not indicated in the immediate future. The City should strive to save the tree.

Chair Shipley conveyed appreciation to community members for spending their time attending the meeting and offering comments about the oak tree.

**DAVIS/MEEKER  
OAK TREE:**

Director Denney advised that although the Commission discussed the situation involving the Davis-Meeker oak tree at its last meeting, Commissioners indicated a need to continue the discussion and receive more information on how the tree was assessed and the various methods that have been recommended that should be added to an evaluation of the tree. Because staff was unable to schedule a work session because of scheduling conflicts, the tree was included on the agenda to continue the discussion.

Kevin McFarland, the City's Urban Forester is prepared to discuss the methods he used to evaluate the tree as well as why he used those particular methods. The decision before the Commission and the recommendation to the City Council is whether to retain the Davis-Meeker oak tree on the City's Historic Register or a recommendation to remove the Davis-Meeker oak from the Historic Register. The Commission is not tasked with deciding the ultimate fate of the tree; however, the Commission's discussion is part of the overall process.

Kevin McFarland thanked the Commission for the invitation to present and clarify information.

**TUMWATER HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF HYBRID MEETING  
April 18, 2024 Page 5**

Commissioner Nicandri commented that some of the testimony speaks to the documentation and the timeframe of evaluation. He asked for an explanation of the timeframe for evaluating the tree. The report referred to future failures that might include large diameter scaffold branches from the east facing co-dominate stem. He asked about the perimeter of “future failures” within that description.

Mr. McFarland replied that the evaluation form timeframe is based on one year. The timeframe is included in Appendix 1 to the report within the tree risk assessment form.

Mr. Nicandri commented that within the report under “Comments,” the narrative indicated the retrenchment option would be controversial to say the least with the potential of its ineffectiveness. He asked Mr. McFarland to elaborate on why the option would be controversial and ineffective.

Mr. McFarland explained that during his consultation with Tyler Bunton with Tree Solutions who conducted the sonic tomography, they discussed retrenchment in detail in addition to his own research on retrenchment pruning. In terms of this particular tree and based on that discussion and the possibility of removing approximately 15 feet of the entire canopy to reduce end weight, it would create too much stress to the tree in terms of canopy removal to ensure the tree survived. Secondly, the option would not have sufficiently reduced the stress load of the co-dominate stem leaning towards the airport hangar. Overall, it would not be adequate and consequently retrenchment was not an option of mitigation that he supported.

Commissioner Nicandri asked whether he was familiar with the repair work completed by Mr. Wolbert 16 years ago.

Mr. McFarland said the repair was for damage that occurred on the side of the trunk of the tree facing the highway.

Commissioner Nicandri referred to written testimony the Commission received suggesting that the damage to the tree was significant and that the damage eventually healed. He asked whether a dying or decayed tree in a regressive mode could heal itself so effectively.

Mr. McFarland advised that the healing process is considered wound closure rather than healing as callus tissue develops over the wound with wood wound eventually developing to cover the exposed wound. The tree is actually vigorous and is growing nicely with good growth and good density of leaves, color, and internode growth during the years he has assessed the tree. The tree was able to close the wound and forestall wood decaying pathogens and insect infestations that might attack inner wood. However, there are structural concerns associated with significant decay

**TUMWATER HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF HYBRID MEETING  
April 18, 2024 Page 6**

found in the stem base, lower main stem, east facing co-dominant stem, and large scaffold branches. The tree can appear to be vigorous, healthy, and growing except it lacks a good foundation and is compromised.

Commissioner Nicandri said the information is helpful but was not clear within the report. Those who are not arborists are having difficulty assessing how a tree appears to be vigorous but deemed worthy of being removed, which appears to be contradictory. Saying the tree is vigorous but unsound is the most forthright declaration by Mr. McFarland to date during this process. He visited the tree earlier in the day prior to the meeting and attempted to view the entirety of the tree without endangering himself because of traffic. He was struck as to how the tree leans to the southwest or into prevailing winds. He asked whether that situation would be conducive to the tree's long-standing ability to withstand windstorms.

Mr. McFarland replied that it might be as trees growing along a coastal shoreline are another example of how trees can lean. Another consideration is how trees and vegetation also tend to grow towards the sun.

Commissioner Nicandri said the Commission received testimony questioning the reliability of sounding the tree with a hammer in addition to sonic tomography. He asked whether sonic tomography focused on a particular vertical area was performed throughout the tree.

Mr. McFarland explained that using a mallet is only one tool of an arborist's assessment. He also took some core samples using an increment borer. When Amanda Hancock (Waxwing Tree Specialists) performed an aerial assessment of the tree canopy, she used a probe and a mallet and conducted some soundings. That method can be very accurate despite being basic as it speaks to a person's experience and familiarity with the process as some species emit sounds differently in terms of whether the tree is solid or whether there is the presence of decay or a void inside a scaffold branch or trunk,. The mallet is only one element of the entire set of tools utilized for the assessment ranging from visual to the mallet and in between. In terms of the resistograph, the instrument indicates decay by drilling a small hole using a drill bit. The device records resistance to the wood to the drill bit that is reflected in a graphic printout similar to a printout from an EKG. The test is accurate and provides information of an indirect area that is drilled compared to sonic tomography that includes sensors placed around the circumference of the tree or the perimeter of the trunk. Sensors transmit and receive sound, which can test a larger area as opposed to a resistograph, which tests horizontally.

Commissioner Nicandri asked whether the main trunk of the tree was at greater risk than the scaffold branches. Mr. McFarland said he agreed with Mr. Bunton's opinion that the tree would not likely collapse similar to



**TUMWATER HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF HYBRID MEETING  
April 18, 2024 Page 7**

demolition of a building. However, it is important to consider with respect to sonic tomography and the cavity at the base of the tree, how it might expand into the root system at the base of the tree. The decay is not restricted to expanding vertically into the tree but can affect the tree below the ground as well. It is possible the entire tree could fail at the base causing the tree to fall over. However, he determined that based on the testing the issue surrounding decay expands upwards to the joint of the two co-dominate stems with one stem hanging to the east over Old Highway 99 and one stem hanging to the west near the airport hangar. The east area is compromised from the scaffold branches from the two co-dominate stems, in particular the ones located on the eastside. That area is of concern because of a potential large scaffold branch or co-dominate stem failure.

Commissioner Nicandri asked about the possible direction of the tree if it were to collapse entirely.

Mr. McFarland said there are many factors to consider such as high winds, snow load, ice storm, or other issues that can affect how the tree might fail and fall. Sometimes it could be a combination of all those factors, gravity, or the weakened structure of the tree within the interior of the stem. It is difficult to guesstimate. It could be theorized that the tree could fall more to the south or southwest based on the lean of the canopy toward the area of the airport hangar. Many factors are at play that speaks to what arborists must consider when assessing a tree.

Commissioner Nicandri said he had asked at the last meeting for the Commission to walk through the risk assessment form and presumes Mr. McFarland is prepared to walk review the form. He is particularly curious as to how a decision in one category necessarily yields a result in a finding in another parallel category. If there is an internal dynamic to the matrix then he is mystified. Additionally, the Commission received testimony that called into question the accuracy of the matrix. It would be helpful to walk through the matrix.

Mr. McFarland invited other feedback from Commissioners.

Commissioner Trospen complimented Mr. McFarland for his obvious love of trees and for the history and heritage of Tumwater, which are the concerns of the Commission. The Commission is not intended to determine the health aspect of the tree and the issues considered by arborists. The Commission is focused on the historic factor in the heritage of Tumwater that is represented by the tree. It is likely the Tree Board has more input on the tree's health and urban forestry, etc., whereas the Historic Preservation Commission's input is history and heritage and not necessarily the health of the tree. The City Council will determine the final decision on the tree by balancing all interests and efforts. Many local arborists have done much work on the tree over the years. When he was

**TUMWATER HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF HYBRID MEETING  
April 18, 2024 Page 8**

little, his grandfather put on his logging spurs and climbed the oak tree to trim branches. Even his grandfather had a little hand in that tree as well as Indian tribes before the arrival of pioneers. People off the Cowlitz Trail camped under the tree as historic records reflect. Much heritage is associated with the tree and it is important to preserve it for the sake of tourism and the City's heritage. Tumwater does not have very many living landmarks except for the buildings. The tree is a living history and is older than the Bush Butternut tree. The Bush Butternut tree failed and was only several hundred years old, whereas the oak tree is over 400 years and worth preserving.

Chair Shipley referred to the last meeting and his quandary as he understands the City's arborist is indicating that the tree is in danger of collapsing while on the other hand somebody needs to speak up for historic structures. Historic structures cannot speak for themselves, which is unfortunate as the tree cannot convey that it is done and tired and would prefer to become mulch in the ground. Consequently, the arborist is indicating that the tree is in danger of falling and provided a graphic illustration of a red line from the base of the tree to the main branch indicative of decay. The Commission has received testimony that other arborists should have an opportunity to determine whether the City's arborist is correct in his assessment. On the one hand he would love to save the tree but recognizes that the tree might serve as a liability to the City. It is a difficult decision, as no one on the Commission would support the destruction of historic buildings, trees, or tombstones. He conveyed his appreciation to Commissioner Nicandri for his input and questions.

Commissioner Nicandri said that the only reason the issue is before the Commission is because of a risk assessment form. It appeared to him to be prudent given the widespread degree of public interest in the tree that it would be incumbent upon the Commission to understand the mechanics of the recommendation that has brought the issue to the Commission. As he indicated at the last meeting, the mere fact that he might completely agree with the logic of the model does not mean that he necessarily agrees with the recommendation to remove the tree. Given the widespread public interest, the Commission owes it to itself as well as to the community to deconstruct and demystify the process. As a reasonably good reader of public policies and documentation and despite the amount of criticism of the report, he is still encountering difficulty in understanding dynamically the mechanism of how circling one dot leads to a determination. It is not readily apparent what the linkages are. If only for intellectual curiosity he would like Mr. McFarland to review the assessment.

Mr. McFarland added that he does not take the issue lightly and as mentioned previously, he has been working, assessing, and supporting the health of the tree for 27 years. Ray Gleason took him up in a bucket to inspect the tree years ago. He remembers when the base of the tree was

**TUMWATER HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF HYBRID MEETING  
April 18, 2024 Page 9**

opened exposing the root rot and the efforts of adding river rock around the base to create an inhospitable environment for the infection to spread. The tree has had other work completed over the years. He deliberated for some time and had to reach a difficult decision. A tree such as the oak tree amongst many other trees is a portal to the past which he recognizes. He discussed the issue with many friends and colleagues and acknowledges that there is much misunderstanding and misconception about his intent. He does not want the tree for firewood, for furniture, and does not have an agreement with the City to funnel off some of the wood to grow shiitake mushrooms. He does not have any ulterior motive other than to work and do his best to assess the tree using his experience and craft. The assessment covered many months and involved many individuals performing different types of assessments on the tree. That process spanned five months of deliberation to arrive at a recommendation.

Mr. McFarland referred to the assessment checklist and explained that the risk categorization is an important part of the assessment to contribute information. The form covers information helpful to an arborist and to others to arrive at a determination. Tyler Bunton performed the sonic tomography. Mr. Bunton spent approximately two hours performing the tomography and did not conduct a risk assessment of the tree. In response to his invitation to share information on potential preventive measures to save the tree, Mr. Bunton offered his opinion that retrenching the tree would be beneficial. Mr. Bunton offered that option after working two hours on the tree. It is important to put that in context with the requirements of a full-blown tree assessment. Mr. Bunton provided important information that was very useful; however, Mr. Bunton did not conduct a tree risk assessment of the oak tree.

The form speaks to target assessments of 1, 2, 3, and 4 and the different descriptions for each number. Old Highway 99 is not necessarily a target but rather reflective of vehicle traffic as a constant occupancy rate. The airport hangar is another target, as well as the north and south parking lots and the electrical service to the hangar. The risk assessment identifies specific targets that should be considered. The next step is considering the likelihood of tree failure affecting those targets and the consequences of that failure.

The next page of the form is risk categorization. In preparation for the Commission's discussion, he reviewed his previous field notes from the risk assessment form and noted that he should have changed conditions 1, 2, & 3 to "probable" rather than "possible." His mistake was indicating "possible" rather than "probable." He offered to provide an amendment to the City to reflect the correction. However, the correction does not change the risk rating as the risk rating is based off the risk assessment form used during the assessment of the tree in June 2023.

**TUMWATER HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF HYBRID MEETING  
April 18, 2024 Page 10**

Commissioner Nicandri asked whether the movement of the selections from “possible” to “probable” within the Failure column automatically affect the Impact, Failure & Impact, and Consequence columns.

Mr. McFarland responded that it would not affect the other columns as he based the information on notes he completed during this field inspection. It was a lack of transferring the information accurately.

Commissioner Nicandri inquired about the conceivability that something could be a likelihood of eminent failure but have very low impact, unlikely failure and impact, or negligible consequence.

Mr. McFarland affirmed it would be possible.

Mr. McFarland walked the Commission through the risk categorization process with the corrected information, and Matrix 1 reflective of the “Likelihood” and Matrix 2 reflective of the “Risk Rating.” In response to the assertion that the selections within each category are subjective, he agreed but added that the outcomes are a component of the entire assessment and help guide the consulting arborist or others to identify a determination.

Commissioner Nicandri asked whether Target #1 was the major concern. Mr. McFarland affirmed it was because the target number described as #1 is vehicle traffic on Old Highway 99 and #3 is the north and south parking lots, which are significant targets as well.

Commissioner Nicandri asked whether the direction by the City included any mitigation steps for preservation of the tree and risk.

Mr. McFarland said if the option selected was retrenchment for the tree and included in the report, the City would support the option.

Commissioner Nicandri asked about the circumstance of trimming the east co-dominate stem that hangs over the highway and the impact to the tree. Mr. McFarland said the removal would stress the tree; however it would be dependent upon the extent of the amount removed. Mr. Bunton’s suggestion of reducing the tree canopy on the eastside by 15 feet would be significant. However, trimming might not necessarily result in an imbalance but could detrimentally affect the tree's ability to withstand wind force and create more vulnerability for the remaining co-dominate stem. It is possible but removal of the east stem could create more vulnerability for the tree to withstand weather events. Essentially, reducing the entire canopy is the best option rather than only one side of the canopy if the retrenchment option was pursued. He does not recommend reducing only one side of the canopy.

**TUMWATER HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF HYBRID MEETING  
April 18, 2024 Page 11**

Chair Shipley inquired about an option of only supporting the western half of the tree with entrenchment methods if the east canopy was removed near the highway. Mr. McFarland said he ruled out the structural support system because he does not believe there is a sufficient scaffold structure to support the western half of the tree near the hangar.

Commissioner Trosper said it was heartwarming to witness the response from the public and other local arborists, as there is a passion that speaks to the purpose of the Commission to encourage passion for the local history of Tumwater. Public input overwhelmingly supports not delisting the tree or removing the tree, but to pursue options that can save the tree as long as possible. He believes the historical value outweighs the legal financial liability, which will be weighed by the City Council. There are few remaining landmarks in existence and it is important to save the Tumwater family tree.

**MOTION: Commissioner Sinclair moved, seconded by Commissioner Trosper, to retain the listing of the Davis-Meeker Oak Tree on the Historic Register. A voice vote approved the motion unanimously.**

**MOTION: Commissioner Nicandri moved to devote all remaining resources within the Commission's budget for 2024 for mitigation measures in support of preservation efforts for the Davis-Meeker oak tree by the Parks and Recreation Department in conjunction with community volunteers and interested third parties for plantings, mulching, bracing, and any other options to help preserve the tree if the final decision is to retain the tree. *The motion died due to the lack of a second.***

Director Denney advised that a motion was not necessary because the City's Tree Fund is adequately funded for any mitigation measures for the tree.

Chair Shipley noted for the benefit of the public that the Commission is an advisory board and any decisions by the Commission are not final. The City Council can either accept the Commission's recommendation to retain the tree on the register or delist the tree. He acknowledged that many people have obtained acorns from the tree and likely planted them in their backyards. The City also collected many of the acorns from the tree for future plantings. Chair Shipley thanked the public for attending. Although the briefing was educational, he still wrestles with the decision and is hopeful the tree lives for many more years.

Commissioner Nicandri asked whether the documentation and communications provided to the Commission over the course of the last two meetings would be automatically forwarded to the City Council.

**TUMWATER HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF HYBRID MEETING  
April 18, 2024 Page 12**

Director Denney advised that the information from both meetings would be available on the City’s website as well as the meeting videos. The City Council has received all emails and other communications from the public. The Council will receive the Commission’s recommendation. Ultimately, the decision on the tree is an administrative decision within the Executive Department. The Mayor and the City Administrator will continue to evaluate all aspects of the issue and render a decision.

Commissioner Nicandri inquired about the timing for collection of acorns from the tree. Mr. McFarland advised collection of acorns is in October/November.

Chair Shipley thanked Mr. McFarland for his time and expertise. He agreed that the assessment form was confusing and that the explanation was educational.

**OLD HIGHWAY 99  
HISTORIC SIGNS:**

Director Denney acknowledged the ongoing efforts by Commissioner Nicandri to pursue completion and installation of the historic signs. The Parks and Recreation Department has advised the Transportation and Engineering Department of the preferred locations to install the signs. Locations of the signs include the south end of Tumwater off Old Highway 99 near Kiperts Korner Feed store, at the north end of the City near Sunset Campus north of the Safeway Store, and one on each side of the Capitol Way Bridge. The signs cost \$400. The Commission has remaining funds from 2023 and 2024. Staff plans to provide proposals for expenditure of the funds.

**NEXT MEETING  
DATE:**

The next meeting is scheduled on May 16, 2024.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

**Commissioner Trospen moved, seconded by Commissioner Sinclair, to adjourn the meeting at 8:10 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.**

Prepared by Valerie L. Gow, Recording Secretary/President  
Puget Sound Meeting Services, [psmsoly@earthlink.net](mailto:psmsoly@earthlink.net)

TO: Historic Preservation Commission  
FROM: Chuck Denney, Parks and Recreation Director  
DATE: March 20, 2025  
SUBJECT: Historic Trails and Roadways

---

1) Recommended Action:

Information/Discussion Item

---

2) Background:

At the November 2024 meeting, the Commission discussed the desirability of doing some long-term planning, notwithstanding the limited staffing now available, to further the commission's work. Commissioner Nicandri volunteered to pull together an element of such a plan relative to the marking of Tumwater's historic trails and roadways. With the assistance of Darlene Kemery, whom the city contracted with to provide graphic design and digital production services, Dave will present this work item at our meeting on the 20th.

---

3) Alternatives:

- Discussion Item – Discussion may include further research or the creation of a work to plan to further define priorities and implementation of suggested projects.
- 

4) Attachments:

None

TO: Historic Preservation Commission  
FROM: Chuck Denney, Parks and Recreation Director  
DATE: March 20, 2025  
SUBJECT: 2025 Department Projects

---

1) Recommended Action:

Information/Discussion Item regarding projects within the Parks and Recreation Department.

---

2) Background:

There are a number of projects scheduled to occur in the 2025/26 biennium that could impact or provide opportunities for the Commission. Staff will be providing information on upcoming park and trail construction, Crosby House improvements, Brewmaster's House completion and the relocation of the Parks and Recreation office.

---

3) Alternatives:

- Discussion Item – Discussion may include opportunities for historical interpretation, art, public access, and tourism.
- 

4) Attachments:

None