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April, 1993

Friends of Vancouver Heritage,

The submittal of this final Vancouver National Historical Reserve Feasibility Study and Environmental Assessment to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army completes the duties of the Vancouver Historical Study Commission in accord with Public Law 101-523, the 1990 act which established the Commission. The report provides important recommendations concerning the feasibility and suitability of establishing a National Historical Reserve in the Vancouver area. The report also provides some specific recommendations regarding the future use of Pearson Airpark.

Over the course of the planning study, we learned about important aspects of the history and heritage of this great community, and the role area history played in the development of the Pacific Northwest and our Nation. This legacy includes the Hudson Bay Company history displayed at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, early U.S. military history at the Vancouver Barracks and Officers Row, Army Air Corps and other aviation history at Pearson Field, and the important role of Vancouver’s Columbia River waterfront; from early trappers and settlers, to World War II shipbuilding, to its present commercial, industrial and recreational uses.

The Final Report that follows is the result of nearly two years of work by many dedicated persons. On behalf of all the members of the Vancouver Historical Study Commission, I would like to thank the literally hundreds of concerned citizens who took the time to be involved in the study process, and who wrote letters and attended meetings to express their views and concerns.

In addition, I want to acknowledge the special assistance of certain persons. The appendices of the report lists the contributions of various individuals who were involved in the production of the study. We would specifically like to acknowledge the work of the Technical Planning Committee along with the special assistance of the staff of the National Park Service who distinguished themselves, and the agency they represent, through their coordination of the entire study process. In particular, we wish to recognize the efforts and professional demeanor of Keith Dunbar in leading the effort to staff and support the Commission.

It is the expressed hope of the Commission that the tremendous energy of people and ideas that were generated during the study process can be translated into action, as the various interests come together to protect these important values, and provide further opportunities for public use and enjoyment of the resources of the Vancouver, Washington area.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr. Harold A. Dengenink
Chariman, Vancouver Historical Study Commission
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Cover Image: A sketch from 1854 depicts Fort Vancouver from the northwest with Mount Hood on the horizon. (Courtesy of the National Park Service.)
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Final Report – April 1993
Executive Summary

The Vancouver Historical Study Commission, hereinafter referred to as "the Commission," finds that the development of a Vancouver National Historical Reserve is both feasible and suitable for establishment within the Vancouver area. Creation of a Vancouver National Historical Reserve presents a unique opportunity to provide a comprehensive management and interpretation umbrella for the diverse collection of valuable cultural, recreational, and natural resources concentrated in the Vancouver, Washington area. Detailed analyses of resources, goals/objectives, and feasibility of management options in this Study provide a foundation for this preferred strategy for management of the important resources of the area. It also offers a solution to potentially conflicting interpretation and preservation goals of the varied public and private entities represented in the area.

The Congressional Act authorizing this Study included the formation of a Vancouver Historical Study Commission composed of representatives of major entities in the area, including Fort Vancouver National Historic Site (Department of the Interior), Vancouver Barracks (Department of the Army), City of Vancouver, and the State Office of Archaeology and Preservation (the State of Washington). To assist in Study development, the Commission formed a Technical Planning Committee composed of community and governmental representatives who met on a regular basis to consider details of the planning process. The Commission began deliberations in late spring of 1991 with detailed considerations of the scope of work and development of issues. Early in 1992 the Study Planning Consultant, Jones & Jones, began preparing background information for use in Commission meetings. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District, was also employed by the Commission to assist in the development of an Environmental Assessment for the Study Area. Monthly meetings were held by the Technical Planning Committee and the Planning Consultant to jointly develop individual Study sections. Results of the meetings formed the basis for discussions during the monthly Commission meetings and defined the sequence of the report process.

Public input was taken by the Commission throughout the planning process. At each monthly management meeting, public comments and concerns were solicited by the Commission. Additionally, a forty-five day review period was established for public comments on the Draft Report. In conjunction with this review period, a public hearing was held in Vancouver in November, 1992. Commission meetings subsequent to the hearing addressed ideas and concerns that were voiced in the hearing and throughout the public review process. This Final Report incorporates Commission responses to issues raised during the planning process.

The Study has five major components: Study Background, Inventory and Assessment of Resources, Alternatives, Impacts (Environmental Assessment), and Study Findings and Recommendations. Each part builds on the one preceding.

The Study Background provides an overview of Congressional requirements for the Study, the history of planning efforts in the area, and a general description of various entities in the Study Area.

The Inventory and Assessment of Resources outlines the Study Area's rich history and describes the area's cultural, natural and recreational resources. Based on the assessment of these resources, seven significant entities were determined for inclusion in a National Reserve. These entities include the Fort Vancouver National
Historic Site, Vancouver Barracks, Officers Row, Pearson Airpark, Marine Park and the Columbia Riverfront from the Interstate 5 Bridge through Marine Park. Other entities such as nearby Providence Academy were considered but were not ultimately recommended for inclusion within the Reserve because they were not integral to the historic and other thematic linkages binding the other entities.

The Alternatives section of the Study includes an analysis of various management strategies and proposes several operational strategies for Pearson Airpark. After consideration of seven alternate management strategies, the Commission reduced these strategies to four Study Alternatives for analysis and further consideration. These four strategies are: Vancouver Reserve, No Action, Vancouver Partnership, and Central Park. Characteristics of each strategy are described in detail, including geographic area, resources, administration, resource protection, entities' responsibilities, capital improvements, revenue sources, legislative requirements, implementation, and estimated costs.

A similar process of analysis and description was applied to the Pearson Airpark configurations. The Commission condensed an initial list of nine Pearson Airpark strategies to three alternatives: Cessation After 2002, Pearson Air Museum (limited to use of historic and antique aircraft), and Continuation After 2002. Each Pearson strategy is described in the Study, applying the same criteria used for the alternate management strategies discussion.

The Findings and Recommendations part of the Study evaluates the alternative strategies discussed in the previous section. Each management and Pearson strategy was compared to Study goals and evaluated for conformance to specific objectives. The conclusions reached describe those strategies that best meet the Study goals and the goals set forth in the Congressional legislation.

Through this process, the creation of a National Historical Reserve emerged as the best management strategy for protecting resources within the Study Area. However, the Commission and the Technical Planning Committee concluded that the best operational mechanism for management of the Study Area would be a combination of the Partnership Management Strategy and the Reserve Strategy. The Partnership Strategy affords a greater degree of consensus and proactive involvement among each entity under a spirit of partnership through a written Memorandum of Understanding, as opposed to being mandated by Federal legislation.

Formation of the Reserve would entail completion of a Reserve Coordination Master Plan which would define a timetable for implementation of various actions for the development of programs and facilities for the National Reserve. This would include Coordination Master Plan sections for increased, coordinated interpretation of the entire Reserve area. Specific responsibilities of entities involved in interpretation throughout the resource area would also be defined in the Master Plan.

After evaluating the various Pearson Airpark strategies, the Commission determined the Continuation of Airpark Operations After 2002 was the recommended approach. The Partnership would devise a Pearson Airpark Economic Viability and Mitigation Plan. This plan would include incentives and regulations to encourage a transition from predominantly general aviation aircraft based at Pearson, to historic aircraft. This transition shall be completed
by April 3, 2022 unless a continuation of general aviation is expressly authorized by an act of Congress by April 3, 2022. It is acknowledged that Congressional legislation is required to extend general aviation use and any occupation on NPS property beyond April 3, 2002. Also included in the Pearson Plan would be a report to Congress regarding the advisability of continuing general aviation activities at Pearson, a program to mitigate any conflicts related to operation of the Airpark, and a Pearson Airpark Museum Plan.

The Commission developed seven mitigation measures for Pearson Airpark. They are included in the Findings and Recommendations of this report.

The Recommendations of this comprehensive Study provide the optimum format for the long-term preservation and interpretation of Vancouver’s significant cultural, natural and recreational resources and the relationships among and transitions between the Area’s layers of history. Cooperation among the diverse entities represented on the Commission was an essential first effort toward realization of a comprehensive resource management structure for the area. The creation of a Vancouver National Historical Reserve is the next step in the preservation of a valuable regional and national asset.
Part I: Introduction

- Congressional Direction
- The Process
- Goals and Objectives

This aerial view from February of 1991 portrays the diversity found along the edge of the Columbia River. The boundary of the proposed Vancouver National Historic Reserve is contained by the river's edge and the Interstate 5 corridor.
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Significant events in the history and development of the Pacific Northwest and the United States in general have occurred in the Vancouver, Washington area. A particularly rich collection of cultural resources is located adjacent to the Columbia River. These resources include Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, Vancouver Barracks, Pearson Airpark, the Columbia Riverfront and the site of the original Kaiser Shipyards. All of these cultural properties demand a coordinated approach to resource management. With this goal, the Congress established an Act, Public Law 101-523, to study the feasibility of establishing a Vancouver Historical Reserve.

The Act

The United States Congress stated in Section 2 (a) of the Act establishing the Vancouver Historical Study Commission, that the Commission shall “study and make recommendations regarding:

1. The preservation, protection, enhancement, enjoyment and utilization of the historic, cultural, natural and recreational resources of the Area; and

2. The feasibility of establishing a Vancouver National Historical Reserve.”

In Section 3 (a)(1)(B) of the Act, Congress further directed that the Commission’s study contain:

“(i) An inventory and assessment of the historic, cultural, natural and recreational resources located within the Area;

(ii) Specific preservation and interpretation goals;

(iii) Proposed alternative management strategies whereby the funds, data, personnel, and authorities of public and private entities may be coordinated; and

(iv) Recommendations concerning the continued operation of Pearson Airpark in a manner that will preserve and promote historic aviation and interpretation of the Area, compatible with other historic and cultural resources of the Area, including Fort Vancouver National Historic Site.”

In making recommendations under paragraph (1)(B)(iv), the Act stated under Section 3 (a)(2), that the Commission shall assess:

(A) The impact of current airport operations on the preservation, use, and interpretation of historic and cultural resources in the Area; and

(B) Future operation of the airport undertaking such mitigation measures as may be necessary to minimize the intrusion on adjacent historic and cultural resources.”

As stipulated in the Act, the Commission is to address the impacts of general aviation and recreational flying on the area’s cultural resources.
The Vancouver National Historical Reserve Commission has directed all aspects of the Feasibility Study. The Commission is composed of five members representing major public entities in the Study Area and other interests:

- City of Vancouver (Represented by the City of Vancouver)
- Department of the Interior (Represented by the National Park Service; representative of the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site)
- State of Washington (Represented by the State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation)
- Department of the Army (Represented by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District; representative of Vancouver Barracks)
- Washington State University, Vancouver Campus (Representative of the General Public)

The Commission met on a monthly basis, beginning May 1991, to consider all issues relating to the process and content of the Feasibility Study. To assist in development of technical data, the Commission formed a Technical Planning Committee comprised of representatives from the Department of the Army, National Park Service, Pearson Airpark, Army Corps of Engineers, City of Vancouver, the State of Washington, and the Center for Columbia River History.

In early 1992 the Commission authorized a Planning Consultant, Jones & Jones, to begin preparation of background information and to propose strategies for the Study. Simultaneously, the Commission began the Environmental Assessment portion of the Study, conducted by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), Seattle District. During the early months of 1992, the Planning Consultant and ACOE representatives met with the Technical Planning Committee to develop initial management strategies. These studies became the background information for the monthly Commission meetings, where ideas and direction for the Study were confirmed and augmented by the Commission.

A forty-five day public comment period was held to receive public comments on the Draft Report. In addition, in November, 1992, a public hearing was held. Approximately sixty-five people attended the hearing and twenty-eight people gave testimony. Issues raised in the hearing process were considered by the Commission and the Final Report incorporates Commission responses to ideas and concerns addressed during the hearing process.

Each monthly Commission meeting included testimony from project consultants and detailed deliberations by the Technical Planning Committee and the Commission. Extensive public testimony was heard at each meeting. Through this process, the Commission was able to formulate comprehensive planning decisions based on the recommendations of the Technical Planning Committee and on public testimony. The Feasibility Study reflects the overall goal to respond to the needs of all the diverse entities represented in the Study Area.
Preservation and Interpretation Goals

The Congressional Act requires that this Study determine specific preservation and interpretation goals pertinent to the resources in the Study Area. After careful consideration of the intent of the Act and review of existing cultural, natural, recreational and natural resources, the Commission established the following four basic goals:

1. Promote preservation, protection, enhancement, enjoyment and utilization of the significant historic, cultural, natural and recreational resources in the Study Area.
   - This goal refers to Section 2(a)(1) of the Act.
   - Based on the findings of this Study, the managing entity for the Study Area should define those resources whose significance merits a thorough presentation program.

2. Maximize and facilitate interpretation of all significant properties in the Study Area, addressing the continuum of history represented.
   - This goal refers to Section 3(a)(B)(ii) of the Act.
   - To ensure that the first goal is met, the opportunities for interpreting the significant resources in the Study Area must be maximized.
   - Interpretation of the diverse entities in the Study Area should be coordinated so that mutually supportive interpretive themes can be implemented.

3. Preserve and promote historic aviation and interpretation of historic aviation in the Study Area.
   - This goal refers to Section 3(a)(B)(iv) of the Act.
   - Preservation of historic aviation should be accomplished in such a way that minimizes adverse impacts on other cultural resources of the Area, including the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site.

4. Promote coordination among the various entities represented.
   - This goal refers to Section 3(a)(B)(iii) and Section 1(5) of the Act; “Failure to coordinate the planning and management within the Area may result in lost opportunities to preserve and enhance irreplaceable historical sites and open spaces.”
   - All of the above goals require a systematically applied management program to facilitate consistency in preservation and interpretation programs.
Introduction

Goals and Objectives

Objectives

Following significant public testimony and Commission deliberations, these four goals were then expanded by the Commission. Objectives were assigned to each goal to aid in the analysis of the feasibility of individual management strategies. (See the Findings and Recommendations Evaluation Section of this Study, Page 85.)

1. Promote preservation, protection, enhancement, enjoyment, and utilization of significant historic, cultural, natural and recreational resources in the Study Area.

   Objective A: Allows for implementation of the Fort Vancouver Master Plan.

   Objective B: Allows for appropriate identification, interpretation, commemoration, and access to resources of local, regional or national importance.

   Objective C: Perpetuates existing open space while providing for additional open space.

   Objective D: Provides the opportunity to enhance the cultural, recreational, and scenic attributes of the Columbia River shoreline located within the City of Vancouver.

   Objective E: Offers opportunity for identification and evaluation of archaeological resources that have not yet been identified.

   Objective F: Enhances visibility of Study Area resources to a broader audience of potential visitors and users.

   Objective G: Assures utilization of resources is accomplished in a manner that minimizes noise and safety hazards.

   Objective H: Facilitates a full range of preservation activities associated with cultural resources in the Study Area.

2. Maximize and facilitate interpretation of all significant properties in the Study Area, addressing the continuum of history represented.

   Objective A: Involves maximum interactive involvement by public and private entities with ownership or influence over resources.

   Objective B: Provides for differential and/or proportional interpretive treatment for resources at a variety of levels of significance.

   Objective C: Provides a mechanism for displaying the “layers” of history and appropriate interrelationships of the various areas.

   Objective D: Provides avenue for “history to continue” in appropriate areas (e.g., provides for future opportunities).
3. Preserve and promote historic aviation and interpretation of historic aviation in the Study Area.

Objective A: Provides for continued use, development, commemoration, and enhancement of Pearson Airpark for historic and antique aircraft.

Objective B: Provides for commemoration of aviation history through an enhanced Pearson Air Museum.

Objective C: Provides for an orderly transition with continued flight activity to enhance interpretation of historic aviation, in a manner that minimizes adverse impacts on Fort Vancouver National Historic Site and the City of Vancouver.

Objective D: Seeks to enhance compatibility of Pearson Airpark operation with the implementation of the other Study goals, particularly in terms of safety and noise.

4. Promote coordination between the various entities represented.

Objective A: Facilitates proactive involvement by all public and private entities—provides for all willing participants.

Objective B: Increases effectiveness of existing funding opportunities and opens potential new channels and sources of monies.

Objective C: Provides structure and administrative mechanism to consider actions, and reach and carry out decisions.

Objective D: Provides forum for encouraging and promoting the protection and visitor use of the Study Area and mutual cooperation among the involved public and private entities.

Objective E: Respects land ownership rights, both public and private.
This sketch from circa 1855 depicts Fort Vancouver on the flatlands adjacent to the Columbia River. The pastoral orchards and early town development in the foreground contrast with the grandeur of Mount Hood in the background. (Courtesy of the National Park Service.)
The Study

There has long been public interest in the diverse historical sites in the Vancouver area. Within the Study Area are an array of historical resources representing the entire span of human settlement along the shores of the Columbia River. These resources range from prehistoric archaeological sites to the reconstructed Fort Vancouver and existing historic facilities of Vancouver Barracks, Pearson Airpark, and the former site of Kaiser Shipyards. A coordinated approach towards management of Vancouver's diverse cultural resources would enhance interpretation of the area's rich history.

Public Law 101-523 was passed by the 101st Congress and enacted into Law on 5 November 1990. This Act describes the "unique array of contiguous historical sites" which require planning and management to preserve and enhance the available historical sites and open space within the area to be studied. The Act establishes the Vancouver Historical Study Commission and assigns the Commission to prepare studies and recommendations regarding: the preservation, protection, enhancement, enjoyment, and utilization of the historic, cultural, natural, and recreational resources of the Area; and to evaluate the feasibility of establishing a Vancouver National Historical Reserve. The Act further directs the Commission to prepare a report containing the following:

1. An inventory and assessment of the historic, cultural, natural, and recreational resources located within the Area;
2. Specific preservation and interpretation goals;
3. Proposed alternative management strategies for the coordination of funds, data, personnel, and authorities of the public and private entities within the Area; and
4. Recommendations concerning the continued operation of Pearson Airpark in a manner that will preserve and promote historic aviation and interpretation of the Area, compatible with other historic and cultural resources of the Area, including the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site.

The Commission was to assess the impact of current airport operations on the preservation, use and interpretation of historic and cultural resources in the Area, and the future operations of the airport undertaking such mitigation measures as may be necessary to minimize the intrusion on adjacent historic and cultural resources.
Establishment of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site

An Act was passed by Congress and enacted into Law on 19 June 1948 which provided for the establishment of the Fort Vancouver National Monument. Subsequent legislation was passed and enacted by Public Law #87-78 on 30 June 1961, which authorized a maximum additional acreage for the historic site and changed the name of the Monument to the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. Among its provisions, the Act provided for the acquisition of non-Federal lands to be added to the Historic Site. Commensurate with this provision, the National Park Service entered into an offer to sell agreement with the City of Vancouver to purchase the western portion of the then Pearson Airport so that the site of the Fort Vancouver stockade and its immediate surrounds would be encompassed within the Historic Site. The Statutory Warranty Deed, recorded on 6 April 1972, included the City-reserved rights for the continued operation of Pearson Airport for thirty years from that date. At the end of that thirty years, 3 April 2002, airport operations on the western half of the airstrip are to cease, thus enabling the Park Service to remove incompatible activities and to complete development of the site in accordance with the Master Plan of the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site.

Development of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site

In the intervening years, the Park Service has developed portions of the Site in accordance with the Master Plan. The perimeter stockade was erected and elements of the interior architecture have been constructed. The Fur Storage building is now in the process of being completed. Archaeological research has continued to uncover the footprint of other Fort structures. Some of the surrounding grounds have been planted with fruit trees and vegetables to replicate some of the agricultural ambiance of the original Fort Vancouver stockade environment.

Efforts by the City/County to Create a New Airport

In an effort to relocate Pearson Airpark's general aviation function, Clark County, with the assistance of the Federal Aviation Authority and the encouragement of the City of Vancouver, was involved with an extensive investigation from 1985 to 1987 to locate a site for a new airport which would serve an area to the north of the City of Vancouver. The proposal included site selection and an environmental assessment, but due to opposition from surrounding residents, County commissioners decided not to pursue further efforts to site a general aviation airport in Clark County. A previous comprehensive effort in the early 1970s had the backing of the FAA, City and other groups but met a fate similar to the 1980s relocation program.

Development of Pearson Airpark Master Plan

In 1987, the City of Vancouver independently prepared a Master Plan for Pearson Airpark which proposes the continued operation of Pearson Airpark after the year 2002. The Master Plan proposes removal of Airpark support structures, such as hangars and taxiways, from NPS property; development of a Pearson Airmuseum complex centered on existing structures with historic aviation significance; use of landscape as a screen between the Airmuseum complex and the Historic Site; and the continued use of the airstrip for limited general aviation and historic aviation operations.
This proposal by the City to extend use of the airstrip for general aviation has been perceived to have a negative impact on the surrounding resources, including Fort Vancouver NHS; half of the airstrip is located on NPS property. The extended use of the airstrip would limit implementation of the Fort Vancouver Master Plan; the original Fort was oriented to the river and the Master Plan calls for restoration of the fort scene on its original location to its historic appearance. The continued general aviation operation at Pearson Airpark is thus one of the key issues which must be addressed by this report.

Legislation Related to Pearson Airpark

Legislation would be necessary to extend or modify any use of National Park Service property for use as an historic and general aviation airfield after 2002. The original purchase agreement dated April 3, 1972, between the City of Vancouver and the National Park Service transferred ownership of the western portion of Pearson Airpark. As a provision of the conveyance of the property to the NPS by the City, the National Park Service granted the City a thirty year Reservation of Use and Occupancy for the purposes of using park land for general aviation uses. This Reservation of Use and Occupancy expires on April 3, 2002. Unless Congressional legislation is forthcoming, the National Park Service proposes to make full use of all NPS land starting in 2002, and will complete implementation of the Fort Vancouver Master Plan.

Study Area Limits

The Study Area identified by the Commission encompasses approximately 500 acres and includes the Vancouver Barracks, Fort Vancouver NHS, Pearson Airpark, Officers Row, and the Columbia River waterfront from Interstate 5 to Marine Park. The general area is bordered by Officers Row to the north, Interstate 5 to the east, the Columbia River to the south and Marine Park to the west.

The Act is specific in noting [Section 1, (E)] that the Study Area includes the “Columbia River, an early Northwest exploration and settlement corridor... center for Indian trade, shipbuilding, and fishing.” The river is a major linking element between various land areas. The Commission therefore included in the Study Area the former site of Kaiser Shipyards and several other properties in private ownership to be considered for possible inclusion in a future coordinated resource management area. The National Reserve Concept has historically included private as well as public property within reserve boundaries.

After the Technical Planning Committee’s presentation on their recommended limits to the Study Area, and after public comment, the boundary of the Study Area was determined by the Commission. The boundary selection occurred during the fifth Commission meeting on 1 October 1991. In a subsequent Commission meeting on 10 March 1992, the boundary was modified to include the grounds of the Washington State School for the Deaf and a parcel held by multiple private owners. This additional parcel is bounded by Pearson Airpark, East Fifth Street and East Reserve Street. (See Illustration Page 16.)

Because the Commission was charged by Congress with evaluating the feasibility of establishing a national historical reserve, the Commission developed specific criteria for the possible inclusion of certain sites for further study. To determine the recommended limits of the Study Area, the Commission described the following attributes which must be included in a National Reserve. These attributes are:
1. The Area is of National concern and/or significance;

2. The Area may contain a core NPS area;

3. The Area may include both private and public entities which are in a partnership in the administration of the Reserve Area;

4. The Area is defined by an authorized boundary;

5. Local zoning regulations are to be observed; and

6. The Reserve is to be created by an Act of Congress.

Study Area Entities

The landowners represented within the Study Area selected by the Commission include entities from both the private and the public sectors. Private sector properties include the Providence Academy property, the two-restaurant complex just east of the I-5 Bridge, the undeveloped Columbia Shores parcel, the Columbia Business Center, the Burlington-Northern Railroad, and the small light manufacturing area surrounded by the City's Pearson Airpark, Fifth Street and Reserve Street. Public sector landowners range from a public utility district to three agencies of the Federal Government. In addition to the Clark County Public Utility District, the following public agencies are landowners within the Study Area: 1) The Bonneville Power Administration; 2) The City of Vancouver; 3) The Washington State Department of Natural Resources; 4) The Washington State Highway Patrol; 5) The Washington State School for the Deaf; 6) The Washington State Department of Transportation; 7) The U.S. Department of Defense; 8) The U.S. Department of Transportation; and 9) The U.S. Department of the Interior.

Some of the properties included above do not contain easily identifiable resources which are of historic significance or have recreational or open space value. They are included because they fall within the contiguous boundaries of the reserve. Inclusion within the Study Area does not deprive the landowners of any currently existing rights nor are any new conditions on the properties inferred by their inclusion. (See Illustration Page 16.)

Final Study Area

During the Inventory and Assessment phase of the study process, the Technical Planning Committee and the Commission defined the Final Study Area Limits. Because Providence Academy does not adhere to thematic linkages that bind the other major entities, the Academy was deleted from the Study Area (See Page 24). The Barracks Cemetery and Washington State School for the Deaf were deleted from the study area due to their remoteness from other major entities and due to the as yet undetermined extent of historical significance of these sites (See Page 18).
This aerial photo from May of 1939 illustrates the arrangement of the Vancouver Barracks before the United States entered World War II. The Barracks are nestled between Officers Row, the City of Vancouver, and Pearson Airfield along the Columbia River. (Courtesy of the National Park Service.)
## Resources Matrix

### Historic, Cultural, Natural and Recreational Resources Summary Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Owner-ship</th>
<th>Existing Preservation Programs</th>
<th>Approx. Dates of Sig.</th>
<th>Historical Significance</th>
<th>Nat. Register Status</th>
<th>Educational Resource</th>
<th>Cultural Resource - Includes Historical</th>
<th>Recreational Resource</th>
<th>Potential for Inclusion in Reserve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Officers Row</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td>1850 – 1941</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Listed L</td>
<td>* = highest importance</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fort Vancouver</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1825 – 1860</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Eligible E</td>
<td>P = potential</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Vancouver Barracks</td>
<td>U.S. Army</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1850 – 1941</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Not Determined N/D</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pearson Airpark</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1905 – 1941</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cemetery</td>
<td>U.S. Army</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1850 – Present</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Providence Academy</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1873 – 1966</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Listed L</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Orig. Ft. Van. Site (W.S. School for Deaf)</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1825 – 1826</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Central Park (North of Study Area)</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Columbia Riverfront (@ Study Area)</td>
<td>NPS/ Private/ City</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Archaeological Sites</td>
<td>NPS/ Private/ City</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>c1750 – 1846</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Other Cultural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Resources from ACOE Scoping Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Dates of Significance are based on National Register Nominations.
2 Ratings for Potential for inclusion are based on the desire to preserve and interpret these properties, and on the Criteria for listing on the National Register. Properties rating "high" have the most significant amount of integrity of surviving historic fabric. Properties rating low have the least amount of integrity of surviving fabric.
3 Cemeteries are not normally listed on the National Register.
Historic Resources

The Study Area encompasses a variety of historic resources ranging from remains dating to pre-historical site occupation through the Hudson’s Bay Company settlement period, the subsequent U.S. Army base at Vancouver Barracks, the growth of Pearson Airpark, and finally the development of present-day Vancouver. Detailed analyses of the site’s historic resources were completed in the early phases of the study process. Three separate reports were produced by independent analysts, covering the spectrum of remains present in the Study Area. The reports included an overview of the archaeological resources on the site by Bryn Thomas; an historical overview and evaluation of significant resources by Patricia C. Erigero; and an historical overview of Pearson Airfield by Von Hardesty, Ph.D. The following summaries of the Study Area’s historic resources are based on these detailed overview analyses.

Pre-History to Early 1800s

The Thomas report provides background information about the people inhabiting the Columbia Basin in the period leading up to European contact. By the end of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth centuries, the aboriginal people of the study area were the Multnomah division of the Chinookan linguistic family. Their economy was based on fishing, gathering, and hunting, with a particular emphasis on the salmon resource of the Columbia River. Sauvic Island, three miles downstream from the present Fort Vancouver site, was a major center for Native American food gathering and trade. Tribal groups from as far away as Walla Walla and Idaho traded in this area owing to easy access to the Columbia River. Although the aboriginal population of the lower Columbia and Willamette Valley was estimated in 1750 to be over 80,000, by 1840 this number had been drastically reduced due to the introduction of foreign diseases. The subsequent spread of European agriculture and stock raising were largely responsible for alteration of the local ecology and for the disappearance of native plant species that were staples of the native diet. The Thomas report notes that significant archaeological material relating to pre-historic habitation has not been found in the Study Area.

Columbia River

The Columbia River is the central feature around which the natural history, prehistoric and historic stories of the Study Area, and indeed the entire Pacific Northwest revolves. This major river drains much of Montana, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, Wyoming, Nevada, Utah, British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan. It has been an artery of commerce and productivity from prehistoric times, providing water, fish, power, transportation and recreation. Vancouver, located 78 miles from the mouth of the river, is navigable by ocean going ships and is within the area influenced by the tidal variation of the Pacific Ocean.
First Western Explorers

Early European exploration and competition for the rich resources of the Pacific Northwest set the stage for subsequent settlement patterns evident today in the region in general, and the Study Area in particular. American and British traders became interested in the fur resources of the Pacific Northwest coast after the publication in 1780 of British Captain James Cook's journal of his third voyage to search for the Northwest Passage. The journal noted the River's potential as a transportation corridor for extraction of resources from interior regions. By 1805, the British North West Company had established trading operations in the Columbia River basin. In 1803, President Thomas Jefferson organized an expedition to document the lands to the west; Meriwether Lewis and William Clark crossed the continent and arrived at the mouth of the Columbia River in the winter of 1805-6. The Pacific Fur Company, organized by John Jacob Astor of New York, began construction of a fur trading post at Fort Astoria in 1811. In 1813, the Pacific Fur Company sold its Columbia River interests to its British competitor; the North West Company operated unchallenged in the Columbia basin for the next eight years.

The Treaty of Ghent in 1814 ended the War of 1812 but failed to resolve claims of both the United States and Great Britain to the territory lying west of the Rocky Mountains. A joint occupation convention of 1818 opened the area west of the Rockies to exploitation by both countries for a period of ten years; but disagreement continued concerning the boundary location between areas under U.S. and British control. In 1821, the British North West Company merged with the Hudson's Bay Company; the strengthened company quickly acted to consolidate British landholding in the Columbia River basin. The founding of Fort Vancouver by the Hudson's Bay Company in 1825 was partially a political strategy to keep territory north of the Columbia River under British dominion. The rationale for siting the Fort was pragmatic in its association with a convenient access to the Columbia and the avenue of trade that the River represented.

While there are no known remains presently documented in the Study Area of the early Western explorers prior to the founding of Fort Vancouver, the present Fort Vancouver site provides a vantage point from which the important geopolitical events of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries may be interpreted.

Hudson's Bay Company

Development of Fort Vancouver by the Hudson's Bay Company from 1825 through 1846 was a seminal event in the development of the lower Columbia basin. The Fort was an outpost of Western civilization during that period and functioned as a commerce and provisionary center for the lucrative fur trade throughout the Pacific Northwest. The Hudson's Bay Company at Fort Vancouver played a central role in the European settlement of the Pacific Northwest. The historic significance of Fort Vancouver is related to this central role and to the importance of the Fort in the subsequent migration of Euro-Americans to the Oregon Country in the early nineteenth century. Owing to its national significance, the site has been designated a National Historic Site by Congress. Fort Vancouver also has international significance with respect to the historic nineteenth century interface between the interests of Great Britain and the United States.
Inventory and Assessment

Resources

Extensive archaeological documentation of the Fort Vancouver site from the 1940s to the present has provided a significant body of information for the interpretation and reconstruction of Fort Vancouver and its environs. The site continues to yield important archaeological information concerning early nineteenth century patterns, events, processes, design and construction methods. In light of the significance of the Fort Vancouver site, present and future areas designated for archaeological investigation are a valuable cultural resource requiring protection and a full range of conservation measures.

Vancouver Barracks

A treaty drawn up by Great Britain and the United States in 1846 established the northern-most U.S. boundary at the 49th parallel, leaving Fort Vancouver within U.S. territory.

Subsequently, in 1846 the U.S. Congress authorized the President of the United States to establish a line of military posts along the route settlers were following from the Mississippi River to the Columbia River. In 1848, the Secretary of War directed the commanding officers of the military posts to establish a ten mile square reservation on the Columbia River. By 1849, the first contingent of U.S. troops was encamped on the hills overlooking Fort Vancouver Stockade. From 1849 until 1856, the U.S. Army and the Hudson's Bay Company existed side by side in amity. However, by 1860 the rapid increase in population due to immigration by U.S. settlers, and the resulting change in the social and political climate had reduced the power of the Hudson's Bay Company. For more than a decade, the two nations argued over the Hudson's Bay presence in the Pacific Northwest. Hudson's Bay holdings at Fort Vancouver were largely abandoned by the mid 1860s, and site use was assumed by the adjacent U.S. Army base called Fort Vancouver (the name was changed in 1879 to its present name, Vancouver Barracks).

Vancouver Barracks was determined eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places in 1979. A notable component of the Barracks' historic significance was its continuous use as the U.S. Army's principal administrative headquarters for the Pacific Northwest military establishment from its founding in 1849 until World War I. The Barracks served a major role in protecting avenues of trade and extraction of Pacific Northwest resources and was a central command post during the Northwest Indian Wars of the mid-nineteenth century. As U.S. influence throughout the Pacific region expanded in the nineteenth century, the Barracks assumed an increasingly important role in the defense of U.S. regional interests. Notable persons associated with the Barracks include George McClellan, Philip Sheridan, Ulysses S. Grant, O. O. Howard and George C. Marshall.

Although archaeological investigation at the Vancouver Barracks site has been less extensive than at Fort Vancouver, evidence from recent investigations suggests that sites for future analysis may be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places and should be conserved.

A notable ensemble of buildings representing the entire span of Vancouver Barracks' development survive, including Officers Row (with buildings dating to the 1870s), structures from the 1880s, and buildings relating to the U.S. Army Air Corps activities at Pearson Airfield.
Providence Academy

In 1856, Bishop Augustine Magliore A. Blanchet, in charge of the diocese of Walla Walla, Fort Hall and Colville since the mid-1840s, requested a mission of the Sisters of Charity of the House of Providence in Montreal. The initial five sisters originally took up residence in the mission house located outside the Hudson’s Bay Company Stockade at Fort Vancouver. The superior of the mission was Mother Joseph, who went on to become the guiding force behind development of many of the region’s first educational institutions.

By the 1870s, Mother Joseph on her own initiative had aggressively pursued projects that were her inspiration, including a major convent, school and orphanage located on a seven acre lot west of the Vancouver Barracks. The Providence Academy was designed by Mother Joseph; she also supervised its construction. At the time of its construction, the Academy was one of the largest and most imposing works of formal architecture (as opposed to vernacular) in the Pacific Northwest. During Mother Joseph’s forty-six year tenure in the Pacific Northwest, she oversaw the establishment and construction of eleven hospitals, seven academies and Indian schools and two orphanages in the region.

Providence Academy was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1978. The Academy is the earliest extant example of the many schools and hospitals built by the Sisters of Providence and is particularly significant in its association with Mother Joseph. The Academy was one of the earliest educational institutions in the Pacific Northwest, and the well preserved existing buildings represent an important movement in the history of educational institutions in the Pacific Northwest.

Pearson Airfield

Significant events in the history of aviation in the Pacific Northwest occurred in or around Vancouver Barracks in the area that is now known as Pearson Airpark. The first recorded aeronautical event in the Vancouver area was Lincoln Beachley’s 1905 dirigible flight which involved a short hop over the Columbia River from Portland to Vancouver Barracks. The first heavier-than-air flight at Vancouver Barracks occurred in 1911 when Charles Walsh and Silas Christofferson began flying on the Barracks polo grounds south of Officers Row.

During World War I, Vancouver Barracks became the locale for a major wartime mobilization effort which included construction of a spruce mill (managed by the Army’s Spruce Production Division) on the site of the former polo grounds. The Spruce Mill played an important role in the expansion and modernization of America’s aircraft production capability.

The post-World War I years saw the demolition of the spruce mill and the development of an Army Air base (called Pearson Airfield) on that site. In 1923, Vancouver Barracks became a part of the U.S. Army Air Service with the arrival of the 321st Observation Squadron, led by Lt. Oakley Kelly. From 1923 until 1941, important events associated with the “golden age of flight” took place at Pearson Airfield, including stopovers of the Douglas World Cruiser flight and the Soviet ANT-25 transpolar flight. Notable persons in the history of U.S. and international aviation, and military history, such as Oakley Kelley, Valery Chkalov and George Marshall, were associated with Pearson Airfield.
Three intact historic structures at Pearson Airpark are enhanced by the backdrop of period military buildings and the grounds at Vancouver Barracks. This backdrop effectively conveys the image of an Army Air Corps airfield of the 1923-1941 period. The unique qualities of this setting merit full consideration in future preservation activities around the site. A National Register Inventory Nomination for Pearson Airpark was prepared in 1990. The Washington State Review Board has recommended listing of the site on the State Register of Historic Places.

**Spruce Production Mill**

Vancouver Barracks played an important role in the development of air power during World War I through the erection of a major aircraft wood products mill on the site of Pearson Airfield. At the onset of the War, the mill was constructed in record time by the U.S. Army Signal Corps (Spruce Production Division) for the mass production of wood components for the manufacture of aircraft. The mill's specialized lumber production effectively supplied the mass manufacture of the U.S. war planes between 1917 and 1918. Period photographs suggest that the Spruce Mill occupied most of the Pearson Airfield site, precluding use of aircraft during the 1917–18 period.

The story of the Spruce Production Mill at Pearson Airfield is important to the history of Northwest aviation and to the history of the Pacific Northwest. World War I saw the transition of aircraft manufacturing from small workshops to large aircraft plants. The wartime emphasis on mass production of airplanes dictated labor specialization and ready access to raw materials. The Spruce Mill played a crucial role in this expansion and modernization of America's aircraft production.

**Kaiser Shipyards**

The entry of the U.S. into World War II, after the bombardment of Pearl Harbor in 1941, necessitated rapid reconstruction of the nation's naval forces. With a proven background for completing major projects ahead of schedule (including Hoover and Grand Coulee Dams), the Kaiser Company had been given the task, prior to Pearl Harbor, of developing 400 acres of Columbia River waterfront into a naval shipbuilding facility. Construction on the site adjacent to Vancouver Barracks began in early 1942 and was completed in a record-breaking 80 days. Applying the organizational lessons of road and dam construction, the Kaiser Company then instituted a highly efficient mass production system for construction of "baby flattops" and other naval craft that consistently set production standards throughout the war. Significantly, the Kaiser operation had never built ships prior to this time.

The Kaiser Shipyards played a key role in the national war effort to rebuild the U.S. Navy from 1941 to 1945. As the first of seven shipyards to be built by the Kaiser operation, the Vancouver yard set a number of shipbuilding records. The yard had a significant impact on the economy and industrial development of the City of Vancouver. The first Kaiser hospital, a precursor to the Kaiser health care system, was built just east of the Shipyards.

Eight major structures of the original fifty buildings in the shipyard complex survive, including major assembly and ship erection facilities. These have been modified to varying degrees and no longer serve the same functions they did when the site was a shipyard. This surviving fabric may be a valuable resource for interpreting the history of U.S. mobilization efforts during World War II. Kaiser Shipyards has not been nominated to the National Register of Historic Places.
City of Vancouver

Vancouver is the oldest and largest city on the Columbia River and the first city in what became Washington State. The street pattern for Columbia City, Vancouver’s original name, was laid out in 1850. The city was incorporated in 1857 in what was then the Oregon Territory.

Thematic Linkages

An overriding economic theme links all of the major historical entities in the Study Area. Investment in the critical mass of infrastructure and economic, political and cultural activities focused on the Hudson’s Bay Company at Fort Vancouver. This initial organizational infrastructure grew and continued with subsequent historical developments in the area.

A second military and national mobilization theme links Fort Vancouver, Vancouver Barracks (including Pearson Airfield) and Kaiser Shipyards. All three of these sites were associated with the role of centralized government in overseeing, organizing and stimulating regional economies. Fort Vancouver and Kaiser Shipyards (and, to a lesser extent, Vancouver Barracks) were focused on the strategic importance of the Columbia River. Although the Sisters of Providence activity in the region began with the original mission to the Hudson’s Bay Company, the significance of Providence Academy does not share this thematic link. The Academy’s significance is, however, more closely associated with the growth of the City of Vancouver than with the functioning of the nearby military facilities.

Cultural Resources

Cultural resources include those elements in the Study Area that have significant potential for historical or educational interpretation due to the integrity and extent of physical fabric present. Site components meeting these criteria include:

- Known (historical and pre-historical) archaeological sites
- Fort Vancouver
- Vancouver Barracks (including Officers Row)
- Pearson Airfield (now Pearson Airpark)
- Providence Academy
- Kaiser Shipyards
- Columbia River

Each of these components represents a link in the span of human settlement of the Columbia Basin, from the first Native Americans to the early European explorers and nineteenth century development of the region. Given these resources, there is great interpretive potential within the Study Area. There are existing interpretive programs at Fort Vancouver, Pearson Airfield and Vancouver Barracks. Additional programs could be developed in the Study Area to represent the entire span of human settlement in the region.

As noted in the Historic Resources Section above, a military and national mobilization theme links cultural resources at Fort Vancouver, Vancouver Barracks (including Pearson Airfield) and Kaiser Shipyards. These three sites demonstrate the role of centralized government in overseeing, organizing and stimulating regional economies.
Natural Resources

The Study Area has undergone over 150 years of urban development. As such, its natural resources are either heavily modified remnants or pioneers maintaining a foothold within the changing matrix of human development. The dominant natural resource within the Study Area is the Columbia River, one of the most important inland waterways in the United States.

The river represents a vast aquatic ecosystem that is host to numerous plant and animal species, the most notable of which are the Columbia salmon runs that have historically been a major regional economic resource. The visual setting of the Study Area is the natural shelf of a flood terrace enclosed by bluffs with dramatic views east to Mount Hood. This topography forms a large amphitheater focused on the river and floodplain below the bluffs.

The Columbia River waterfront is an armored urban and industrial shoreline with the exception of a portion of Marine Park and FVNHS. The Marine Park wetlands, beach and back beach areas are in a relatively natural and undeveloped state. Enhancements to the wetlands area (to be executed in conjunction with redevelopment of the Water Reclamation Facility) will further enrich the natural resource value of this area as well as its educational potential. The boat launch and future excavation and development of a boat repair and construction slip in Marine Park are additional urban waterfront developments bounding the natural areas of the park.

The other major natural resource feature in the Study Area reflects a long tradition of urban forestry demonstrated by street trees and landscape development within Vancouver Barracks, Officers Row and on Columbia Way. Street trees and other landscape development and protection of native vegetation provide Vancouver with a significant open space resource.

Recreational Resources

The Study Area contains numerous sites that can be used by the general public for both passive and active recreational purposes. These include:

- Fort Vancouver National Historic Site
- Officers Row
- Pearson Airpark
- Marine Park
  - Play and picnic area
  - Beach
  - Boat launch
- Kaiser Shipyards Viewing Tower
- Waterfront Park
- Fishing Pier
- Old Apple Tree Park
- Central Park
  - Sports fields
  - Open areas
- Columbia Way (Bike Route)
Planned recreational developments in the Study Area include:

- Continuous trail access paralleling the Columbia River
- Improved river access at Waterfront Park
- Acquisition of park space adjacent to Waterfront Park
- Marine Park Environmental Center and Wetland Enhancement/Interpretation

These resources provide for a wide variety of activities ranging from pedestrian walks along the Columbia shores to cultural events at Fort Vancouver and recreational use of private aircraft at Pearson Airpark.

**Physical Resources**

*Image of a river scene*

Columbia River's history is evolving as earlier industrial uses are replaced by park and recreational uses.

**The Columbia River**

The Columbia River is a paramount influence in the Columbia/Willamette River watershed area. These rivers provided sustenance to the Native Americans who lived and thrived here long before the coming of the French, British and American trappers and explorers. The rivers also served as avenues of commerce allowing articles of trade to be exchanged with tribal neighbors from the Pacific Coast and upriver. The rivers drain an enormously rich resource area and their extent and length are critical to their regional and national significance.

The 'discovery' of the Columbia River by America's Captain Gray and the charting of the lower 100 miles by British Lieutenant Broughton provided the impetus whereby the British first, and then the Americans, competed with each other for sovereignty over these rich resources. Through this international competition, the living Native American presence has significantly diminished over time.

In their stead, the British Hudson's Bay Company established a thriving center of commerce based on the fur trade. One can envision the barter with pelts, offered first by the local Native Americans, and then by Hudson's Bay trappers; both contributed to the success of this outpost in the Pacific North West. It is this legacy which is celebrated in the establishment of the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. The FVNHS property along the Columbia shoreline provides opportunity for interpretation of Hudson's Bay Company activities and trading along the Columbia River.

**The Site of the Washington State School for the Deaf**

The current site of the Washington State School for the Deaf is purported to be the original site of the first Hudson's Bay Company stockade. Although a current sign board advertises this as a fact, there is at present no supporting archeological evidence. However, this site on the edge of a bluff commands a view over the Columbia River and would be an ideal defensive position from possible raids and incursions from the Columbia River. Absence of hostile action from the direction of the river resulted in the abandonment of this first encampment and in the subsequent construction of the stockade in the current location at the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site.
Fort Vancouver National Historic Site

The abandonment of the first site on the bluff resulted in the construction of the Hudson’s Bay Company stockade at the current location of the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. The siting of the re-creation of the stockade and of the layout of its various building elements and components has been verified by recent archaeological investigations.

The current reconstruction effort, in addition to the Palisade and the Bastion, consists of the Blacksmith’s Shop, the Bakery, the Indian Trade Shop and Dispensary, the Chief Factor’s Residence, the Kitchen, and the first of the Fur Warehouses, which is now nearing completion. An orchard and a garden have been replicated on the north side of the Stockade.

Old Apple Tree Park

The apple tree commemorated in Old Apple Tree Park is thought to be a remaining fruit tree from the Hudson’s Bay Company period. Local attention has focused on the apple tree site for many years. During the early years of this century, repeated proposals were developed to commemorate the tree and interpret its role as a surviving example of the beginnings of the region’s rise to national importance as an apple production area. The present park was created in 1948 and subsequent developments in the area have been carefully designed to avoid impacts on this significant Pacific Northwest horticultural specimen.

Vancouver Barracks

With the establishment in June of 1846 of the boundary between British Canada and the United States at the 49th Parallel, the U.S. Army began to assert its influence within the region. The first Army contingents rented facilities from the Hudson’s Bay Company but subsequent Army commanders exhibited a less amicable attitude towards the remaining members of the Company and its landholdings. The Hudson’s Bay Company abandoned their facilities on the Columbia River by the mid-1860s and set sail, with its remaining movable assets, for new headquarters in Victoria, British Columbia.

The Army claimed a significant portion of the Hudson’s Bay Company landholdings and settlers claimed that which remained. In 1850, the Army surveyed a four-square mile area, which included the Hudson’s Bay Company Fort, for a new military reservation. In 1853-54, Congress approved the military reservation but reduced it to 640 acres. This area today equals the current area of the City of Vancouver’s Central Park Master Plan, the area currently bounded by the I-5 Freeway to the west, East Fourth Plain Boulevard to the north, East Reserve Street to the east and the Columbia River to the south.
This Barracks area remained intact until after World War II when further downsizing surmised the area north of McLoughlin Boulevard. The creation of the Fort Vancouver National Monument, the transfer of lands surrounding the west end of the Pearson Airstrip to the City of Vancouver, the surpling of Officers Row to the City, and other land transfers have resulted in the current, lean configuration of the Vancouver Barracks. (See Illustration Page 37.)

The current mission of Vancouver Barracks is to maintain the readiness of the U.S. Army Reserve, and there is no indication that further downsizing will occur within the Barracks in the immediate future.

**Officers Row**

In 1984, the Veterans Administration declared Officers Row, the residential complex along the northern edge of Evergreen Boulevard, in excess of their needs and the area was transferred to the City of Vancouver. (See Illustration Page 38.) Officers Row is included in one of the City’s Conservation Combining Districts. The structures were refurbished and retrofitted by the City for commercial office and residential rental uses. Officers Row today is a good example of the dedication asserted by the City in restoring an historic asset and maintaining it for use and viewing by the current generation.

**Pearson Airpark**

The grounds of the current Pearson Airpark were originally linked to Vancouver Barracks ‘Polo Field’, which was located within the Columbia River flood plain to the south of the main body of the Barracks. Early twentieth century aircraft activity occurred at these grounds since they provided a flat, cleared surface sufficient for the needs of initial aircraft types. However, seasonal flooding did prevent aircraft activity from operating during prolonged rainy periods. This flooding caused the infant airmail service to relocate their operations from Pearson to another area free of this seasonal impediment.

Archival photos of the World War I period suggest that the construction and operation of the Spruce Production Mill by the Army during the latter stages of the War briefly interrupted aircraft use of the area from December 1917 through December 1918.

The construction of the system of dams on the Columbia reduced the seasonal flooding of the area and enabled the year-around use of the facility. However, the facility was still associated with the Vancouver Barracks and consisted of a grass airstrip.

The years following World War II saw the burgeoning of private aircraft ownership and use. With the surpling of the ‘Polo Fields’ by the Army, the City of Vancouver acquired these lands and extended the airstrip complex, which was the predecessor of today’s Pearson Airpark.

The eastern portion of the present Pearson site for many years was known as the Chamber of Commerce Airport, which was the local of several significant events including the trial flights of the "Ellsworth Equilibrator", the forerunner of the modern auto pilot (developed by a local pilot). Other events include famous barnstormers and the development of air mail by Pacific Air Transport (now United Airlines).
Inventory and Assessment Resources

The purchase from the City of the western portion of the airstrip by the National Park Service, and the agreement to allow airstrip operations until the year 2002, has resulted in the Pearson Airpark configuration seen today. The western half of the paved airstrip and a complex of aircraft T-hangers are currently on NPS property. The facilities on the eastern half are on lands owned by the City of Vancouver.

In December of 1987, a Master Plan for Pearson Airpark was presented by the City of Vancouver. It proposes three alternative options for the Airpark configuration. All three options include continuation of general aviation operations. Each of the three alternatives propose varying levels of removal of airport development from the NPS grounds with landscape treatment to screen airport development from that of the Historic Site.

The proposed Airport Layout Plan was evaluated as Alternative 3C in the Pearson Airpark Master Plan. With exception of an historic Airmuseum complex to be developed on NPS lands, all airport structures are to be removed from NPS lands and relocated on lands owned by the City. The Plan also assumes continued operation of Pearson Airpark beyond the year 2002.

A portion of Pearson Airpark, centered on the three remaining structures with possible historic significance, is included in the City of Vancouver's Conservation Combining District.

The Barracks Cemetery

The Barracks Cemetery is today owned, operated and maintained by the U.S. Army. It is an active operation with interments still occurring.

Although not the original military cemetery, it contains the remains of the military and their dependents dating back to the 1850s, including four Medal of Honor recipients. By walking the cemetery, one can capture a glimpse of the history of the Barracks.

The cemetery was not always isolated and removed from the Barracks grounds. It formerly was the northwest corner of the Barracks when the Barrack grounds extended up to East Fourth Plain Boulevard.

Medal of Honor recipients and others rest in the manicured grounds of the cemetery.
Providence Academy
In May of 1853, the Catholic St. James Mission filed a claim for land including much of the area within the current downtown City of Vancouver. This claim is probably the precursor to the establishment in the 1870s of the House of Providence Convent, School and Orphanage by Mother Joseph on the present grounds of the Academy.

The Providence Academy was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1978 and is currently in private ownership. In addition, the City of Vancouver has included the property in its Conservation Combining District, which includes provisions for historic areas.

The Chkalov Monument
The Chkalov Monument commemorates one of the two Russian flights which landed at Pearson Airfield. The flight commemorated was the first transpolar flight between Russia and the United States; the plane, commanded by Valeri Chkalov, landed at Pearson in 1937. The current monument to this flight was dedicated in 1975 and now requires a new home because construction of an interchange off SR-14 will displace it.

The Railway Berm
The tracks of the current Burlington Northern Railway ride on a berm which is approximately 15' to 18' high. The berm parallels the shore of the Columbia River, and its height probably serves two functions. First, it raises the trackage above the seasonal floods of the Columbia River, which occurred with regularity before the system of dams was constructed upstream from this site. Second, the berm provides a transition from the higher elevations found a mile east of this site to the grade level at the City of Vancouver. Nevertheless, the railroad berm is a major visual barrier to the Columbia River from areas north of the berm. In addition, the berm and SR-14 are physical barriers inhibiting properties found to the north from accessing the Columbia River waterfront. These aspects impact the physical connections of interior development to the waterfront, especially the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, which was originally developed at this location because of its proximity to the Columbia River.
The Clark County P.U.D. Building
The Clark County P.U.D. building is located on the eastern edge of the I-5 Freeway Bridge, north of the Burlington Northern Railroad berm and across Columbia Way from the two-restaurant complex on the shores of the Columbia River. Constructed in 1912, the building has been retrofitted for new uses and is a good example of a functional but obsolete utility building being recycled for other uses.

The Site of the World War II Kaiser Shipyards
The current site of the Columbia Business Center previously was the site of an innovative World War II shipyard erected by Kaiser Industries. To speed construction of the facility, Kaiser applied the lessons learned in the firm’s construction of Grand Coulee Dam. Kaiser also applied mass assembly-line production techniques to shipbuilding, which resulted in the completion of major vessels in record-breaking time. Although this was the first of the Kaiser shipyards, others were subsequently built which ultimately matched and surpassed the record of shipbuilding established at this yard.

Of all the shipyards Henry Kaiser built during this period, it is this yard, the company’s first, which still retains remnants of its World War II activity. Some of the large buildings where whole ship sections were constructed remain. Remnants of the shipways, where sections were joined, finished, and then whole ships launched, are still visible along the shores of the Columbia.

Marine Park
Marine Park, constructed in 1971, anchors the eastern end of the Study Area. The City of Vancouver owns and operates the park which offers both land based and water based activities for local residents of the City and the surrounding areas. Marine Park includes a significant stretch of the Columbia River shoreline, most of which is in a wild and undeveloped state. Some of the park’s upland areas have been developed for formal recreational purposes, such as play fields and picnic areas. A small public boat launching facility has been developed at the western end of the Park.

The City of Vancouver, in its Marine Park Waterfront Development Program, has proposed that a significant portion of the park be slated for a wetlands enhancement program. If successful, the program would recreate some of the ambiance which existed before the arrival of the French, the British and the early American explorers. This would be a wonderful legacy to leave for future generations to experience.
Central Park

The City of Vancouver has prepared a Master Plan outlining the development of the Central Park area which combines historical, recreational and open space resources that will become increasingly valuable as a public amenity as the city grows. The area described within the Master Plan replicates an earlier extent of Vancouver Barracks grounds before the U.S. Army saw a need to decrease its mission within the Vancouver area.

It should be noted that, thanks to the U.S. Army, large tracts of undeveloped land on the former Barracks grounds have been retained for incorporation into the City of Vancouver’s future open space planning. This is the legacy that has been handed to the City, a legacy which must be continued and enhanced.
Ownership

The ownership pattern within the Study Area boundary includes both private ownership and public ownership. However, public ownership within the Study Area predominates. The public owners include branches of the Federal, State and local governments. The Federal Government has jurisdiction over the Vancouver Barracks including the Barracks Cemetery (Department of Defense), the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site (Department of the Interior), and Interstate-5 and the Highways Testing Lab (Department of Transportation). The State of Washington has jurisdiction over the State Highway Patrol facility and SR-14 (Transportation Department). The City of Vancouver has jurisdiction over Officers Row, Old Apple Tree Park, Marine Park, and the City streets and arterials including Columbia Way, East Fifth Street, Evergreen Boulevard and East Reserve Street. The City has partial jurisdiction over Pearson Airpark and the small waterfront park between the I-5 Bridge and the private restaurant developments. The National Park Service owns the western portion of Pearson Airpark and portions of the Columbia River waterfront between the I-5 Bridge and the Columbia Shores development.

The Providence Academy development, the proposed Columbia Shores development, and the Columbia Business Center are all owned by private interests. (See Illustration Page 37.)

Land Use and Zoning

The predominant land use classification within the Study Area boundary is Recreation and Open Space. The prime examples of this designation are the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, Marine Park, Old Apple Tree Park, and the City of Vancouver’s small Waterfront Park adjacent to the two privately-held restaurant complexes.

The other public land use classifications consist primarily of the U.S. Department of Defense’s Vancouver Barracks, the City of Vancouver’s Officers Row and Pearson Airpark parcels, and the State of Washington’s State Highway Patrol Facility and SR-14 Right-of-Way.

Private landholdings range from Downtown Commercial, as exemplified by the Providence Academy facilities, to Light Commercial and Industry, as exemplified by the Columbia Business Center and the adjacent Columbia Shores development.

In addition to these zoning classifications, the City Downtown Plan includes five conservation districts, three of which are located in the Study Area. These three districts are: The Academy, Officers Row and Pearson Airpark (See Illustration Page 38). The Pearson District provides for protection of 21 Officers Row dwellings and includes the Vancouver Barracks parade grounds and the tree-lined way of Evergreen Boulevard. The Pearson Airpark District includes historic airpark structures currently on NPS owned land. Preservation of historic structures in the Pearson District should be accomplished in conjunction with development of an aviation museum documenting significant historic events that have occurred at Pearson Airfield. The Pearson District also provides regulations for development of the private lands located between Pearson Airpark and East Fifth Street. These lands could continue their light industrial and airport related uses consistent with design standards of the Vancouver Central Park Plan. (See Illustration Page 37.)
### Highways, Arterials and Streets

The major highway systems which impact the Study Area are the I-5 Freeway and SR-14. The major arterials are Mill Plain Boulevard at the Study Area’s northern edge and Columbia Way at the Study Area’s southern edge, parallel to the Columbia River. Other significant street systems are Evergreen Boulevard, Fort Vancouver Way and East Reserve Street. (See Illustration Page 39.)

### Public Transit

The Study Area is well served by the City of Vancouver Transit System along the east-west axis of Evergreen Boulevard. A parallel transit line exists along Fourth Plain Boulevard to serve the outer, northern section of the Study Area. Except for slight north-south jogs in the predominantly east-west system, there is no public transit service which directly services areas to the north of the Study Area. (See Illustration Page 39.)

### Parks and Open Space, Schools, and Recreation Facilities

The Study Area contains an extensive network of parks and open space. The City of Vancouver’s park lands include Marine Park, Old Apple Tree Park, and the pier and boardwalk at the Interstate-5 Bridge across Columbia Way from Old Apple Tree Park. The National Park Service’s park lands include Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, which includes a length of Columbia River shoreline adjacent and parallel to Columbia Way. (See Illustration Page 40.)

The grounds of Marine Park include an extensive system of play fields accommodating baseball and other sports as well as picnicking. Marine Park also includes a major launching facility for small boats on trailers. The grounds of the National Historic Site include picnicking sites, as well as the visitor experience of the Fort Vancouver Stockade Complex.

The City of Vancouver’s Pearson Airpark includes a considerable portion of open space around the Airpark development. The site of the Columbia Shores project, which is not yet fully developed, is currently an open space.

In addition, much of the City’s Central Park north of Officers Row and the Study Area can be categorized as park land and open space. This area also includes the grounds of a community college and of a senior high school. The Washington State School for the Deaf, no longer included in the Study Area, is sited to the north and east of the Study Area (See Illustration Page 16.)

The Columbia River and shoreline in the Study Area comprise a major regional recreational resource. The shoreline provides a variety of viewing opportunities ranging from areas for viewing of Portland International Airport activity and river commercial vessel movement, to expansive vistas of Mount Hood, as well as quiet areas for passive enjoyment of wetland wildlife. Water quality is suited for water contact but the river is not recommended as a swimming site due to swift currents and nearby boating activity. User activity is oriented to shoreside strolling and beach-related uses and to recreational boating on the river. The shoreline in the Study Area is one of the few places in public ownership in the City or County allowing public access to the Columbia.
Existing and Planned Public Trails

Vancouver has an urban trail network connecting natural areas, schools and public facilities. Trails in the Fort Vancouver vicinity include a waterfront promenade under construction in the winter of 1992/3 which will be a segment of a continuous 12 mile trail parallel to the Columbia River. The Burnt Bridge Trail traverses the city north of Fort Vancouver and Central Park. Connector trails link these main routes.

Other Transportation Systems

In addition to the highway and street system described above, the Study Area includes Pearson Airpark, a general aviation facility operated by the City of Vancouver. The trackage for the Burlington Northern Railway parallels the Columbia River and is located between SR-14 and Columbia Way. The Columbia River itself is a major transportation system for ships calling at upriver ports. Columbia Business Center, on the shores of the river, has two operational barge slips and a boat manufacturer’s small boat launching and refinishing facility.

Across the Columbia River and slightly upriver is the Portland International Airport. Its western flight path extends over the Columbia River and crosses the I-5 Freeway Bridge and is parallel to the flight path from Pearson Airpark. Although several other general aviation airfields are located in the Vancouver area, none have the maintenance and repair facilities found at Pearson Airpark. One of these general aviation airfields is surrounded by development; therefore, its continued operation is problematic.

Other Infrastructure

The Bonneville Power Administration has a transformer complex within the Study Area. The City of Vancouver has an extensive complex of underground utilities that supply potable water and provide facilities for storm water runoff and sanitary sewer distribution. The City also operates a sanitary treatment plant at the east end of Marine Park. The above-ground utilities also include electrical power and communications distribution systems provided by private utility companies.

Existing Plans and Studies

A number of planning studies and master plans have been completed or are ongoing with various entities in the Study Area.

City-initiated plans include:

Vancouver Central Park Concept Plan (1979)

A plan developed in cooperation with 13 public property ownerships (federal, state and local), building on the historic, cultural, educational and recreational potential of this 640 acres of land.

Pearson Airpark Master Plan (1988)

The plan includes general aviation and historic aviation layouts.

Officers Row Redevelopment Plan (1984)

The plan outlines preservation and restoration of 21 former Vancouver Barracks Officers Row houses acquired by the City. The project was completed in 1986.
Urban Trails Plan (1974)

The plan addresses long-range waterfront uses and includes a waterfront/ Central Park link to recreational and historical points of interest. Included in the plan are provisions for a pedestrian overpass linking Old Apple Tree Park and FVNHS.

Pearson Airpark Historic Master Site Plan (1988 and 1991)

A long-range plan that includes museum, Chkalov monument relocation, preservation of historic buildings and removal of certain non-historic improvements.

Columbia River Renaissance Project (vision plan completed November 1992)

The plan creates a vision for Vancouver’s waterfront and includes public access, trails, viewing points, historical interpretations, environmental center, recreational activities and events, and economic development.

Vancouver Barracks plans include:

Maintenance and Repair Manual for Historic Structures (1987)

A comprehensive analysis including recommendations for preserving historic Army-owned properties.


A comprehensive plan for management of Army-owned cultural resources.

Fort Vancouver National Historic Site Plans include:

Master Plan: Fort Vancouver National Historic Monument (1969)

A detailed plan outlining long-range use for the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site area.

Master Plan: Fort Vancouver National Historic Site (1978)

An update of the previous plan that discusses specific site programs for long-range implementation.
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- Management Strategies
- Pearson Airpark Options

This recent aerial photo provides a comprehensive view of the core areas of the proposed Vancouver National Historic Reserve. The City of Vancouver's Central Park occupies the large rectangular area north of Officers Row. (Photo Courtesy of the National Park Service.)
## Management Strategies Summary Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Institutional Mechanism</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>Geographic Extent</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Vancouver National Historical Reserve</td>
<td>M.O.U. (memorandum of understanding) and Congressional Legislation to create Reserve Commission and for Airpark (if extended)</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td>Existing Parties + Congressional Appropriations + Cooperative Ventures</td>
<td>Study Area or Revised Boundary</td>
<td>(1994, est.) Congressional Legislation prior to 2002 for Airpark to remain open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. No Action</td>
<td>Status Quo</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Existing Parties</td>
<td>Existing Properties</td>
<td>(immediate) 2002 Airpark closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Vancouver Partnership</td>
<td>M.O.U. &amp; Congressional Legislation for Airpark (if extended)</td>
<td>Equal Partners with Coordinating Body</td>
<td>Existing Parties + Cooperative Ventures</td>
<td>Study Area or Revised Boundary</td>
<td>(1994, est.) Congressional legislation prior to 2002 for Airpark to remain open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Central Park</td>
<td>M.O.U. &amp; Congressional Legislation for Airpark (if extended)</td>
<td>City leads, with Advisory Body to City Council</td>
<td>Existing Parties + Cooperative Ventures</td>
<td>Study Area &amp; North Lands</td>
<td>(1994, est.) Congressional Legislation prior to 2002 for Airpark to remain open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In early discussions with the Technical Planning Committee, a variety of strategies were considered by the Commission. The goal for developing these initial strategies was to present the range of management mechanisms applicable to resources in the Study Area; initially, all ideas were considered equally. As the strategies coalesced, wording was simplified and a short list of seven initial management strategies was developed for consideration by the Commission.

**The No Action Strategy**
The first of the seven strategies is a No Action Strategy which maintains the existing situation, the status quo. The entities within the Study Area are individual landholders, each independently responsible for the maintenance and operation of their holdings. The landholders within the Study Area range from private individuals to public entities. Public landholders include agencies of Federal, State, and City government.

**The Vancouver Partnership Strategy**
The second strategy is the Vancouver Partnership Strategy. Each of the entities choosing to participate in a resource management plan would be signatories to a Memorandum of Understanding. The Memorandum would define the means to accomplish coordination and management of identified resources. This strategy does not include a central management and coordinating body responsible for the implementation of policies as set forth in the Memorandum.

**The Vancouver Heritage Trust Strategy**
The third strategy is the Vancouver Trust Strategy. This proposal includes the creation of a private non-profit Vancouver Heritage trust. A Board of Trustees would represent each member of the Trust. The Board of Trustees would establish and direct a central management team to execute the policies of the Trust and administer various programs within the Vancouver area.

**The Expanded Central Park Strategy**
The fourth strategy is the Expanded Central Park Strategy. The City of Vancouver would take the lead role in promoting coordination of resource protection among the participating entities. An advisory committee confirmed by the Mayor of the City of Vancouver is to be nominated by each of the participating entities. The advisory committee would set policy to be coordinated by a designated City agency.

**The Washington State Heritage Park Strategy**
The fifth strategy is the Washington State Heritage Park Strategy. An agency of the State of Washington would implement the policy of an advisory body for management of the identified resources. In this instance, the Governor of the State of Washington would confirm members of the advisory committee nominated by each of the participating entities.

**The Vancouver National Historical Reserve Strategy**
The sixth strategy is the Vancouver National Historical Reserve Strategy. This strategy proposes the creation by Congressional act of an Historical Reserve Commission. The Commission members would be appointed by the Secretary of the Department of the Interior from a list proposed by each of the entities participating in this strategy.
The Columbia River International Historical Park Strategy

The seventh and final option proposed by the Technical Planning Committee is the Columbia River International Historical Park Strategy. This strategy would require an international agreement between Canada and the United States because the area would incorporate the entire Columbia River system. An international advisory committee, selected from a list recommended by the participating entities, would be jointly appointed by the Canadian Minister of the Environment and the Secretary of the U.S. Department of the Interior.

These seven proposed options were presented to the Commission at a monthly meeting on 14 April 1992. The range of proposed strategies was narrowed to four, to be further developed by the Technical Planning Committee. These four alternatives include:

1. The Vancouver National Historical Reserve Strategy,
2. The No Action Strategy,
3. The Vancouver Partnership Strategy, and
4. The Central Park Strategy.

Alternatives Eliminated from Further Study

The Vancouver Trust Strategy and the Washington State Heritage Park Strategy were eliminated from further consideration because each of these included entities not considered to be major representative landholders of significant resources within the Study Area. The Columbia River International Historical Park Strategy, although intriguing, was eliminated because of the added dimension of international coordination which it presented; in addition, it expanded the concept area far beyond the Study Area being considered. While the Congressional Act notes that alternate management strategies should be considered, the prime focus of the study is to be upon resources within the Vancouver area and their feasibility regarding incorporation into the Historical Reserve Strategy.
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The National Historical Reserve

Overall Concept
Based on the past history of Reserve designation, a National Reserve area usually has the following features:

- It incorporates areas of National concern;
- It may contain a core National Park Service area;
- A private and public partnership is often established to administer the Reserve Area;
- The Reserve area is defined by a clear boundary;
- Development within the Area is governed by local zoning; and
- The Reserve is created by an Act of Congress.

Historical Reserves are administered under the aegis of the National Park Service as either “units” of the system or as “affiliated areas.” If Congress created a Vancouver National Historical Reserve (VNHR), it would become the fifth National Historical Reserve. Two areas (Ice Age National Scientific Reserve and Pinelands National Reserve) are considered affiliated areas. Two other areas, City of Rocks National Reserve and Ebey’s Landing National Reserve, are considered units of the National Park system. If the NPS were selected to administer the VNHR it would mean the Reserve would be a unit of the NPS system. (If a commission or other entity administers the area, it would be considered an affiliated area.)

Because the NPS already has a management responsibility at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, and since FVNHS will become a principle component of the reserve, NPS administration of a national historical reserve would be the most appropriate and cost effective use of Federal operational funds. Other administrative systems would be more appropriate if NPS management were not already present in the area.

Geographic Area
Sites or areas recommended for incorporation in the National Historical Reserve include the following: Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, Vancouver Barracks, Officers Row, Pearson Airpark and Museum, and a section of Vancouver’s Columbia River waterfront bounded by the I-5 Bridge to the west and Marine Park to the east, including portions of the former Kaiser Shipyards and some private property near Pearson Airpark and along the waterfront. (See Illustration Page 16.)

Resources
Individual resources in the Reserve area depend on those entities signatory to a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Resources that would bring the greatest cultural diversity and significance to the reserve include:

- Fort Vancouver National Historic Site
- Vancouver Barracks
- Officers Row National Register Historic District
- Pearson Airpark
- The site of the former Kaiser Shipyards
- The City-owned Columbia River waterfront areas within the Study Area.
Other properties are recommended to be within the Reserve area that may or may not exhibit the criterion requirement of 'significance.' These other properties include the Washington State Highway Patrol Facility, the U.S. Department of Transportation's Testing Lab Facility, a parcel under multiple, private ownership surrounded by the existing Pearson Airpark facility, and other properties. (See Illustrations Pages 16 and 37.) Inclusion of these areas within the Study Area does not imply any loss of property rights nor any added involuntary requirements which a Reserve status may include.

**Administration and Management Strategies**

**Operational Instrument**

The various entities of the Reserve would participate through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) among Federal, State, and City governments. The MOU would delineate responsibility and coordinate the management and planning for the Reserve.

Each public entity (Federal, State, and City) would each have one representative on a reserve coordinating body called the “Reserve Commission.” The NPS would take the lead in managing the Reserve, and a NPS representative would be the chair of the Reserve Commission. Participation in the Commission by representatives of the community and area organizations would also be encouraged.

The Reserve would be established to oversee the protection, enhancement, and development of the Reserve Area. The Reserve would be formalized by the MOU and created through a provision in the Reserve legislation.

The NPS would be responsible for the administration of the Vancouver National Historical Reserve. The NPS would have the lead Federal agency role for comprehensive Reserve planning, development of interpretive and educational programs and media, and the planning, design and construction supervision of any common Reserve facilities. These NPS responsibilities would be coordinated with the public members of the Reserve Commission who are signatories to the MOU.

In the VNHR, the rights of individual private property owners would be fully respected and the Reserve legislation, while including certain private properties, would not allow for the acquisition of any land without the consent of the owner. Private property within the Reserve would remain subject to the land use provisions of the City of Vancouver and other existing laws and ordinances that already pertain to the area.
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Staff Requirement
Under this strategy, each of the entities would have added staff requirements to meet needs for increased interpretation and management of significant cultural resources. Because the NPS would take a lead role in managing the Reserve, its staff requirements are correspondingly larger. The following staff increases may be anticipated in terms of Full-Time Equivalent Employees (FTE). These are included to assist in describing the range of costs for establishing the reserve:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FVNHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1) Interpreter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Clerical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Mgmt. Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Barracks</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>(1) Mgmt. Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.5) Interpreter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Pearson Airpark</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Depends on Pearson Option Chosen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City (not including Pearson)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1) Interpreter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For costs associated with staffing, see Estimated Costs Matrix, Page 49.

Resource Protection and Interpretation
Distribution of funding for resource protection and interpretation may vary in accordance with the specific need of each resource. For example, interpretation of some of the resources may only require that the visitor be informed as to the significance of that resource within the context of local history. Other resources may require additional funding so that they can be adequately restored or maintained to prevent their further deterioration.

Responsibilities of Participating Entities
The Vancouver Historical Study Commission enabling Act specifically states that any “Federal entity conducting or supporting activities directly affecting the Area shall: 1) Consult with the Secretary (of the Department of the Interior) and the (Reserve) Commission with respect to such activities; 2) Cooperate with the Secretary and the Commission in carrying out their duties under this Act and, to the maximum extent practicable, coordinate such activities with the carrying out of such duties; and 3) to the maximum extent practicable, conduct or support such activities in a manner consistent with the provisions of this Act.”

If the concept of a Vancouver National Historical Reserve is found to be both suitable and feasible, an act establishing the Reserve may contain language similar to the above. With this intent, the participating entities would agree to exercise Reserve responsibilities in a manner defined by the act. However, the specific language of the proposed act could be revised in accordance with the needs and requirements of each participating entity.
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Capital Improvements
See Estimated Costs Matrix, Page 49. The matrix illustrates costs associated with the Reserve Strategy over and above the normal staffing and operating budgets of participating agencies.

The development of a jointly staffed and operated visitor orientation/information facility may occur under this alternative. Cooperative interpretation and educational programs would also be proposed. The cost of construction of the orientation facility would be assigned to the Department of the Interior/FVHNS. Joint funds would not be expected from other members of the Vancouver Partnership for construction of the orientation facility; neither the Vancouver Partnership nor the National Park Service would request matching construction funds from the budgets of the other cooperating agencies to build the facility. Once constructed, the orientation facility may receive assistance from cooperating entities such as staffing assistance, educational program support, exhibits, educational materials or in-kind services.

Revenue Sources
The funding sources currently available to each of the entities within the Study Area could be complemented by funding authorized within the act to establish the Reserve. This could include Federal monies targeted to accomplish the goals and objectives of the Reserve, potentially providing greater resources than available through existing funding of the current entities. Or put another way, legislation creating the Reserve should also provide a funding mechanism whereby agencies can request Congress fund projects for the Reserve through separate line items in a Federal agency's budget. Additional funding could be provided by trusts or organizations which may have an interest in specific aspects of the Reserve. For instance, an historical trust could provide funding for the design and construction of interpretive panels and displays within the Reserve, or an organization could fund the purchase of property and the construction of an expanded Pearson Airmuseum.

Legislative Requirements
Specific legislation will be required for the creation of the Reserve. The recommended Reserve strategy included in this Study will need to be reviewed and approved by Congress, and specific Congressional action enacted to establish the VNHR.

Implementation Strategy
If the Reserve concept is found to be both suitable and feasible by the Commission, the Commission will define particulars of the recommended management strategy in the Final Report submitted to the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior. With their approval and concurrence, the Study Report will be submitted for action by Congress. (See Findings and Recommendations, Page 86.)
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Estimated Costs Matrix

**Estimated Costs – Vancouver National Historical Reserve Strategy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Admin/Operation (per year)(^2)</th>
<th>Program (per year)</th>
<th>Capital Improvements (total)</th>
<th>Maintenance (per year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Barracks</td>
<td>1.5 FTE = $80,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>(Rehab) $5,000,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FVNHS</td>
<td>3 FTE = $160,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>(Orientation Facility) $1,250,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Pearson Airpark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See Estimated Costs Matrix, Pearson Airpark Options)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Reserve Functions</td>
<td>1 FTE = $45,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>- 0 -</td>
<td>- 0 -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals:**

$705,000  Annual Expenditure

$6,250,000  Capital Expenditure

1  These costs are over and above the normal programmed costs of each of the entities involved in the Reserve:
   - The costs do not include funds for ongoing projects that would be undertaken even if the reserve did not exist.
   - The extent of projected costs would be verified by the Reserve management body through the process of developing the Reserve Master Plan.
   - It is anticipated that the costs would be derived from a variety of sources, both public and private.

2  FTE costs vary from agency to agency.
**The No Action Management Strategy**

**Overall Concept**

The No Action Management strategy describes the current state of Study Area resource management and requires no changes to this existing status. Each of the represented entities fund, operate and maintain each of their resources in accordance with their abilities. Since each of the entities act independently of the other entities, no formal boundary for this strategy is required. A formal mechanism of cooperative endeavors between any of the represented entities is not established, although this strategy does not prevent any of the entities from establishing agreements for the sharing of such endeavors. The National Environmental Policy Act requires that the No Action Management Strategy be included in the Environmental Assessment developed for the Vancouver Historical Study. No additional actions by the representative entities are required for this strategy.

Existing master plans that have been completed or are ongoing with various entities would continue to the extent that plans of separate entities do not conflict (e.g., the Pearson Airpark Historic Master Plan could not be fully implemented if the existing runway were closed).

**Geographic Area**

Because the No Action Strategy reinforces the existing status quo, the boundaries for this strategy correspond to the Study Area limits as described in Part II, Page 16.

**Resources**

Resources for this strategy include:

- Fort Vancouver National Historic Site,
- Vancouver Barracks,
- Officers Row National Register Historic District,
- Pearson Airpark,
- The Columbia River and other sites contained within the Study Area.

**Administration and Management Strategies**

**Operational Instrument**

If No Action were selected as a management strategy, all existing parties within the confines of the Study Area would operate individually as separate entities. Each entity would, at its own discretion, develop interpretive and administrative programs for the properties under its jurisdiction. There would be opportunity for ad hoc pooling of management efforts between several entities, but no formal agreements would be established for ongoing coordination of properties within the Study Area. Under this strategy, Pearson Airpark would cease operations as an active general aviation airfield in 2002 in accord with the 1971 purchase by the National Park Service. No action would be undertaken to combine interpretation and preservation goals.
Alternatives

Management Strategies

Staff Requirements
Individual entities in the Study Area would continue to staff their facilities as they are presently staffed. Closure of Pearson’s general aviation activities would mean elimination of staff positions related to the present facility. While the museum function on the Pearson site could continue, additional staffing would not be anticipated.

Reserve Protection and Interpretation
Each entity within the No Action Strategy would continue to administer protection and interpretation of its historic and cultural resources using current standards and practices. Ad hoc pooling of interpretation and educational program efforts as the need arises could occur, but no formal instrument would be created for these efforts.

Responsibilities of Participating Entities
Entities within the Study Area under the No Action Strategy would continue to administer properties under their jurisdiction following applicable local, State or Federal mandates but without a uniformly applied coordinating mechanism.

Capital Improvements
No additional facilities are proposed beyond those plans and facilities currently programmed for individual entities in the Study Area. However, there would be a City-estimated cost of $600,000 to remove Pearson’s non-historic T-hangars, miscellaneous buildings, and improvements from NPS property.

Revenue Sources
Funding sources used currently by individual entities would be employed under this strategy.

Legislative Requirements
No specific legislation is required for this strategy. Existing management programs and legislative covenants would remain, including the closure of Pearson Airpark in 2002.

Implementation Strategy
If the No Action Strategy is found suitable and feasible, no further action is required by the entities in the Study Area.

Estimated Costs
No additional costs are associated with the No Action Strategy, beyond the costs noted in Capitol Improvements, above.
Overall Concept
The Vancouver Partnership Management Strategy proposes that a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) be developed as the mechanism for efficiently coordinating resource protection, funding and staffing. Each of the entities in the Study Area would have the option of being signatories to the MOU. Under the MOU, specific courses of action for management of the area would be described. However, no single entity would have overall responsibility for interpretation or preservation of diverse cultural resources. Each of the entities in the Partnership would manage and oversee its own particular resources, making use of a ‘pool’ of ideas and techniques employed by individual Partnership members.

Geographic Area
The overall area for this management strategy could be equivalent to the area proposed for the Vancouver National Historical Reserve. Final boundaries and requirements for participation would be determined by the signatories to the MOU.

Resources
Depending on the entities who would be signatory to the MOU, the resources would be similar to those of the proposed Vancouver National Historical Reserve. Resources that would bring the greatest cultural diversity and significance to the Partnership include:

- Fort Vancouver National Historic Site,
- Vancouver Barracks,
- Officers Row National Historic District,
- Pearson Airpark, and
- The City-owned Columbia River waterfront areas within the Study Area.

Administration and Management Strategies
Operational Instrument
A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) would be the mechanism allowing interested entities to exchange management information and develop goals for interpretation of significant resources. Each entity in the Partnership would retain its present autonomy and the authority of the Partnership would be advisory only. A provision of the MOU would include methods outlining how individual entities would share information regarding interpretation and management techniques with other entities in the Partnership. Coordination of interpretive goals in the Partnership area would be facilitated through ongoing dialogue and cooperation among individual Partnership members.

Staff Requirement
Under this strategy, each of the entities would have added staff requirements to meet needs for increased interpretation and management of significant cultural resources. Tasks would be shared relatively equally. The following staff increases may be anticipated in terms of Full-Time Equivalent Employees (FTE). These are included to assist in describing the range of costs for establishing this management strategy:
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Vancouver Barracks 1.5 FTE: (1) Mgmt. Assistant (.5) Interpreter
FVNHS 1.5 FTE: (1) Mgmt. Assistant (.5) Interpreter

City: Pearson Airpark (Depends on Pearson Option Chosen)
City (not including Pearson) 1 FTE: (1) Interpreter

For costs associated with staffing, see Estimated Costs Matrix, Page 54.

Resource Protection and Interpretation
The MOU of the Partnership would promote the protection and visitor use of the area and cooperation among the various public and private entities that make up the Reserve. Information regarding preservation and interpretation practices would be shared among the various entities in the area and common goals established as part of the MOU.

Responsibilities of Participating Entities
Each of the participating entities in the Partnership area would promote and protect cultural and recreational resources under its jurisdiction and control, as specifically noted in the MOU. Common goals and objectives would be agreed upon by entities in the area. Each entity would be responsible for directing their efforts towards meeting these goals.

Capital Improvements
See Estimated Costs Matrix. The matrix illustrates costs associated with the Partnership Management Strategy over and above the normal staffing and operating budgets of participating agencies.

The development of a jointly staffed and operated visitor contact/information facility may occur under this alternative. Cooperative interpretation and educational programs would also be proposed.

Revenue Sources
Funding would be limited to the current sources available to entities in the area. However, additional funding could be sought through participating entities or from outside trusts or interested organizations.

Legislative Requirements
Specific Congressional legislation is not required for establishment of the Partnership. The management and autonomy of individual entities in the area would remain as it is today. However, Congressional legislation would be required if the Partnership adopted a policy for the extension of general aviation use at Pearson Airpark.

Implementation Strategy
If this strategy is found to be suitable and feasible, individual entities would meet to develop a mutually acceptable MOU. The MOU would clarify the schedule and sequence for implementing interpretation and educational programs and protection of resources in the area.
### Estimated Costs Matrix

#### Estimated Costs – Vancouver Partnership Management Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Admin/Operation (per year)</th>
<th>Program (per year)</th>
<th>Capital Improvements (total)</th>
<th>Maintenance (per year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Barracks</td>
<td>1.5 FTE = $80,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>(Rehab) $5,000,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FVNHS</td>
<td>1.5 FTE = $53,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>(Orientation Facility) $1,250,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Pearson Airpark (See Estimated Costs Matrix, Pearson Airpark Options)</td>
<td>1 FTE = $45,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>– 0 –</td>
<td>– 0 –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Partnership Functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals:**
- $518,000 Annual Expenditure
- $6,250,000 Total Capital Expenditure

---

1. These costs are over and above the normal programmed costs of each of the entities involved in the Reserve:
   - The costs do not include funds for on-going projects that would be undertaken even if the Reserve did not exist.
   - The extent of projected costs would be verified by the Reserve management body through the process of developing the Reserve Master Plan.
   - It is anticipated that the costs would be derived from a variety of sources, both public and private.

2. FTE costs vary from agency to agency.
Overall Concept
As in the above Vancouver Partnership Strategy, the Central Park Management Strategy proposes the use of a Memorandum of Understanding to form an alliance between participating entities with the common goal to protect their shared resource. This strategy proposes that the City of Vancouver assume the lead role in the administration and operation of this strategy. The management area, in addition to the Study Area, would incorporate the area north of Officers Row. This area is coincidental to the area contained in the City’s Central Park Master Plan.

Geographic Area
In addition to the City’s existing parks and open space, the expanded area in the Central Park Management Strategy would include the community college, the high school, a City recreation center, the City library, a public utility facility, the Veteran’s Administration Hospital, and the Vancouver Barracks Cemetery.

Resources
Resources within this management area include those listed in the Vancouver Historical Reserve Management Strategy. Other resources are included in the Central Park area. These additional resources include recreational areas in the City’s existing parks and open space, and diverse cultural resources ranging from the community college to the Vancouver Barracks Cemetery.

Administration and Management Strategies
Operational Instruments
The basic management instrument of this strategy would be a Memorandum of Understanding. In the MOU, the City of Vancouver would be designated to take a lead role in management of interpretation goals agreed upon by the various entities in the area. The City would have no legislated authority over other public agencies. It would encourage and promote the protection and visitor use of the entire area and facilitate cooperation among the various public and private entities.

Staff Requirement
Under this strategy, each of the entities would have added staff requirements to meet needs for increased interpretation and management of significant cultural resources. Because the City would take a lead management role, its staff requirements are correspondingly larger. The following staff increases may be anticipated in terms of Full-Time Equivalent Employees (FTE). These are included to assist in describing the range of costs for establishing this management strategy:

- Vancouver Barracks: 1 FTE: (1) Interpreter
- FVNHS: 1 FTE: (1) Interpreter
- City: Pearson Airpark: (Depends on Pearson Option Chosen)
- City (not including Pearson): 3 FTE: (1) Project Coord., (1) Clerical, (1) Interpreter

For costs associated with staffing see Estimated Costs Matrix, Page 57.
Resource Protection and Interpretation
While the City would take the lead role in promoting coordination of resource protection and interpretation and educational programs under this strategy, the programs already in place by other entities would be respected. The City would coordinate the sharing of information and implementation of common interpretation goals.

Responsibilities of Participating Entities
Each of the participating entities in the Central Park Management Strategy area would promote and protect cultural and recreational resources under its jurisdiction. Common goals and objectives as agreed upon in the MOU would be coordinated by the City.

Capital Improvements
See Estimated Costs Matrix. The matrix illustrates costs associated with the Central Park Management Strategy over and above the normal staffing and operating budgets of participating agencies.

The development of a visitor contact/information center, staffed and operated by the City, is envisioned under this alternative. Cooperative interpretation and educational programs among the signatory entities would be proposed.

Revenue Sources
Funding for the administration and operation of this strategy would primarily be the responsibility of the City. However, the Memorandum of Understanding between the participating entities could include the provision for specific areas of support funding from each of the entities. Additional funding from sources outside this strategy area (such as independent trusts and interested organizations) could also be sought.

Legislative Requirements
Specific Congressional legislation is not required for establishment of the Central Park Management Strategy. The management and autonomy of individual entities in the area would remain as it is today. However, Congressional legislation would be required if an extension of general aviation use at Pearson Airpark were proposed.

Implementation Strategy
If this strategy is found suitable, individual entities would meet to develop a mutually acceptable MOU. The MOU would clarify the sequence and schedule for implementing interpretation and protection of resources in the area. The City would assume a lead role in facilitating and coordinating development of the MOU and in implementing strategies outlined in the MOU process.
## Estimated Costs Matrix

### Estimated Costs – Central Park Management Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Admin/Operation (per year)²</th>
<th>Program (per year)</th>
<th>Capital Improvements (total)</th>
<th>Maintenance (per year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Barracks</td>
<td>1 FTE = $53,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>(Rehab) $5,000,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FVNHS</td>
<td>1 FTE = $53,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Pearson Airpark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(See Estimated Costs Matrix, Pearson Airpark Options)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Central Park</td>
<td>3 FTE = $135,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>(Orientation Facility) $1,250,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$241,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$6,250,000</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals:**

- $536,000 Annual Expenditure
- $6,250,000 Capital Expenditure

¹ These costs are over and above the normal programmed costs of each of the entities involved in the Reserve:
  - The costs do not include funds for on-going projects that would be undertaken even if the Reserve did not exist.
  - The extent of projected costs would be verified by the Reserve management body through the process of developing the Reserve Master Plan.
  - It is anticipated that the costs would be derived from a variety of sources, both public and private.
  - Other owner agencies are responsible for their own maintenance/operation.

² FTE costs vary from agency to agency.
In the early part of this Study, nine Airpark configurations were developed for consideration by the Commission. These nine configurations were used to facilitate discussion concerning Airpark issues and to show the range of strategies available for resolving the continued general aviation use at Pearson Airpark. The nine configurations are listed below:

Cessation of Airpark Activity After 2002
In accordance with the current agreement, the Airpark operations would cease after 2002 and all aspects of the agreement would be implemented. Aviation activity would cease on NPS holdings.

Conditional Airpark Operations
During planning and construction of a new general aviation airport in Clark County and with Congressional authorization, current Airpark operations would be extended up to a maximum of five years by annual permits.

Historic Airpark
The existing Airpark would be converted to a facility for the interpretation of antique and historic aircraft and for preservation of cultural resources on the site. The historicity of all Pearson structures would be evaluated according to the criteria of eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places and the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The general aviation role of Pearson Airpark would cease after 2002 and all non-historic structures would be removed from the grounds of the historic site.

STOL/VTOL Aircraft
The western end of the airstrip would be removed and the eastern end converted to Short Take Off and Landing and Vertical Take Off and Landing aircraft operations. This would mean all remaining aircraft operations would be on City-owned land.

Limited Airpark Operations
General aircraft operations would be limited to hours outside Fort Vancouver special events and regular visitor hours (9:00 A.M. – 5:00 P.M.). Historic/antique aircraft operations would be allowed during visitor hours on the basis of permits.

Current Operations with Re-Aligned Airstrip
The current east-west oriented landing strip would be angled more towards the river to provide greater area in front of the Fort Vancouver Stockade. Congressional action and an Environmental Impact Statement would be required for extension of revised Airpark activity on National Park Service landholdings after 2002.

Current Operations with Revised Airstrip
The western end of the runway on NPS landholdings would be demolished and a new runway extension would be constructed to the east of existing Airpark properties.
Alternatives
Pearson Airpark Options

Current Operations with Revised Landholdings
The NPS would sell its portion of the western end of the runway back to the City. A safety zone would be established around the existing runway and Fort Vancouver Master Plan goals for this area would be shelved.

Current Operations After 2002
Pearson Airpark would continue its current level of operations on the existing runway after 2002. Congressional action and an Environmental Impact Statement would be required for extension of current Airpark activity on NPS landholdings for an additional period to be determined.

Alternatives Eliminated from Further Study
Commission discussions resulted in elimination of several of the original nine configurations. It was determined that Conditional Airpark Operations and Limited Airpark Operations should be options under the umbrella of the Current Operations After 2002 configuration. Current Operations with Realigned Airstrip and with Revised Airstrip were determined to be impractical both from an economic and aircraft operations standpoint. While the concept of an eastern runway extension would accomplish removing the runway from NPS property, the Commission had concerns about the public cost of the project, the social and economic impact on the businesses located there, and the potential economic impact on the City of Vancouver. The STOL/VTOL Aircraft Operations was determined to depend too heavily on unspecified future aircraft technology and noise would continue to be an issue for Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. Finally, the Revised Landholdings configuration would prevent implementation of the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site Master Plan.

The nine preliminary configurations were thus narrowed to five, and finally, after consultation with the Commission, the five were refined to three. The three Pearson Airpark configurations included in this Study are the following: Cessation of Airpark Activity After the Year 2002, Development of a Pearson Air Museum, and Continuation of General Aviation Activity After the Year 2002.
Cessation of Airpark Activity After the Year 2002

Overall Concept
This configuration is outlined in the current agreement between the City of Vancouver and the Department of the Interior. It is a component of the No Action Management Strategy but also could be a component of the other three management strategies discussed previously.

Under the Cessation Strategy, the Airpark operations would cease after 2002 in accordance with the current agreement between the National Park Service and the City of Vancouver. All aspects of the current agreement would be fulfilled. This strategy permits the implementation of the Master Plan for the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site and could be amended to include the proposed Pearson Air Museum (with static exhibits only). Reversion of lands to the NPS would mean the removal of all non-historic hangars and other structures within the confines of the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. The western end of the landing strip would be vacated within this area. (See Illustration Page 62.)

Geographic Area
Under this strategy, all lands on the west side of East Reserve Street would revert to the National Park Service, as required in the original agreement between the City of Vancouver and the National Park Service. The historicity of all Pearson structures would be evaluated according to the criteria of eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places and the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Reversion of lands to the NPS would mean the removal of all non-historic hangars and other structures within the confines of the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. The western end of the landing strip would be vacated within this area. (See Illustration Page 62.)

Resources
In addition to the cultural resources within the larger Fort Vancouver NHS area, this strategy would include additional resources created through implementation of the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site Master Plan; crops and public access roads and pathways could be constructed in areas formerly occupied by Pearson structures. Upon consultation with the National Park Service, existing Pearson historic structures could remain on NPS owned land to facilitate display and interpretation of static aircraft. The recreational resource of Pearson's general aviation activity would be eliminated with the closure of the facility.

Administration and Management Strategies
Operational Instrument
The existing agreement between the City of Vancouver and the National Park Service would remain the operational instrument under this strategy. As noted above, discussions about the incorporation of Pearson's site history in static displays could be pursued.

Staff Requirement
For staffing requirements see the Estimated Costs Matrix — Airpark Cessation After 2002, Page 69.
Alternatives Pearson Airpark Options

Resource Protection and Interpretation
The Cessation Strategy would mean implementation of the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site Master Plan and re-creation of croplands and the original agricultural setting of the Fort, as well as facilitating additional pedestrian routes through the site. Consultations between the National Park Service and the City of Vancouver could focus on the interpretation of historic aspects of Pearson Airpark. However, the loss of the east end of the runway would mean general aviation may cease, which could limit the City's funding capability for the present and future Air Museum. In addition, antique aircraft would be limited to static display, with no opportunity for active aircraft demonstrations. Finally, recreational use of Pearson would end with cessation of general aviation activity.

Responsibilities of Participating Entities
The City and the National Park Service would exercise their responsibilities as outlined in the existing purchase agreement. After cessation of general aviation activities, the City could administer the Pearson site as appropriate under current zoning, including operation of the Air Museum for static display. The NPS would continue to operate and manage the Historic Site. As noted above, consultations between the National Park Service and the City could result in NPS participation in assisting with interpretation of Pearson Airpark's historic resources.

Capital Improvements
Implementation of the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site Master Plan after cessation of Airpark activities would allow phased construction of walkways, trails, fields and interpretive areas to the east of the existing stockade. Other capital improvements would include removal of the 'T' hangars presently on NPS lands and, upon consultation with the NPS, creation of a new Air Museum for static display.

The existing general aviation facility would need to be moved to another site, which would entail the full range of costs associated with a new facility.

Revenue Sources
Under the Cessation Strategy, the NPS would be fiscally responsible for the lands under its control, including funding for implementation of the Master Plan. The City would provide funding for all properties owned and operated by the City, including the reduced area of Pearson Airpark after 2002. Additional City funding for this area could be secured through private development of the City owned area in accord with current zoning.

Legislative Requirements
No new legislation would be required for this Strategy. The existing City of Vancouver/National Park Service agreement would remain in force.
Implementation Strategy
The Cessation Strategy would employ the present timetable for the 2002 vacation of Pearson Airpark lands by the City. Prior to vacation, consultations could be held to determine NPS participation in the interpretation of Pearson Airpark-related cultural resources.

Estimated Costs
For estimated costs see the Estimated Costs Matrix — Airpark Cessation After 2002, Page 69.
Alternatives
Pearson Airpark Options

Development of a Pearson Air Museum for Both Antique Aircraft and Static Aircraft Displays

Overall Concept
This configuration could be a component of all four management strategies. It could be incorporated into the legislative language establishing a National Historical Reserve, but special Congressional action would be required to incorporate this configuration into the other three management strategies. Special flight permits would be required from the National Park Service, and all flights would be limited to antique aircraft which represent an era of flight as described in either the Reserve legislation or in the Memorandum of Understanding. The Fort Vancouver National Historic Site Master Plan could be modified to incorporate Pearson historic structures currently on the grounds of the Historic Site. Any new structures to be part of the museum complex would be erected on lands outside of the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. The historicity of all Pearson structures would be evaluated according to the criteria of eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places and the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The general aviation role of Pearson Airpark would cease after the year 2002 in this configuration, and all non-historic structures would be removed from the grounds of the Historic Site.

Operation of antique and historic aircraft could continue in perpetuity after the 2002 closure date for general aviation, with Congressional approval. The Master Plan for the Reserve should define what constitutes 'antique' and 'historic' aircraft as well as what is the optimum runway configuration for these types of aircraft. The maximum number of antique and historic aircraft would be limited to 165 planes.

This Strategy would provide an opportunity to develop collaborative programs with the aviation museum network in order to advance collections and to facilitate exhibiting and interpretive programs related to aviation history (with an emphasis on Pearson Airfield history).

Geographic Area
The geographic area under this Strategy is the same as described under the Cessation Strategy above, with the exception that the airstrip would remain on NPS owned land for operation of antique aircraft. (See Illustration Page 65.)

Resources
Resources for this Strategy are the same as for the Cessation Strategy, except that creation of an historical focus at Pearson Airpark would include interpretation of both static and active antique aircraft. The closure of the Airpark to general aviation would mean loss of the recreational resource associated with operation of private aircraft at Pearson.

Administration and Management Strategies
Operational Instrument
A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) would be used in the Air Museum Strategy to define the activities of participating entities and to describe the types of aircraft appropriate to the interpretation of Pearson Airfield.

Staff Requirement
For staff requirements see the Estimated Costs Matrix — Pearson Air Museum, Page 69.
Alternatives
Pearson Airpark Options

Resource Protection and Interpretation
The Air Museum Strategy would allow implementation of both the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site Master Plan and creation of an expanded Pearson Air Museum. Both static and active displays would be part of Air Museum interpretation. Scheduling of antique aircraft operations would allow pedestrians to safely use areas south of the Fort stockade during times when aircraft operation was suspended. Cessation of general aviation activity, however, could limit the City’s funding resources for the Air Museum. In addition, the existing general aviation recreational resource would be eliminated with the cessation of general aviation activity.

Responsibilities of Participating Entities
The Memorandum of Understanding would define specific responsibilities of the National Park Service and the City of Vancouver in maintaining and interpreting Pearson Airfield. In general, the NPS would continue to manage and interpret NPS owned areas and the City would manage all City owned areas; the City and NPS would jointly facilitate interpretation of Pearson Airfield.

Capital Improvements
Implementation of the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site Master Plan after cessation of Airpark activities would allow phased construction of walkways, trails, fields and interpretive areas to the east of the existing stockade. The City would implement removal of ‘T’ hangars and non-historic structures currently on NPS landholdings.

Existing Pearson historic structures would be restored and a new Air Museum could be constructed on City owned or private land. The landing strip could be modified as necessary to accommodate operation of antique and historic aircraft.

The existing general aviation facility would need to be moved to another site, which would entail the full range of costs associated with a new facility.

Revenue Sources
The NPS would be fiscally responsible for lands under its control, including funding for implementation of the Master Plan. The City would provide funding for all properties owned and operated by the City, including the area not used for interpretation of Pearson Airfield. Additional funding for interpretation of Pearson Airfield could be provided through NPS participation as defined in the MOU, or through private sources.

Legislative Requirements
Congressional action would be required to include aviation heritage as an adjunct to the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site mission. In addition, the NPS and City would be co-signatories to a MOU defining specific responsibilities for the maintenance and interpretation of Pearson Airfield’s historic and cultural resources.
Implementation Strategy
The NPS and City would agree to a timetable for establishing a MOU for management of Pearson Airfield interpretation. After the signing of the MOU, Congressional action could be initiated to expand the scope of NPS activities to include interpretation of Pearson Airfield. A sequence would then be initiated for planning and scheduling of activities related to the establishment of an expanded Pearson Air Museum.

Estimated Costs
For estimated costs see the Estimated Costs Matrix—Pearson Air Museum, Page 69.
**Alternatives**

**Pearson Airpark Options**

**Continuation of General Aviation Activity After the Year 2002**

**Overall Concept**
This configuration also could be a component of all four management strategies. It could be incorporated into the legislative language establishing a Reserve, but special Congressional action would be required to incorporate this configuration into the other three management strategies. The number of aircraft to be based at Pearson Airpark would be limited as agreed by the participating entities, and the type of aircraft allowed to operate at Pearson Airpark would also be determined by agreement. The runway alignment and aircraft taxiways could be modified in accordance with the agreement so that the impact of aircraft operations on the National Historic Site could be decreased. The duration of aircraft operation after the year 2002 would be contained within the language of the legislation or agreement. The historicity of all Pearson structures would be evaluated according to the criteria of eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places and the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. All non-historic structures would be removed from the grounds of the Historic Site by parties identified in the legislation or agreement, and any new Air Museum structures would be constructed on grounds off the Historic Site.

Like the previous strategy, the Continuation Strategy would provide an opportunity to develop collaborative programs with the aviation network in order to advance collections and to facilitate exhibiting and interpretive programs related to aviation history (with an emphasis on Pearson Airfield history).

**Geographic Area**
Under this strategy, all lands on the west side of East Reserve Street would revert to the NPS as required in the original agreement between the City and the NPS. The western end of the landing strip would remain under NPS ownership, but use for general aviation purposes would be extended for a period defined in a MOU with the City. (See Illustration Page 68.)

**Resources**
This strategy includes resources relating to both the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site and to Pearson Airpark. With the removal of non-historic Pearson structures to the east of the Fort stockade, certain components of the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site Master Plan can be implemented, augmenting the cultural resource currently in place. Limited crops could be planted around the landing strip to help mitigate impacts of continued general aviation use. Upon consultation with the NPS, existing Pearson historic structures could remain on NPS owned land to facilitate display and interpretation of static and active antique and historic aircraft. The recreational resource associated with Pearson's general aviation activity would remain.

**Administration and Management Strategies**

**Operational Instrument**
A Memorandum of Understanding would be developed by the NPS and the City to define numbers and types of operating aircraft and responsibilities of each entity in the management and interpretation of Pearson's historic resources. The MOU would also define runway and taxiway alignment and duration of aircraft operation after 2002. Congressional action and an Environmental Impact Statement would be required for extension of current Airpark activity on NPS landholdings for the period determined in the MOU.
Alternatives
Pearson Airpark Options

Staff Requirement
For estimated staff requirements see the Estimated Costs Matrix — Continuation of General Aviation, Page 69.

Resource Protection and Interpretation
The Continuation Strategy would allow implementation of certain aspects of the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site Master Plan and the creation of an expanded Pearson Air Museum incorporating both active and static displays. The City’s funding resource for Air Museum interpretive activities would be preserved through continuation of general aviation activity.

However, continued general aviation activity would restrict the implementation of portions of the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site Master Plan, including the provision for pedestrian use of open fields and trails south of the stockade.

Responsibilities of Participating Entities
The Memorandum of Understanding would define specific responsibilities of the NPS and the City in maintaining and interpreting Pearson Airfield. In general, the NPS would continue to manage and interpret NPS owned areas and the City would manage all City owned areas. The City would be responsible for removal and/or relocation of non-historic Airpark structures currently on NPS landholdings.

Capital Improvements
Implementation of the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site Master Plan after removal of non-historic Pearson structures would allow phased construction of walkways, trails and interpretive areas to the east of the existing stockade. As noted above, the City would implement removal of ‘T’ hangars and other designated non-historic structures currently on NPS landholdings.

Existing Pearson historic structures could be restored and a new Air Museum constructed on City owned or private land. As defined in the MOU, the landing strip could be modified as necessary to augment planting of surrounding interpretive crops associated with the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site.

Additional new or relocated hangars to house aircraft and activities associated with continued general aviation could be sited on City owned land.

Revenue Sources
The NPS would be fiscally responsible for lands under its control, including funding for implementation of the Master Plan. The City would provide funding for all properties owned and operated by the City, including the Pearson Air Museum.
Legislative Requirements
Congressional legislation and an Environmental Impact Statement would be required for extension of current Airpark activity on NPS landholdings for the period determined in the MOU. In addition, the NPS and the City would be co-signatories to a MOU defining specific responsibilities in the interpretation of Pearson Airfield. The MOU would also define the period of continued general aviation activity and include a schedule for implementation of interpretation strategies.

Implementation Strategy
The NPS and City would agree to a timetable for establishing a MOU for management of Pearson Airpark and for interpretation of Pearson’s historic resources. After signing the MOU, Congressional action would need to be initiated as described above.

Estimated Costs
For estimated costs see the Estimated Costs Matrix — Continuation of General Aviation, Page 69.

3. CONTINUATION OF GENERAL AVIATION AFTER 2002
## Alternatives
### Pearson Airpark Options

### Estimated Costs Matrix

#### Estimated Costs – Airpark Cessation After 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Admin/Operation (per year)</th>
<th>Program (per year)</th>
<th>Capital Improvements (total)</th>
<th>Maintenance (per year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| NPS City:  
  Airpark    | 0.5 FTE = $25,000         | -0-                | $850,000                     | $65,000                |
| Museum³     | 1 FTE = $30,000           | $20,000            | -0-                          | $15,000                |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Costs - Airpark Cessation After 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Expenditure:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$155,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditure:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$895,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Estimated Costs – Pearson Air Museum⁵

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Admin/Operation (per year)</th>
<th>Program (per year)</th>
<th>Capital Improvements (total)</th>
<th>Maintenance (per year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City:</td>
<td>2.0 FTE = $60,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>(New museum) $2,000,000 (Demolition) $500,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Costs - Pearson Air Museum⁵</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Expenditure:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditure:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Estimated Costs – Continuation of General Aviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Admin/Operation (per year)</th>
<th>Program (per year)</th>
<th>Capital Improvements (total)</th>
<th>Maintenance (per year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| City:        | (General Aviation)  
  0.5 FTE = $25,000          | -0-                | (New facilities) $3,000,000 (Demolition) $600,000 | $65,000                |
|              | (Museum)                  | $75,000            | (New Museum) $2,000,000 (Demolition) $500,000 | $60,000                |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Costs - Continuation of General Aviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Expenditure:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$285,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditure:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. The cost to remove all buildings and improvements from NPS property.
2. Includes existing debt service on improvements (these costs end in 1997).
4. Does not include relocation of museum to City property, which would be an option.
5. Budget is based on the current Master Plan for museum development.
6. Includes new T-hangars on City-owned property.
7. Demolition includes removal of non-historic buildings and taxiways from NPS property.
8. Planning and design costs are not included in these estimates.
Part V: Impacts of Alternative

- Environmental Assessment

This 1948 photo of Pearson Airfield shows the historic relationship between the hangars, airstrip, Officers Row, and the Parade Ground. (Courtesy of the National Park Service.)
Introduction

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires that federal actions be considered in light of their consequences for the environment of future generations of Americans. This involves a planning and documentation process as prescribed in the rules of the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and agency implementing regulations. In this case, National Park Service Implementing Guidelines NPS-12 of September 1982 apply.

Compliance with NEPA means compliance with a host of other environmental statutes as well, such as Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act, etc. To effect this environmental consideration, CEQ has directed that an Environmental Assessment (EA) be conducted for each proposed action. The EA is a process of evaluation, the results of which may be documented in a variety of ways. For instance, if the assessment results in a finding that the proposed action is a major federal action having a significant impact on the human environment, then the proponent agency must prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). On the other hand, if an action or group of actions is found to have negligible impact, those actions are "categorically excluded" from further documentation. Those proposals that are not categorically excluded, but also seem not to have a "significant" impact can be reported in an EA report with a Finding Of No Significant Impact (FONSI). The range of analysis and methods of documentation for EA/FONSI are broad. Many EA/FONSI determinations are straight-forward. Little EA process is required and FONSI decisions are made at local or regional administrative levels. Some, however, like the Vancouver National Historical Reserve Feasibility Study require an extensive process, including scoping and coordination with interested publics. The documenting report (also called the "EA") is forwarded along with other project or study information (in this case, The Report of the Vancouver Historical Study Commission) to decision makers at the highest levels of government. These officials may, after considering a variety of tests of significance, prepare a FONSI. The EA for this study is presented in this section for an integrated review with feasibility study results.

Impact Analysis Process

Various management alternatives and Pearson Airpark options have been evaluated in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality rules and National Park Service policies and guidelines for implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act. Through a scoping process involving interested agencies, groups, and individuals, the environmental coordinators identified key issues of concern, alternatives and potential mitigation strategies, and gathered resource and impact information.

They focused impact assessment on these and other, previously identified, important areas. Depth of assessment was commensurate with the study itself so the degree of attention given the various alternatives varied with the feasibility determined for it as the study progressed. For example, an option considered early in the study (Columbia River International Historic Park) received only cursory impact evaluation while the Commission's preferred alternative received in-depth scrutiny, both in the feasibility study and the impact analysis.
Impact Analysis

For the most part, the impacts associated with all options in the study are in the political, social, cultural, and economic arenas, though there are some potential effects, mitigation strategies, and opportunities related to the biological values of the Columbia River and shoreline. Management strategies basically represent a continuum from less to more “structure” with increasing institutional complexity and costs, but also enhanced potential for defining and improving the area’s historic resources. Key concerns are the degree to which the involved agencies can interact productively in a variety of structured relationships to develop themes and coordinate funding etc.; what the cost of doing this would be; and whether these costs (funds, lost flexibility, personnel, increased bureaucracy) are offset adequately by monetary and nonmonetary benefits.

Community cohesion is an issue in considering impacts of Pearson Airpark options. Continued operation of Pearson Airpark could result in impacts in a number of areas. Cultural, historical and natural resources are involved that will require aggressive exploration and development of mitigative strategies. Cessation of existing activities at Pearson Airpark, whether by converting it to a Historic Airpark or selection of the “No Action” alternative, will alienate a segment of the community that is interested in retaining general aviation use at the site. There appears to be no short term mitigation that would ameliorate this, though in the long term a new general aviation airport and changing players and attitudes may make cessation of the operation of Pearson Airpark for general aviation acceptable to the community.

Impacts associated with study options will contribute cumulatively to the effects of various initiatives that are, will, or may be undertaken by the City or other entities to maintain and enhance the amenities of the study vicinity. Study results and recommendations, for example, may influence future planning for a new airport in Clark County and may relate to the results of various city master plans in such a way that the overall improvement is greater than simply additive. Generally, the cumulative effect of any of the structured management choices, if successfully implemented, would be beneficial to the various study area resources. These impacts of the study alternatives are displayed generally and summarized in the matrices, figures 1 to 5. (See pages 80-84.)
Impacts to Physical Resources

Climate
None of the alternative management strategies or Pearson Airpark options would affect the climate of the study area.

Current Land Use
Under the “No Action” alternative, important land use changes would occur after 2002 and the closure of Pearson Airpark. For example, the National Park Service would implement completion of the master plan for the historic site on lands currently used for the Airpark. The City of Vancouver would likely find new uses, including possible commercial facilities, for its portion of these lands. The basic character of the area would change.

Any mix of other alternatives and Pearson Airpark options would result in only minor land use changes and subtle adjustments in existing uses because an airport of some type would remain operational. Of these other choices, Central Park or Historical Reserve management options potentially offer greatest opportunity for beneficial impacts in the area of preservation, protection, and enhancement of study area resources and open space.

Geology
No study alternatives would measurably impact geological features.

Air Quality
Air quality in the vicinity is judged to be minimally improved due to cessation of the airpark after 2002 with the “No Action” alternative. Depending on what new uses may be made of Airpark lands any improvement to air quality may be offset. Other Pearson Airpark options may result in minimal local air quality improvement with eventual cessation of general aviation use. Otherwise no air quality impacts from any study alternatives are expected.
## Impacts to Water Resources

**Surface Water**
Fine sediments, oils, and metals carried in runoff from Pearson Airpark runways generally contribute to pollution in the Columbia River and near shore areas and have adverse impacts on that resource. Any option including continuation of Pearson Airpark operation should include consideration of measures to offset any identified adverse water quality impacts. Berms, buffers, vegetation—all are possibilities in this regard. Through integrated management of study area resources, a structured multi-entity management approach offers the greatest opportunity to reduce any adverse impacts to surface waters and to manage for future protection.

**Ground Water**
Impacts on ground water would be negligible.

**Hazardous and Toxic Materials**
No study alternatives would result in adverse hazardous and toxic materials impacts. Prior to rehabilitation or demolition of any existing buildings, asbestos surveys and proper clearances would be required.

## Permit, Regulatory Authorization
Permits and regulatory actions under any of the study alternatives would be routine.

## Impacts to Biological Resources
Natural resource issues associated with the study are limited. Management alternatives, to the extent they might be successful in integrating all values into an overall management scheme, could result in enhancement to natural values. The National Historical Reserve management alternative could markedly enhance natural values, for example, if it resulted eventually in a virtual restoration on site of the Hudson’s Bay Company, circa 1830-40. Contemporary concerns and possibilities relate to preservation of open space and the significant fish and wildlife resources of the Columbia River, including several species of concern.

No adverse impacts to any federally listed threatened or endangered species are expected to result from implementation of the various study options. Specific coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service pursuant to the Endangered Species Act would have to be done prior to implementation of any alternative.
Communications, Traffic, and Transportation
With closure of Pearson Airpark, the “No Action” alternative would increase pressure on and potential opportunity for other regional airports. Pearson Airpark users would suffer inconvenience and delay. People who rely on the use of Pearson to support their businesses would suffer adverse economic impacts, with secondary impacts to the Vancouver community. Use of Pearson as a disaster relief staging area and for other emergencies would be lost.

The Aeronautics Division of the Washington State Department of Transportation (WDOT) has indicated that Pearson is an integral part of the air transportation of Washington State and that its closure would adversely impact aviation both within and outside the Vancouver area.

In the 1987 siting study accomplished for Clark County, a new site for an airpark was identified. However, there are environmental and cost concerns associated with the site and there is currently no local sponsorship for its development as an airpark. With or without Pearson Airpark, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) prefers development of a new airpark in Clark County. Until that airpark becomes a reality, they have indicated their support for the continuation of general aviation use at Pearson Airpark.

Other management and Pearson Airpark alternatives would have minor impacts. With a later cessation date for general aviation use at Pearson Airpark, users would have greater opportunity to plan for their relocation to an alternative site.

Quality of Life
The quality of life would be enhanced by an integrated management alternative for the study area resources. The greatest opportunity is provided by the National Historical Reserve alternative or the Central Park alternative. The quality of life for the segment of the community which relies on Pearson for general aviation would be adversely impacted by closure of Pearson Airpark. The management alternatives could include mitigation allowing for some continued use of Pearson Airpark for general aviation, as well as for historic aircraft.

Visual and Aesthetic Values
Visual values center around the Fort Vancouver site and adjacent Columbia River shoreline. Any alternative that would allow completion of the Fort Vancouver master plan would result in improved aesthetic values. Other opportunities which serve to enhance aesthetic values exist with alternatives emphasizing preservation of open space and the natural resources of the Columbia River.

Demographics
The management alternatives and Pearson Airpark options are not expected to have significant impact on study area population and employment patterns.
Infrastructure
The management alternatives would have no significant impact on study area facilities and utilities. The Washington State Department of Transportation has commented that the continued operation of Pearson Airpark will have an impact on the planned highway safety and capacity improvements along the State Route 14/Columbia Way Interchange.

Safety
There are safety concerns associated with potential conflicts between general aviation use of Pearson Airpark and interpretive use of Fort Vancouver. An integrated management alternative and eventual cessation of the use of Pearson Airpark for general aviation use would ameliorate safety concerns. No significant safety issues related to existing use of Pearson Airpark at its current level have been identified by either the FAA or Portland International Airport.

Noise
Noise impacts to interpretation of Fort Vancouver would be reduced by any alternative which results in cessation of general aviation at Pearson Airpark; although the greatest noise source is attributed to flyovers from Portland International Airport. Other primary sources of noise to the Fort Vancouver Site include I-5 and SR-14 freeways and the Burlington Northern Railroad. According to information provided by the City of Vancouver, the results of noise monitoring at Pearson Airpark over a four day test period of June 3-6, 1988, (Friday through Monday) indicated that only 163 operations out of the recorded 424 exceeded a 60 decibel threshold, set to account for freeway, railroad, and other environmental noise. (Note: the Environmental Protection Agency uses a standard of 65 decibels as the breakpoint for sentence intelligibility). Forty-eight of the recorded operations exceeded 70 decibels; 3 were above 75 decibels. On the Portland Airport site, 337 of 368 recorded flights during this same period were over 70 decibels. The duration of noise above 60 decibels ranged from 0-12 seconds for Pearson Airpark compared to 12-50 seconds for Portland International Airport. Contact with FAA and Portland International has not indicated any plans to increase air traffic over the study area if Pearson Airpark closes.

Native American, Ethnic Concerns
Initial study coordination has not indicated any adverse impacts to Native American or ethnic concerns from implementation of any of the study alternatives. Detailed coordination would be accomplished during the master planning phase of study should a National Historical Reserve be approved by Congress.
Impacts to Economic Development

Regional Economic Activity
Under the “No Action” alternative, economic activity to the region may increase with new uses of the Pearson Airpark site even though the airpark and related activities would be lost. The net impact from these changes has not been quantified.

The completion of the Fort Vancouver Historic Site Master Plan would likely attract increasing numbers of tourists to the region. Establishment of the National Historical Reserve potentially offers the greatest beneficial impacts on the regional economy. Enhanced tourism could occur from federal designation and through the integrated multi-entity management approach. There would be expanded opportunities to utilize both public and private financial resources that could result in expanded facilities and tourism opportunities. To the extent they could be successfully implemented, other options could have beneficial impacts as well.

Closure of Pearson Airpark with no alternative provisions for meeting general aviation needs would adversely impact aviation users throughout the region. The FAA indicated that even with Pearson Airpark remaining open for use by general aviation aircraft, a new regional airpark in Clark County is needed. As reported in the Clark County Airport Master Plan, dated 1987, by the year 2005, there will be an excess demand in the county for 363 based aircraft. This estimation is based on the assumption that Pearson Airpark will continue general aviation use by 170 aircraft.

According to the Aeronautics Division, WDOT, Pearson Airpark handles a majority of the business-related flights for the Clark County area. Results of a WDOT analysis of operations and based aircraft data indicated that 97% of the air taxi operations in the county and 55% of operations by visiting aircraft occur at Pearson. Further, the analysis concluded that 52% of the on airport aviation businesses in the county are located on Pearson. Closing Pearson Airpark could drive the air traffic and the business to Oregon, with subsequent losses of tax revenues and tourism dollars to Washington. An additional concern of the Aeronautics Division would be the loss of a major disaster relief staging area in southwestern Washington should Pearson Airpark close.

Site Contribution, Local Expenditures
The economic contribution associated with Pearson Airpark is based on the number of aircraft that the airport can accommodate in terms of hangar and tie-down space and the physical limitations of the site. Under the “No Action” alternative, this activity would cease in 2002 and there would be economic costs associated with demolition, building removals, and conversion of the land to other uses. Under other mixes of management and Pearson Airpark options, this activity would continue beyond 2002, but because the Fort Vancouver Master Plan would not be fully implemented, realization of the full contribution of the Historic Site would be delayed until general aviation use ceased.
The Pearson Airpark Master Plan, dated 1987, discusses the revenue and expense projections for the airpark through 2008. There is a segment of the community that believes the economic contribution by Pearson's general aviation use is needed to support the historic use and interpretation of the airpark site as part of the National Historical Reserve.

Generally, to the extent management and Pearson Airpark options are successful in meeting goals and objectives, the more structured (e.g., Central Park or National Historical Reserve) choices would result in the most beneficial local and regional economic impacts.

Under the "No Action" alternative, management of the area's cultural resources would continue as it has in the past with each involved entity implementing its specific program responsibilities and coordinating with other jurisdictions as needed.

All action management alternatives provide opportunities for the enhanced preservation and interpretation of the cultural resources of the Study Area. These significant resources include the nationally significant Fort Vancouver site, as well as other resources of potential national, state, and local significance, such as Vancouver Barracks, Officers Row, Pearson Airpark, the Kaiser Shipyards, and unrecovered archeological resources. The National Historical Reserve Management Strategy offers the greatest means to accomplish interpretation and enhancement goals. Under this alternative, the National Park Service would have a lead management role, providing access to an existing management system tuned to the effective interpretation of cultural resources. Included in this strategy could be development of Pearson Airpark as a historic airpark adding to the full interpretation of the continuum of history within the Study Area.

Mitigation features could be included in any of the management strategies to minimize the adverse impacts associated with the continued use of Pearson Airpark for general aviation for a defined period of time beyond 2002.

Some study alternatives have real or perceived institutional and social impacts that have been the focus of most of the agency and public interaction throughout the duration of this Study. Key among these are:

**Safety of the Pearson Airpark Operations**

The study has determined that, although Pearson Airpark does not meet current FAA standards for general aviation airports, it is acceptable to the FAA at the existing level of operation. FAA would give close scrutiny to any proposals for increased activities at Pearson Airpark. None of the options that provide for Pearson Airpark continuation at current levels would have an adverse impact on safety. Mitigation for perceptions in this arena might focus on the alleged intentional overflights of Fort Vancouver by Pearson Airpark pilots. The issue of the safety of Pearson Airpark operations is a divisive issue within the community. Some believe safety is a very real concern associated with the use of Pearson for general aviation in view of the interpretive use of Fort Vancouver. Others believe that there are no safety concerns, based on the lack of documented records of safety violations. Safety concerns remain, however, given the proximity of Pearson Aircraft operations' to the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site.
Mutual Interference between Pearson Airpark and Portland International Airport

Coordination with FAA and Portland International Airport has indicated that operation at existing levels is acceptable. There are some inconveniences (alternating operations in adverse conditions, for example) that would be eliminated if Pearson Airpark ceased to exist, but impacts in this area are minimal at present. There is community concern that if Pearson Airpark ceases operation, Portland International Airport flights will cause noise and increase safety impacts in the Vancouver area (i.e., Pearson Airpark is now “protecting” the Vancouver area from Portland International Airport). While it is undoubtedly the case that if Pearson Airpark did not exist, Portland would have increased operational flexibility, it is also true that existing tools are in place to coordinate and assure that the Vancouver area’s needs are met. For instance, any notable change in Portland International Airport operations would require close scrutiny under NEPA, and other statutes, regulations, and agreements.

Pearson Airpark Operations Disrupting Fort Vancouver

If intentional overflights are eliminated and if helicopter use continues to be restricted to emergency use only, current-level operations at Pearson Airpark on a day-to-day basis would reduce noise impacts on existing Fort Vancouver operation and management. Noise from Portland International Airport is far more disruptive. The concern here is the existence of Pearson Airpark and Pearson Airpark operations, and the impacts on cultural, historical, and natural resources, including ambience as it relates to the interpretational, educational, and recreational experience.

Mitigation

Mitigation planning in the form of adverse impact avoidance, minimization, rectification, reduction or compensation has been an integral part of this study. Various mitigative strategies can be brought to bear on any or all management alternatives and Pearson Airpark options.

A key mitigative approach focuses on assuring cooperative management with each governmental agency retaining its authority, responsibility, and prerogatives. Private entities’ rights would be fully respected. Great effort would be made to establish and maintain a true partnership approach. Partnership would be documented with a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) among all willing parties. Signatories could develop joint resource plans. The MOU would include dispute resolution procedures.

Mitigative measures associated with Pearson Airpark could include berms, landscape screening and vegetative buffers for aesthetic improvement and water runoff control. Any measures implemented would be accomplished in a manner that would minimize adverse impacts to the site aesthetics and the historic setting.

Various conditions might be established for Pearson Airpark operation, including direction concerning non-historic aircraft, buildings, management, and options for future development of the airpark and Air Museum.

Finally, development of a new general aviation facility in Clark County, if this occurs, would establish the basis for further important mitigative measures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION</th>
<th>ECONOMIC</th>
<th>INSTITUTIONAL</th>
<th>SOCIAL</th>
<th>CULTURAL</th>
<th>NATURAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>MITIGATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Action</td>
<td>• Increased economic activity depending upon land use</td>
<td>• Allows National Park Service master plan to occur on schedule</td>
<td>• With closure of Airpark, safety and airpark-related noise concerns removed</td>
<td>• Some benefit to study area cultural values</td>
<td>• Benefits on NPS land</td>
<td>• Cooperative management among involved entities (advanced planning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Decreased revenues from Airpark, as well as decreased expenses.</td>
<td>• Does not establish a formal overall resource management framework</td>
<td>• Fort Vancouver interpretation enhanced with some opportunity for interpretation of other historic resources</td>
<td>• Unknown on city owned land; potential for enhancement</td>
<td>• Development of static exhibits</td>
<td>• Development of new Airpark in Clark County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Possible building removal costs</td>
<td>• Future uncertainty related to coordinated management of area resources</td>
<td>• Adverse impacts to Airpark recreational users</td>
<td>• Potential adverse impacts to wetlands from new uses on airpark lands</td>
<td>• Pearson Air Museum on Fort Vancouver Historic Site</td>
<td>• Development of new Airpark in Clark County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adverse impacts to businesses catering to Airpark use of area resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Positive social impacts if use of Airpark is for park and open space</td>
<td>• Opportunity for fly-in historic exhibit at Airpark would be lost</td>
<td>(subject to verification of presence of wetlands)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adverse impacts to commercial users of Airpark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased pressure/opportunity on other general aviation airports in the region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Fort Vancouver Historic Reserve Environmental Impact Matrix – Pearson Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION</th>
<th>ECONOMIC</th>
<th>INSTITUTIONAL</th>
<th>SOCIAL</th>
<th>CULTURAL</th>
<th>NATURAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>MITIGATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Vancouver Partnership | • Potential for increased economic activity from increased recreational and educational use and tourism  
• Greater encouragement for development of partnership ventures and associated cost savings  
• Potential for increased management costs to participants | • The proposed framework enhances opportunities for coordinated management  
• Greater potential to minimize adverse impacts and enhance benefits  
• Plans of individual entities may conflict with common goals  
• Funding priority would remain on an individual entity basis  
• Cooperative ventures that require cost sharing may prove difficult  
• More reliance on voluntary participation | • Potential for increased public enjoyment of the area resources | • Greater potential for benefiting cultural values and for interpreting the range of history in the area | • Greater potential to enhance management of area resources | • Sign Memorandum of Understanding  
• Involved entities could develop a joint plan for area resources (e.g. master plan)  
• Dispute resolution process |
## Fort Vancouver Historic Reserve Environmental Impact Matrix – Pearson Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION</th>
<th>ECONOMIC</th>
<th>INSTITUTIONAL</th>
<th>SOCIAL</th>
<th>CULTURAL</th>
<th>NATURAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>MITIGATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Park</td>
<td>• Increases study area size with potential for greater economic activity</td>
<td>• The proposed framework enhances opportunities for coordinated management</td>
<td>• Presents a major opportunity to enhance community cohesion</td>
<td>• Incrementally greater opportunity for benefiting cultural values</td>
<td>• Potentially greatest opportunity to enhance management of area resources</td>
<td>• Cooperative agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased management costs</td>
<td>• Coordinated funding initiative providing increased access to other funding sources</td>
<td>• Enhances recreational, historic, and cultural opportunities</td>
<td>• Opportunities for entities to interpret the range of history</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Funding focus on local public/private sources versus Federal entities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunity for enhanced City coordination with other entities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides forum for resolution of differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTION</td>
<td>ECONOMIC</td>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL</td>
<td>SOCIAL</td>
<td>CULTURAL</td>
<td>NATURAL RESOURCES</td>
<td>MITIGATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Reserve</td>
<td>• National designation offers the greatest opportunity to contribute to the regional economy through enhanced tourism and educational pursuits.</td>
<td>• The proposed framework enhances opportunities for coordinated management</td>
<td>• Greatest opportunity to enhance historic and cultural values of the study area</td>
<td>• Resources have greater regional and national emphasis</td>
<td>• Greater management opportunity for resources of the area</td>
<td>• Willing partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides forum for resolution of intergovernmental differences</td>
<td>• Benefits from a formal structured management framework by federal legislation with National Park Service having a prominent role</td>
<td>• Opportunities for entities to interpret the range of history</td>
<td>• Greatest emphasis on cultural values due to National designation, focus on nationally important historical themes, and increased opportunities for coordination and cooperation among all public and private entities</td>
<td>• All federal resource protection laws will apply to all actions funded by federal monies</td>
<td>• Communications framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reserve operation may require Nonfederal matching funds and some for O&amp;M funding by local entities</td>
<td>• Commission has limited authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Resolution of Pearson Airpark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cooperative agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Fort Vancouver Historic Reserve Environmental Impact Matrix – Pearson Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION</th>
<th>ECONOMIC</th>
<th>INSTITUTIONAL</th>
<th>SOCIAL</th>
<th>CULTURAL</th>
<th>NATURAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>MITIGATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cessation After 2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to No Action Alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historical Airpark</strong></td>
<td>• Similar to No Action</td>
<td>• Congressional authorization required</td>
<td>• Similar to No Action</td>
<td>• Provides for antique aircraft operation</td>
<td>• Opportunity for increased open-space on city-owned lands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Attract new tourism enthusiasts</td>
<td>• FAA review and approval required</td>
<td>• Safety concerns</td>
<td>• Adds new historic/cultural dimension</td>
<td>• New general aviation Airpark in Clark County</td>
<td>• Pearson Air Museum on NPS lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adverse impacts to Airpark users with cessation of general aviation</td>
<td>• NPS becomes involved interpreting Airpark history</td>
<td>• Adverse impacts to some users with cessation of general aviation</td>
<td>• Opportunity to develop air museum</td>
<td>• Grass strip runway</td>
<td>• Landscape screening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Congressional authorization required</td>
<td>• Provides for antique aircraft operation</td>
<td>• Congressional authorization required</td>
<td>• Fort Vancouver M.P. can be implemented with modifications</td>
<td>• NPS becomes involved interpreting Airpark history</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• FAA review and approval required</td>
<td>• Adds new historic/cultural dimension</td>
<td>• FAA review and approval required</td>
<td>• Opportunity to develop air museum</td>
<td>• Extinguish runway lights during visitor hours</td>
<td>• Landscape screening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NPS becomes involved interpreting Airpark history</td>
<td>• Opportunity to develop air museum</td>
<td>• NPS becomes involved interpreting Airpark history</td>
<td>• Opportunity for increased open-space on city-owned lands</td>
<td>• Phased general aviation use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Current Operations after 2002 | • Continue revenues from Airpark | • Congressional authorization required | • Continued visual/noise distractions to Fort Vancouver visitors | • Fort Vancouver master plan not fully implemented | • No natural resource enhancement opportunity | |
| | • Reduced opportunity for revenue from recreational, educational uses, and tourism | • Reduce incentive for rapid planning for new Airpark | • Safety concerns associated with general aviation use remain | • Opportunity for full enhancement of historic/cultural values is precluded | • City proposal | • Limited Airpark operation |
| | | • Manageable for FAA if kept at current use or less | • Other uses of Airpark lands foregone | • Opportunity for Pearson Air Museum on NPS land | • Finite extension | • New Airpark in Clark County |

*Fig. 5*
Part VI: Findings and Recommendations

- Evaluation of Alternatives
- Feasibility of National Historic Reserve
- Protection of Resources
- Pearson Airpark

The Spruce Production Mill, as pictured in this historic 1918 photo, played an important role in the expansion and modernization of the United States aircraft industry. (Courtesy of the National Park Service.)
Findings and Recommendations
Evaluation of Alternatives

The Management and Pearson Airpark Strategies were evaluated using the Goals and Objectives included in the Introduction to this Study. Each strategy was compared to individual goals and noted for conformance to specific objectives. A summary evaluation for each strategy follows. The differences among the action alternatives are largely due to the degree of management structure inherent in each and thus the degree to which each meets the study Goals and Objectives.

Vancouver National Historical Reserve Management Strategy
This Strategy effectively meets the objectives of all the major goals with the following exceptions:

- The full implementation of the Fort Vancouver Master Plan (Goal 1, Objective A) is contingent on the selection of an appropriate Pearson Strategy to allow planting of crops and construction of pedestrian paths to the south of the Stockade.
- Continued use of Pearson Airpark for historic and antique aircraft (Goal 3, Objective A) is contingent on selection of an appropriate Pearson Strategy.
- Because the NPS would take a lead role in the Reserve Strategy, individual entities may not have the equal participation offered in the Partnership Strategy.

No Action Management Strategy
While the No Action Management Strategy allows full implementation of the Fort Vancouver Master Plan, this strategy conflicts with several goals and objectives, as noted below:

- It does not provide maximum interactive involvement by public and private entities with ownership and/or influence over resources (Goal 2, Objective A).
- It does not allow “history to continue” in the form of landing and takeoff of antique aircraft at Pearson Airpark (Goal 2, Objective D; Goal 3, Objectives A–D).
- It does not facilitate proactive involvement by all public and private entities (Goal 4, Objective A).

Vancouver Partnership Management Strategy
Like the Vancouver National Historic Reserve Management Strategy, the Vancouver Partnership Management Strategy meets most of the study’s goals and objectives. Conformance with Pearson Airpark-specific goals and objectives depends on the Pearson option selected.

The Partnership Strategy is particularly strong in its ability to facilitate proactive involvement by all public and private entities (Goal 4, Objective A) because each entity has equal status in the Partnership. However, the Partnership Strategy is less effective than the Reserve Strategy in providing structure and an administrative mechanism to carry out decisions (Goal 4, Objective C); the NPS lead management role in the Reserve Strategy affords access to an existing management system that
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Central Park Management Strategy
The Central Park Management Strategy meets most goals and objectives. Like the Reserve and Partnership Strategies, meeting goals relating to Pearson Airpark is contingent on selection of the appropriate Pearson Strategy.

However, because the City of Vancouver would take the lead role in the Central Park Strategy, individual member entities would not have the equal participation offered in the Partnership Strategy. Encouragement of proactive involvement by all public and private entities (Goal 4, Objective A) could thus be more difficult to facilitate under the Central Park Strategy than under the Partnership Strategy because all entities would not have the equal status afforded by the Partnership Strategy. In addition, heavier reliance would be placed on City government to implement area-wide objectives. However, the City could be more effective in managing private entities than other lead agencies.

Management Strategy Conclusions
In measuring the Management Strategies against the Study goals and objectives, the Commission determined that the Reserve Strategy presents the best mechanism for protecting cultural resources, while the Partnership Strategy permits the most effective means of achieving consensus and proactive involvement among the diverse entities within the Study Area. Therefore, after reviewing all proposed management strategies, the Commission concluded that a combination of the two strategies would be the most effective means for meeting Study goals and objectives.

The combined Reserve/Partnership Strategy affords flexibility for ongoing management of the area’s resources and presents diverse options for ongoing funding programs. Taking the best components of each management strategy, the Reserve/Partnership Strategy capitalizes on NPS expertise in interpreting cultural resources and the existing physical presence of the NPS mission at Fort Vancouver. Simultaneously, through the Partnership Strategy, public entities will maintain direct management control over their properties while actively coordinating financial and human resources necessary to manage the area. (See Operational Instrument, Reserve/Partnership Strategy, Page 94.)
Pearson Alternatives

Cessation of Airpark Activity After 2002
The Cessation Strategy would allow the implementation of the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site Master Plan (Goal 1, Objective A). However, this strategy fails to meet most of the goals and objectives for interpretation of active antique aircraft at Pearson Airpark. (Goal 1, Objective F; Goal 2, Objectives C–D; Goal 3, Objectives A, C, D.)

Development of a Pearson Air Museum
While it is recognized that there are other museums in the region that demonstrate various periods of aviation history, Pearson Airpark is unique in the region in its ability to demonstrate the context for early Army Air Corps Aviation from the 1920s through the 1930s.

The Air Museum strategy meets many of the Pearson Airpark–specific requirements of the goals and objectives, particularly those relating to interpretation of the full range of history at Pearson Airpark. The Air Museum Strategy would also allow general implementation of the Fort Vancouver Master Plan (Goal 1, Objective A).

However, this strategy does not allow for 'history to continue' (Goal 2, Objective D), nor does it provide for limited use of Pearson Airpark for general aviation (Goal 3, Objective C).

Continuation of General Aviation After 2002
This Strategy meets all Pearson Airpark–specific goals and objectives but would not allow full implementation of the Fort Vancouver Master Plan (Goal 1, Objective A).

Pearson Strategy Conclusions
The Cessation Strategy clearly fails to meet a number of the goals and objectives criteria relating to the interpretation of historic resources at Pearson Airpark. Conversely, the Air Museum Strategy meets Pearson preservation objectives but does not provide for limited use of Pearson Airpark for general aviation. The Continuation Strategy provides for limited general aviation use but could conflict with the full implementation of the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site Master Plan. However, the Continuation Strategy could be worded to contain language to phase out general aviation by some future date while preserving the continued operation of historic aircraft in perpetuity. This latter strategy would be the most effective strategy for achieving Study goals and objectives while minimizing adverse environmental impacts. Combined with the Reserve/Partnership Management Strategy described above, this strategy would constitute a viable mechanism for preserving and interpreting valuable resources in the Study Area.
Feasibility of Establishing a National Historical Reserve

Section 2 (a)(2) of Public Law 101-523, calls for the Commission to study and make recommendations regarding "the feasibility of establishing a Vancouver National Historical Reserve". This analysis was accomplished by the Commission in full recognition that such designation would either add the area as a unit of the National Park System, or as an "affiliated area" of the system. In making an evaluation of feasibility, the Commission was guided by three National Park Service documents; NPS Management Policies (1988), Affiliated Area Criteria (1990), and Criteria for Boundary Adjustments (1991). These documents provide guidance in evaluating potential areas for their suitability and feasibility for addition to the National Park System, and address boundary additions and other issues.

The 1988 NPS Management Policies, Chapter 2, establishes the criteria for evaluating the worthiness of an area for inclusion in the National Park System, noting that system inclusion is only one of several methods to provide for the protection and public enjoyment of resources that are important to an area and the Nation. To be eligible for favorable consideration as a unit of the National Park System, the potential Vancouver National Historical Reserve must possess:

1. Nationally significant natural, cultural or recreational resources,
2. be a suitable and feasible addition to the system, and
3. require direct NPS management instead of alternative protection by other agencies or the private sector.

National Significance

The NPS Management Policies sets criteria for National Significance. Aspects of significance to be considered for inclusion as a unit of the NPS are that the area:

- be an outstanding example of a particular type of resource,
- possess exceptional value or quality in illustrating or interpreting the natural or cultural themes of our nation’s heritage,
- offer superlative opportunities for recreation, public use, and enjoyment,
- retain a high degree of integrity as a true, accurate, and relatively unspoiled example of a resource.

Nationally significant cultural resources are considered those "districts, sites, buildings, structures, or objects that possess exceptional value or quality in illustrating or interpreting our heritage and that possess a high degree of integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association."

To address the issue of significance, a discussion of the relationship of Vancouver area resources to themes identified in History and Prehistory in the National Park System and the National Historic Landmark Program is necessary.

The national significance of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site was acknowledged by Congress with the establishment of the area as a unit of the National Park System. At present the volume History and Prehistory in the National Park System and the National Historic Landmark Program associates the Fort Vancouver site with two themes. Under the heading X. WESTWARD EXPANSION OF THE BRITISH COLONIES AND THE UNITED STATES, 1763-1898, Fort Vancouver is listed under X.B.6: Hudson's Bay Company and the Northwest Coast Fur Trade and X.D.3: Oregon Trail and Settlement of Oregon. Recent
research on the agricultural efforts of the Hudson's Bay Company, including the development of the far-flung Puget Sound Agricultural Company and the support provided by Chief Factor McLoughlin to American settlements in the Willamette Valley, support Fort Vancouver's inclusion under X.F.31: The Farmer's Frontier: Later Settlements and Farming in the California Valley, Oregon, and Washington.

Vancouver Barracks served as the principle administrative outpost of the U.S. Army in the Pacific Northwest from its founding in 1849 until World War I. The Barracks supported U.S. military activities ranging from the Indian wars of the late nineteenth century to providing major facilities for support of U.S. military ventures throughout the Pacific during the Spanish American and two World Wars. The history and significance of Officers Row and Pearson Airpark are primarily related to their functions as part of the Barracks' military operations. Vancouver Barracks has been determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, and Officers Row has been separately listed on the National Register; the eligibility of Pearson Airpark, either individually or as a component of the Barracks has yet to be determined.

The key role Vancouver Barracks played in the settlement of the Northwest and in support of U.S. military actions abroad support a determination of national significance. Within the thematic framework of History and Prehistory in the National Park System and the National Historic Landmark Program, Vancouver Barracks (including Officers Row, Pearson Airpark, and the Spruce Production Mill) would be associated with subthemes under VII. POLITICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS, 1865-1939; VII. World War I, 1914-1919 and VII. MILITARY AFFAIRS NOT RELATED TO WORLD WAR I AND WORLD WAR II, 1914-1941. In addition, Vancouver Barracks illustrates VIII. WORLD WAR II, War in the Pacific, 1941-1945, and X. WESTWARD EXPANSION OF THE BRITISH COLONIES AND THE UNITED STATES, 1763-1898, C.6. Military-Aboriginal American Contact and Conflict-The Pacific Coast.

Suitability/Feasibility

NPS Management Policies describe an area to be suitable for addition to the National Park System if it "represents a natural/cultural theme or type of recreational resource that is not already adequately represented in the National Park System, unless an area is comparably protected and presented for public enjoyment by another land-managing entity."

Based upon the National Park system themes listed previously, the WESTWARD EXPANSION OF THE BRITISH COLONIES AND THE UNITED STATES, 1763-1898 is already addressed by the presence of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site.

The theme POLITICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS, 1865-1939 is currently poorly represented within the National Park System, having only one area, Fort Jefferson, assigned as a primary facet. Thus regarding the suitability question, the addition of a Vancouver National Historical Reserve, which would be inclusive of the Vancouver Barracks and the themes and subthemes it represents, would help the National Park Service meet an important historical thematic gap within the system.
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The cultural importance of the resources identified within the Vancouver study area provide important contributions to the protection and public understanding of an aspect of American history. By virtue of its designation as a National Historical Site, the importance of the Hudson Bay Company and Fort Vancouver to Pacific Northwest and U.S. history has been well documented. Likewise, the importance of the strategic fort location led the United States Army to establish the Vancouver Barracks on the site, and to solidify U.S. interests in the new Northwest Territory. Potential National Reserve elements of Officers Row, the Vancouver Barracks property under U.S. Army management, and Pearson Air Field's operation at Vancouver Barracks as a U.S. Army Air Corps field provide important contributions to the significance of the site. Other supporting elements involve recreation and open space along the Columbia River waterfront, and portions of the site of the Kaiser Shipyards during World War II. Taken together, these important cultural elements form a "critical mass" of resources that lend themselves to a national designation.

Regarding the issue of feasibility, NPS Management Policies call for new units of the National Park System to be of "sufficient size and appropriate configuration, considering natural systems and/or historic settings, to ensure long-term protection of resources and to accommodate public use, and it must have potential for efficient administration at a reasonable cost." The NPS policies also note that important factors to consider regarding feasibility include existing landownership, any potential public land acquisition costs, opportunities for public access, threats to resources, and anticipated public expense to staff, develop, and maintain the area. Fort Vancouver National Historic Site would not be replaced by the proposed National Reserve designation, rather the National Historic Site would remain as one important component of a larger Reserve Area, and should be viewed as a part of a core Federal ownership of NPS and U.S. Army property within the larger context of the Reserve.

The recommended National Reserve Area encompasses some 366 acres, a reasonable area to manage given the urban setting of the area. The vast majority of land in the Reserve Area is currently in public ownership, including lands managed by the National Park Service, U.S. Army, State of Washington, and City of Vancouver. Opportunities for public access are high within the proposed Reserve Area. Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, Officers Row, and the Pearson Air Museum are already accessible to the general public. The area currently has a moderate level of protection and opportunity for public use and enjoyment. This would be enhanced by designation of the area as a National Reserve, and by each of the public entities being a member of the Vancouver Partnership and signatories to a Memorandum of Understanding concerning the protection of area resources and a commitment to provide for public use and appreciation of those resources.

The concept of the Vancouver Partnership would be a forum of cooperation and coordination between the public agencies represented in the area, and opportunities to minimize staffing, development, and operational costs to each entity would be actively pursued by the Partnership. Regarding management alternatives, four management approaches to administer a potential National Reserve for the Vancouver area were examined. These included (1) a continuation of existing policies, (2) the creation of a partnership via a Memorandum of Understanding between the various public entities, (3) an expanded role by the
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City of Vancouver related to their ongoing management of Central Park, and (4) the creation of a National Reserve. Of the four viable management approaches examined, it has been determined by the Commission that the designation of a Vancouver National Historical Reserve, coupled with the creation of a Vancouver Partnership via a Memorandum of Understanding, provides the best management approach for the long range protection and public use of area resources.

Since the primary resource values present in the area are cultural, it was suggested that the wording “National Historical Reserve” be maintained.

Regarding the question of administration of the proposed National Historical Reserve, both National Park Service administration and management by a commission or board was examined. It was determined, given the ongoing management presence of park staff at Fort Vancouver National Historical Site and the expertise and technical assistance available through National Park Service programs, that it was most appropriate to recommend NPS administration of the Reserve Area. However, NPS management responsibilities for the Reserve Area would be limited, except for ongoing agency responsibilities at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. Each public entity would retain existing management and program authorities over their own individual properties within the Reserve. With regard to the administration of the Reserve, the NPS role would be oriented to facilitation and coordination. The NPS would administer the National Reserve in consort with the proposed Vancouver Partnership. Formed via a Memorandum of Understanding, the Vancouver Partnership would be established to provide a forum for cooperation among the public and private entities involved with the Reserve, and to promote resource protection, the development of visitor interpretive and educational programs, and other initiatives. A Reserve Area Management Plan would be developed to identify specific program initiatives, facility needs, operational issues, and opportunities for cooperation.

Reserve Feasibility Summary

Therefore, the Vancouver Historical Study Commission considers it both feasible and suitable to establish a Vancouver National Historical Reserve within the Vancouver, Washington area, and recommends that the National Park Service management of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site be retained and expanded to provide for the administration of the designated Reserve Area. The Commission further recommends that each of the public entities represented within the proposed Vancouver National Historical Reserve be signatories to a Memorandum of Understanding which would set forth the principles of cooperation and coordination among the entities represented.

Regarding the appropriate designation of the area, the establishment of the area as a National Historical Reserve seems most appropriate to the Vancouver situation. It is an area possessing important cultural, scenic and recreational resources that are worthy of protection and commemoration, it has several common historical themes that represent an important continuum of history, and there is an expressed commitment at the local level for all entities to work together to achieve mutually desired goals for the area.
Findings and Recommendations
Feasibility of National Historical Reserve

Reasons for Establishing a Reserve
A Vancouver National Historical Reserve would realize the Congressional objective for coordination and cooperation among all public entities and encourage the same with and among private entities. There are several advantages that creation of a National Reserve would present:

1. Community cohesion would be enhanced through the Congressional direction and through the Reserve Commission's Master Plan establishing a clear management umbrella for the Reserve Area.

2. Establishment of the National Historical Reserve offers the greatest opportunity to contribute to the regional economy through the enhanced tourism that could result from Federal designation.

3. The integrated multi-entity management approach of the Reserve/Partnership Strategy presents increased potential for expanded public and private funding strategies.

4. The main mission of the NPS is interpretation and preservation; the NPS is already present in the Reserve Area and can readily extend its interpretation/preservation expertise to other entities in the Reserve.

The creation of this Reserve would provide a greater opportunity for preserving and interpreting the continuum of history at this site from early Native Americans through World War II. The focus would be on nationally important historical themes, such as Native Americans, the Hudson's Bay Company and early settlement, U.S. Military history at the Vancouver Barracks and associated Army Air Corps aviation at Pearson Field. Other recent events could be interpreted after an appropriate passage of time allowed sufficient perspective to evaluate their significance. The fifty-year standard used by the National Register of Historic Places would provide guidance.

Uses have and will continue to change, but the creation of a National Historical Reserve would increase the opportunities for coordination and cooperation among all public and private entities, as well as increase the preservation, protection, enhancement, enjoyment, and utilization of the historic, cultural, natural and recreational resources of the area.

Fort Vancouver National Historic Site (FVNHS) holds national importance, with or without the creation of the Reserve. However, as this Study has shown, other components of the Study Area were integral to the development of the Northwest and should be preserved, interpreted, and commemorated as such.
Operational Instrument — Reserve/Partnership Strategy

Under the Reserve/Partnership Management system, all public entities (Federal, State and local) would each have one representative on a reserve coordinating body called the “Vancouver Partnership.” Five members are recommended to comprise the Vancouver Partnership, and include the five entities represented by the Commission. It would be practical to retain the present constitution of the Commission, which includes responsibilities of the NPS, Department of the Army, Washington State, the City of Vancouver, and the Educational Community/General Public. The chair of the Vancouver Partnership would rotate every two years among the public entities. Participation in the Vancouver Partnership by representatives of the community and area organizations would also be encouraged.

The Vancouver Partnership would be established to oversee the protection, enhancement, and development of the Reserve Area. The Vancouver Partnership would be formalized by the MOU.

The NPS, in coordination with the Vancouver Partnership, would be responsible for the administration of the Vancouver National Historical Reserve. The NPS would have the lead Federal agency role for comprehensive Reserve interpretive and educational development, and the planning, design and construction supervision of any common Reserve facilities. These NPS responsibilities would be coordinated with the public members of the Partnership who are signatories to the MOU.

The Vancouver Partnership would not have any legislated authority over other public agencies or private landowners nor be interpreted as another layer of government. It would encourage and promote the protection and visitor use of the area and cooperation among the various public and private entities that make up the Reserve. Army use of the Vancouver Barracks would not be hindered by the establishment of the Reserve or the MOU.

In the VNHR, the rights of individual private property owners would be fully respected and the Reserve legislation, while including certain private properties, would not allow for the acquisition of any land without the consent of the owner. Private property within the Reserve would remain subject to the land use provisions of the City of Vancouver and other existing laws and ordinances that already pertain to the area.

A primary initial task of the Vancouver Partnership would be to produce a Reserve Coordination Master Plan which would define a timetable for implementation of various actions for the development of programs and facilities for the Reserve Area. Other items to be included in the Coordination Master Plan are described in Mitigation Measures (See Page 100).
Legal Issues

Creation of a National Historical Reserve will require Congressional authorization. It should be noted that "Historical Reserves" are administered under the aegis of the National Park Service (NPS) as either "units" of the System or "affiliated areas." If Congress created a VNHR, it would join four other reserves in the Nation. Two areas (Ice Age and Pinelands) are currently considered affiliated areas. Two areas (City of Rocks and Ebey's Landing) are considered units of the National Park System.

Establishment of a National Reserve requires that:

1. The area possesses nationally significant resources; and
2. The area is both suitable and feasible to add to the National Park System as either a unit of the system or an affiliated area.

The Vancouver Study Area meets both criteria, and since the NPS already has a management presence at FVNHS, NPS administration of the Reserve Area would be the most appropriate and cost-effective use of public funds. Other administrative systems might be more appropriate if NPS management was not already present in the area.

In contrast to other NPS administered areas, the NPS administration of the VNHR should not involve direct or indirect management authority over other units of government or over private lands within the boundaries of the Reserve. Rather, the NPS administrative responsibilities, in addition to those present responsibilities at FVNHS, should apply only to those specified in legislation and/or those mutually agreed upon facility and program development items identified in a VNHR Master Plan developed jointly by participating entities in the Reserve. Thus, through Reserve legislation, the NPS could be charged with the administration of the Reserve without having direct or indirect management responsibility over the lands, facilities, and programs of the separate entities represented. Federal legislation should be explicit concerning the autonomy of other public entities within the Reserve Area.

Federal designation of the area should not impose Federal jurisdiction over the use and management of non-Federal land. Therefore, the definition of a National Reserve applies to the Study Area. The definition was set forth in the NPS Revised Land Acquisition Policy, Federal Register, Vol. 44, No. 82, Thursday, April 26, 1979, p. 24797:

In National Reserves (Areas of National Concern)—Federal, State and local governments form a special partnership around an area to be protected. Planning, implementation and maintenance is a joint effort and is based on a mutual desire to protect the resource.

In line with this special Partnership goal, Congressional action should allow separate Reserve Area agencies to request funding resources for the common good of the Reserve. Legislation creating the Reserve should also provide a funding mechanism whereby agencies can request Congress fund projects for the Reserve through separate line items in an agency's budget.
Under this concept, there may be core zones of Federally managed and protected property. In the case of the Study Area, this would include the Vancouver Barracks and FVNHS. Often National Reserves also can include properties not in Federal ownership, such as Vancouver’s Central Park, Marine Park, and private lands. In these instances, local zoning and other land use measures of the City of Vancouver would assist in the protection of historical and other values within the boundaries of the Reserve.

**Proposed Reserve Area**

Sites or areas recommended for incorporation in the Reserve include the following: Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, Vancouver Barracks, Officers Row, Pearson Airpark and Museum, Old Apple Tree Park and sections of Vancouver’s Columbia River waterfront bounded by the I-5 Bridge to the west and Marine Park to the east. (See Illustration Page 97.)

Included in the Reserve Area are the land and easements dedicated to the City of Vancouver for a waterfront trail within the Columbia Shores property, but no other portion of Columbia Shores.

In future long range planning, provision should be made for a pedestrian link between the west end of the Columbia shoreline trail (at the Columbia Shores property) and Marine Park. This link should be considered in consultation with the owners of the Columbia Business Center during the future Reserve Coordination Master Plan process. In the interim, the trail linking Marine Park and the west Columbia shoreline trail should extend around the Columbia Business Center property as currently planned by the City and the Columbia Business Center.

The Commission determined that the site of the Kaiser Shipyards may have high cultural significance, and recommends further detailed research be conducted to establish whether the site is eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. The current owners of the site are not interested in having the site listed on the National Register. For these reasons, the site of the former Kaiser Shipyards (with the exception of the trail areas described above) is excluded from the Reserve Area at this time.
Preservation
The Commission has determined that, in addition to the nationally significant Fort Vancouver site, there are other resources of national, state and local significance worthy of preservation—Vancouver Barracks, Officers Row, Pearson Airpark, and portions of the Columbia River waterfront. The Reserve concept provides a means to enhance the preservation and interpretation of all these sites. The mitigation proposals included in this Study would reduce the negative effects of modern intrusions on these resources.

The Reserve Area presently excludes the Columbia Business Center, site of the former Kaiser Shipyards. However, the Vancouver Partnership should encourage further research that may provide sufficient evidence of historic significance to include a portion of the former Kaiser Shipyards site in the Reserve. (The National Reserve concept typically does include private along with public property).

Use
Noise
The noise study referenced in the 1988 City of Vancouver's Pearson proposal confirms that Portland International Airport contributes to the bulk of the noise problems above the 70 decibel level. Only 11.3 percent of Pearson traffic exceeded the 70 decibel level, mostly helicopters; therefore, continuing the elimination of helicopter use (except for emergencies) at Pearson will relieve most of the noise issues. Ongoing monitoring and compliance with established acceptable noise levels is recommended to ensure that the majority of Pearson flights do not exceed the 70 decibel level.

Safety
Of concern is the safety of the some 250,000 annual visitors to FVNHS. There is no "guarantee" that there will not be aircraft accidents in the area; e.g., due to human error, mechanical failures, weather conditions. To keep this possibility to its lowest factor, a Commission priority should be to request the FAA regularly monitor and improve the aviation practices and conditions at Pearson and work with the City to incorporate the improvements into Pearson Airpark operations. Similarly, concern exists for visitor safety due to vehicular use around the Fort area.

Interpretation
If the Reserve is established, it is recommended that interpretation of the Area by all institutions include basic information about the entire Reserve—past and present. An interpretive plan would be developed as part of the Reserve Master Plan. This interpretive plan would provide a framework for all institutions within the Reserve to incorporate basic information on the continuum of history represented by the Reserve within the individual partnership programs. The plan would also address any joint facilities and programs.

Reserve Costs
Estimated costs for the Reserve/Partnership Strategy are as shown on the Reserve Strategy Estimated Costs Matrix, below. The matrix illustrates costs associated with the Reserve/Partnership Strategy, over and above the normal staffing and operating budgets of participating agencies.
Estimated Costs
Matrix for Vancouver
Reserve Strategy

## Estimated Costs – Reserve Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Admin/Operation (per year)</th>
<th>Program (per year)</th>
<th>Capital Improvements (total)</th>
<th>Maintenance (per year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Barracks</td>
<td>1.5 FTE = $80,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>(Rehab) $5,000,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(full time equiv. employee)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FVNHS</td>
<td>3 FTE = $160,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>(Orientation Facility) $1,250,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Pearson Airpark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See Estimated Costs, Continued Operation of Pearson Airpark)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Reserve Functions</td>
<td>1 FTE = $45,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>- 0 -</td>
<td>- 0 -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: $705,000 Annual Expenditure  
$6,250,000 Capital Expenditure

1 These costs are over and above the normal programmed costs of each of the entities involved in the Reserve:
   - The costs do not include funds for ongoing projects that would be undertaken even if the reserve did not exist.
   - The extent of projected costs would be verified by the Reserve management body through the process of developing the Reserve Master Plan.
   - It is anticipated that the costs would be derived from a variety of sources, both public and private.

2 FTE costs vary from agency to agency.
Continued Operation of Pearson Airpark
(Reference Section 3(a)(1)(B)(iv) of the Act.)

Historic Aviation and Operation of Pearson
Continued general aviation use and operation of the NPS owned portion of Pearson Airpark should be extended as specified in Mitigation Measures, below. It is acknowledged that Congressional legislation is required to extend general aviation use and any occupation on NPS property beyond April 3, 2002. As discussed in detail in the previous section of this Study, extension of general aviation would allow interpretation of both active and passive displays of antique and historic aircraft. The Reserve Coordination Master Plan would be developed by Reserve entities within thirty-six months after the first Partnership meeting. The Plan would address the most appropriate periods for emphasis in Pearson’s restoration and interpretation activities, taking into consideration the Pearson historical report presented to the Commission in the course of this Study. That report notes that Pearson may be a unique national and regional resource in its potential to recreate the ambiance of an Army Air Corps field during the ‘Golden Era of Flight’ of the 1920s–1930s.

The National Park Service would not involve itself in the routine operation and management of the Pearson Air Museum. As with all other entities represented within the framework of the Vancouver Partnership, and as a signatory to the proposed Memorandum of Understanding, Pearson Air Museum would be viewed as a partner in helping to commemorate Pearson Field’s aviation history to the American public. The National Park Service would, however, continue to reserve the right to approve uses, and changes in uses, of museum structures and facilities that occur on National Park Service land. Furthermore, the National Park Service, as a member of the Vancouver Partnership, would extend an offer of technical assistance to the Pearson Air Museum staff for developing a museum collection policy, exhibit planning, and in other areas of expertise on which the Museum staff may request assistance.

The FAA has testified that a new modern and expandable general aviation facility is needed regardless of how Pearson Airpark is ultimately configured. An Airpark Economic Viability Plan (described in Mitigation Measures below) would address the need for Clark County and the region to pursue another site for a new general aviation airport.

Antique and historic aircraft would be allowed to operate from Pearson Airfield in perpetuity.

Mitigation Measures
General aviation at Pearson Airpark, as currently occurs on NPS property, will be permitted to continue subject to the following conditions:

1. Pearson Field and Air Museum shall be operated by the City of Vancouver, or its designated entity.

2. The City shall pay NPS a fee of $1 per year for continued use and occupancy of the Airpark and Air Museum on NPS property.

3. All non-historic, aviation-related buildings and devices, except those necessary for navigation and safety, including T-hangars and associated taxiways, shall be removed by the City from NPS property by 2003.
4. The City of Vancouver shall not be compensated for historic buildings remaining on NPS property but shall continue to bear liability and responsibility for continued use and maintenance of these structures. Museum improvements on NPS property would be subject to NPS approval.

5. Helicopters shall not be based at Pearson Airpark, except as necessary to accommodate emergency, disaster, or national security needs.

6. The total number of airworthy aircraft based on Pearson shall be determined by the Pearson Airpark Economic Viability and Mitigation Plan and an agreement by the Vancouver Partnership.

7. The Vancouver Partnership shall prepare, as part of the Reserve Coordination Master Plan, devise, and as necessary revise, the Pearson Airpark Economic Viability and Mitigation Plan. The Plan will be completed within 36 months after the first meeting of the Vancouver Partnership and forwarded to Congress. The Plan shall include the following:

a. Report to Congress by 2022 regarding the advisability of continuing to base some general aviation aircraft at Pearson Airpark, taking into account their impact on NPS operations, the needs of the community, and whether general aviation aircraft are necessary to support the economic viability of the historic aviation mission within the Reserve. The report may be submitted separate from the plan, but must be submitted prior to 2022.

b. Incentives and regulations to encourage a transition from predominantly general aviation aircraft to historic aircraft. This transition shall be completed by April 3, 2022, unless a continuation of general aviation is expressly authorized by an act of Congress by April 3, 2022. The term “historic aircraft” is defined as any aircraft which is based on a design 1) from the World War II era or earlier, 2) which is 50 years or older, or 3) which, as determined by a qualified Aviation Advisory Group selected by the Vancouver Partnership, is of historical significance.

c. A program to mitigate any conflicts related to the operation of the Airpark and other activities within the Reserve. The mitigation program shall (in coordination with the FAA and other agencies) address, but not be limited to, noise, safety, visual intrusion, and the location of new facilities.

d. A Pearson Airpark Museum Plan, including budgetary strategies by which proceeds from general aviation and other sources fund the museum and other aviation curation activities.

Every five years, the Vancouver Partnership will evaluate the progress made in implementing the Reserve Coordination Master Plan, including the conversion of Pearson Airpark from predominantly general aviation aircraft to historic aircraft and the mitigation of conflicts between the operations of the Airpark and other activities within the Reserve, and recommend modifying the plan as needed.
Estimated Pearson Airpark Continued Operation Costs

Estimated costs for the continued operation of Pearson Airpark are shown on the Estimated Costs Matrix, below. These costs would generally be assumed by the City of Vancouver, although there may be opportunities for sharing of interpretation and capital costs among entities signatory to the MOU.

### Estimated Costs - Continuation of General Aviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Admin/Operation (per year)</th>
<th>Program (per year)</th>
<th>Capital Improvements (total)</th>
<th>Maintenance (per year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(General Aviation)</td>
<td>0.5 FTE = $25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>(New facilities)</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Museum)</td>
<td>2.0 FTE = $60,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>(Demolition)</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(New Museum)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Demolition)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$6,100,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals:**
- $285,000  Annual Expenditure
- $6,100,000  Capital Expenditure

1. Includes new T-hangars on City-owned property.
2. Demolition includes removal of non-historic buildings and taxiways from NPS property.
Part VII: Coordination

This image of the Kaiser Shipyards shows the facility in 1944, just after its peak production years during World War II. Note the large structures where whole sections of ships were constructed and the shipways along the Columbia River in the lower right corner.
The Study Team

The Vancouver Historical Reserve Feasibility Study was conducted by an interdisciplinary, multi-entity team representing the National Park Service, the Army, the State of Washington, and the City of Vancouver. The public involvement plan consisted of a public scoping process, monthly Commission meetings open to the public, inclusion of representatives of key interest groups on the Technical Planning Committee, public review of the Draft Report/Environmental Assessment (EA), and a public hearing.

Scoping

Scoping is a process emphasized in CEQ rules whereby proponent agencies define issues of concern to the various publics, gather input and consider the resulting information in project or program planning. For the Fort Vancouver Historical Study, on May 29, 1992, environmental planners mailed a scoping letter to more than 200 entities considered to be potentially interested in the Study. About 20 responses were received. Further, all Commission meetings have provided for public input and a number of groups and individuals have taken advantage of this provision to make statements and provide information. Generally, input to date has emphasized the highly political nature of the Study. The Commission considered the scoping results, along with other analysis, in formulating its preferred alternative.

Public Involvement

Public input was solicited throughout the study process. At each monthly Commission meeting over the 18 month planning period, the Commission provided time in each meeting agenda for public comments, questions, and concerns. Copies of each month's Commission minutes were placed in area libraries and a project mailing list was maintained. Each Commission meeting was announced in the Federal Register and through the local media. In addition, the draft study report was released to the public for a forty-five day public comment period.

In November 1992, a public hearing was held to allow public comment on the Final Draft Report. Approximately sixty-five people attended the hearing and twenty-eight people gave testimony. Principal concerns of the public pertained to continuing aviation operations at Pearson Airpark. Comments concerning the validity of a Reserve or Reserve Partnership were positive. Both written comments and comments received at the public hearing were fully considered by the Commission in preparation of the Final Report. Issues raised throughout the study process were considered by the Commission and Commission responses to these issues are incorporated in the Final Report.
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This historic photo from the 1880s depicts Officers Row and the original wooded character of the site. The grand houses of the officers overlooked the Parade Ground which was used for military training, formal exercises and troop encampment. (Courtesy of the National Park Service.)
Study Participants

The Vancouver Historical Study Commission

Commission Members
Dr. Harold A. Dengerink, Chairman
Washington State University, Vancouver Campus
Representative of the General Public

Mr. John Fischbach
City Manager, City of Vancouver
Representative of the City of Vancouver

Mr. Horace H. Foxall, Jr.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District
Representative of the Secretary of the Army

Mr. David M. Hansen
Washington State Deputy Historic Preservation Officer
Representative of the Washington State Historic Preservation Office

Mr. Charles H. Odegaard
Regional Director, Pacific Northwest Region, National Park Service
Representative of the National Park Service

The Technical Planning Committee

The City of Vancouver
Karen Haines, Director
Department of Community Preservation and Development

Ted Brown, Director
Parks and Recreation Department

Thayer Rorabaugh, Manager
Transportation Division

U.S. Army, Fort Lewis
Cathy Jerbic
Cultural Resource Manager
DEH, Environmental Division
Fort Lewis, Washington

Joe Huddleston
I Corps Historian
Fort Lewis, Washington

National Park Service
David P. Herrera, Superintendent
NPS Fort Vancouver National Historic Site
Vancouver, Washington

Keith Dunbar, Chief
Planning and Environmental Compliance
NPS Pacific Northwest Region
Seattle, Washington
Appendices

Study Participants

Stephanie Toothman, Chief
Cultural Resources Division
NPS Pacific Northwest Region
Seattle, Washington

Rick Wagner, Chief
Lands Division
Pacific Northwest Regional Office
Seattle, Washington

Arlene Yamada
Planning and Environmental Compliance
NPS Pacific Northeast Region
Seattle, Washington

Pearson Airpark
Dr. Richard Cantrell
Vancouver, Washington

Mr. James Johnson
Vancouver, Washington

State of Washington
Dr. Robert Whitlam, State Archaeologist
Washington State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation
Olympia, Washington

Center for Columbia River History
Bill Lang, Director
Vancouver, Washington

Jones & Jones
Johnpaul Jones, Principal-in-Charge
Jones & Jones
Seattle, Washington

Kai Kazuto Mikami, Project Manager
Jones & Jones
Seattle, Washington

John Kvapil, Historical Architect
Jones & Jones
Seattle, Washington

Steve Durrant, Natural Resource Planner
Jones & Jones
Seattle, Washington

Resource Consultants
Jane Morrison, Director
Clark County Heritage Trust
Vancouver, Washington
Appendices

Study Participants

J. Wade Bryant, Manager
Federal Aviation Administration
Seattle Airports District Office/SEA-600
Renton, Washington

Richard Winters, Associate Regional Director
Recreation Resources and Professional Services
NPS Pacific Northwest Region
Seattle, Washington

Frank Sannino, Cartographic Technician
NPS Pacific Northwest Region
Seattle, Washington

Jon R. Wagner, Principal Planner
The City of Vancouver
Planning and Building Department
Vancouver, Washington

Gary Thompson, Director
Pearson Airmuseum
Vancouver, Washington

Cultural Resource Consultants

Historical Overview and Evaluation of Significant Resources
Patricia C. Erigero
Historical Consultant
Winters, California

Historical Overview of Pearson Airfield
Von Hardesty, Ph. D., Curator
Smithsonian Institution
Washington, D.C.

Archaeological Overview
Bryn Thomas, Archaeologist
Archaeological and Historical Services
Eastern Washington University
Cheney, Washington

Environmental Assessment Consultants

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Karen S. Northup, Chief
Environmental Resources Section
Seattle, Washington

Mike McNeely
Environmental Resources Section
Seattle, Washington

Planning Consultant

Jones & Jones
Architects, Planners and Landscape Architects
Seattle, Washington
(See Jones & Jones above.)
Public Law 101-523
101st Congress

An Act

To provide for the study of certain historical and cultural resources located in the city of Vancouver, Washington, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. STATEMENT OF FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—
(1) the city of Vancouver, Washington, has a unique array of contiguous historical sites which chronicle important steps in the settlement and development of the Northwest, including—
(A) Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, the site of the Hudson’s Bay Company trading post established in 1825;
(B) Vancouver Barracks, an active military installation since 1849;
(C) Officers’ Row National Register Historic District, 21 adaptively rehabilitated military officers’ quarters;
(D) Pearson Airpark, an early United States Army airfield and one of the oldest operating airports in the country; and
(E) the Columbia River, an early Northwest exploration and settlement corridor, including the route of the Lewis and Clark expedition, center of Indian trade, shipbuilding, and fishing;
(2) these historical assets are owned and managed by several governmental entities, including the National Park Service, city of Vancouver, and the United States Army;
(3) sites within the Vancouver historical area are in a state of transition and are the focus of various proposals and initiatives;
(4) there is a lack of formal coordination of management or planning among the various entities; and
(5) failure to coordinate the planning and management within the Area may result in lost opportunities to preserve and enhance irreplaceable historical sites and open space.

SEC. 2. VANCOUVER HISTORICAL STUDY COMMISSION.

(a) Establishment.—There is hereby established a Vancouver Historical Study Commission which shall study and make recommendations regarding—
(1) the preservation, protection, enhancement, enjoyment, and utilization of the historic, cultural, natural, and recreational resources of the Area; and
(2) the feasibility of establishing a Vancouver National Historical Reserve.
(b) Membership.—The Commission shall consist of the following 5 members:
(1) The Director of the National Park Service, or his designee.
(2) One individual appointed by the Secretary of the Interior from recommendations submitted by the Mayor of Vancouver to represent the city of Vancouver.
(3) The Secretary of the Army, or his designee.
(4) One individual appointed by the Secretary of the Interior from recommendations submitted by the Governor of Washington to represent the State Historic Preservation Office.
(5) One individual appointed by the Secretary of the Interior to represent the general public.

Members shall be appointed within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) VACANCY.—A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) COMPENSATION.—Members of the Commission shall serve without pay. While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in Government service are allowed expenses under section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code.

(e) CHAIRPERSON.—The Chairperson of the Commission shall be appointed by the Secretary.

(f) QUORUM.—Three members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(g) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairperson or a majority of its members.

(h) STAFF.—The Secretary shall provide the Commission with such staff and technical assistance as the Secretary, after consultation with the Commission, considers appropriate to enable the Commission to carry out its duties. Upon request of the Secretary, any Federal agency may provide to the Commission on a reimbursable basis information, personnel, property, and services to assist in carrying out its duties under this Act. The Secretary may accept the services of personnel detailed from the State of Washington or any political subdivision of the State and may reimburse the State or such political subdivision for such services. The Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(i) TERMINATION OF COMMISSION.—The Commission shall terminate upon submission of the study report as provided in section 3.

SEC. 3. DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) REPORT.—(1) The Commission shall prepare a report—
(A) specifying the results of the study required by section 2(a); and
(B) containing—
(i) an inventory and assessment of the historic, cultural, natural, and recreational resources located within the Area;
(ii) specific preservation and interpretation goals;
(iii) proposed alternative management strategies whereby the funds, data, personnel, and authorities of public and private entities may be coordinated; and
(iv) recommendations concerning the continued operation of Pearson Airpark in a manner that will preserve and promote historic aviation and interpretation of the Area,
compatible with other historic and cultural resources of the Area, including Fort Vancouver National Historic Site.

(2) In making recommendations under paragraph (1)(iv), the Commission shall assess—

(A) the impact of current airport operations on the preservation, use, and interpretation of historic and cultural resources in the Area; and

(B) future operation of the airport undertaking such mitigation measures as may be necessary to minimize the intrusion on adjacent historic and cultural resources.

(b) DEVELOPMENT OF STUDY.—

(1) In undertaking the study under section 2(a), the Commission shall consult on a regular basis with appropriate officials of any local government or Federal or State agency which has jurisdiction over lands and waters within the Area.

(2) In undertaking the study under section 2(a), the Commission shall consult with interested conservation, business, professional and citizen organizations.

(3) In undertaking the study under section 2(a), the Commission shall conduct public hearings within the Area, and at such other places as may be appropriate, for the purpose of providing interested persons with the opportunity to testify with respect to matters to be addressed by the study.

(c) TRANSMITTAL OF STUDY REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit the report required under subsection (a) to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army. The Secretary of the Interior shall submit the report along with any comments or recommendations that the Secretary may wish to make to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate within 30 days after receipt of such report from the Commission.

SEC. 4. DETERMINATION OF SUITABILITY OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY.

(a) NOTIFICATION OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—The Secretary of Defense shall notify the Secretary of the Interior upon any determination by the Secretary of Defense that any real property located at Vancouver Barracks is excess property of the Department of Defense.

(b) REVIEW OF PROPERTY BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—Not later than 90 days after receiving notification from the Secretary of Defense under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) review the property that is the subject of the notification with respect to the suitability of all or part of the property for administration by the Secretary of the Interior or the State of Washington or its political subdivisions; and

(2) report to the Congress the findings of that review and recommendations for any legislation.

SEC. 5. RESTRICTION ON DISPOSAL OR USE OF PROPERTY.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any real property located at Vancouver Barracks that is determined by the Secretary of Defense to be excess property of the Department of Defense may not be disposed of or used by any Federal agency before the end of the one-year period following submission of a report to the Congress regarding that property under section 4(b).
SEC. 6. DUTIES OF OTHER FEDERAL ENTITIES.

Any Federal entity conducting or supporting activities directly affecting the Area shall—

(1) consult with the Secretary and the Commission with respect to such activities;

(2) cooperate with the Secretary and the Commission in carrying out their duties under this Act and, to the maximum extent practicable, coordinate such activities with the carrying out of such duties; and

(3) to the maximum extent practicable, conduct or support such activities in a manner consistent with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) the term "Area" means the area which incorporates those resources listed in section (1);

(2) the term "Commission" means the Vancouver Historical Study Commission established by section 2; and

(3) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

Approved November 5, 1990.
ESTABLISHING THE VANCOUVER NATIONAL HISTORICAL RESERVE IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

SEPTEMBER 24, 1990.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. Udall, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 5144]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 5144) to establish the Vancouver National Historical Reserve in the State of Washington, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. STATEMENT OF FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) the city of Vancouver, Washington, has a unique array of contiguous historical sites which chronicle important steps in the settlement and development of the Northwest, including—

(A) Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, the site of the Hudson's Bay Company trading post established in 1825;

(B) Vancouver Barracks, an active military installation since 1849;

(C) Officers' Row National Register Historic District, 21 adaptively rehabilitated military officers' quarters;

(D) Pearson Airpark, an early United States Army airfield and one of the oldest operating airports in the country; and

(E) the Columbia River, an early Northwest exploration and settlement corridor, including the route of the Lewis and Clark expedition, center of Indian trade, shipbuilding, and fishing;

(2) these historical assets are owned and managed by several governmental entities, including the National Park Service, city of Vancouver, and United States Army;
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(3) sites within the Vancouver historical area are in a state of transition and are the focus of various proposals and initiatives; and
(4) there is a lack of formal coordination of management or planning among the various entities; and
(5) failure to coordinate the planning and management within the Area may result in lost opportunities to preserve and enhance irreplaceable historical sites and open space.

SEC. 2. VANCOUVER HISTORICAL STUDY COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established a Vancouver Historical Study Commission which shall study and make recommendations regarding—
(1) the preservation, protection, enhancement, enjoyment, and utilization of the historic, cultural, natural, and recreational resources of the Area; and
(2) the feasibility of establishing a Vancouver National Historical Reserve.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Commission shall consist of the following 5 members:
(1) The Director of the National Park Service, or his designee.
(2) One individual appointed by the Secretary of the Interior from recommendations submitted by the Mayor of Vancouver to represent the city of Vancouver.
(3) The Secretary of the Army, or his designee.
(4) One individual appointed by the Secretary of the Interior from recommendations submitted by the Governor of Washington to represent the State Historic Preservation Office.
(5) One individual appointed by the Secretary of the Interior to represent the general public.

Members shall be appointed within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) VACANCY.—A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) COMPENSATION.—Members of the Commission shall serve without pay. While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in Government service are allowed expenses under section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code.

(e) CHAIRPERSON.—The Chairperson of the Commission shall be appointed by the Secretary.

(f) QUORUM.—3 members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(g) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairperson or a majority of its members.

(h) STAFF.—The Secretary shall provide the Commission with such staff and technical assistance as the Secretary, after consultation with the Commission, considers appropriate to enable the Commission to carry out its duties. Upon request of the Secretary, any Federal agency may provide to the Commission on a reimbursable basis information, personnel, property, and services to assist in carrying out its duties under this Act. The Secretary may accept the services of personnel detailed from the State of Washington or any political subdivision of the State and may reimburse the State or such political subdivision for such services. The Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(i) TERMINATION OF COMMISSION.—The Commission shall terminate upon submission of the study report as provided in section 3.

SEC. 3. DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) REPORT.—(1) The Commission shall prepare a report—
(A) specifying the results of the study required by section 2(a); and
(B) containing—
(i) an inventory and assessment of the historic, cultural, natural, and recreational resources located within the Area;
(ii) specific preservation and interpretation goals; and
(iii) proposed alternative management strategies whereby the funds, data, personnel, and authorities of public and private entities may be coordinated; and
(iv) recommendations concerning the continued operation of Pearson Airpark in a manner that will preserve and promote historic aviation and interpretation of the Area, compatible with other historic and cultural resources of the Area, including Fort Vancouver National Historic Site.

(2) In making recommendations under paragraph (1)(B)(iv), the Commission shall assess—
(A) the impact of current airport operations on the preservation, use, and interpretation of historic and cultural resources in the Area; and

(B) future operations of the airport undertaking such mitigation measures as may be necessary to minimize the intrusion on adjacent historic and cultural resources.

(b) DEVELOPMENT OF STUDY.—

(1) In undertaking the study under section 2(a), the Commission shall consult on a regular basis with appropriate officials of any local government or Federal or State agency which has jurisdiction over lands and waters within the Area.

(2) In undertaking the study under section 2(a), the Commission shall consult with interested conservation, business, professional and citizen organizations.

(3) In undertaking the study under section 2(a), the Commission shall conduct public hearings within the Area, and at such other places as may be appropriate, for the purpose of providing interested persons with the opportunity to testify with respect to matters to be addressed by the study.

(c) TRANSMITTAL OF STUDY REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit the report required under subsection (a) to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army. The Secretary of the Interior shall submit the report along with any comments or recommendations that the Secretary may wish to make to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate within 30 days after receipt of such report from the Commission.

SEC. 4. DETERMINATION OF SUITABILITY OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY.

(a) NOTIFICATION OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—The Secretary of Defense shall notify the Secretary of the Interior upon any determination by the Secretary of Defense that any real property located at Vancouver Barracks is excess property of the Department of Defense.

(b) REVIEW OF PROPERTY BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—Not later than 90 days after receiving notification from the Secretary of Defense under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) review the property that is the subject of the notification with respect to the suitability of all or part of the property for administration by the Secretary of the Interior or the State of Washington or its political subdivisions; and

(2) report to the Congress the findings of that review and recommendations for any legislation.

SEC. 5. RESTRICTION ON DISPOSAL OR USE OF PROPERTY.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any real property located at Vancouver Barracks that is determined by the Secretary of Defense to be excess property of the Department of Defense may not be disposed of or used by any federal agency before the end of the one-year period following submission of a report to the Congress regarding that property under section 4(b).

SEC. 6. DUTIES OF OTHER FEDERAL ENTITIES.

Any Federal entity conducting or supporting activities directly affecting the Area shall—

(1) consult with the Secretary and the Commission with respect to such activities;

(2) cooperate with the Secretary and the Commission in carrying out their duties under this Act and, to the maximum extent practicable, coordinate such activities with the carrying out of such duties; and

(3) to the maximum extent practicable, conduct or support such activities in a manner consistent with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) the term "Area" means the area which incorporates those resources listed in section (1);

(2) the term "Commission" means the Vancouver Historical Study Commission established by section 2; and

(3) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

Amend the title so as to read:
A bill to provide for the study of certain historical and cultural resources located in the city of Vancouver, Washington, and for other purposes.

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 5144, as amended, is to provide for the study of certain historical and cultural resources located in the City of Vancouver, Washington.

BACKGROUND

In the early 1800's the United States and Great Britain struggled for control of the northern Pacific coast. The two countries agreed to share access to the region, which was then known as Oregon Country, until a boundary could be agreed upon. To strengthen British claims to the region, the Hudson's Bay Company in 1825 moved its regional headquarters and established Fort Vancouver as a fur-trading post and supply depot. For the next several decades the Fort was an important center of commerce in the region.

The influx of American settlers beginning in the late 1830's increased the American position, and the Treaty of 1846 drew the boundary along the 49th parallel, leaving the Fort squarely within the United States. In 1849, the U.S. Army established its first base in the Northwest, setting out a military reservation that encompassed the Fort. Fort Vancouver continued to operate for the next decade but was shut down in 1860. Over the next several years decay and fire destroyed the Fort's structures.

Fort Vancouver National Monument was authorized by an Act of Congress in 1948. The monument was established from lands administered by the Department of the Army and the War Assets Administration. In 1961 the boundaries were revised to include additional acreage and the park was redesignated Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. The U.S. Army's Vancouver Barracks, which adjoins the Fort is still in active military installation.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1 provides the findings of the Congress regarding certain specified historical and cultural resources located in the City of Vancouver, Washington.

Section 2 (a), as amended, provides for establishment of a Vancouver Historical Study Commission whose purpose is to study and make recommendations regarding the historical, cultural, national and recreational resources of the study area as well as the feasibility of establishing a Vancouver National Historical Reserve.

The bill, as introduced, would have immediately established the reserve. Based on the information received at the hearing on this matter, the Committee determined that it would be desirable for a study to be done to provide an inventory and analysis of the resources proposed to be included in the reserve, a review of possible management strategies, and an analysis of the feasibility and suitability of such a designation.

1 H.R. 5144 was introduced on June 21, 1990 by Mrs. Unsoeld, for herself, Mr. Chandler, Mr. Dicks, Mr. McDermott, Mr. Miller of Washington, Mr. Morrison of Washington, Mr. Swift, Mr. AuCoin, Mr. DeFazio, Mr. Denny Smith, Mr. Robert F. Smith, and Mr. Wyden.
Section 2(b)-(i) sets forth the membership of the Study Commission, the filling of vacancies, compensation, appointment of a chairperson, quorum and meetings. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to provide staff and technical assistance to the Commission. The use of staff from another Federal, State and local agency is authorized as well as the procurement of experts and consultants on a temporary or intermittent basis. Further, the Commission is terminated upon submission of the study report.

The Committee expects the Secretary to consult with State and local officials in choosing the Commission member to represent the General public, and the chairperson of the Commission. All Commission appointments should possess the necessary knowledge and experience to provide constructive input on matters to be addressed by the study.

Section 3 sets forth the matters to be addressed by the study report; provides for consultation and public hearings by the Commission during the study; and directs that the study report be submitted within 18 months from the date of enactment.

The Committee has provided for the study report to address a broad range of issues, so that Congress may have the opportunity to assess all relevant matters regarding the preservation and use of the resources within the study area. The Committee is aware of the ongoing interest and concern regarding the operation of Pearson Airpark and its impact on Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. The Committee expects a careful and thorough analysis of this matter consistent with the directives contained in the legislation.

Section 4 provides for a review by the Secretary of the Interior of the Vancouver Barracks property upon notification by the Secretary of Defense that such property is excess to the needs of the Department of Defense. Such review is to assess the suitability of administration of all or part of the property by the Secretary of the Interior, the State of Washington or its political subdivisions. Following completion of the review, the Secretary is to submit his findings and recommendations to the Congress.

Section 5 directs that the excess property identified in Section 4 may not be disposed of or used by another Federal agency before the end of the one-year period following submission of the report to Congress required under Section 4(b).

The Committee provided a limitation on the disposal of the Vancouver Barracks property at such time as it is declared excess, so that the Congress may have the opportunity to assess this property's resource values and possible future administration without irreversible decisions being made in the meantime.

Section 6 directs other Federal entities to cooperate and coordinate with the Secretary and the Commission on activities undertaken by such Federal entity within the study area.

Section 7 provides the definitions of terms used in this Act.

Section 8 authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY AND COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

A hearing on H.R. 5144 was held by the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands on July 31, 1990. At the meeting of
the Subcommittee on September 11, 1990, H.R. 5144 was favorably recommended with an amendment to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs ordered the bill, as amended, favorably reported to the House on September 19, 1990 by voice vote.

OVERSIGHT STATEMENT

The Committee intends to carefully monitor the implementation of this legislation to ensure compliance with the intent of the Act, but no specific oversight hearings have been conducted on this matter. No recommendations were submitted to the Committee pursuant to Rule X, clause 2.

INFLATIONARY IMPACT STATEMENT

The Committee finds that enactment of this measure would have no inflationary impact on the national economy.

COST AND BUDGET ACT COMPLIANCE

The Committee has determined that Federal expenditures will be nominal as a result from enactment of this bill. The report of the Congressional Budget Office which the Committee adopts as its own, follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,

Hon. Morris K. Udall,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has reviewed H.R. 5144, a bill to establish the Vancouver National Historical Reserve in the State of Washington, and for other purposes, as ordered reported by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on September 19, 1990. We estimate that the implementation of this bill would cost the federal government about $200,000 over fiscal years 1991 and 1992, assuming appropriation of the necessary sums.

H.R. 5144 would establish a five-member study commission to identify and assess certain resources in the Vancouver historical area and to assess the feasibility of establishing a Vancouver National Historical Reserve. Also, the bill would require the Department of Defense (DoD) to notify the Department of the Interior (DOI) of any real property at Vancouver Barracks that is found to be unneeded. The DOI then would have 90 days to assess such property and report to the Congress on its suitability for park and recreational purposes. For one year following the submission of the DOI report, the DoD would be prohibited from using or disposing of this property. The bill would authorize the appropriation of whatever sums are necessary for these purposes.

CBO estimates that the DOI would spend about $200,000 to support the study commission activities during fiscal years 1991 and
1992. The cost of assessing DoD holdings at Vancouver Barracks are not expected to be significant.

The enactment of this bill is not expected to have any impact on the budgets of state or local governments.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Deborah Reis, who can be reached at 226-2860.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. BLUM
(For Robert D. Reischauer).
SENATOR HATFIELD: Mr. President, I rise today in support of S. 2771, a bill to establish the Vancouver Historical Study Commission. As many of my colleagues may be aware, Ft. Vancouver is located in Vancouver, Washington, which is located across the Columbia River from Portland, Oregon. A conflict among several local interest groups has arisen over continuing the operation of the Pearson Airpark which is located adjacent to the Fort on land which is partially owned by the Park Service.

S. 2771 sets up a Commission in order to suggest future management of Ft. Vancouver and its adjacent lands and, specifically, Pearson Airpark -- a process which I support. However, during the consideration of S. 2771 in the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee I indicated that I had concerns over some of the bill's provisions. Those concerns rested with the language outlining the Commission's duties. If we are going to set up a Commission to judge the substantive merits of a case, it is important that it be able to render an unbiased overall recommendation on its findings. It is on this point that I would like to enter into a colloquy with my the Chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee, Senator Bumpers, and the bill's sponsor, Senator Adams.
SENATOR HATFIELD: Section 3 of the bill calls on the Vancouver Historical Study Commission to prepare a report containing an inventory and assessment of the area, preservation and interpretation goals, management strategies, and recommendations concerning the Ft. Vancouver area and, specifically, Pearson Airpark. It is this last requirement that I would like to have the committee and the bill's sponsor clarify.

Subparagraph (a)(1)(B)(iv) requires the Commission to develop "recommendations concerning the continued operation of Pearson Airpark in a manner that will preserve and promote historic aviation and interpretation of the Area, compatible with other historic and cultural resources of the Area, including Fort Vancouver National Historic Site."

It is my understanding that this provision would not limit the Commission's ability to develop any number of alternative recommendations with respect to the operation of Pearson Airpark which may include removing that portion of the Airpark which exists on Park Service land, continuing the Airpark as it is currently being managed, or any alternative management option.

SENATOR BUMPERS: The Senator is correct. The Commission would be free to develop a number of different recommendations regarding the operation of Pearson Airpark. Section 3 does require that the Commission address the issue of the continued operation of Pearson Airpark. It requires that the Commission "assess" the impact of the Airpark on other resources, and it calls on the Commission to "assess" mitigation measures that would minimize the intrusion on adjacent resources. But nothing in the bill limits the ability of the Commission to develop alternative recommendations.

SENATOR HATFIELD: Senator Adams, is this your understanding of the bill's provisions?

SENATOR ADAMS: As one of the sponsors of the Senate bill, I would like to state that this is also my interpretation of the bill's provision to look at all management options for the area without preordaining the outcome with respect to the Commission's overall recommendation. Specifically, the Commission is able to make recommendations on management options with respect to the Pearson Airpark in addition to the proposal to continue operation.
1. The official designation of the Commission is the Vancouver Historical Study Commission.

2. The purpose of the Commission is to study and make recommendations regarding (1) the preservation, protection, enhancement, enjoyment, and utilization of the historic, cultural, natural, and recreational resources of the Area; and (2) the feasibility of establishing a Vancouver National Historical Reserve.

3. The Commission will terminate upon submission of the study report to the Secretaries of the Interior and Army. The Commission is subject to rechartering every biennial anniversary of November 5, 1990, when Public Law 101-523 was enacted. The Commission shall take no action unless the filing requirements of sections 9 and 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. Appendix (1988), have been complied with. This charter is for the period from the date of filing to November 5, 1992.

4. The Commission reports to the Regional Director, Pacific Northwest Region, National Park Service, 83 South King Street, Seattle, Washington 98104.

5. Support for the Commission is provided by the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. Upon request of the Secretary of the Interior, any Federal agency may provide to the Commission on a reimbursable basis information, personnel, property, and services to assist in carrying out its duties. The Secretary may accept the services of personnel detailed from the State of Washington or any political subdivision of the State and may reimburse the State or such political subdivision for such services. The Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code.

6. The duties of the Commission are as stated in paragraph 2 above. The Commission shall prepare a report specifying the results of the study required, and the report shall contain an inventory and assessment of the historic, cultural, natural, and recreational resources located within the Area; state specific preservation and interpretation goals; propose alternative management strategies whereby the funds, data, personnel, and authorities of public and private entities may be coordinated; and make recommendations concerning the continued operation of Pearson Airpark in a manner that will preserve and promote historic aviation and interpretation of the Area compatible with other historic and cultural resources of the Area, including Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. In undertaking the study, the Commission shall consult regularly with appropriate officials of any local, state or Federal agency with jurisdiction over lands and water within the Area, as well as interested business,
conservation, professional and citizen organizations. Additionally, the Commission shall conduct public hearings within the Area and at other appropriate areas.

7. The estimated annual operating cost of the Commission is $6,000, which includes the cost of one-fourth person years of staff support.

8. The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairperson or a majority of its members. All meetings of the Commission shall be subject to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. Appendix (1988).

9. The Commission shall terminate upon submission of the study report to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army which is to occur not later than 18 months from the enactment of P.L. 101-523, November 5, 1990.

10. The Commission shall be composed of five members as follows:

   a. The Director of the National Park Service, or his designee.

   b. One individual appointed by the Secretary of the Interior from recommendations submitted by the Mayor of Vancouver to represent the city of Vancouver.

   c. The Secretary of the Army, or his designee.

   d. One individual appointed by the Secretary of the Interior from recommendations submitted by the Governor of Washington to represent the State Historic Preservation Office.

   e. One individual appointed by the Secretary of the Interior to represent the general public.

11. Vacancies on the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made. The member appointed by the Secretary of the Interior under paragraph 9e shall represent interests other than those of the Federal government.

   The Chairperson of the Commission shall be appointed by the Secretary.

   Three members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

12. Members of the Commission shall serve without pay. While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in government service upon presentation of vouchers signed by the Chairperson and approved by the Regional Director, Pacific Northwest Region.
The Commission shall operate in accordance with the provisions of section 10 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. Appendix (1988).

13. The Regional Director, Pacific Northwest Region, or in the Regional Director's absence, a Federal employee designated by the Regional Director, will serve as the Designated Federal Officer as required by Section 10 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. Appendix (1988).

14. The Vancouver Historical Study Commission is established by Public Law 101-523, November 5, 1990.

Secretary of the Interior

Date Charter Signed: March 18, 1991

Date Charter Filed: MAR 18 1991
10. Fort Vancouver National Historic Site

Establishment as national monument; transfer of lands by War Assets Administration and Secretary of the Army to Secretary of the Interior authorized.---------------------------------Act of June 19, 1948 355
Boundaries revised and monument redesignated "Fort Vancouver National Historic Site"---------------------------------Act of June 30, 1961 356

An Act To provide for the establishment of the Fort Vancouver National Monument, in the State of Washington, to include the site of the old Hudson's Bay Company stockade, and for other purposes, approved June 19, 1948 (62 Stat. 532)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of establishing a Federal area of national historical importance for the benefit of the people of the United States, to be known as the "Fort Vancouver National Monument", the Administrator of the War Assets Administration and the Secretary of the Army are authorized to transfer to the Secretary of the Interior, without exchange of funds, administrative jurisdiction over such federally owned lands and other property, real or personal, under their jurisdiction, including the site of the old Hudson's Bay Company stockade in the State of Washington, as they shall find to be surplus to the needs of their respective agencies, such properties to be selected, with their approval, by the Secretary of the Interior for inclusion within the national monument. (16 U.S.C. § 450ff.)

Sec. 2. The total area of the national monument as established or as enlarged by transfers pursuant to this Act shall not exceed ninety acres. Establishment of the monument shall be effective, upon publication in the Federal Register of notice of such establishment, following the transfer to the Secretary of the Interior of administrative jurisdiction over such lands as the Secretary of the Interior shall deem to be sufficient for purposes of establishing the national monument. Additional lands may be added to the monument in accordance with the procedure prescribed in section 1 hereof, governing surplus properties, or by donation, subject to the maximum acreage limitation prescribed by this Act, upon publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register. (16 U.S.C. § 450ff-1.)

Sec. 3. The administration, protection, and development of the aforesaid national monument shall be exercised under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior by the National Park Service, subject to the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", as amended. (16 U.S.C. § 450ff-2.)

Ft. Vancouver National Monument, Wash.
An Act To revise the boundaries and to change the name of Fort Vancouver National Monument, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes, approved June 30, 1961 (75 Stat. 196)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of preserving certain historic properties associated with the Fort Vancouver National Monument, established pursuant to the Act of June 19, 1948, chapter 546 (62 Stat. 532; 16 U.S.C. 450ff-450ff-2), the Secretary of the Interior may revise the boundaries of the monument to include therein not more than one hundred and thirty additional acres of land adjacent to, contiguous to, or in the vicinity of the existing monument. (16 U.S.C. § 450ff-3.)

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior may acquire in such manner as he may consider to be in the public interest the non-Federal lands and interests in lands within the revised boundaries. (16 U.S.C. § 450ff-4.)

Sec. 3. The heads of executive departments may transfer to the Secretary of the Interior, without exchange of funds, administrative jurisdiction over such federally owned lands and other property under their administrative jurisdictions within the revised boundary as may become excess to the needs of their respective agencies for inclusion in the Fort Vancouver National Monument. (16 U.S.C. § 450ff-5.)

Sec. 4. Fort Vancouver National Monument is redesignated Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. (16 U.S.C. § 450ff-6.)
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The park began in 1918. The layout evolved in 1926 and the hospital plan was revised by 1928.

The officers' quarters on the southeast were built by the end of the decade. The old 1909 quarters, except the officers' club barracks house, were demolished.

The hospital was built on the north side.

"Moneymaker" was removed from the old quarters. Each modern room structure used on shooting targets.

Sources:
VANCOUVER MILITARY RESERVATION SPRUCE MILL 1918

Historic photos capture the full extent of development; depicting additional bldgs., tents and stacked milled lumber covering virtually the entire reservation south of 5th St.

NOTES:

• THE DRAGOON SQUADRONS' FIVE TO VANCOUVER, WHERE THEY STAYED IN SEPTEMBER 1848.

• THESE DRAGOON SQUADRONS WERE THEN CONVOLUTED TO PORT AND THE SQUADRONS MATTED TO QUEEN'S VILLAGE IN OCTOBER.

• NEW OFFICERS' QUARTERS ON OFFICERS' ROW WERE BUILT BEHIND THE GENERAL STORE, AND OLD OFFICERS' SQUADRONS CAMPED THE OFFICERS' CLUB (BARTON'S MANSION). (NOT LOCATED)

• POISSON VILLAGE NOW BUILT ON THE SITE TODAY.

• SIGNATURES WERE PROMINENT "SAGE" BUTF, EACH OFFICER'S OFFICE DREW A SIGNATURE.
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