

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION AGENDA**

**WORKSHOP: 2024 GOALS**

**City Hall – Conference Room #6**

**January 24, 2024**

**11:00 A.M. – 1:00 P.M.**

**11:00 A.M. CALL TO ORDER:**

**ROLL CALL:** Burns, Emerson, Lowe, Miller, Anderson, Sardell, Shaffer

**MINUTES: \*\*ITEMS BELOW ARE CONSIDERED TO BE ACTION ITEMS\*\***

November 15, 2023 – Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

January 8, 2024 – Historic Preservation Commission Special Meeting

**COMMISSIONER UPDATES**

**ELECTION OF OFFICERS \*\* ITEM BELOW IS CONSIDERED AN ACTION ITEM\***

**PRIORITIZING HPC EFFORTS IN 2024: \*\* ITEMS BELOW ARE CONSIDERED ACTION ITEMS\***

**Previously Identified Priorities**

- City Council Presentation
- CLG Grant – Garden District – Public Meeting in April, IHSRB Meeting in May
- Government Way Corridor Outreach, Questionnaire, Survey of Properties
- May: Historic Preservation Month Celebrations
  - Reception with Mayor and Council, community members and other stakeholders (Museum, County HPC, SHPO, historic building owners, neighborhood groups)
  - Awards Ceremony – Heart of History Awards
  - Tours
  - Wood Window & Door Restoration Training or Presentation?
- CLG Grant Request – Downtown Survey (*September start, if awarded*)

**Open Discussion**

- Other Possible Preservation Efforts in 2024
  - HREI building discussion
  - Historic Building Style & Materials Guide, including Wood Window Research
- 2024 Goals (Preservation, Outreach, Education, etc.)
- Individual thoughts and ideas
- What can we do better?

**Calendar**

- Identify public meetings, stakeholder outreach, deadlines and target dates

**Assignments/Subcommittees**

**ADJOURNMENT/CONTINUATION:**

Motion by \_\_\_\_\_, seconded by \_\_\_\_\_,  
to continue meeting to \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_, at \_\_ p.m.; motion carried unanimously.

Motion by \_\_\_\_\_, seconded by \_\_\_\_\_, to adjourn meeting; motion carried unanimously.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank



# MINUTES



This Page Intentionally Left Blank

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES**

**November 15, 2023**

**City Hall – Conference Room #6**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:**

Walter Burns, Chair  
Sandy Emerson  
Shannon Sardell (on Teams)  
Richard Shaffer  
Anneliese Miller, Vice Chair

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Hilary Patterson, Community Planning Director  
Traci Clark, Admin. Assistant  
  
Kiki Miller, Council Liaison

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:**

Ali Marienau  
Tyler Douglas Lowe  
Anne Anderson

**12:00 p.m. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MINUTES: \*\*ITEM BELOW IS CONSIDERED TO BE AN ACTION ITEM\*\***

October 25, 2023

Motion by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Emerson, to approve the minutes for October 25, 2023. Motion carried.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

None.

**STAFF COMMENTS:**

Ms. Patterson commented she did not have a chance to contact the Tribe before today's meeting. The committee was thinking about Jill Wagner with the Coeur d'Alene Tribe in the Cultural Department as a possible commission member since we have not had any luck to date with getting in touch with Dixie Stensgar.

**PRESENTATION:**

Chairman Burns introduced Mr. Doug Harro who is an archeologist and a neighbor who lives in the Garden District. He indicated that Mr. Harro's archaeology expertise is a skill that the commission does not have on the board. He was invited to come to this meeting to see what the Historic Preservation Commission discusses and see if he might be interested in a future position on the commission.

Mr. Harro states he lives at 614 Foster Avenue and he has lived there since 2001.

Chairman Burns welcomed Mr. Shaffer as the newest Historic Preservation Commission member.

Mr. Shaffer introduced himself and told the commission he has been in the hospitality business, was born and raised in Stroussberg PA. He works for the Magnuson Family. He volunteers, does tourism, works in hospitality, and works on recreational committees. He has worked for the Idaho Tribal Council as Chairman, (he was with them for 6 years), Parks and Rec., he had met Governor Andrews at the time. It had a very positive experience for him in Wallace for a small town. He has a home now in the Fort Grounds, a house in Downtown Wallace and a Cabin in the Mountains.

Chairman Burns asked Mr. Shaffer what his experience with the Wallace Historic Preservation Committee was like.

Mr. Shaffer stated he does tours and whatever it takes to get people off the highway. He goes throughout North Idaho, and into Montana. He wants the people to play and stay. He has worked with the State Parks, the Tribe on the construction of the Trails of the Coeur d'Alene and Route of the Hiwatha. He has been focused on how tourism and history benefit the economy, including the museums and the mine tours. He also takes part in the Sixth Street Melodrama and Theater.

**OTHER BUSINESS: \*\*ITEMS BELOW ARE CONSIDERED TO BE ACTION ITEMS\*\***

Commissioner Sardell did not have any new info on wood window research.

Council Liaison Miller wanted to know if the commission came up with a list of people who wanted to be involved with the Government Way corridor and surrounding neighborhoods.

Chairman Burns stated that Ms. Thurman was at last month's commission meeting, and she will be putting together a neighborhood meeting in January. Chairman Burns states he will make sure that Council Liaison Miller will get an invite to that meeting.

Commissioner Emerson would like to make sure someone is following up on getting names from the County Assessor's office. Chairman Burns responded that he believed Ms. Thurman volunteered to do that.

Commissioner Sardell has produced a historic design guideline questionnaire to distribute to the neighborhood to get a sense of their level of support to form a historic overlay district.

She read from her draft document, which states,

"Need a short write up about the Historic Commission's concerns regarding the demolition of historic resources within neighborhoods and what is lost when these resources are removed. The HRB is interested in understanding more from the resident of these neighborhoods and if there is interest and trying to protect the character of the places that we live."

**Would you support guidelines/regulations governing new construction in your neighborhood?**

- Setbacks consistent with surrounding properties and in conformance with city codes
- Building massing that respects privacy and shared property lines
- Garage locations on the alley or side yard.
- Roof forms that are consistent with historic styles and surrounding properties.

Coeur d'Alene City Code currently has no review of demolition permits for buildings that could be considered historic (more than 50 years old. Would you support a review process for demolition permits and/or new construction in established neighborhoods older than 50 years old?

- Clarify process right now
- Is it an old building?

- How do we define demolition
- Link to current demolition permit process
- What changes in permit if any?

**Less enforceable because most of these items are considered design criteria but make clear it is for new construction.**

New homes build in the general built style of historic homes that exist throughout the neighborhood. (If so, it would be better to tease of the characteristics that are important rather than be so general. Is it front porches, massing, setbacks, opening size, siding choices).

Visually distinct exterior design that separates the old and historic construction from the new (in terms of Historic Preservation this is best practice).

Siding material and shape consistent with other homes in the neighborhood.

Maintaining historic window appearance (guidelines about proportion and locations).

Chairman Burns asked if the commission wanted to include a question in the survey to gauge neighborhood support for limiting homes from being exactly the same for instance, in the Garden District, there are many newer homes that are basically identical.

Commissioner Sardell commented that yes, some houses will have the same floor plan or foot print because they were developed by a developer, but they may have different figurations of front porches, or bay windows or styles. We could ask planning and development staff how enforceable that could be.

Ms. Patterson stated that would be very hard to enforce. If it was a new development with design standards, it could be limited. But it would be very hard in an established neighborhood to say you can only have this particular style for new construction.

Commissioner Emerson wanted to know about demolition permits and if the city gets involved with the disposal of the materials, such as hazardous materials. It becomes interesting to us is because the museum actually called about some of the older houses. They have elements such as the front door that maybe the museum might would like to know about before they are torn down as part of the demolition permits. Is there a way to notify the commission if there is a historic element on a building that is going to be demolished?

Ms. Patterson clarified that Commissioner Anderson suggested that we have some kind of informational document attached to the demolition permits. The information guide that is attached to the demolition permit would have some guidelines if you are going forward with the demolition there would be some entities to contact for example, Habitat for Humanity, the Museum and others who might be interested in your historic doors or window. It would be an informational attachment on the permit.

Chairman Burns asked if there are an architectural salvage business in Spokane.

Commissioner Emerson answered Spokane Demolition Service is very good at knowing what they are doing.

Chairman Burns reminded the commission that the demolition permit process it is just over the counter. You just walk in and get one. There is no review. The building can just be torn down. There is no requirement about what would be put in its place.

Council Liaison Miller asked if there was a way to dispose of hazardous materials.

Ms. Patterson stated that the demolition permit probably includes documentation on what to do if there

was any hazardous material Regarding commissioner's Sardell question, the commission should consider asking the neighborhood if they would support having this commission review demolition permits. The State Statues allow to a Historic Preservation Commission to do a demolition review and issue a certificate of appropriateness for local historic districts. That would be if we were creating a historic district under the State Statues. As proposed, the historic overlay process can be more ala carte where the neighborhood can pick and choose things from that, or we come up with our own if the neighborhoods opt in and the council will ultimately approve it. It would then get into our zoning code as an overlay. This one question needs to be clarified a little more, as it could confuse the people on what does "demolition review" mean? what is the role of the commission on what they are reviewing a demolition permit and or new construction? We need to clarify different options, so they can say yes or no.

Chairman Burns stated the reason we are asking for the neighborhood's input, we do not want to put any limitations on existing homes. He doesn't think anyone would want to accept that.

Ms. Patterson responded that the exception might be if the home owners would be doing a demolition permit and building an ADU, an attached garage or large addition.

Council Liaison Miller stated that the commission is on the right track with the questionnaire. This is what the neighborhood needs to decide. This is up to the people that live there.

Mr. Harro asked how does the demolition process work, Is it the same for partial and full demolitions, and interior only demolitions?

Ms. Patterson answered the permit is both. She has seen just a kitchen be remodeled and the homeowners have pulled a demolition permit. We might want to clarify that with the neighbors to better understand what is being demolished and what level of review they would find acceptable.

Council Liaison Miller suggested having a link to the demolition permit so people can educate themselves on what exists today with the demolition permit process, explain here is what we are suggesting that you could consider if there is a district formed, and ask them what changes they would like to see with this permit if any?

Ms. Patterson stated that the commission should determine if it would like to have demolition review authority for an outbuilding (garage), if it would review demolition permits for full or partial demolitions of a main residence or a commercial use, and possible outbuildings. The questionnaire should make those options clear.

#### **Subcommittee Reports & 2023 Work Plan Project Updates:**

- Historic Building Materials Guide, including Wood Window Research  
(Burns, Sardell and Lowe)
- Infill Guidelines, Historic Overlay Zone, and Local Districts  
(Anderson, Miller, Burns, Marienau, Sardell, Lowe)
- Awards/Outreach  
(Emerson, Burns, and ??)

#### **Certified Local Government (CLG) Grant Application Ideas**

- Historic Resources Style Guide with illustrations
- Training for local contractors on wood window restoration



- Thematic Survey of the Government Way corridor and ABC streets district for local historic overlay
- Thematic Survey of the Mill workers homes for NRHP for thematic nomination
- Individual Nomination of the Johnson House for NRHP
- Thematic Survey of Farragut buildings that have been relocated to Coeur d'Alene
- Thematic Survey of railroad-related buildings in the city

Chairman Burns commented on grant application ideas that have been discussed previously. Ultimately it will be up to the commission to make a decision and vote upon neighborhood needs the grant funds. The Johnson House could be taken off the list at this point and look at this as having it be eligible for an award. The homeowner's hope to turn it into a bed and breakfast, since it's so close to downtown it is kind of in a threatened area. They are restoring the exterior and interior they are doing a very good job. We would like to support and recognize their efforts.

Ms. Patterson stated that the Government Way would be very labor intensive and cost would be high. It would be similar with the County Historic Preservation Commission when they worked on the Garden District survey.

Chairman Burns agreed that the Garden District survey was a huge project and the value and the request for CLG grant funds would be over \$13,000.

Commissioner Sardell stated she could find out the cost of local contractor's wood window restoration such as wood shop. She thinks it might be around \$10,000. The surveys from Government Way or the Mill Worker Homes any one of those survey's is going to be dependent on how you set the scope of work. If we can get Mr. Kirk Huffaker involved it might be cheaper if we have a smaller district. The Mill Worker Homes would be a smaller district. Individual nominations are at least \$5,000. Right now, I have two that we are trying to get prices on for Idaho Heritage Trust and they are running north of \$5,000 each. We are trying to get three (3) historic theaters on the national register. This will run probably around \$7,500 for the survey work. The Railroad buildings this would be very interesting, it could link into trails, privately owned building. These surveys really give the Historic Preservation Commission a better understating of what is actually out there so we can encourage people to do national nominations.

Chairman Burns stated at the subcommittee meeting that the Farragut buildings had already been identified to some extent. He will look into this as a future project. The Railroad presentation was great. He was focused on the railroads that ran between the parks. It ran from Spokane to Coeur d'Alene, and up to Spirit Lake, ID. Maybe Jon Mueller would be willing to share his presentation on the Railroad buildings with the commission. Is there a direction that the committee would like to narrow the list down further and put something in front of SHPO?

Ms. Patterson stated there needs to be a time and cash match, and we need to remember that the commission has no budget. If something requires a lot of time and we do not have it, we would be looking at having to do some kind of cash match on a bigger survey for example the Government Way Corridor project.

Chairman Burns stated he will speak with Evie with the Johnson House to see if they are interested in an individual nomination.

Mr. Patterson asked regarding the workshop training in Florida and if Commissioner Lowe was still going to attend with his crew. That was discussed at the last commission meeting with Commissioner Sardell.

Commissioner Sardell replied that she has not spoken with Commissioner Lowe regarding the training. He might still be out of the Country on active duty.

Ms. Patterson asked about the Historic Resource Guide idea for CLG grant funding.

Commissioner Sardell stated that yes, it does fit with the guidelines, with a potential project, but the cost might hinder us.

Chairman Burns states his experience with SHPO is much more national register oriented as opposed to some of the other things that fall within their purview.

Commissioner Emerson likes the idea of the Johnson House as two parts. One as a nominee, for the Heart of History award and putting it on the National Register of Historic Places.

Commissioner Sardell stated if we established some boundaries of the Government Way historic area that were more realistic, we could limit the scope of work to the most significant historic areas, that would help reduce the cost of the survey work and make it more affordable.

Ms. Patterson pointed out with any of the surveys that there will be a delay for when it happens. If the commission applies and they award us money, we will not be starting until 2025 and it will not be done until 2026.

Chairman Burns states that SHPO gave the committee a 3-year grant rather than 2-year grant which should give us more time, although the way they handled the last one, we actually ended up with less time because of the delay. Hopefully they will be more efficient with it going forward.

Commissioner Sardell stated there are three (3) options to consider for the CLG grant: 1. Government Way survey. 2. Johnson House Nominations. 3. Training local contractors for wood window and door repair (at least to talk to them about a window workshop).

Ms. Patterson stated the Commission will need to go to City Council to get approval to apply for the CLG Grant funds. Applications are due to SHPO by the end of January of 2024.

Motion by Commissioner Emerson, seconded by commissioner Miller, to make a decision on wood windows, Government Way, and the Johnson House as the top three priorities to evaluate for the CLG grant funds. Motion carried.

### **COMMISSION COMMENTS:**

Commissioner Emerson received a phone call from the Garden District Researcher saying she was researching the history of the neighborhood and asked if he and others could help provide historical knowledge about something notable about, such as if a mayor had resided in the home.

Council Liaison Miller mentioned that she would track down the historic map of the downtown neighborhoods and that she had spoken with two people that remember that it had existed, but didn't have a copy. Roger Hudson's wife, Leigh was the one that she thought had the copy and she does not. If it did exist, she does not know where to find the photos now.

Chairman Burns wanted to know if the commission was on schedule with the consultant Kirk Huffaker regarding the preliminary draft of the Garden District Nomination to have it submitted to SHPO by the first of the year.

Ms. Patterson was going to check on the status of the draft and report back to the commission.

Chairman Burns commented on the Human Rights building and stated he was concerned about it after hearing about the condition of the brick. It was discussed as part of the historic railroad buildings.

Commissioner Emerson did speak with Bill Greenwood and he stated he had requested an engineering study which came back and the numbers are pretty high to restore it to bring it up to code. There is some question as to whether it's worth saving according to the council members.

Council Liaison Miller stated that it just had a roof repair issue done. It is not out of code compliance but you cannot have any upgrade functions done to it because everything there is too old. It is ok in its current capacity, but it cannot be improved for anything else.

Commissioner Emerson stated that the cost of shoring up the bricks on the exterior and the interior construction was very expensive.

Chairman Burns stated it is a very important historical building for the city.

Council Liaison Miller stated that the study that was done by engineering going to be done, the city was going to use the building for a different city purpose. That was the discussion for the cost prohibitive conversation. If something is going to happen to it. If it is going to be kept for its existing purpose but to restore it or to convert it to a city building that is the issue.

Commissioner Sardell requested that the commission receive a copy of the report on the Human Rights Building to review.

Commissioner Emerson would like to go on record that the commission would like to preserve the Human Rights Building if at all possible.

Motion by Commissioner Emerson, seconded by Sardell to add this as an agenda item for the next meeting to discuss preservation of the Human Rights Building. Motion carried.

Chairman Burns discussed having a workshop in January to start the commissions 2024 goals.

#### **CITY COUNCIL PRESENTATION:**

Council Liaison Miller will let the Mayor know that the commission will be doing a presentation sometime in the Spring and will have it put on the agenda.

Chairman Burns suggested having the workshop first and put together an outline. He also suggested turning the regular commission meeting in January into a longer workshop format.

Motion by Commissioner Emerson, seconded by Commissioner Miller to replace the regular January Historic Preservation Commission meeting with a workshop in January. Motion carried.

#### **TRACKING TIME:**

Chairman Burns reminded the commission to track their time and send it to Commissioner Anderson.

#### **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS: \*\*ITEM BELOW IS CONSIDERED TO BE AN ACTION ITEM\*\***

The Commission requested the following items to be discussed:

- Government Way Questionnaire
- HREI building preservation
- CLG Grant Ideas
- City Council Presentation

#### **ADJOURNMENT:**

Motion by Commissioner Miller seconded, Commissioner Emerson, to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

Submitted by Traci Clark, Administrative Assistant

This Page Intentionally Left Blank



# MINUTES



This Page Intentionally Left Blank

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
SPECIAL MEETING**

**City Hall – Conference Room #6**

**January 8, 2024**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:**

Walter Burns, Chair  
Anneliese Miller, Vice Chair  
Anne Anderson  
Alexandria Marienau (On Teams)  
Sandy Emerson  
Shannon Sardell (On Teams)  
Rick Shaffer (On Teams)

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Hilary Patterson, Community Planning Director  
Traci Clark, Admin. Assistant

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:**

Tyler Douglas Lowe

**1:30 p.m. CALL TO ORDER:**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

None.

**OTHER BUSINESS: Certified Local Government (CLG) Grant Application – FY24 CLG Grant Program**

Chairman Burns stated he met with Ms. Patterson, Commissioner Sardell and State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) (Dan Everhart and Maria Rachal) last month to present the ideas that we had come up with for the grant. Dan Everhart suggested doing a survey of the Downtown. We agreed and are looking at two (2) different areas. The smaller area would be Front Street to Lakeside Avenue with the east-west boundaries being 1<sup>st</sup> Street to 6<sup>th</sup> Street. The larger area would extend up to Indiana and would have the same east-west boundaries. Ms. Patterson asked historic preservation consultants Sherry Boswell and Kirk Huffaker to give some ball park prices that we can include with the grant application. Chairman Burns spoke with Dan Everhart this morning regarding this project and what he thinks would work best for the grant request. His response was to go for both. Propose the larger one and then the alternative would be for the smaller dollar amount. Chairman Burns said he thinks this make sense. Mr. Everhart pointed out the economy doesn't work out a lot of times, you pay the low price twice rather than doing one big thing. He believes this is a great idea.

Ms. Patterson asked the commission if they were wanting to apply as two grant requests, or to include the two alternatives in the same grant request.

Chairman Burns stated yes. The estimates that we received from the consultants are similar for the small area – both were about \$8,200.00. They varied for the larger area – with one estimate being \$10,700.00 and the other one was almost \$15,000.00. This brings the question how much do we ask for, remembering of course all the time that we do need to match this with hours.

Commissioner Emerson asked how is the commission doing on hours.

Ms. Patterson stated they have not collected all of the hours. The current Garden District has not had a

lot of opportunity for hours based on the type of work that it is. But she clarified that hours spent at commission meetings, including travel to/from, does count toward the match.

Chairman Burns stated that having worked with both Mr. Huffaker and Ms. Boswell. Ms. Boswell likes to involve volunteers a great deal more than Mr. Huffaker. He has not needed much for the project that we are working on now.

Ms. Patterson clarified the hours vary for the type of work. The nomination doesn't require as much volunteer time as the reconnaissance survey. For the nomination, Mr. Huffaker is more writing versus doing the leg work.

Commissioner Sardell replied yes, the surveys are more intensive with hours of writing and make more sense because there is a lot more boots on the ground with the required forms and photography. However, the experience with the Garden District survey was a struggle of the uniformity of photography, or the consistency of styles or observations in doing the survey work, due to volunteer labor. On this proposal we would have to do a bid process depending on the amount of money that we ask for. It makes sense, not knowing the pain of the volunteer hours for the Garden District previously. Going for the maximum of the \$15,000. dollars. We should see who comes in Ms. Boswell or Mr. Huffaker with the dollar amount. She would rather propose the smaller amount of money over the larger amount of money.

Chairman Burns stated he can provide context on the original Garden District Survey, which was a \$13,000. dollar grant. We put in way more volunteer hours than what was necessary to match that grant. This was during covid which Ms. Boswell with relying more upon volunteers than she might have otherwise because she could not travel here. There were a larger number of properties as well. He felt assured that Ms. Boswell would be very specific on what the volunteers need and that was not made very clear last time.

Commissioner Marienau asked what are the matches required for the grant, as far as hours and or dollar amount.

Ms. Patterson replied it is 1 to 1, it could be in-kind or cash. In the past when we have asked for \$15,000. the match was \$15,000. but it was only \$250.00 for cash because it was for printing costs and everything else was the volunteer hours. For the Historic Preservation Plan we met that with no problem, with commission meeting time, a couple of community meetings and open houses.

Chairman Burns stated he is more concerned about the current grant then he would be about matching on whatever the commission is proposing.

Commissioner Miller asked about the time and whether it can it be carried over from the previous year.

Ms. Patterson replied we cannot double up but you can include your research or commission time when the grant is awarded.

Commissioner Miller clarified if we are applying in 2024, we can start counting our time.

Ms. Patterson replied as soon as the other grant is done in April, we can start counting our time. She will double check this.

Commissioner Emerson asked who approves the grant. Is it SHPO office staff in Boise?

Commissioner Sardell answered that it is the State Historical Preservation Office. Since the program is through the State, the National Park Service gives them the funding but the State can do with it as they wish.

Chairman Burns stated the State is required to spend 10% of their funding to CLG.



Commissioner Emerson asked if we know some of the people who would make the selection.

Chairman Burns stated that Mr. Everhart is not involved this the selection.

Commissioner Sardell stated it is the people who approve National Register Nominations, and a secondary panel that will approve our National Register of Historic Places Historic District for the Garden District. They will approve the process and Mr. Huffaker will present it. The Committee for the State of Idaho sends it on to the National Park Service. In this case all we are working with is a State Agency, it could be the Idaho State Historical Society and the personnel within that is Jan Gallimore, Trish Kennedy, Jason Tippeconnic Fox who does the National Register. It could include Ashley Molloy. Mr. Everhart and Ms. Rachal are probably not on the committee as they are the one working directly with all of the different CLG's and associations.

Chairman Burns explained that the possibility of us getting a grant is going to be determined by how many other grant requests there will be. Mr. Everhart indicated that he would put in a good word for us. This is his brain child and he brought it to us and feels like it is important.

Mr. Shaffer asked if the commission should ask for the larger grant and if it not acceptable would like the smaller one automatically.

Chairman Burns replied we would have to specify very clearly.

Commissioner Marienau replied we need to apply in one application.

Ms. Patterson stated that Mr. Everhart suggested filing out one application with both options.

Chairman Burns stated we need to ask for something to get the project going sooner than later. The smaller grant is the more important of the two as it really encompasses Sherman and the Downtown areas.

Ms. Patterson commented that Ms. Boswell's report did not include any travel, but she had to have travel since she did field work.

Commissioner Anderson suggested asking for \$9,000. for the small grant and \$15,000. for the large grant.

Commissioner Emerson want to clarify that there will be a couple of neighborhood meetings to keep them abreast at what the commission is doing, communicating plus building hours.

Chairman Burns replied that we need to speak with the Downtown Association. It would be an extra level of outreach.

Commissioner Shaffer asked is there a percentage for a cash match.

Ms. Patterson stated it would have to come from the City. But she feels we would be okay on this one obtaining the in-kind match. We would propose a small cash match because of any printing, etc. It is important to continue keeping track of any travel time and meeting times and give that to Commissioner Anderson.

Chairman Burns stated the commission will be have another community meeting for the Garden District nomination.

Commissioner Sardel stated that she feels the need to make an argument as to why the larger boundary is important and what the difference would be. The original boundary marks a historic component of

downtown which would relate to the preservation plan in terms of what has been written. It would be important to make the argument as to why there is a larger boundary and why this is the downtown core district. We need to be able to inventory the entire downtown.

Commissioner Marienau asked would it be a possibility if the amount can be a range. When looking at the map we would be applying a certain dollar amount but we could go down to \$9,000. and open it up for anything available in the middle, then if we received more than \$9,000. maybe go up to Wallace Avenue, or capture Lakeside Avenue.

Commissioner Emerson asked why the boundary did not go to 7<sup>th</sup> Street. The buildings are so old with the commercial buildings, (phone company), school etc.

Ms. Patterson stated the boundary overlaps with the Garden District a bit.

Chairman Burns stated that the Garden District stops at Lakeside Avenue., We can make the argument from 9<sup>th</sup> Street or beyond because you can capture the old library. We have determined the core of downtown and what would be historic buildings run between 1<sup>st</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup>.

Commissioner Emerson agrees with Chairman Burns regarding the residential buildings, but when you talk about all building types, when you go up 7<sup>th</sup> Street you would be surprised at what you see.

Ms. Patterson stated the downtown buildings are more historic.

Commissioner Emerson stated if you're communicating with the downtown, they see 5<sup>th</sup> Street as leaving the downtown area.

Chairman Burns stated they are not looking at the residential properties except Pepper Smock's place. Mostly it is all commercial.

Motion by Commissioner Anderson, seconded by Commissioner Emerson, to put a range from \$9,000. to \$15,000, and adjust the surveys boundaries accordingly based on funding. Motion Carried.

Chairman Burns asked if they want to extend further to 7<sup>th</sup> Street as Commissioner Emerson had suggested.

Ms. Patterson responded that the only challenge with that is we have not done the mapping to see how many additional properties will be for the scope of work for both consultants. Commission members Miller and Anderson noted there are some parking lots and the Liberty Building on 7<sup>th</sup> Street.

Commissioner Sardell stated that the boundaries in the proposals are simply to get started and to have survey work to understand what we have. If the consultants do come in, we have provided a boundary we do have some exterior on the edge of the boundaries, we can explore those specific properties in some way, either within this project or the next project. There needs to be some properties as how we survey and the historic nature of the Downtown areas. If we do receive the Grant, we will have to decide with how much money we receive, what the boundaries will be. We can discuss the push and pull within creating the scope of work.

Commissioner Emerson stated he did not know what the flexibility would be.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Motion by Commissioner Emerson, seconded by Commissioner Anderson to adjourn the meeting. Motion approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:58 p.m.

Submitted by Traci Clark, Administrative Assistant

DRAFT