CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Miller called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m.

ROLL CALL

The following Preservation Commission members were present: Justyn Arnold, Fernando Castrejon, Amber Foster, Seth Hoffman, Kristin Ludwig, Dan Miller, Simon Munoz, Al Signorelli and Mike Walker. Jen Del Debbio and Mike Lord were absent.

OTHERS PRESENT

The following staff members were present: Jill Morgan and Sue Jackson.

Others Present: None.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

19-0388 Approval of the Minutes for the Historic Preservation Commission meeting on April 11, 2019.

A motion was made by Mr. Castrejon, seconded by Ms. Foster, that the minutes be approved and filed. The motion carried by voice vote.

COA REPORT

19-0599 April Historic Certificate of Appropriateness Report

There were no questions on the COA report.

19-0600 May Historic Certificate of Appropriateness Report

Mr. Hoffman said I have a question on 461 Grand Avenue, replace front door, paint garage. Are they replacing the front door or just installing a storm door over the existing? It looked like there were a couple of different entries.

Mrs. Morgan said it is a storm door, a glass storm door.
Mr. Hoffman said and the detached garage at 502 Palace is the one that was before the Commission in January or February, correct?

Mrs. Morgan said correct. I confirmed with him all the details we talked about. He didn’t do the section, but he came back with a revised description noting all the things we had said.

Mr. Signorelli said I’m just curious at 725 Palace. There are 3 different houses that have markers, flag sticks. Is that just because of the driveway and the drainage?

Mrs. Morgan said you mean they have like little flags in their yard?

Mr. Signorelli said it is stick with a colored flag.

Mrs. Morgan said probably, I would think, several things it could be. They sometimes do that for driveways. Also to note where utilities are if they are doing some type of digging. Or if they are putting up a new fence and they have someone come out and actually survey where their property lines are, they might flag it.

Mr. Signorelli said I think they dug a couple of holes, one on my property and one at the house next door that wasn’t flagged, but they dug a hole and it looks like to find a marker.

Mrs. Morgan said to find where the property line is.

Mr. Signorelli said I guess so. I didn’t know why those things were there, but that’s probably why.

There were no other questions on the COA report.

19-0601

June Historic Certificate of Appropriateness Report

Mr. Hoffman said I have a question on 79 S. 4th Street, windows and soffits. Is this the address where the owner asked for guidance on the existing windows and they decided that they were going to repair?

Mrs. Morgan said yes.

Mr. Miller said at 737 Wilder, I guess I haven’t seen these come through before or else I didn’t notice, do we require a COA to replace an existing AC unit?

Mrs. Morgan said typically, yes. This one, they just did a regular permit for it, so they just did a notation. That’s why it is per Jill. I just approved it on the phone so they could go ahead and get that permit.

Mr. Hoffman said and that’s the section of the guidelines that addresses visible exterior condenser units. I forget the exact section, but it describes concealing it with landscaping.

Mrs. Morgan said yes.

There were no other questions on the COA report.
AGENDA

19-0598 Approving Rating Guidelines for the Historic Preservation Grant Program

Mrs. Morgan said so just a little overview of where we stand. I think I sent out an e-mail kind of with a heads up. It was a quick notice. We had some internal things figuring out where it went and once we figured everything out, we kind of went quickly to get it onto the BZE and to City Council.

Chairman Miller said did this pass City Council last night?

Mrs. Morgan said it did. It passed City Council Tuesday night. It is approved. We approved, and I think you guys have seen, allowing the current $100,000 to be allocated for a Historic Preservation Grant Program instead of the Revolving Loan Program. They also approved new program guidelines. These you saw at the April meeting where we looked at them. It is pretty similar to what we've done before. The biggest changes are we have a maximum of $20,000. Anywhere up to $10,000 is an outright grant. Anything over $10,000 up to $20,000 requires a dollar for dollar match for every dollar over $10,000. If you have a $20,000 project, $10,000 is a grant. The city will do $5,000 in a grant and then the homeowner would have $5,000 that they would also have to invest. The thought process was like usually these are larger projects. Most people will have thought of them in advance and have saved up some money, whereas, like the under $10,000 can help people for the small projects that kind of crop up with like winter damage or something like that. Some other changes, as we mentioned, we are limiting it to owner occupied. It has to be 2 living units or less unless it was built as more than 2. The same requirements for eligibility in the local historic districts, landmarks or the National Register District if they become a landmark. That's been the case for several years with our grants. Another slight change is only exterior work that's similar. We have prohibited a few, or made ineligible, some of the projects like driveway repavement, new asphalt roofs, fencing and landscaping. For the most part, staff felt that the requirements for historic districts is not more onerous really than anyone else in the city. They are never going to rank high, so it saves people the effort of doing the application. The rest of it is pretty general. I believe at one point we talked about if you had an existing loan out there that still is outstanding to make you ineligible. We did take that out of this final, but as you see in the ranking, you do get extra points if you don't have an outstanding loan. For people who have gotten funding before in the past, while they still don't have to pay it off until they sell the home, it gives people a little bit of an edge who have not ever had any funding. Other than that, I think it is straightforward with all of the rest of our grant programs. What I'm bringing for you today is the ratings sheet. We've done this before. This is not anything new. We'll do a call for nominations. They will come in. Staff will review them. Typically we'll take them to the Grant Committee to kind of look through them a little more thoroughly and then the Grant Committee will provide recommendations to the Preservation Commission and then the Preservation Commission will make the official recommendation to City Council. So we are trying to get a little more official way of how those recommendations are determined.

Mr. Signorelli said who makes up the Grant Committee?

Mrs. Morgan said right now I don't recall who is on it.

Chairman Miller said I think the last we sorted through that I gave myself Chairmanship
of that committee.

Mrs. Morgan said I think Dan is Chair. I believe Jim Schweizer serves on it. I know there is woman who is a realtor.

Chairman Miller said is that Linda Pilmer?

Mrs. Morgan said yes. I'm not for sure if she is still interested. When we did it in 2015 she was there. There is at least one other person from here. I can't remember who else. There are at least 2 of the Commissioners that serve on the committee. I'll have to look at that.

Mr. Walker said for structure eligibility requirements for #5, it seems like it is worded the opposite way.

Mrs. Morgan said yes it is. I updated it and I forget to update it in Legistar. It should be work is all exterior. If no, then you are disqualified. I'm open if anyone has any other ideas that we should add. We can change the point system. If there is any pre-wording. I know some of them were kind of a little difficult to exactly word correctly.

Chairman Miller said I have a few questions on the document. On the Grant Program Guidelines, under 2) Special Conditions b) that all work should be non-maintenance. Can we discuss what that would involve? A lot of work could be considered maintenance, even painting.

Mrs. Morgan said I think it is more of that it will last the 5 years. This was a comment that was made by our Finance Department just to make sure that whenever we are funding that it is something that is going to last, not just cleaning out gutters. Other than cleaning, I wasn’t real sure what else I thought fell into that. That was the only one that really came to mind, but it was just to make sure it is something that is going to have some longevity and that we are not going to be funding it again in 3 years.

Mr. Signorelli said I've got a question about painting as well. So then you don’t think that if someone wanted a grant to scrape and paint their house and paint their trim or whatever, they would still be eligible?

Mrs. Morgan said yes. I wouldn’t consider that maintenance, especially if that would last less than 5 years.

Mr. Signorelli said and also it is a project that can be very expensive.

Chairman Miller said expensive and has a high impact on the streetscape. The painting and the window restoration is what a lot of them need. In the eye of the beholder, you could call that maintenance, I guess, or deferred maintenance even. I agree that it would last over 5 years. Then under Grant Financing & Conditions, B) and then 7), it says proof must be provided that the contractor use prevailing wage for the portion of the project funded by the Historic Preservation Grant Program.

Mrs. Morgan said yes. This was also another request from our Finance Department. It has kind of been an initiative of the city in general to try to make sure that when the city funds stuff that we are supporting livable wage requirements. If we are only funding $10,000 of it, you just have to pay for $10,000 for the livable wage. If someone owns their own business, that doesn’t apply.
Chairman Miller said it doesn't apply to their own labor you mean?

Mrs. Morgan said yes because your income is the profit of the business. You don't have to show that you are paying yourself a wage.

Mr. Signorelli said as a homeowner, I don't want to have to police the contractor to find out what he is paying the people that are doing my work.

Mrs. Morgan said for this, we do want to see that. We might have them sign a waiver. I'm not sure if we will just have a form they will have to sign or if they actually have to show us hourly wage. I hadn't thought about that.

Mr. Hoffman said does the application have to be made and approved prior to selecting who the contractor can be? There is a section that says they need to select a contractor within a certain time period. You don't know who your contractor is yet…

Chairman Miller said I think this requires 2 quotes or 2 estimates.

Mrs. Morgan said 2 estimates. But, yes, you don't pick your contractor until after you get the quotes.

Mr. Signorelli said could we conceivably have some kind of a piece of paper that when you've selected your contractor we have a piece of paper that we can look at so that he knows what his requirements are and one of which would be that salary thing?

Mrs. Morgan said yes.

Mr. Hoffman said is this the prevailing wage list for trades? Is that a city list or is it regional?

Mrs. Morgan said I think it is a state list.

Mr. Hoffman said I know in a lot of my big public construction projects it's written into that specific project spec. If it is a prevailing wage project, then it will be included in that, but I'm not familiar for the small stuff. Is there a city list so a contractor can look and say I need to pay my painters $18 an hour?

Mrs. Morgan said I'm not sure about that either. I was thinking it was something state-wide, but I'm not positive.

Mr. Signorelli said I think we could take the responsibility off the homeowner with this little piece of paper so the contractor would know right away what is required of him and then we wouldn't have to be saying by the way what's your hourly wage for your workers.

Mr. Hoffman said so they could submit their affidavit or whatever it is with their permit application and then another the contractor needs to submit.

Mrs. Morgan said that's a good idea. And also make sure we get it up front so we don't have to worry about contractors…

Chairman Miller said if there are any future revisions of this, I'd like to see this removed. This is much too onerous for residential work. For residential work, I don't think that's practical. It is bad enough they are taxing them on it. I don't think they will
Mr. Signorelli said I think we could just add that to the contractor. That’s his responsibility to show the city what he is paying. I don’t want to get involved in that.

Mr. Hoffman said on the item before that, the agreement will include contractor waiver, paid invoices and final inspection prior to reimbursement. So if that requirement could be included and the contractor has to make some statement or an affidavit.

Mrs. Morgan said get that prevailing wage and the waiver to them upfront. The waiver is for saying they were paid. The city is not getting involved with well I never got paid for this project. But that could be a packet they give them upfront because I’ve had issues with people then having to find their contractor after the job was finished to sign that, so to have that given to them upfront would also be good.

Chairman Miller said there is a line here that recipients are free to choose any contractor. However, recipients will be eligible for a $1,000 bonus of original grant amount if chosen contractor’s office is based in Aurora. How would that be handled? Who is the $1,000 for?

Mrs. Morgan said the $1,000 is for the additional project. Say if you have the $20,000, you could go over $1,000 if you used an Aurora contractor, so you could have a $21,000 project, or if you had $10,000 and you could do $11,000 without having to match if you use an Aurora contractor. It might not help in a lot of situations, but we might be able to make it a little more clear. It is for the project. It is not just a bonus to the homeowner.

Mr. Hoffman said does that give any perverse incentives to inflate costs for the project?

Ms. Ludwig said I was thinking too like sometimes you have jobs with multiple contractors and so you could have one guy that you are paying $50 to do something small, but then I get $1,000 because he is in Aurora. Does it have to be like 90% of the work from an Aurora contractor because maybe you could have more than one contractor?

Mrs. Morgan said typically I feel like in these jobs we usually see only one contractor. Sometimes with maybe a porch restoration you might bring in 2, like the carpenter and the painter.

Ms. Ludwig said maybe if you just put general contractor.

Mrs. Morgan said it is just $1,000. I would think if any of them are Aurora, for $1,000 I wouldn’t think someone is just going to lie, so I would kind of be open to if any of them are. It is giving some work to a local firm.

Ms. Ludwig said is there any time period that we are going to say that the structure has to remain owner occupied? I’m thinking like I could take this grant. I could put $20,000 on whatever and then I could Airbnb it and now I can make it an attractive rental or whatever, which is not what I assume you want to see people doing with a grant.

Mrs. Morgan said we didn’t put that in.
Mr. Signorelli said it seems to me, unless there are zoning issues involved in whatever those later decisions might be, I don't think it would be even our place really to say it couldn't be an Airbnb maybe.

Mrs. Morgan said that kind of involves active regulation. Could that happen? Yes. Is it worth trying to regulate it for the time it might? There are still a lot of restrictions about rentals in the city in general, having to have so much parking and code requirements. From something to go from single family to rental, it is a little more difficult than it used to be today.

Ms. Ludwig said I wouldn't even mind it not being owner occupied just because I think we have some really important buildings that aren't.

Mrs. Morgan said I think maybe down the road maybe we look at doing it once we give a little help to the owner occupied.

Ms. Ludwig said I see the point because in theory they are making income and they ought to be able to take that out of their profit.

Mrs. Morgan said yes. There are ones who just have one they rent, but there are a lot of them that that's their living. They have multiple rentals throughout the city and other cities.

Mr. Hoffman said if you are a landlord and you want a rental, it is a cash producing asset. If you are an owner occupied, it is all cost. I think the bigger picture is to help people improve and maintain the stability and the fabric of the neighborhood. If they are going to do that and then they sell the house immediately, I think that's still a benefit to the historic neighborhoods.

Mr. Signorelli said I have another question, and maybe it's obvious, but I'm going to ask. Would the committee in a situation where, obviously, we have limited funds and hopefully there are going to be a lot of people that are going to try to take advantage of that funding, say there is a situation where there are 2 parties eligible. One is say within a historic district, but it is non-contributing and there is another homeowner who has a very significant architectural house within the district. It would seem to me in judging those that we would take the more historic one, the contributing home to be more important than the non-contributing.

Mrs. Morgan said yes, and that is part of the ranking. One of the eligibility requirements outright is that you have to be of local historical architectural significance. So if it is a completely non-contributing 1980's building, it wouldn't be eligible.

Mr. Signorelli said I guess my question would be say it isn't non-contributing, it is contributing, but another homeowner has a very significant architectural home. That would probably take priority over the two in this situation.

Mrs. Morgan said on the ratings sheet, #4, and maybe we need to add more points, it says rate the significance of the structure with those structures of greater architectural or historical significance receiving higher points. I did give that 10 points. If we think that needs to be weighted a little more we can do that. We don't have to stick to 100. Now it is 100 and you get the 5 points bonus at the bottom.

Mr. Hoffman said for eligibility requirements it has to be within a district, a local
landmark or a National Historic District. That doesn’t state that non-contributing houses are excluded.

Mrs. Morgan said #8, structures of local significance.

Mr. Hoffman said okay, so it is worded a little differently.

Mrs. Morgan said I kept it a little vague because there are some that are maybe technically non-contributing, but still might have like a 1950’s but not have wood siding underneath, so we might say that is locally significant if they take off the siding and restore the wood siding. It might rank lower on other elements. I left it a little vague. We can make it more and just say outright contributing and non-contributing.

Mr. Hoffman said I see the logic in leaving it a little bit flexible.

Chairman Miller said I had a question on #8 too like how we intended to use it. As I’m thinking of it now as you described it, I’m thinking well it is in a local district I would assume it is eligible unless there is a modern structure or something that is clearly non-contributing to the district and then you would not include that. You can’t replace your vinyl siding on your 80’s home that was built without vinyl siding.

Mr. Hoffman said one of the requirements is to resolve any current or past violations. Are they eligible to use the grants to rectify those violations?

Mrs. Morgan said yes. That was discussed as well. I think staff pushed that if it gets it corrected and sometimes some of these violations have been inherited.

Chairman Miller said think I asked for that as well.

Mr. Hoffman said I think it makes sense for people who are correcting a violation that was pre-dating their ownership. I would feel less positive about it going toward someone who willfully made a violation.

Mrs. Morgan said we could add maybe a rating to that like if it is a violation that the homeowner contributed to, lose 5 points, or if it is not a violation they contributed to then an additional 5 points. We could do something like that. We didn’t want to exclude it outright, but it might not be something if we are choosing between and one is a violation that the owner did and the other one is not.

Mr. Signorelli said I think that is fair.

Mr. Hoffman said a theoretical complete worse case would be someone intentionally creating a violation with very cheap work in an attempt to make them more eligible to get the funding. But less to that extreme it would support people who have commitment to maintaining the historic fabric.

Mrs. Morgan said so do you want to add another point and should we be adding 5 or 10 points?

Chairman Miller said I’m not quite sure how to word that. Of the major violations that are out there now, I just want them done. I have no interest in punishing any of these people. We could argue, in the case of the person who was in here multiple times crying in front of us, we could argue that it was the contractor that did it. I think the homeowners knew too, but I don’t really want to get in the point of judging people’s
motivations. That might be beyond our skill level/jurisdiction.

Mr. Signorelli said and why would we want to put ourselves in the situation where somebody takes grant money and even though they, in fact, were eligible and followed all the rules, if they still had violations and they would have to come back to Preservation and come back to the condition and all that kind of thing? That's all being taken care of. We don't have to look at a problem later.

Mr. Hoffman said in order to be eligible, does the work need to resolve all outstanding violations?

Mrs. Morgan said no. If you have a violation and you are coming in for something else, we're not going to approve that. You have to correct the violation first.

Mr. Hoffman said so hypothetically if someone has a violation for siding and windows that all added up to more than $20,000, they would be eligible to get the grant to cover one of them?

Mrs. Morgan said yes.

Mr. Hoffman said would they need to have to show a good faith plan to correct the other in order to be eligible for that?

Mr. Signorelli said well it seems to me if there are violations, then the violations have to be taken care of period, not negotiating well I'm going to take care of this violation but maybe later I might do this other thing. I think the money should be used to fix those violations period and then move on to whatever else.

Mrs. Morgan said but if the $20,000 won't do both violations, I would say we wouldn't exclude them just because they are doing one. If they have a violation and are not moving forward, we can still take them to court on that violation, so we do have a way to make sure they do address the second violation later after the grant money.

Chairman Miller said we have agreed to give people fairly lengthy timelines to address. I don't know if they are even beating those timelines, but we have been generous with them.

Mr. Signorelli said would we be involved in any way in contacting anyone who has come before the Commission where money was an issue, the folks with the vinyl siding removal and also the elderly lady who needed to replace almost all of the windows in her house?

Mrs. Morgan said I'm going to send out e-mails. If they had e-mails, and most of them did, I'll pull that from their record when they came before the Commission and they will also get a postcard, which is what I'm planning for everyone in the district, so they definitely will be notified about it. I think a lot of them kind of knew something was coming, at least for the past year, so hopefully it's been kind of on their mind.

Mr. Hoffman said I have one question about the multi-unit exclusion. If someone is doing an Apartment D conversion, if they were planning that, would they be eligible for the exterior portions of that work if they show that they were going to bring it down to that?

Mrs. Morgan said if they were coming back to a single family, but it wasn't currently, I would say yes. We would just have to be careful about how we make sure that
Chairman Miller said there could be a zoning change as part of that agreement if it is zoned multi-family and we are bringing it back if it was intended to be a single family.

Mrs. Morgan said that would be the idea, like if they were going from multi-family and it was zoned multi-family and they came in for a grant for exterior to convert it to single family I would say we would need to start the zoning process for that.

Mr. Hoffman said so that would be the legal driver that would enforce that.

Mrs. Morgan said we can also put in the agreement that they sign that if it is not converted to single family in 2 years that they would have to refund the money.

Chairman Miller said or that the upstairs kitchen comes out before we disperse any funds.

Mrs. Morgan said and that’s true too. We could just not disperse the funds until our inspectors have verified that it has been converted to single family.

Chairman Miller said it is a little complicated to have an interior inspection on exterior work. Then on the Scope of Work Ratings, I see overall streetscape is 1, 2 and 3. At first I didn’t understand the difference, but I think I do, so let me say what I think that means. Original fabric being preserved, meaning a structure that has such things as original windows and they are being restored.

Mrs. Morgan said yes.

Chairman Miller said and #3 we give points to maybe a building that maybe one someone put in all vinyl windows so the original fabric isn’t there, but it says restore the building to historic conditions. That could be removing vinyl and putting in wooden windows.

Mr. Hoffman said or a missing porch.

Mrs. Morgan said yes.

Chairman Miller said does anyone have any thoughts on #7? What types of work prevent further deterioration?

Mrs. Morgan said I was thinking tuck pointing.

Ms. Ludwig said wood rot.

Mr. Hoffman said gutters. Like repair and restoration of built-in gutters, I would give that full points.

Chairman Miller said so it could be bonus points for something that really is preventing water from getting inside the structure.

Mrs. Morgan said it often won’t have probably a lot of the other points, but it can be a very vital thing from deterioration.

Chairman Miller said true. The built-in gutters or tuck pointing may not have a lot to do
with streetscape. This would give us a chance to give an extra 10 points to something that needs to be done even if it’s not quite as visible.

Ms. Ludwig said the alternative as far as further deterioration is also sometimes you have safety situations. I had one in my house where there was a chimney still there. It was deteriorating. It really just needed to be leveled with the top of the roof. It was becoming a hazardous situation. So sometimes you have a situation like that where it is an exterior project, but there are some things that once in a while will represent a hazardous situation, things falling off of roofs and that sort of thing. Is that deterioration for safety?

Mrs. Morgan said I would think that would fall under #7, but we could even maybe add something about prevents further deterioration and/or safety.

Mr. Hoffman said it could also fall under #5.

Mr. Signorelli said and certainly something that was an emergency situation. If the chimney was going to fall and could fall on someone and kill them, obviously you’d want to take care of that as quickly as possible.

Mrs. Morgan said I guess, depending on the project, maybe #6 if you are talking about structural, like if something structurally has a problem and is a safety issue, correcting that. Hopefully that comes across with #6 is what I’m trying to get to. There are some projects that aren’t really visual, but are really…

Ms. Ludwig said you’re right, continued preservation of the structure like if is going to have water damage.

Chairman Miller said like the chimney falling off, which would contribute to the preservation of the structure.

Mr. Hoffman said chimneys might be an example of something that could be presented as a COA for removal and require approval, depending on whether was contributing to the architecture of the place. In some homes, especially Victorian or Tudor style, it is a focal point of the structure. Some are purely totalitarian and not a contributing element to the building.

Chairman Miller said I could agree with that. Are there any other comments on what Seth brought up about existing violations? I don’t know if there is any way to word that or work that in here where I’m not engaging people’s motivations, which I’m not sure we really want to do. Any other thoughts on that or should we try to work that in somehow?

Mr. Signorelli said it seems simple to me that a certain amount of that kind of work is going to have to be done with either all or part of the grant money. You can’t just make improvements on top of a slew of violations. They have to show good faith if, in fact, they’re not spending all of the grant money on just doing those violations as you kind of mentioned. Maybe there could be slack cut for them on some things rather than taking up say the whole $10,000 on just those existing or previous violations.

Chairman Miller said I think that’s clear. I think the point Seth might have been trying to bring up was there be some way of rating, like if someone has incurred a violation through some sort of gross negligence and that we would view that as a less worthy application for that reason. Is that correct?
Mrs. Morgan said so to somehow try to put that into the rating that the people who don’t have an existing violation would be ranked higher. If everything else was equal, that would rate higher than one that does.

Chairman Miller said or be deducting points. In my response, I’m not sure I want to judge people’s motivations right now. The major outstanding violations I know about I really have no interest in deducting points.

Mrs. Morgan said and we can add that later once we have a handle on some of the older violations.

Mr. Signorelli said can’t that just be on the committee?

Chairman Miller said that’s true. It could be more informal.

Mr. Hoffman said I would agree with that rather than making it a formal points item. Some of the value in the grant money being available is to correct those violations. I don’t know that it would be in the best interest to disincentive where it is sometimes needed the most.

Chairman Miller said and since we’ve had no grant money available, I find it difficult to think that someone deliberately incurred a violation so they could get grant money.

Mr. Walker said I don’t know how we would score it per se, but is there any way to take into account the owner’s ability to pay if not for the grant, so that we are not just funding extremely rich people’s houses?

Mrs. Morgan said yes. That is difficult as far as you would have to have people provide information. Some of that maybe comes out with like granted you can’t have a lot of money sitting in your bank and have a house in poor condition, but hopefully that most people if they have the money their home wouldn’t be in as much of a poor condition as other people.

Chairman Miller said I kind of get the point. Again, it seems like addressing a problem that we don’t have. The problem in our districts isn’t there are too many wealthy people living in them.

Mrs. Morgan said we are excluding the landlords.

Chairman Miller said so if a wealthy person gets a grant, it is a wealthy person that chose to live in one of our districts.

Mr. Signorelli said well you could say it depends on the resource. Talk to the folks that own the Copley Manor.

Chairman Miller said is that a local landmark?

Mr. Signorelli said I know it is National Register. I’m pretty sure it is a local landmark.

Mrs. Morgan said it is.

Mr. Hoffman said maybe it is just an emphasis in awareness and publicizing is often more affluent people have more access to resources to get these programs, so there
could be a bias there. But with awareness and publicizing it, I think that helps keep it
with better to people who do have a need without establishing an eligibility based on
need. I do have a question on how the points then are used. Is there a period where
applications are collected and then ranked and then scored so that they are actually
competing?

Mrs. Morgan said yes. There is a deadline. All applications have to be in by a certain
deadline and then the Commission will look at them and rank them and you’ll put them
all in order and then wherever the $100,000 cuts off, those would be the ones we would
propose to take before City Council. Then if by chance somebody falls out and we
have additional money, I would assume we would just go to the next person if we were
still able to in the timeframe.

Mr. Hoffman said what is the application and award period? Is it annual?

Mrs. Morgan said it will be once a year. This will be a little different. It is going to be a
lot quicker of a process to try to get it through. I’m still kind of figuring out the
timeframe. I’m thinking everything will probably fall with a call for proposals in like
February or March, depending on when the budget is approved and actually available.
It will probably end up being a lot work summer/fall because our year is January. It is
going to be hard to get by spring, to have everything done before spring for people to
start working in the spring. You are probably looking at more summer/fall work.

Mr. Signorelli said work could conceivably start for the homeowners in spring/summer
of 2020 or possibly the fall of 2020?

Mrs. Morgan said yes for the 2020 round. For the 2019 round, probably they are going
to be the same. I’m looking at trying to cut it off in summer to get it finished and so
we are probably looking at smaller projects. Possibly if it is a small enough project,
you might get some people be able to do…

Mr. Signorelli said the fall of 2019.

Mrs. Morgan said late fall if winter doesn’t set in too early.

Mr. Hoffman said the timelines are an important part to publicize to people when they
are getting quotes because if people are asking for a quote in April and contractors
and looking at starting in 8 weeks when they are busiest, that may drive up prices
versus if they realize the work in going to start in September and that’s a slow period
for them and farther out they are not booked up yet. That can help them get better
pricing.

Chairman Miller said I suppose for the 2019 round we’d have to allow people to
continue to work into 2020. I don’t think we’d require that they complete the work in
2019.

Mrs. Morgan said maybe we can even add that, or if not add it to the application, add it
to the discussions or maybe even add it to the application that all work will need to be
finished by a certain date and homeowners can kind of figure out well my project is
going to take so many months and I need to have it fall in this timeframe. Once they
come in, and they’ve probably got their quotes, we can give them a better idea of when
they could start the work. That’s kind of hard to do in the application process.

Mr. Hoffman said this year, since it is starting out later it is going to be a little bit
atypical, but could the application packet have sort of an anticipated timeline that lays out your application period is open, the application is due and then just when they might expect to have the money or their contractor. Could they do the work before their application is approved and then if they are selected use that to reimburse?

Mrs. Morgan said not before the application is approved. We don’t want to fund work that’s already been done. I don’t think there is anything prohibiting from starting like during the whole process. The only issue there is 1) you are not guaranteed it until it is final and 2) you just have to make sure you are following all the requirements.

Mr. Hoffman said so once their application is submitted and accepted they are eligible even if they start before they know whether they have been selected or not?

Mrs. Morgan said we never said they were ineligible. I don’t know if we’ve actually discussed that. That might be a point of discussion whether we want to get into them starting work early. Let me run that by my Director and see what they think about that.

Mr. Signorelli said I would think people wouldn’t want a situation where they might not follow all of the guidelines having started the work and then find out later they wouldn’t get a grant. I would rather wait to make sure I’ve got the grant if I’m applying for it.

Mrs. Morgan said yes and then would that put us in an awkward situation where they are like well you didn’t inform me well enough that I needed to do x, y and z?

Mr. Signorelli said it could come back to bite us.

Mr. Walker said if the work begins and you have to deal with your contractor, but then you get the grant and now the contractor would have had to pay prevailing wages the whole time, are we going to make them do back pay to even it out?

Mrs. Morgan said right. You would have to make sure they know about that on the front end, so it might be a little too complicated. I’m going to talk to my Director on the timeframe and see what’s the earliest we can actually start trying to kick this off to see if there is anyway to tighten some of this. The way I laid it out, you are looking at a good 3½ months through the whole process. That was giving a 6 week application process. We can narrow that down to a month. I’m not for sure how early we can even go into a bid for applications once the budget is passed.

Mr. Hoffman said as long as people are aware of this, there’s nothing to prevent them from working on their application 6 months before it even opens. People are aware of finding out things even if they can’t actually turn it in until March.

Mrs. Morgan said especially if you are trying to get cost estimates, which I know can take a while.

Mr. Hoffman said if people submit an application for one year and don’t make the cut, are they eligible then to try again the next year?

Mrs. Morgan said yes they can try again. I don’t want to necessarily keep the applications and just roll them over because things change. They can apply, as long as it wasn’t an item that was disqualified.

Ms. Ludwig said what would you do for the last person that’s on that line? Let’s say like they have a $5,000 project, and we could have covered $1,000 of it, do you offer
them that $1,000 or would you not offer them anything and not spend that $1,000?

Mrs. Morgan said if it is just like $1,000, probably nothing. If it is several thousand we might say we have this amount of money. We don’t want to roll over money so I do want to use it. Anything over $1,000 I might try to offer it.

Mr. Signorelli said I would think you would just roll it over to the following year.

Mrs. Morgan said I would like to try to show that we are spending it.

Chairman Miller said so is the plan to hold a 2019 round of funding?

Mrs. Morgan said it is.

Chairman Miller said then it sounds like the goal would be to spend it all, but I would assume that means commit it because I don’t know if the homeowner would be able to actually submit all their forms and get reimbursed before the end of 2019.

Mrs. Morgan said correct, to commit it. Once I commit it, I don’t have to roll it over if I’m committing it to a certain project.

PENDING

COMMITTEE REPORTS

A) Grants - Dan Miller, Chairman

No Report.

B) Near Eastside Historic District - Jennifer Baird-del Debbio, Chairperson

No Report.

C) Riddle Highlands Historic District - Fernando Castrejon, Chairperson

No Report.

D) Public Awareness - Mike Walker, Chairman

No Report.

E) Landmarks - Al Signorelli, Chairman

No Report.

F) FoxWalk Design Review - Fernando Castrejon, Chairperson

No Report.
G) Tanner/Palace Historic District Committee - Justyn Arnold, Chairperson

No Report.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Mr. Signorelli, seconded by Mr. Castrejon, that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried by voice vote. Chairman Miller adjourned the meeting at 8:15 p.m.
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