

**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 1st Street to 6th 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 7th 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 9th 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 1st and 6th.

Commissioner Emerson agrees with Chairman Burns regarding the residential buildings, but when you talk about all building types, when you go up 7th 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 5th 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 7th 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 7th 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