



MINUTES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION - REGULAR SESSION
THURSDAY, MAY 18, 2023, 5:00 PM

The Historic Preservation Commission convened in regular session at 5:02 PM , May 18, 2023. Chair Greg Koos called the meeting to order.

Roll Call

| Attendee Name | Title | Status |
|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Greg Koos | Commission Chair | Present |
| Paul Scharnett | Commission Vice Chair | Present (5:05 pm) |
| Sarah Lindenbaum | Commissioner | Present |
| Kim Miller | Commissioner | Present |
| John Elterich | Commissioner | Present |
| Emma Meyer | Commissioner | Present |
| Dawn Peters | Commissioner | Present |

Public Comment

Individuals wishing to provide emailed public comment must email comments to publiccomment@cityblm.org at least 15 minutes before the start of the meeting. Individuals wishing to speak in-person may register at cityblm.org/register at least 5 minutes before the start of the meeting.

Consent Agenda

Items listed on the Consent Agenda are approved with one motion; Items pulled from the Consent Agenda for discussion are listed and voted on separately.

Chair Koos pulled items 4.A. and 4.B. from the consent agenda.

Chair Koos introduced two new Commissioners, Emma Meyer and Sarah Lindenbaum, who provided background on their Historic Preservation interest and experience.

Regular Session

The following item was presented:

Item 4.A. Review and approval of the minutes of the April 20, 2023, regular meeting of the Bloomington Historic Preservation Commission.

Chair Koos described minor changes to the minutes of the prior meeting, including a clarification on “composite” materials.

Commissioner Elterich made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Peters, to approve the minutes, as amended.

AYES: Commissioner Lindenbaum; Commissioner Elterich; Commissioner Meyer; Commission Chair Koos; Commission Vice Chair Scharnett; Commissioner Peters; Commissioner Miller

Motion carried (viva voce).

The following item was presented:

Item 4.B. BHP-15-23 - Consideration, review and action on a request submitted by Zac Alvis, for a Certificate of Appropriateness for priming and painting on the east side of the home, as well as repairing broken box gutters, fascia, soffit, window, and railings on the exterior of the home on the property located at 809 N. Mclean Street (PIN: 21-04-210-001).

Commission Chair Koos asked for clarification on “composite materials,” as related to the approved materials for fascia and soffit repair on the property.

Commission Vice Chair Scharnett spoke on behalf of the subcommittee that had reviewed and preliminarily approved the Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA). He clarified that “composite materials” in this instance are referring to products like MiraTEC or LP SmartSide; glued/laminated product, not plywood-type products. Given location and exposure, the material is preferable for longevity, and is acceptable per NPS Standards with similar texture and color.

Chair Koos asked that the CoA be amended to specifically refer to those types of products, and inquired whether the property owner had received a copy of the document. Staff explained that the document had been provided to the Owner and entered into the City’s permitting system. Staff will update the document.

Commissioner Elterich made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Peters, to affirm the Certificate of Appropriateness, as presented and amended.

AYES: Commissioner Lindenbaum; Commissioner Elterich; Commissioner Meyer; Commission Chair Koos; Commission Vice Chair Scharnett; Commissioner Peters; Commissioner Miller

Motion passed.

Commission Chair Koos asked for concurrence on reviewing agenda item 5.F. prior to the other items remaining on the Regular Agenda, as any decision could impact the other cases. There were no objections, and the Item was brought forward for consideration.

The following item was presented:

Item 5.F. Consideration, review, and possible action on updates and amendments to the Eugene D. Funk, Jr. Historic Preservation Grant Program Guidelines , as requested by the Economic & Community Development Department.

Ms. Pemberton presented the staff report and briefly explained the first two potential amendments, 1) Increasing the maximum award value from \$5,000 to \$7,500, and 2) adding a 25% cost share for National Register properties that are not S-4 designated.

Chair Koos inquired whether this would result in a property that is designated as both S-4 and on the National Register being able to double up on funding. Ms. Pemberton answered in the negative, noting that the restrictions on a single grant per property per year would still apply.

Commissioner Elterich inquired whether a property in a National Register (not just those individually designated) would be eligible for funding if this change was made. Ms. Pemberton answered in the affirmative. Commissioner Peters asked whether that would be only for Contributing structures. Ms. Pemberton stated this would need to be part of the final decision on how to proceed if this amendment was made.

Ms. Pemberton explained the remaining potential amendments, 1) removing "Landscaping" from the limitations on funding (9d) while adding funding for designated landscaping, 2) adding periodic funding for "Preservation Maintenance Plans" as a separate line item that could be awarded at 100% up to a reasonable cost, in addition to a grant for work in the subject year, 3) amending the applicability and limitations to allow funding of phased painting projects, and 4) minor routine updates and changes.

The Commission discussed the proposal to increase the potential award amount. Concerns were expressed that \$7,500 is still a small amount based on the increased costs of construction and trades. Staff affirmed Commissioner Peters' statement that at the current budget that would likely allow five property owners to acquire funding each year. Commission Vice Chair Scharnett asked whether it would be appropriate to insert language that automatically increases the maximum award amount annually. Staff advised existing language in the Schedule of Fees includes a similar provision.

Ms. Pemberton reviewed the assessed and cash values of different Historic Districts and properties, then compared those to possible "major restoration" project costs and previous real-life projects. The Commission weighed the positives and negatives of defining "major restoration," as it relates to the ability to award more than one grant amount per year.

Commissioner Elterich asked for clarification on what landscaping would be funded. Staff explained that only landscaping that is an item called out for protection in a designating Ordinance, or that—based on nominating or supporting documentation—is clearly a historic component of the property within itself would qualify. Commission Chair Koos provided examples of existing and potentially eligible landscape features.

Commissioner Peters expressed concerns with opening eligibility to historic properties that are not S-4 designated, considering the restricted annual funding amount and the necessary partnership S-4 owners have with the HPC. Staff explained that reason for the specific proposal is related to ensuring full expenditure of the annual funding, but given recent interest and the increased award amount that may no longer be a relevant

concern. Commission Chair Koos asserted that the Commissioner's purview is to protect all historic buildings in the community, so access to resources should be available to all.

Commissioner Elterich made a motion to approve the content of the amendments, as presented.

The motion failed for a second.

The Commission discussed the merits of adopting the proposed amendments individually, or as a whole.

Commissioner Meyer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Peters, to approve the increase in maximum award amount of \$5,000 to \$7,500.

AYES: Commissioner Lindenbaum; Commissioner Elterich; Commissioner Meyer; Commission Vice Chair Scharnett; Commissioner Peters; Commissioner Miller

NAYS: Commission Chair Koos

Motion passed.

Commission Chair Koos asserted that the proposed amendment should be taken as a whole. Staff confirmed that any combination of proposed amendments the Commission should adopt will work together within updated Guidelines; not passing one of them will not prevent the program from functioning. Commission Vice Chair Scharnett clarified the recommended motion is for Staff to return with implementation language for each amendment that the Commission decides should go forward, so a current approval would be for the general concept of a proposed amendment. Staff confirmed.

Commission Vice Chair Scharnett made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Meyer, for City Staff to move forward with creating recommended implementation language for proposed amendments two through six.

AYES: Commissioner Lindenbaum; Commissioner Elterich; Commissioner Meyer; Commission Vice Chair Scharnett; Commissioner Miller; Commission Chair Koos

NAYS: Commissioner Peters

Motion passed.

Staff stated that proposed language would be presented at a future meeting.

Ms. Pemberton inquired whether the Commission was ready to define the term "major restoration," as used in the Funk Grant Guidelines. Commissioner Peters stated her support for including it for clear homeowner understanding. Commission Vice Chair Scharnett stated his support for attaching the definition to the Equalized Assessed Value (EAV). Commissioner Peters and Meyer concurred. Discussion of what the preferred threshold is ensued.

Commissioner Peters made a motion, seconded by Vice Chair Scharnett, for City Staff to define projects with expenses equal to, or greater than, 45% of the subject property's EAV as "major restoration" projects.

AYES: Commissioner Lindenbaum; Commissioner Peters; Commissioner Meyer; Commission Vice Chair Scharnett; Commissioner Miller; Commission Chair Koos

NAYS: Commissioner Elterich

Motion passed.

Ms. Pemberton asked for a subcommittee and volunteers to assist with identifying the criteria and qualifications required for future funding of "Preservation Maintenance Plans." The Commission discussed which members might be most appropriate.

Commissioner Miller asked for additional information on Preservation Maintenance Plans. Ms. Pemberton explained the process for National Parks and the prevalence of this type of planning. Commission Vice Chair Scharnett elaborated on similar planning the school systems conduct.

Commissioners Peters and Lindenbaum were selected to staff the subcommittee.

Commission Chair Koos asked for verification that the Commission would not be recommending specific parties to conduct the work. Ms. Pemberton answered in the affirmative; the Commission will set the criteria required for the professionals whose work would be eligible for reimbursement, property owners would select the person they contract to complete the work.

Commissioner Elterich asked for clarification that an award limitation of \$500 would be sufficient funding. Staff stated the average home inspection is in the range of \$4-500 at this time, so a \$500 100% funded plan is reasonable. Commissioner Peters concurred.

Commissioner Peters made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Miller, to establish a subcommittee of two members to create criteria for what constitutes as a "qualified professional" for the purposes of funding "Preservation Maintenance Plans" under the Funk Grant program.

AYES: Commissioner Lindenbaum; Commissioner Peters; Commissioner Meyer; Commission Vice Chair Scharnett; Commissioner Miller; Commissioner Elterich; Commission Chair Koos

Motion passed.

Ms. Pemberton inquired whether the Commission desired the proposed amendments to the Funk Grant Guidelines to take effect, retroactively, beginning May 1, 2023, to keep competition consistent across FY24. No projects have been reviewed yet this fiscal year.

Commissioner Peters made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Meyer, that if the proposed increase to the maximum award amount for Funk Grants is adopted within the first quarter of the fiscal year, it be applied retroactively to grants awarded since the beginning of the fiscal year (May 1).

AYES: Commissioner Lindenbaum; Commissioner Peters; Commissioner Meyer; Commission Vice Chair Scharnett; Commissioner Miller; Commissioner Elterich; Commission Chair Koos

Motion passed.

The following item was presented:

Item 5.A. BHP-17-23 - Consideration, review and action on a request submitted by Jeffrey Deaver, for a Certificate of Appropriateness for siding repair/replacement, and painting

on the property located at 1007 E. Jefferson Street (PIN: 21-03-304-008), as requested by the Economic & Community Development Department.

Chair Koos opened the floor for testimony.

Jeffrey Deaver (1007 E. Jefferson Street) summarized the project as primarily a painting project with some repair and very minor replacement required as part of preparing the surface. He surmised the home was last painted in the early 1990s and stated the total siding repair required is less than 10 square feet.

Commissioner Scharnett asked for a description of the materials planned for use on the project. Mr. Deaver stated the contractor planned to use an oil-based primer and premium finish paint. Commissioner Scharnett asked whether the Applicant would be willing to use a different paint. A discussion regarding the importance of water vapor permeability of coatings for historic homes, and the implications for longevity of the work and materials ensued.

Commissioner Elterich inquired what the cost increase between coatings of standard and recommended permeability was. Commissioner Scharnett replied that it is typically nominal.

Commissioner Lindenbaum inquired about the intended longevity of the paint job. Commissioner Scharnett explained paint it typically not warranted for more than 10 years.

Commissioner Koos asked that Staff and Scharnett work with Applicant to identify an appropriate way forward on the materials for the project. The Applicant agreed.

Commissioner Scharnett inquired whether there is lead flashing above windows. The owner was unaware and asked additional clarifying questions.

Commissioner Peters inquired whether the scope of work included painting all surfaces. Mr. Deaver confirmed.

No other testimony was provided.

Chair Koos closed the public hearing.

Ms. Pemberton presented the staff reports for BHP-17-23 and BHP-18-23, with a recommendation for approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness and associated Funk Grant. She noted the scope of work for Full exterior painting with minor siding repair and replacement. Methods include hand scraping and soft wash prior to priming and painting with Sherwin William Premium Grade exterior paint(s). Painting of architectural details (dentals, trim) are included in the scope.

Commission Vice Chair Scharnett made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Peters, to approve the scope of work and request for a Certificate of Appropriateness, with the modification that the Applicant provide specifics on the proposed methods and materials for discussion and subsequent recommendation.

AYES: Commissioner Lindenbaum; Commissioner Elterich; Commissioner Meyer; Commission Chair Koos; Commission Vice Chair Scharnett; Commissioner Peters; Commissioner Miller
Motion passed.

The following item was presented:

Item 5.B. BHP-18-23 - Consideration, review and action on a request submitted by Jeffrey Deaver for a Funk Grant in the amount of \$5,000 for siding repair/replacement, and painting on the property located at 1007 E. Jefferson Street (PIN: 21-03-304-008), as requested by the Economic & Community Development Department.

Commissioner Peters made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Meyer, to approve the request, as presented, in the amount of up to \$7,500.

AYES: Commissioner Lindenbaum; Commissioner Elterich; Commissioner Meyer; Commission Chair Koos; Commission Vice Chair Scharnett; Commissioner Peters; Commissioner Miller
Motion passed.

The following item was presented:

Item 5.C. BHP-19-23 - Consideration, review and action on a request submitted by Dave Bogenrief, for a Certificate of Appropriateness for soffit, siding, and trim repair and replacement on the property located at 1104 E. Jefferson Street (PIN: 21-03-326-002), as requested by the Economic & Community Development Department.

Commission Chair Koos opened the floor for testimony.

Brad Williams (613 E. Gove Street) representing the Applicant, provided a description of the project and materials and methods to be used. He stated repairs would be completed in cedar; painting will occur at a later date.

Commissioner Scharnett inquired whether there were any areas that are candidates for consolidation rather than replacement. Mr. Williams responded that he does try to use material-saving approaches, when possible, but some of the work areas for this project are actually missing or beyond repair. He explained there are many other repairs needed on the property and the subject scope of work is just what the Applicant has chosen to pursue at this time.

Chair Koos asked whether Mr. Williams agreed with the Applicant's prioritization of projects. Mr. Williams stated his agreement, and explained his goal of ensuring there are no water penetration issues on the structure.

Ms. Pemberton presented the staff reports for BHP-19-23 and BHP-20-23, with a recommendation for approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness and associated Funk Grant.

Commissioner Peters made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Lindenbaum, to approve the scope of work and request for a Certificate of Appropriateness.

AYES: Commissioner Lindenbaum; Commissioner Elterich; Commissioner Meyer; Commission Chair Koos; Commission Vice Chair Scharnett; Commissioner Peters; Commissioner Miller
Motion passed.

The following item was presented:

Item 5.D. **BHP-20-23** - Consideration, review and action on a request submitted by Dave Bogenrief for a **Funk Grant** in the amount of \$5,000 for soffit, siding, and trim repair and replacement on the property located at 1104 E. Jefferson Street (PIN: 21-03-326-002), as requested by the Economic & Community Development Department.

Commissioner Peters made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Elterich, to approve the request, as presented, in the amount of up to \$7,500.

AYES: Commissioner Lindenbaum; Commissioner Elterich; Commissioner Meyer; Commission Chair Koos; Commission Vice Chair Scharnett; Commissioner Peters; Commissioner Miller
Motion passed.

The following item was presented:

Item 5.E. **BHP-21-23** - Consideration, review and action on a request submitted by Sherri Masters, for a **Certificate of Appropriateness** for installation of a new perimeter fence on the property located at 905 N. McLean Street (PIN: 21-04-207-004), as requested by the Economic & Community Development Department.

Commission Chair Koos opened the floor for testimony.

Sherry Masters (905 N. McLean) provided background on the request, including the desire to replace the current fence with the same profile and material, plus extending that fencing in the rear for additional privacy, and installing an era-appropriate steel fence visible from the front of the property. The wooden portions of the fence will be painted white, while the steel portions of the fence will be painted black.

Ms. Pemberton presented the staff report with a recommendation for approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness.

Commissioner Peters made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Lindenbaum, to approve the scope of work and request for a Certificate of Appropriateness.

AYES: Commissioner Lindenbaum; Commissioner Elterich; Commissioner Meyer; Commission Chair Koos; Commission Vice Chair Scharnett; Commissioner Peters; Commissioner Miller
Motion passed.

New Business

Commission Chair Koos announced a 5-minute recess at 6:50 p.m.
Commissioner Lindenbaum left at 6:55 p.m.
The Commission reconvened at 6:57 p.m.

The following item was presented:

Item 6.A. Rust Grant Guidelines Defining Priorities Discussion, as requested by the Economic & Community Development Department.

Ms. Pemberton reported the success of the solicitation for submissions as part of the new Rust Grant process, informed the Commission that there may be more requests for funding than money to award, and asked the Commission to discuss the current prioritization language in the Guidelines to prepare for that possibility. She provided the National Parks definitions for “Preservation” and “Restoration.” Commission Chair Koos stated using the Secretary of Interior’s definitions is appropriate. The rest of the Commission concurred.

Ms. Pemberton reviewed possible definitions for “maintenance,” and the relationship of those definitions to upkeep and avoidance of damage. Commission Vice Chair Scharnett elaborated on components of the definitions provided, noting they point to components rather than whole systems, such as a window sash but not a window. Commissioner Peters stated that each project is still going to be somewhat subjective, but having something documented to help guide would be beneficial.

Staff led the Commission through a review of recent projects to elaborate and further clarify how the proposed definitions might apply. The Commission discussed different examples and how they might be prioritized. Commissioner Peters proposed that maintenance is more important than restoration; Commissioner Elterich proposed that preservation is more important than maintenance. The Commission discussed further, deciding to adjust the language and order of prioritization based on the goals of the program to 1) celebrate and protect historic buildings in Downtown Bloomington, 2) improve the appearance, safety, and structural integrity of those buildings, and 3) serve as an economic development incentive.

Commissioner Elterich inquired how tuckpointing would be classified. Ms. Pemberton clarified that two activities could be the same, but the element upon which the activity occurs may define whether it is classified as “preservation” or “maintenance,” using the example of tuckpointing on an original historic structure (preservation), or tuckpointing on a modern addition to that historic structure (maintenance).

Commission Chair Koos provided the nuance of addressing specific elements of a property, rather than of a property as a whole. Commissioner Peters recommended that the prioritization list be changed to address elements of properties instead of properties, and that “Preserving a non-historic property” should be removed, since maintenance of the non-historic property does that.

Commission Vice Chair Scharnett noted that NPS prioritizes maintenance, then repair, then restoration, then replacement. Commission Chair Koos noted that restoration is typically the need in the historic Downtown district due to the condition of the buildings.

Commissioner Elterich inquired what the definitions of “Historic” and “Non-Historic” are for the purposes of the Rust Grant. Staff explained it is not defined within the guidelines,

but there are four possible levels: 1) National Register Contributing Structure, 2) National Register Non-Contributing Structure, 3) Older than 50 years, 4) <50 years old. The proposal to remove “restoration of non-historic” was discussed, and decision was made to retain for economic development reasons; assistance with fire damage or rehabilitation of a newer building could be equally impactful as preservation of some of the older buildings, depending upon size and location.

Commissioner Meyer asked for clarification that the prioritization criteria are just one of the components used to evaluate the appropriateness of awarding funding to a project. Staff confirmed.

The Commission discussed developing a scoring matrix to assist in reviewing funding proposals. Commission Vice Chair Scharnett requested a way to evaluate the community impact of funding a project. Ms. Pemberton proposed an evaluation score related to the historic status of a building. Commissioner Peters requested a way to score the impact to the structure. Commission Chair Koos requested a way to take the existing building condition into consideration and recommended using the categories Staff had previously created to evaluate the Franklin Square properties. Commission Vice Chair Scharnett requested a way to evaluate the opportunities that a project creates for the Downtown.

Ms. Pemberton committed to drafting and providing a scoring sheet that presents the items discussed in a manner that they may be consistently evaluated across projects, and will begin providing completed grant reports as they become available to provide ample time for the Commission to review in advance of the next meeting.

Adjournment


Commissioner Miller made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Meyer, to adjourn.

AYES: Commissioner Lindenbaum; Commissioner Elterich; Commissioner Meyer; Commission Vice Chair Koos; Commission Chair Scharnett; Commissioner Peters; Commissioner Miller

Motion carried (viva voce).

The Meeting Adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

CITY OF BLOOMINGTON



Chair Greg Koos



Staff Liaison Alissa Pemberton

Exhibit A Excerpts from Staff Presentation

Amendments & Updates to the Funk Grant Guidelines

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

1. Increase maximum award value from \$5,000 to \$7,500
2. Add a 25% cost share for National Register properties (non-S-4)
3. Remove “Landscaping” from limitation of funding (9d) and add funding for designated landscaping only
4. Add periodic funding for “Preservation Maintenance Plans” as a separate line item.
5. Amend applicability/limitation to allow funding of phased painting projects.
6. Minor Updates and Changes

A vote on the content and context should be considered at this time; a vote on the precise language for implementation will be requested at a future meeting.

Determining what qualifies as a “Major Restoration” project.

Current guidelines state, “Any one applicant may receive only one grant per fiscal year, per property, except for major restoration projects which may be considered for two.”

Grants awards for >\$5,000 in the **last 5 years** have been granted at rate of **one or fewer per year**.

| Funk Grants ≥ \$5,000 | |
|-----------------------|---|
| FY23 | 3 |
| FY22 | 4 |
| FY21 | 3 |
| FY20 | 4 |
| FY19 | 3 |

More than \$6,000 remained unawarded last year.

IL State Historic Preservation Office Tax Assessment Freeze Program

Requires a historic property to undergo a rehabilitation whose budget **exceeds 25% of the property’s assessor’s fair market value** within a 24-month period.

Title I Property Improvement Loan Program (HUD)

The maximum amount for a Single Family property improvement loan for the alteration, repair or improvement of an existing single family structure is **\$25,000**.

Selecting a Benchmark for what qualifies as “Major Restoration”

Potential Project Budgets and which would “max out” the potential award value

| EAV | Franklin Square | Davis-Jefferson | N Roosevelt | E Grove | ECV | Franklin Square | Davis-Jefferson | N Roosevelt | E Grove |
|-----|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|-----|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|
| 10% | \$ 6,180 | \$ 7,151 | \$ 3,371 | \$ 6,469 | 10% | \$ 18,540 | \$ 21,452 | \$ 10,113 | \$ 19,406 |
| 15% | \$ 9,270 | \$ 10,726 | \$ 5,057 | \$ 9,703 | 15% | \$ 27,811 | \$ 32,178 | \$ 15,170 | \$ 29,109 |
| 25% | \$ 15,450 | \$ 17,877 | \$ 8,428 | \$ 16,171 | 25% | \$ 46,351 | \$ 53,630 | \$ 25,283 | \$ 48,514 |
| 30% | \$ 18,540 | \$ 21,452 | \$ 10,113 | \$ 19,406 | 30% | \$ 55,621 | \$ 64,356 | \$ 30,340 | \$ 58,217 |
| 35% | \$ 21,631 | \$ 25,027 | \$ 11,799 | \$ 22,640 | 35% | \$ 64,892 | \$ 75,082 | \$ 35,396 | \$ 67,920 |
| 40% | \$ 24,721 | \$ 28,603 | \$ 13,484 | \$ 25,874 | 40% | \$ 74,162 | \$ 85,808 | \$ 40,453 | \$ 77,623 |
| 45% | \$ 27,811 | \$ 32,178 | \$ 15,170 | \$ 29,109 | 45% | \$ 83,432 | \$ 96,534 | \$ 45,509 | \$ 87,326 |
| 50% | \$ 30,901 | \$ 35,753 | \$ 16,855 | \$ 32,343 | 50% | \$ 92,702 | \$ 107,260 | \$ 50,566 | \$ 97,029 |

| EAV % | ECV% | Current Max | Proposed Max |
|-------|------|-------------|--------------|
| 10 | 3.3 | \$ 10,000 | \$ 15,000 |
| 15 | 5 | | |
| 25 | 8.3 | | |
| 30 | 10.0 | | |
| 35 | 11.7 | | |
| 40 | 13.3 | | |
| 45 | 15.0 | | |
| 50 | 16.7 | | |

Note: by IL law, EAV = 1/3 ECV

Selecting a Benchmark for what qualifies as “Major Restoration”

Real-Life Results of Project Budgets, Funding and EAV Comparisons

| EAV | Project Cost | Funding | Project % of EAV | % of Project Cost Covered | FY |
|-----------|--------------|---------|------------------|---------------------------|------|
| \$43,521 | \$12,650 | \$5,000 | 29% | 40% | 2021 |
| \$49,449 | \$34,500 | \$5,000 | 70% | 14% | 2021 |
| \$55,390 | \$29,400 | \$5,000 | 53% | 17% | 2021 |
| \$51,433 | \$15,805 | \$1,838 | 31% | 12% | 2021 |
| \$101,313 | \$1,850 | \$925 | 2% | 50% | 2021 |
| \$104,414 | \$12,800 | \$5,000 | 12% | 39% | 2021 |
| \$47,346 | \$6,150 | \$3,075 | 13% | 50% | 2021 |
| \$73,622 | \$11,535 | \$5,000 | 16% | 43% | 2022 |
| \$79,564 | \$1,575 | \$788 | 2% | 50% | 2022 |
| \$41,501 | \$47,500 | \$5,000 | 114% | 11% | 2022 |
| \$62,679 | \$9,200 | \$4,600 | 15% | 50% | 2022 |
| \$66,898 | \$16,709 | \$5,000 | 25% | 30% | 2023 |
| \$103,917 | \$8,960 | \$4,480 | 9% | 50% | 2023 |

| Project % of EAV | % of Project Cost Covered |
|------------------|---------------------------|
| ≤ 25% | 50% (Max) |
| > 25 - < 30 | 25% - 50% |
| ≥ 30 - < 50 | ≤ 25% |
| ≥ 50 | |

Note: by IL law, EAV = 1/3 ECV



Recommendation UPDATES & AMENDMENTS TO FUNK GRANT GUIDELINES

Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Commission take the following actions:

Motion to approve the content of the amendments to the Funk Grant Guidelines, as presented, and direct Staff to return with proposed language to effect the changes.

Motion to classify projects with cost >45% of a property’s Equalized Assessed Value (EAV) as “Major Restoration” projects.

Motion to establish a subcommittee to identify what constitutes a “qualified professional,” as related to the Preservation Maintenance Plan item, and any criteria that should be required of a plan itself to be eligible for reimbursement.

Rust Grant Guidelines Defining Priorities Discussion

1. Preserving a historic property.
2. Restoring a historic property.
3. Projects that improve ADA Compliance for a historic or non-historic property.
4. Preserving a non-historic property.
5. Restoring a non-historic property.
6. Maintenance of a historic property.
7. Maintenance of a non-historic property

For Discussion

- Discuss examples of Eligible Improvements in the context of recent proposals.
- Attempt to develop clear definitions and/or rubric for applying general definitions of prioritization terms to funding proposals.
- Identify potential needs and information from applicants or Staff to assist in review of the coming round of funding proposals.

| PRESERVATION | RESTORATION | MAINTENANCE |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| ? | ? | ? |
| ? | ? | ? |
| ? | ? | ? |
| ? | ? | ? |
| ? | ? | ? |
| ? | ? | ? |
| ? | ? | ? |