

**MINUTES
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
April 10, 2008**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Jody Cole
Tom Liden
Estok Menton
Tom Hise
Richard Moser, Chair
Nick Thayer

OTHERS PRESENT

Dave Hull
Julie Hull
Maya Simerson
Kerry Randall
Jimmy Brown

MEMBERS ABSENT

Alan Nicholson

STAFF PRESENT

Senior Planner Townsend
Cathy Elawadly, Recording
Secretary

The meeting of the Design Review Board was called to order by Chair Moser at 2:00 p.m., at Ukiah Civic Center, Conference Room No. 3, 300 Seminary Avenue, Ukiah, California.

2. ROLL CALL

Roll was taken with the results listed above.

3. AUDIENCE COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

No one came forward.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 13, 2008 minutes

M/S Liden/Moser to approve March 13, 2008 minutes, as submitted. Motion carried.

ABSTAIN: Member Cole

5. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

5A. Façade Improvement Grant Program: Review program emphasis and eligibility requirements, for possible recommendation to Ukiah Redevelopment Agency.

Senior Planner Townsend stated the DRB has expressed interest in clarifying project eligibility and its responsibility in making project recommendations to the RDA under the adopted Façade Improvement Grant program guidelines with the increase in grants to \$50,000 per store front with a lifetime maximum of \$100,000. The FY 2007-08 Façade Improvement grant program budget is \$100,000. While the FIP budget amount is \$100,000 per year, there may be more reflected in the budget for a particular fiscal year for projects that have been approved and funding encumbered, but the funding not yet disbursed.

Senior Planner Townsend recommended discussion of the following eligibility improvement guidelines and stated any recommendations for amendments will be forwarded to the Finance Review Committee (FRC):

1. Eligibility of projects as a whole and specific to various components.
2. Project costs.
3. Maintenance versus rehabilitation, repair or refurbishing of elements.
4. Public/private partnership.

5. Energy upgrades.
6. Proactive program.

To assist with the discussion, staff included excerpts relevant to the FIP guidelines relevant to program emphasis, eligible improvements and expenses, and program exclusions.

Staff/Committee discussed the above-referenced eligibility improvements in conjunction with the existing guidelines for the FIP as follows:

- It may be that the FIP should be divided into two different programs, one for façade and one for landscaping and other elements. The annual \$100,000 budget funding amount would then be divided into two pots of money, which can be accomplished under one application. Potentially dividing the funding into two different programs may actually simplify the process.
- The intent of the program is to make a visual impact and make as good of use of public funds as possible.
- There was discussion about expanding boundaries for the program, since the program has essentially expanded and consideration includes the Downtown District and City gateways. The City gateways could be expanded to include not only Perkins Street and Gobbi Street, but to strip mall areas along Talmage Road and South on State Street by Miller Donuts and/or as far north as State Street/Brush Street and State Street/Empire Drive where the commercial establishments of the Tack Room and Diamond Jim's are located.

The City gateways are the primary areas a person first sees when traveling from the freeway and entering Ukiah where visual presentation is important because the appearance makes a statement about the community.

The Committee acknowledged while the presentations of the gateways are important, expansion of FIP boundaries may not be the best approach whereby the primary concentration should likely be the Downtown area and/or areas within the Commercial Development Design Guidelines. The objective is to determine how to get the 'most bang for the buck' without expending all or most of the funding on one project to attain the desired visual impact necessary, since the annual funding amount does not go very far.

The Committee was also concerned with sporadic façade improvements that beautify one site while another site nearby is in need of renovation/repairs/maintenance, by expanding the boundaries too far.

Staff stated it may be that certain areas should be targeted whereby the property owners are contacted about making repairs and maintenance to the site or building.

- The Committee also favored the concept of recruiting potential properties that could benefit from the FIP by advertising that an active program exists. The property owner can decide whether or not to apply. A Press Release can be issued advising that funding is available.
- It would be the Committee's role to determine which components of a project can be funded and make a recommendation to the Finance Review Committee since

there may be many components as in the case of the Hull project on E. Gobbi Street. The role of the DRB is to decide whether or not a project would be a nice design and an asset to the community. The Committee is aware such decisions can be subjective.

- Staff noted an applicant should be made aware early on that a project or component of a project may not be funded. At the same time, a conceptual design/plan of the project is important so that the Committee has an understanding of what the applicant is trying to accomplish. It may not be necessary for the applicant to spend a lot of money on elaborate project plans during the initial evaluation stage when the Committee looks at the merits of the project being proposed. The applicant should have the opportunity to meet with the DRB and present some kind concept that does not necessarily have to be real detailed. It would be at this point the Committee could decide which components of the project could be funded and why it can be funded so that the applicant has sufficient information to be able to bring back a more detailed design concept/plan.
- Funding availability will also depend on the time of year and the number of projects being considered or that have been considered and the money encumbered.
- The Committee's role is also to evaluate the degree of impact the proposed improvement would make compared to the existing conditions.
- The Ukiah Main Street Program can be of assistance with regard to advertisement of the FIP.
- The key to a quality project is the need to encourage improvements as part of the process.
- There are buildings in the Downtown Design District that could benefit from the FIP.

The Commission addressed the matter of maintaining the existing boundaries and questioned how the desire to expand the boundaries came about.

Senior Planner Townsend commented the subject of potentially expanding the FIP boundaries came about from suggestions and discussions with applicants, Councilmembers and other persons interested in the FIP.

Chair Moser commented it may make better sense for the DRB to recommend money be set aside for property improvements in the City's gateways, as opposed to dividing the FIP into two separate pots of money. Since the amount of money that can be apportioned is an issue, it may be that gateways should be a later consideration or that gateways should not be a consideration at all. He cited the sign north of town advertising Ukiah is located in the City's gateway and needs renovation, noting the importance of first impressions.

Vice Chair Menton stated it may be the gateway boundaries should include Gobbi and Perkins Streets to the freeway and State Street to the north and south boundaries of the City limits.

There was discussion about possibly excluding Talmage as a gateway.

The Committee noted projects in the Downtown where a new color palette and awnings have made a significant difference in the appearance of buildings and completed at a reasonable cost whereas other properties in the gateways, for instance, might require much more renovation at a higher cost than the FIP can fund in order to beautify a building and/or property. It is therefore, important for the Board to consider projects case-by-case relative to the amount of funding that is available and can be appropriated and to formulate a chart or format for the purpose of prorating by percentage the different elements of a project for eligibility and reimbursement at 50% as they relate to landscaping, building exterior treatments, materials, and paint schemes, roof/gutter systems, walkways, fencing, windows/doors, lighting, paving, and drainage. Having a \$100,000 annual cap actually restricts the types of improvements that can be done for a project. It would be the responsibility of the DRB to determine which components of a project can be funded.

- With regard to eligibility of projects as a whole, the Committee agreed a pre-application is necessary in order to determine which elements of a project would be eligible for funding. This aspect should be addressed in the FIP guidelines.
- The FIP guidelines should emphasize a project objective as being the best visual impact for the public's money wherein the improvements should be façade-related rather than structural and/or retrofitting improvements.
- The existing 'Program Emphasis' section of the guidelines includes: Buildings with deteriorated facades, historic buildings and sites, landscaping and related site elements in highly visible locations such as City gateways and Downtown core, improvements that incentivize private investment that would not otherwise be undertaken consistent with RDA and City objectives, and buildings/site elements in significantly blighted areas serving as a catalyst for investment by other property owners in the area.
- The FIP guidelines should emphasize program beautification extends to all types of building facades as opposed to just emphasizing façade improvements for buildings having an obvious need due to significant deterioration.
- There was discussion whether to eliminate 'City gateways' from the 'Program Emphasis' section. Staff pointed out the General Plan defines gateways pertinent to North and South State Street, Perkins and Gobbi Streets, and Talmage and Low Gap Roads.
- It was noted the Eligible Improvements and Expenses category allows for the addition or renovation of exterior architectural elements, doors, windows, awnings, landscaping, exterior lighting in conjunction with façade work, and certain types of passive energy conservation improvements. There was a discussion about the definition of passive energy.
- **Member Cole** questioned the guidelines as they relate to funding for energy upgrades and whether this should be included in another City energy-conservation program rather than a part of the FIP.
- **Chair Moser** stated funding should be made available for a window or door replacement that is energy saving if it significantly impacts the appearance and/or contributes to the longevity of a building because it relates to long-term beautification.
- The Committee addressed 'Proactive Program' and whether the City should solicit/target certain buildings, properties or areas for participation in the FIP and agreed the Ukiah Main Street Program could be of assistance in this regard.

- The Committee also addressed the matter of FIP funding relative to Maintenance versus Rehabilitation, Repair or Refurbishing of Elements section. The City's commercial property maintenance ordinance makes it the responsibility of the property owner to maintain the property. The Program Emphasis provides the greatest guidance in this regard,' noting there are situations where property owners neglect for lack of money to make improvements that could result in blight or a condition having a negative impact in the community who can apply for funding. The degree and/or whether a project necessitates improvements and/or is a quality project would be evaluated by Board, since the property owner is essentially responsible for maintenance such as painting and/or other features that affect the overall aesthetics and, the Board may decide to consider funding only segments of a proposed project after reviewing the cost estimates for the work being done.
- It is important to emphasize that owners use quality paint brands for façade improvements for longevity purposes, which only applies to commercial properties.
- **Member Thayer** stated the guidelines state funding cannot be used to help someone out of a maintenance ordinance violation where the project was tagged by City Code Enforcement for non-compliance with City Codes. The section relevant to 'Program Exclusions' includes: "New construction projects, code compliance or legalization of illegal or nonconforming construction or uses, and projects involving buildings in a state of deterioration beyond repair." It is for this reason that property owners comply with the maintenance ordinance and consistently make necessary repairs before the property deteriorates beyond repair with the understanding public funding is available.
- The Committee agreed projects should be held to the highest standard even though the FIP is paying for ½ of the improvement work. Applicants should be encouraged to meet with color consultants/architects because it is not the DRB's role to design projects. It is the DRB's role to evaluate projects and make recommendations.
- **Member Cole** referred to 'Eligible Improvements and Expenses,' and inquired why planning, building permit and professional fees such as engineering, architectural, historical or design professional fees are eligible for funding under the FIP grants because the end product may not be what the DRB's is looking for in a project.
- **Chair Moser** stated the key to a quality project is to encourage rather than discourage persons to consider the FIP wherein it may be crucial to the quality of project for an applicant to consult with an engineer or architect to maintain a quality project. This process also assists the DRB in its evaluation of a project in order to understand what aspects of a project may be structural in nature and which aspects pertain to actual façade-related improvements.
- The Committee agreed essentially 'everything' is initially eligible under the FIP wherein it is the DRB's role to effectively evaluate by prioritizing projects to determine how much can be funded for a project and to encourage applicants to complete a pre-application so the Board can provide direction. During the initial pre-application process, an applicant can present 'conceptual' drawings/plans, allowing the DRB to make recommendations about the project.
- **Chair Moser** emphasized the DRB's objective is to look at projects for effective ways to 'beautify and enhance' the community.

Senior Planner Townsend stated even though Member Nicholson was unable to attend today's meeting, he would like to be able to provide input about the discussions. The matter was therefore continued to May 8.

5B. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

ON A MOTION by **Member Menton**, seconded by **Member Liden** to elect Richard Moser as Chair. Motion carried.

ON A MOTION by **Member Liden**, seconded by **Member Cole** to elect Estok Menton as Vice-Chair. Motion carried.

5C. Review adopted Commercial Development Design Guidelines and other adopted documents; discuss topics for joint Design Review Board/Planning Commission meeting.

No discussion.

6. MATTERS FROM STAFF

6A. Continuation of Review: **Downtown Ukiah-Perkins Street Corridor Form-Based Zoning Code Amendment**, City of Ukiah Planning and Community Development Department: Review and comment on proposal.

Senior Planner Townsend referred to her Memorandum dated March 27, 2008 regarding continuation of review relevant to the Downtown Ukiah-Perkins Street Corridor Form-Based Zoning Code Amendment, and stated the intent of the memorandum is to provide staff's responses to questions/concerns/issues in summary form that have been raised about SMARTCODE. It may be the DRB desires to address SMARTCODE at another meeting. Specifically, questions were raised about code sections/Tables: 9070 (Purpose and Intent), 9072 (Procedures and Process), 9073 (Zoning Map and Regulating Plan), 9074 (Building and Site Plans relative to uses), (Table 6 Summary of Standards/Table 9 relative to residential density, block perimeter, lot size, façade width, lot coverage, building height) sections on Parking, Architectural Standards, Landscape Standards, Signage, Lighting, Circulation, Other Standards and Requirements relative to noise, toxic substances/odors, drainage and water quality, and fire protection, and Other Issues relative to law enforcement, solid waste, Airport regulations, floodplain. She included comments from Alan Nicholson as they relate to Architectural Standards (materials and elements), openings, roofs and rooflines, screening and fences, and corner treatments.

Senior Planner Townsend commented as follows:

- Staff has been focusing on aligning the new roads and alleys with property lines relative to the Regulating Plan/SMARTCODE documents through the use of aerial photographs and Assessors parcel numbers in conjunction with the location of buildings for clarity/continuity purposes because some of the proposed new roads/alleys would go through buildings. The other concept about alleys is that property owners will have to address access issues particularly if parking is located to the rear of buildings.
- Staff has been looking at the size and shapes of lots whether or not they would be feasible for development.

Member Hise stated in his conversations with property owners in the Downtown, the next step would be to hire a consultant to address the questions raised and other issues

about SMARTCODE so that the document can move forward from a concept into an adopted and working document.

The Committee will discuss this agenda item in greater detail at a later date.

Member Liden inquired about the process for addressing the issues/questions raised since he has concerns that adoption and application of SMARTCODE could essentially make Ukiah look like every other community that has adopted the Code.

Senior Planner Townsend addressed an e-mail from Member Nicholson regarding site view at 307 N. State Street.

7 FAÇADE IMPROVEMENT GRANT PROGRAM

7A. Façade Improvement Grant Program 07-06, City of Ukiah, 200 S. School Street. Replace awning fabric and repaint Ukiah Valley Conference Center. (Continuation of Review) Recommendation to Finance Review Committee

Senior Planner Townsend commented the Ukiah Valley Conference Center received initial feedback from the DRB on March 13, 2008 and asked the applicant to explore additional colors that would coordinate with the proposed new awning while maintaining the Art Deco Style of the building.

The applicant submitted a new proposed awning fabric and color palette, as shown on the color boards presented to the Committee. The work proposed involves:

1. Replacing the existing five burgundy awnings along school street with Charcoal Tweed canvas (Sunbrella #4607) using the existing frames. The cost estimate is \$15,000.
2. Replacing the existing burgundy awning and frame over the main entrance to the Conference Center at the Oak Street entrance with an extended canopy, maintaining the same rounded effect to match the other awnings. The cost estimate is \$4,000.
3. Preparing exterior building surface for painting. The building is currently painted in pink tones. The applicant is proposing a four tone pallet to include Silver Trophy, Wood Anemone, Seal Gray and Deep Garret. The cost estimate is \$25,000.

According to the Commercial Downtown Development Design Guidelines, building facades within the Downtown area should have visual variety and distinctiveness and exterior paint colors should relate to natural building materials and be compatible to surrounding properties.

In terms of consistency with the FIP grant guidelines:

- Type and location of work: Exterior awnings, paint and preparation are eligible expenses. Facades are emphasized. Walls not facing public streets are eligible on a case by case basis when highly visible. Given the mass of the building and its location downtown, staff recommends all work be considered for eligibility.
- Cost: The total cost is \$44,000 of which 50% of eligible expenses could be considered for reimbursement. The FIP allows a lifetime maximum reimbursement of \$50,000 per storefront. The building has not previously received a FIP grant.

Staff/applicant/Committee commented as follows:

- Staff advised Member Nicholson was not supportive of the color scheme.
- **Maya Simerson** referred to the proposed color scheme and demonstrated how the different color palettes would be effectively applied where the intent is to provide for a nice contrast and aesthetically pleasing building that is compatible with other buildings in the neighborhood and complementary to the community. The exterior color scheme will blend in nicely with the existing interior colors.
- **Kerry Randall** stated selection of an exterior color palette to be harmonious with the existing color scheme for the interior of the building was the most cost effective approach.
- The DRB supports extending the awning behind the existing awning at the back entrance on Oak Street.
- The DRB emphasized selecting quality paint to maintain longevity.
- It was noted the preparation work for painting of the exterior should be included in the cost estimate as being part of the paint process rather than as a separate cost.
- It was noted the existing frames for awnings will be kept except for an additional frame on the Oak Street door will be needed.
- There was a discussion about the proposed color palettes in keeping with the 'Art Deco' architectural style as opposed to the use of darker earth tones that anchor the building and help reduce the mass.
- The applicant noted the primary color palette effectively softens the appearance of the building and the other color palettes provide the balance necessary for a nice presentation. The color of the awnings was selected to provide for that extra harmonious touch.
- The applicant advised the RFP's for bids are ready to go out.
- It was noted since the applicant is the City of Ukiah, additional money should be added to the \$100,000 pot so that the proposed project does not take away from other projects.
- **Chair Moser** stated the DRB can make a recommendation to the FRB supporting approval of the project, but final cost figures must be submitted before the project can actually be approved. The DRB requested the applicant come back to either to Board or to staff with the final cost figures.
- **Senior Planner Townsend** stated with regard to the cost estimates in the sum of \$44,000, the alternative would be for the Board to affirm that the final costs should not exceed the estimated sum. It could be the final cost for the project is less.
- **Member Liden** supports the proposed color scheme as being 'very warm' and provides for a 'clean' appearance and highly complementary to the Downtown.
- **Senior Planner Townsend** commented the Ukiah Conference Center is essentially the 'hub of commerce' in the Downtown because people from all over the State use the facility. She supported forming a sub-committee to look at different color palettes.
- **Kerry Randall** addressed other buildings that feature light colors with contrasting grays to enhance/enrich the appearance and in keeping with the Art Deco form of architecture.
- The DRB likes the proposed colors scheme and does not support the application of earth tone colors for the building.

M/S Hise/Cole to recommend the Finance Review Committee approves Façade Improvement Grant Program 07-06 contingent on compliance with the project Conditions of Approval. Motion carried.

7B. Façade Improvement Grant Program 07-05, Dave Hull, 376 E. Gobbi Street. Paint and reroof building, landscaping and parking lot improvement: Recommendation to Finance Review Committee.

Senior Planner Townsend commented as follows:

- The applicant has applied for a FIP grant to update his building on East Gobbi Street.
- The project involves the following improvements:
 - Parking Lot – Re-grade and repave the parking lot.
 - Landscaping – Replace all existing trees with shade trees, add landscape strip with shrubs and trees along the northern property line to provide a break between the site and the mobilehome park to the north, remove a portion of the front walkway and replace with permeable pavers along with a new planter, remove trees on the east side of the building and replace with low growing shrubs and small entry trees, add small fence along the front landscape area, and add lighting.
 - Building exterior – Paint the existing building and covered walkway along with the existing wood post and beams, and replace the existing window and doors.
 - Roof – Replace existing roof with clay tiles.
 - Fence – New fence along the east property line to be installed between the parking lot and the existing retail store. A chain link fence is proposed for the portion of the fence hidden behind the store and a wrought iron fence is proposed for the portion that will be seen from the street. A wrought iron fence is also proposed along the front landscape area along the E. Gobbi street sidewalk.
- The project received a pre-application review by the DRB and more recently a review wherein the Board made many suggestions relevant to the conceptual site plan, requesting the applicant bring back a more defined plan specific to landscaping design, color and material choices.
- As addressed in the staff report, the applicant revised his project and proposes for the roof a ‘one-piece S Clay Tile – color combination of El Camino Blend, Mallorca, and Fire Flash. For the exterior paint color, a three tone color palette is proposed. Ferncliffe for the main color, Oxford brown for the trim around the windows and doors and Saltillo for the roof trim. For the landscaping, the applicant has submitted a detailed landscape plan that includes 15 gallon Maples ‘Autumn Glory’ trees proposed for the interior of the parking lot also serving as a street tree, and six 15 gallon Sycamore trees are proposed along the northern property line. A portion of the front walkway will be removed and replaced with permeable pavers along with a new planter. With regard to the fence, a small wrought iron fence is proposed in the front landscape area along E. Gobbi Street.
- Table 1 on page 2 of the staff report provides a revised list of the cost estimates relative to painting the building’s exterior, a roof and gutter system, fencing, windows/doors, landscaping/irrigation/lighting, front pavers and grading/drainage and paving for a total of \$121,213.
- Since the building has not previously received a FIP grant, the grant allows 50% of eligible expenses up to \$50,000 to be considered for reimbursement with a

lifetime maximum reimbursement of \$100,000 per storefront. The maximum reimbursement that could be considered at this time is \$50,000. Staff determined the proposed exterior painting, roof replacement and landscaping along with the windows and doors replacement are eligible items for funding because they are part of the façade that is highly visible from E. Gobbi Street, which is a City gateway.

- Staff recommends the Board discuss whether the wrought iron fence should be eligible for reimbursement under the grant program.
- Staff further recommends the Board review whether or not parking lot repaving would be an eligible item. Staff supports parking lot remediation as required to enlarge and install new planters and improve the aesthetics of the site and recommends **50% of the costs for paving one-half of the site be eligible.**
- Table 2 on pages 2 and 3 of the staff report, shows the recommended eligible expenses reimbursable at 50% for a total of \$27,569 not to exceed \$30,000.
- Staff calculated the eligible expenses relative to drainage and irrigation by percentage based on the site because more information about the project was needed in order to make a more informed recommendation.
- While the applicant initially proposed installing trash/recycling containers, staff is of the opinion this project component is necessary and therefore, suggests that \$30,000 be encumbered for the project to help fund 50% of the trash/recycle enclosure.

Dave Hull commented as follows:

- He met with a color consultant and proposes an alternative color scheme that provides for a Reckwick Olive for the body, Fiery Brown and Rookwood Terra Cotta for the window trim/eaves and facia/posts/front door.
- He proposed a change in the windows materials as featured in an Anderson windows and patio doors catalogue to be of a sandtone color. He submitted a cost estimate in the sum of \$2,712.56 from Home Depot's bid room, which is significantly less than originally proposed.
- A French door is proposed where there is no window for southeast corner of the building on the Gobbi Street face.
- He commented briefly on the proposed landscaping features, particularly the proposed tree species for the site and parking lot.
- The roof treatment remains the same as initially proposed.
- The applicant's Farmers Insurance Group business and the District Office of Farmers Insurance Group will be the only occupants.
- He intends to replace the front door and he will submit a cost estimate for the new door.

Staff/applicant/DRB discussed the project as follows:

- **Member Liden** commented the proposed new color scheme is lighter and less contrasting than the initial proposal.
- The Committee supports the proposed new color scheme for the building exterior.
- **Member Thayer** addressed the shade producing trees proposed for the parking lot, including the parking area to the north.
- **Dave Hull** stated portions of the landscaping plan that includes the proposed fencing are the result of problems with people trespassing on his property.

- The DRB addressed the matter of the windows type and grade and corresponding color selection and agreed the color of the windows would blend nicely with the new color palette.
- **Dave Hull** stated the cost of windows vary depending upon type and grade.
- **Dave Hull** needs to relocate his business as soon as possible to the E. Gobbi Street site and advised he must begin work on the building/site improvements.
- **Member Thayer** asked about how the fencing would work.
- **Dave Hull** is reluctant to install extensive landscaping without a fence around the perimeter because it would get ruined by the homeless and/or other undesirables in the area that trespass on his property. The wrought iron fencing will be black.
- **Member Thayer** commented on the design of the fence and suggested the top treatment on the fence be a ball rather than of arrow design.
- There was discussion about the exiting Redwood trees and other vegetative species that would be a good fit and be able to compete with the size of the Redwood trees.
- **Member Thayer** stated the existing Junipers Trees will be left on the site. The front of the site will be of evergreen tree species and the Maples (Autumn Glory) and existing Cedars for the interior of the site will be representative of the Fall colors. Vines will clad to the chain link fence in the rear of the property. The irrigation system/pavers will function to ensure vegetative survival. The site will also feature Manzanita, sycamore trees, Feather Grass, and other vegetative species provided for on Attachment 3 of the staff report.
- Staff noted fencing was not recommended for eligibility.
- **Dave Hull** expressed concerned about the landscape budget, which was originally \$15,000 and is now \$24,065, particularly with the plan changes relative to the vegetation and paving of the parking lot on the northern boundary. Originally, staff recommended 50% of the asphalt be eligible for reimbursement wherein the FIP participation has been reduced to from \$50,000 to \$30,000. It was his understanding there would be 100% FIP participation for the roof, painting of the building's exterior, and landscaping with the exception of some elements relative to lighting. Now that the participation for the parking lot will be 50% as opposed to 100%, it would be costly for him to 'saw-cut' the asphalt to prepare for the landscaping around the building. He questions the consistency of participation if the FIP will include exterior building painting, roof, and landscaping with the exception of the asphalt for rear parking lot. He could exclude improvements to the northern most parking lot and/or pay out-of-pocket to have the existing pavement 'saw-cut' to accommodate the landscaping and pave the front parking area, since this portion would be included in the participation. Saw-cutting takes time and is costly in terms of labor.
- Staff commented on the original participation of \$50,000 wherein the cost was projected at \$165,000, and noted even with elimination of the grading, paving, and drainage reducing the projected cost to \$115,000, the project would still be over what can be expended. She referred to the recommended eligible expenses and stated this is the reason the project cost for drainage and irrigation in the sum of \$59,000 was apportioned by percentage for a total of \$14,750. There was not sufficient detail to the plan for staff to factor in the cost of 'saw-cutting' pavement.
- Staff estimated the eligibility costs at \$55,139 x 50% reimbursement for a total of \$27,569.

- There was discussion about the most cost effective way to prepare for the landscaping with the reduction in participation for the paving.
- **Chair Moser** stated not every item of the project would be eligible for reimbursement with regard to all aspects of landscaping and paving so it may not be possible for Mr. Hull to make all improvement as originally anticipated. Therefore, the DRB must decide whether to accept the project as being a 'good' design' according to eligibility under the FIP guidelines if certain aspects of the original plans such as landscaping and paving of the northern portion of site were eliminated relative to the staff's recommendation in Table 2 of the staff report.
- **Dave Hull** commented his project costs would be reduced if certain portions of the landscaping and paving were eliminated since the participation has changed. He inquired whether the Board will consider participating in the cost of paving the parking lot to the north since the participation in paving of the site has been reduced. He recommended approving the building and roofing portion of the project, since the DRB supports the design aspects for this portion of project and leave out the paving and landscaping portion of the proposal at this time.
- **Member Thayer** recommended dividing the project into phases wherein Phase I would include the building and roof and Phase II would include landscaping and paving.
- The Committee supports approval of the building's exterior and roof improvements and leaving the landscaping/paving and other issues to be continued.

M/S Thayer/Liden to recommend the Finance Review Committee approve for Grant Program 07-05 contingent on compliance with the project Conditions of Approval with regard to the building's exterior and roof only and leave the landscaping/paving and other issues to be continued for discussion at a later date. Motion carried.

8. SET NEXT MEETING/ADJOURNMENT:

The DRB set a tentative date of April 24, 2008 to continue with Board business. If this date is not feasible, the next regular meeting will be May 8, 2008.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:26 p.m.

Richard Moser, Chair

Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary