



City of Ukiah, CA  
Design Review Board

---

---

MINUTES

---

---

Regular Meeting July 9, 2009  
Conference Room 3 3:00 p.m.  
Ukiah Civic Center, 300 Seminary Avenue

---

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL Present: Tom Hise, Nick Thayer,  
Alan Nicholson, Tom Liden  
Richard Moser, Chair  
Absent: Jody Cole, Estok Menton  
Others Present: None  
Staff Present: Jennifer Faso, Associate Planner  
Kim Jordan, Senior Planner  
Gordon Elton, Director of Finance  
Sage Sangiacomo, Assistant City Manager  
Cathleen Moller, Economic Development  
Manager  
Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary

---

3. CORRESPONDENCE – None

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – April 9, 2009, May 6, 2009, June 25, 2009

5. AUDIENCE COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS – None

6. RIGHT TO APPEAL – N/A

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

7A. Discussion and possible action on the revisions to the Façade Improvement Program

- Roles and responsibilities of Design Review Board and Finance Review Committee

- The DRB role for FIP projects is to make a recommendation to the FRC for funding based on the criteria/guidelines as to which components of the project are eligible. While the DRB has criteria/guidelines to follow for projects, determining whether a project has value, is a good use of RDA funds and how to 'get the most bag for the buck' is not always easy.
- FRC role is to look at projects as to whether there is money available, is the project an acceptable redevelopment expense that meets the statutory guidelines for redevelopment and/or consider whether the project fits with the overall redevelopment plan for the City, and approve the project based on the DRB's recommendation and feedback.
- **Having too many boards/committees involved in the review process would not be feasible.** The DRB that has a mix of professional expertise in design, construction, and architecture to make decisions about the design aspects and determining factors for which components would be eligible and at placing a

1 percentage of value for each component based on eligibility requirements.  
2 These functions should be left to the discretion of the DRB.

- 3 • Projects can be appealed to the RDA.
- 4 • **Look at possibly leveraging the most investment out of each project for the**
- 5 **most worthwhile projects.** The amount of funding available has increased from
- 6 \$10,000 to \$50,000 for a project which has significantly changed the purview of
- 7 the DRB's role. It used to be that DRB approved projects for just new awnings
- 8 and paint. Now, applicants are asking for funding for landscaping and other
- 9 project amenities. The Board evaluates project components by assigning a
- 10 percentage of value in keeping with the criteria and guidelines for assessing the
- 11 projects.
- 12 • **It may be the DRB requires more structure concerning the manner in which**
- 13 **project review are conducted. Additional information would be helpful.** It
- 14 may also be that the process could be more streamlined at staff level when a FIP
- 15 application is initially submitted.
- 16 • The DRB has revised documents and guidelines to better assist with making
- 17 funding decisions about a project in terms of eligibility and whether the project
- 18 has value to the community. The DRB must decide whether a proposed project is
- 19 a good use of public funds in terms of maintaining high standards for
- 20 architectural design.
- 21 • **Update City Resolution outlining the duties and responsibilities of the DRB**
- 22 **and FRC in compliance with the adopted goals/objectives and policies of**
- 23 **the RDA and provide to the DRB.**
- 24 • How should the DRB treat blight?
- 25 • **Should applicants receive funding when it is essentially the property**
- 26 **owner's responsibility to upgrade and provide maintenance to their**
- 27 **buildings.** Where should the responsibility be drawn regarding maintenance that
- 28 could eventually lead to a blighted condition? Should public funding be available
- 29 for general maintenance such as paint?
- 30 • Often property owners do not take advantage of the FIP because they do have
- 31 money for the 50% matching funds.
- 32 • **Some projects require more funding assistance in order to do a quality**
- 33 **project. Where should the line be drawn in this instance?**
- 34 • **If a building is in need of improvement and the property owner is willing,**
- 35 **but unable to pay for the repairs, should public funding be accessible?**
- 36 • **What should occur when the DRB considers a project and the project is**
- 37 **determined to be worthwhile, but the property owner does not have the**
- 38 **capacity to maintain the building or the improvements made.**
- 39 • **A maintenance agreement is required when funding is approved.**

40  
41 - Eligible vs. Ineligible expenses

42 Project Management and Supervision

43 Insurance

44 Profit & Overhead

- 45 • **These expenses are typically the cost of doing business and automatically**
- 46 **incorporated in the line items for cost estimates/bids.**
- 47 • Line items for cost estimates depend upon how much value the DRB gives for
- 48 each component of a project. The DRB can question a line item and request bid
- 49 estimates for cost comparison purposes.

- 1 • There is really no clear-cut way to determine whether a cost is legitimate
- 2 for a line item.
- 3 • It may be helpful for staff to initially inform an applicant of certain pre-
- 4 application costs and/or provide a ballpark figure of what the applicant can
- 5 potentially anticipate in funding. This allows applicant the opportunity to
- 6 rethink/modify their project and project design to come up with a quality
- 7 product and with getting 'the most bang for the buck.'
- 8 • In order to receive funding for an approved project, receipts must be
- 9 submitted and this procedure should remain a policy.
- 10 • Should an automatic percentage be assigned to address overhead costs as
- 11 a duty of responsibility?
- 12 • Are locally owned corporate franchises eligible for FIP funding?

13  
14 - Blight

- 15 • **One of the primary objectives for use of redevelopment funding is to**
- 16 **reduce blight in areas where necessary.**
- 17 • City Code generally directs blighted conditions for properties, but there is still the
- 18 matter of redevelopment blight and how this should be treated. What should
- 19 occur in cases where property owners do not maintain their buildings to City
- 20 Code maintenance standards that allows for a use permit for the building to make
- 21 money and no basic maintenance is performed as a duty of responsibility. Are
- 22 such property owners 'entitled' to redevelopment money for maintenance on
- 23 buildings?
- 24 • **What constitutes 'entitlement' to redevelopment money? Is anyone**
- 25 **entitled? Do property owners have a duty of responsibility to perform**
- 26 **general maintenance on buildings without public funding assistance? A**
- 27 **project should have a specific/well-defined purpose in order to receive**
- 28 **redevelopment money. The key is to leverage the funding in a way that**
- 29 **benefits the community so that the end result is the 'biggest bang for the**
- 30 **buck.'** Is this the perception that exists? Funding should be contingent
- 31 upon compliance with the criteria/guidelines for eligibility, as well as
- 32 project consideration for degree of worthiness.
- 33 • **Applicants receiving FIP funding should live up to their obligations to**
- 34 **preserve and perform general maintenance as is reasonable.**
- 35 • The element of blight is defined according to redevelopment law and is
- 36 subjective.
- 37 • **It would be helpful if DRB has the statutory requirements and/or discussion**
- 38 **language concerning blight for effective decisions purposes.**
- 39 • What happens in cases where a property has expended its lifetime cycle of
- 40 funding and the building/property has become a blighted condition? Is this
- 41 property owner eligible for assistance? What should happen in instances where
- 42 property ownership has changed and the lifetime funding cycle has been
- 43 expended for that property? Should this be treated as maintenance/upkeep and
- 44 is the property owner eligible for assistance? Furthermore, what should occur in
- 45 instances where the tenant is seeking funding because the property owner will
- 46 not paint the building or fix/replace an awning?
- 47 • Is a torn awning considered a blighted condition? Is this a maintenance issue?
- 48 There a fine line between maintenance and what is the property owner's
- 49 responsibility for upkeep to prevent a blighted condition from occurring.
- 50

1 -Façade Improvement District Boundary Lines

- 2 • Has been the topic of many DRB discussions, particularly with trying to define  
3 project areas and establishing priorities/preference for these areas. Initially, FIP  
4 projects were limited more to the Downtown.  
5 • As the boundaries have been expanded, project consideration takes on a range  
6 of new questions and issues. This is when the DRB proposed use of the FIP  
7 Scorecard as a way to rank projects relative to worth and value in a matter of  
8 different ways as provided for on the document. The Scorecard begins with the  
9 location of the project. The DRB may want to revise assignment of a point  
10 system for projects and/or revise the Scorecard in general. Project location does  
11 play a significant role in terms of project preference. Size (linear square footage)  
12 for projects could be a factor to receive more credit, such as a building on a  
13 corner lot or building having a larger façade.  
14 • **It may be that anyone in the project is eligible for funding, but a more**  
15 **recognized scoring system is necessary that will focus/prioritize the**  
16 **gateways/downtown areas emphasized in the Five-Year Redevelopment**  
17 **Implementation Plan goals and objectives.**

18  
19 -Formula/percentage of grant money allocated for each parcel or project.

- 20 • **This is not clearly defined. The FRC relies on DRB decisions about projects**  
21 **and project worthiness.**

22  
23 -Fluctuation of grant funding per Fiscal Year

- 24 • The \$150,000 available per fiscal year for FIP programs is never a use it or lose  
25 it scenario. Money can carry over to the next fiscal if not used. **Given the**  
26 **current economic crisis with the State, it is not known if funding is**  
27 **available each fiscal year. Funding is available for this fiscal year.**

28  
29 **Discussion consensus:**

- 30 • **Staff will provide the DRB with additional information to include**  
31 **redevelopment statutory requirements to use.**  
32 • **Revisit the Scorecard.**

33  
34 **8. NEW BUSINESS – None**

35  
36 **9. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD: None**

37  
38 **10. MATTERS FROM STAFF: None**

39  
40 **11. SET NEXT MEETING/ADJOURNMENT**

41 The next regular meeting will be August 13, 2009. There being no further business, the  
42 meeting adjourned at 4:56 p.m.

43  
44  
45 \_\_\_\_\_  
46 Richard Moser, Chair

47  
48 \_\_\_\_\_  
Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary