

**MINUTES
CITY OF AMES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

Date: January 09, 2023	Edith Hunter	2023
	Susan Minks	2024
Call to Order: 6:00PM	Angie Kolz	2024
Place: Council Chambers	Mary Jo Winder	2024
	Matt Oakley	2023
Adjournment: 8:00PM	Jesse David Chariton	2023
	Rosemary Dale	2025

[*Absent]

CALL TO ORDER: Susan Minks, Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

MOTION: (Winder/Chariton) to approve the Agenda for the meeting of January 09, 2023.

MOTION PASSED: (7-0)

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF DECEMBER 12, 2022:

MOTION: (Chariton/Oakley) to approve the Minutes of the meeting of December 12, 2022 with corrections. Ms. Winder noted that on page 3, the 7th paragraph should say, "encourages modern architecture", not discourages.

MOTION PASSED: (7-0)

PUBLIC FORUM: There were no public comments.

**CONSIDER THE PROPOSED NOMINATION OF THE CRANFORD APARTMENT BUILDING
AT 103 STANTON AVENUE, TO THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES**

Ray Anderson, Planner for the City of Ames, displayed the location and photo of the building at 103 Stanton Avenue on the overhead screens. The State Historic Preservation office requested the Historic Preservation Commission review the buildings eligibility. The Commission must decide if the nominated property meets the National Register criteria. In this case, it is Criterion A. The consultant that prepared the report, Alexa McDowell, was present to answer questions as well as the owners. Mr. Anderson discussed the Statement of Significance that gave a summary as to why the nominated building is significant, and why it should be listed on the National Register of

Historic Places. Staff are recommending Alternative 1 be adopted by the Commission, which is a recommendation to the National Register for National Register eligibility and a recommendation to the State Nominations Review Committee. The State Nominations Review Committee will meet on February 10th, 2023. This item will be on the City Council Agenda for the January 24th meeting. It will include the recommendation form the Commission, as well as a recommendation from the Mayor on the eligibility of this property under Criterion A to be listed on the National Register.

Alexa McDowell from AK Consulting spoke about the nominated property. She noted the first floor of the building has been rehabilitated multiple times. The upper stories are largely intact and have efficiency, one bedroom, and two-bedroom units. The units were plain when they were constructed and have remained that way. In wall Murphy Beds were used originally and although the beds have since been removed, the wall recesses remain intact. The alterations that have impacted the interior and exterior of the building have been the replacement of the windows. Part of the rehabilitation plan is to install period sympathetic windows that would follow the Secretary of the Interiors standards and guidelines.

Ms. McDowell introduced the owners, Rena and Dick Hall. She also introduced the building manager, Nate Walty. Ms. Winder asked if the designation application was to allow for the use of Federal and State tax credits. Ms. McDowell said it was. She described the status of their application with the State and noted they have not had any issues.

Ms. Winder asked Mr. Anderson if it would be best for the Commission to make their recommendation for signing the nomination or if they also recommend that City Council approve the National Register nomination.

Mr. Anderson replied that the Commission's recommendation is going to the State, not to City Council.

Mr. Chariton asked if Mr. Anderson could clarify what Alternative 1 stated and Mr. Anderson reiterated the verbiage.

MOTION: (Winder/Dale) approve the Nomination for listing on the National Register of Historic Places

MOTION PASSED: (6-0) Oakley abstained from voting.

Angie Kolz, Commission Member, asked why the Commission would not include Criterion A in the motion.

Ms. Winder said it was not requested and the criteria are decided by professionals and the Commission doesn't have that collection of knowledge.

Ms. Minks asked if that motion met all the criteria. Mr. Anderson said the question the Commission is to answer is whether the nominated property meets the National Register

of Historic Places criteria for significance in integrity. He noted the Commission is recommending rather than approving to the State Nominations Review Committee that the nominated property meets Criterion A. He explained the Commission needs to go by what the State has provided to them regarding whether the property meets Criterion A.

Ms. Winder said the Commission is charged with approving or denying the nomination as it is presented, and the nomination clearly states it is Criterion A.

Ms. Minks asked the other Commission members if they felt that was adequate.

Edith Hunter, Commission Member, said Criterion A appeared to be the reason the property was nominated.

Mr. Anderson asked what the motion was, and Ms. Winder restated it. Ms. Minks said it doesn't specifically say Criterion A in the motion.

Mr. Anderson stated that recommendations on nominated properties are not normally done this way. He said the Commission is to respond to the Criterion that was selected and answer back whether the Commission recommends the nomination based on that criterion, which was Criterion A in this case.

The motion was withdrawn.

MOTION: (Winder/Kolz) to adopt Alternative #1, to recommend Nation Register eligibility to the State Nominations Review Committee.

MOTION PASSED: (5-1) Voting Nay: Winder. Oakley abstained from voting.

DISCUSS THE 2022 CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT (CLG) ANNUAL REPORT

Eloise Sahlstrom, planner for the City of Ames, said every year the Commission reviews the successes and challenges as well as the work plan. The same information will go to the City Council so the Mayor can sign a form as part of the Certified Local Government Annual Report. Ms. Sahlstrom opened item 8.1 for discussion and asked if there were any edits.

Ms. Dale said she did not have any comments on 8.1 and Ms. Winder agreed. There were no comments for item 8.2

Ms. Winder said the last two bullets under item 8.3 should be under accomplishments or successes instead. She said education of the Historic Preservation Commission seemed to fall under successes and challenges in item 9. Ms. Sahlstrom confirmed she would move the last two bullets from item 8.3 to item 9. Ms. Winder noted she attended a Zoom meeting of the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions and that needs to be added as well as the Preservation Summit.

Ms. Sahlstrom said next was Item 9 concerning challenges. Ms. Winder had brought a statement she shared with the Commission Members.

Ms. Winder said she had written a letter that she wanted to be public record and included with the Annual Report regarding the CLG grant for the survey project. Ms. Winder stated she thought what she wrote presents an accurate and more appropriate narrative than that offered by staff in the Annual Report. The statement provided criticism of the overall process utilized by the City of Ames to administer the grant, including having the students hired as City employees, and that it did not follow the initial grant proposal.

Ms. Winder noted the positives of receiving the \$14,000 grant. Another success was the presentation of the survey project to property owners and interested parties that attended a public meeting. Ms. Winder said the added information may be helpful.

Mr. Oakley said the letter appeared to be something Ms. Winder wanted to be on the record as written. He asked Ms. Winder what the appropriateness was of the letter and asked Planning staff what their response would be.

Ms. Sahlstrom responded describing what occurred with administration of the grant, including the hiring of students and the difficulties of project management that were not anticipated. Once the students became City employees, it was required that a City employee supervise the students. The intent was always to have the Commission involved in managing the quality control and the Historic Preservation aspect of the materials because of the expertise levels of the individuals who originally indicated they would be involved. Staff ultimately had more time with the project than planned and the process of firing one of the students and having Ms. Winder step down from the project added to the City staff involvement. Ultimately, the project was completed with a successful neighborhood meeting and the survey has been submitted to SHPO for approval. Once Ms. Winder withdrew from the project, Ms. Sahlstrom and Ms. Minks spent many hours editing and reviewing the grant materials, beginning in late September of 2022. Ms. Sahlstrom said that had this not been done, the grant would not have been completed in a timely manner. Ms. Sahlstrom disagreed with the terminology Ms. Winder proposed in her letter to use in the Challenges section of the report.

Mr. Oakley asked if the report was a document that represented what the Commission has accomplished or what the City has accomplished. Ms. Sahlstrom said it is representing what has been accomplished for Historic Preservation, primarily through the Commission. Also included in the document were City Council funded events or projects that have not had anything directly to do with the Commission but have furthered Historic Preservation. They have claimed those things as part of the effort for the year.

Mr. Anderson said the City of Ames is the Certified Local Government, which includes Historic Preservation Commission and the City organization. The State designates by community or by county.

Ms. Winder also offered that she did not feel that she was recognized in her intended role as project manager and comfortable with the process once the students were City employees. Ms. Winder also stated City staff took over the project and it was not as it was intended to be, and it interfered with her ability to train the students. It also caused her undue stress to terminate a student, so she had to quit.

Mr. Chariton asked questions regarding the hiring process and if there was a way the students could have been hired as consultants or as 1099 individuals.

Ms. Sahlstrom said when hiring a consultant, the City must post a Request for Proposal (RFP) and interested parties respond via the RFP. That is the State's process for hiring a consultant. Human Resources determined that the process required the students to be employees, apparently there was no other way to do it at the time the decision was made.

Ms. Winder thought there would have been a way to do that, but the Human Resources staff shut down any kind of discussion on an alternative.

Mr. Oakley stated it sounded like the conflict came from the Human Resources protocols for the hiring process and caused the delay of getting the students hired, since they had to be hired as City Employees.

Mr. Oakley said he was trying to be objective in his conversation as he read through Ms. Winder's letter and what was written in the CLG report. Mr. Oakley felt that Ms. Sahlstrom in the report did address the same challenges Ms. Winder put in her letter in a more factual language.

Ms. Dale said Ms. Winder has a right to write what she wants and feel what she wants to feel. Ms. Dale said she thought the emphasis should be on what could be learned from this situation and how to prevent it from happening in the future. Things obviously did go wrong, and the Commission was not brought in and perhaps they should have been brought in sooner in light of some of the issues mentioned. Ms. Dale said despite everything there was a great neighborhood meeting about the survey results that took place.

Mr. Oakley agreed and said there were challenges, and the Commission could state that and that there was a neighborhood meeting that attendees appeared to be excited about.

Ms. Minks asked since the City of Ames is the Certified Local Government, and the Council is in agreement with the State, Planning staff has to write the reports. She asked if the Commission could have Commission comments added to the report as an addendum. She asked if they could recommend having additional info added to the report.

Ms. Sahlstrom said it would be appropriate to report to the Council information based on fact, not opinion, perception, or emotion. She said the dismissal of the student was not based on a personality conflict and that was not the issue. She said she understood how from Ms. Winder's perspective that what was she believed. Ms. Sahlstrom said she can't in good conscience accept what Ms. Winder summarized as the challenges as something she could put in the report. She said if the Commission directs her to make changes to the report, she will make sure they are changed. She noted the Planning Director will read the report before it goes to Council. If Council is approving it, which is what they are asked to do, they are not going to want to approve something they don't agree with. The City council has to approve the report and the 2023 Work Plan.

Ms. Minks asked if Ms. Winder's comments could accompany the report as a separate letter. Ms. Sahlstrom said Ms. Winder she could send a letter to City Council if she would like. She said the Commission may or may not know the student that was dismissed did send a letter to the City Council.

Ms. Dale said she did not entirely agree with Ms. Winder that what she wrote was all factual and not her own perception.

Mr. Oakley asked when the report needed to be finalized. Ms. Sahlstrom said it goes to City Council on January 24th and the agenda is due the week before that. Mr. Oakley asked what the best way to get a revised summary of the Challenges completed between now and the next week would be.

Mr. Oakley asked if anyone had concerns with the first two bullets under successes. Ms. Sahlstrom said it does not mention the 150 properties that were surveyed or the grant amount that was awarded. Mr. Oakley suggested they should combine first two bullets. He said the challenges would then be rewritten.

Ms. Minks proposed that if Ms. Winder feels strongly about the issue, she could submit a separate letter to Council and keep the report separate. Mr. Oakley asked if the letter was to be from Ms. Winder or the whole Commission. Ms. Winder said she hoped it would be from the entire Commission. She said she did not feel she should have to stick her neck out to the City Council.

Ms. Dale said she thought the Commission would have to vote if the letter was to be from the whole Commission. She would not sign off on a letter based on Ms. Winder's statement.

Mr. Chariton said he must recuse himself from voting because he is in the same History program at Iowa State University as the student whose employment was terminated.

MOTION: (Oakley/Kolz) Mr. Oakley will rewrite the challenges, submit them back to the Commission for approval, and Ms. Winder's letter would be a separate matter.

MOTION PASSED: (6-0) Chariton abstained from voting.

Mr. Anderson asked how the whole Commission would know if they all agree with what Mr. Oakley writes. Ms. Minks said due to the timeframe the need to work within, they may need to meet again. Mr. Oakley suggested they could vote if they agreed or not via email.

Ms. Dale questioned if that would meet the open meetings law requirements. Mr. Chariton said the Commission could make the edits during tonight's meeting.

Motion was withdrawn.

Ms. Minks suggested they start with successes. Ms. Hunter said all they needed to add was, "The survey was funded through a CLG grant in the amount of \$14,000, the second largest grant awarded in the States 2021 Annual Program, and in-kind donations." Ms. Hunter said second bullet point is fine as is and doesn't seem different than what Ms. Winder had written. Mr. Oakley agreed.

Ms. Hunter said for the challenges section, they could speak in passive tense. She said instead of having language that is more direct the Commission could acknowledge there was misunderstanding of what was going to happen regarding the hiring of students. There were certain protocols that they had to follow and a budget to stay within.

Mr. Oakley proposed they state under the challenges section, "Due to Human Resources protocols, the expectations of management and how students would be hired was unclear and the project had to be managed differently. Due to these conflicts, the outcome of the project was managed more by the city, rather than the commission and Mary Jo Winder, project manager. In conclusion, future projects related to CLG grants, will be evaluated on resource availability from both the City, outside employment, and Commission Members."

Ms. Hunter suggested they add the paragraph under the challenges bullet points that were already in the report.

MOTION: (Oakley/Hunter) to approve to the rewrite of the Challenges and Successes in the Certified Local Government Report.

MOTION PASSED: (5-0) Chariton and Winder abstained from voting.

Ms. Sahlstrom said the next item to review is item 18 on work program. This section talks about the Work Plan for 2022 and the assessment of the progress of those items.

MOTION: (Oakley/Hunter) to approve the 2022 Certified Local Government (CLG) Annual Report with edits.

MOTION PASSED: (7-0)

DISCUSS PLANS FOR 2023 HISTORIC PRESERVATION AWARDS

Ms. Sahlstrom said every year they ask the Commission to kick off the Historic Preservation Awards and determine if they want to proceed with nominations. In 2021 some of the award categories were updated and those edits are reflected in the materials sent to the Commission. The Commission can make nominations as a group or individually. Ms. Sahlstrom said it will be advertised in various forms such as social media and the newspaper.

MS. Hunter said she thinks the Commission should go forward with having the awards this year, as she has seen projects come through that would be worthwhile to nominate.

Ms. Winder encouraged the Commission to look for potential nominations.

MOTION: (Winder/Hunter) to proceed with the 2023 Historic Preservation Awards Program.

MOTION PASSED: (7-0)

CLG GRANT UPDATE

Ms. Sahlstrom said the survey was submitted to the state on December 31st along with the quarterly report that was due. She said the report broke down contributions by City staff and the Commission that went towards the in-kind amount. She said she has not heard back from the State, but they don't usually confirm they received a submittal.

COMMISSION COMMENTS:

Ms. Minks said she was contacted by Deb Schildroth, Assistant City Manager, about a board meeting on the 26th of January for all Commissions at the City. Ms. Minks was asked to be on a panel of people currently serving on a City boards or commission. The panel will answer questions from 7-8 PM in the hopes the event will generate interest in City Commissions.

Ms. Winder said they didn't have Chapter 31 on the agenda, but she hoped it would be on the next one. Ms. Dale asked Planning staff to remind the Commission what section they are to review if it is on the next agenda.

Ms. Hunter said the History Walk will be on May 17th, 2023 as part of 515 Week event that the Ames Chamber already had planned. The Chamber will do a solicitation for sponsors. The History Museum will be providing information to interested businesses. She said as it gets closer the plans will come together more. Ms. Dale said they need to

make sure it is Historic Preservation month listed on the fliers. Each night of 515 week has its own theme. Ms. Hunter said they partnered with another organization this year but could always have their own stand-alone event in future years.

Ms. Winder asked if they could come up with something for children regarding history. Ms. Hunter suggested a bingo event and Ms. Minks suggested a scavenger hunt. Ms. Dale said they could have a table out and people could write out their own history stories and put them on a board.

Ms. Hunter said as it gets closer, they can decide how they want to be involved and what they want to do to represent the Commission.

Ms. Dale asked if the City of Ames will be able to make story boards. Ms. Hunter said the Ames Chamber was going to look for sponsors to assist with costs. The Commission discussed assisting the Ames History Museum with covering cost for posters. Mr. Anderson said he would find out if they can reimburse the Museum.

STAFF COMMENTS

There were no comments by staff members.

MOTION TO ADJOURN:

MOTION: (Winder/Chariton) to adjourn the meeting at 8:00PM.

MOTION PASSED: (7-0)

The meeting adjourned at 8:00PM.



Mary Jo Winder, Vice-Chairperson
Historic Preservation Commission



Laura Colebrooke, Recording Secretary
Department of Planning & Housing