MEETING NOTICE
The City of Cedar Rapids Historic Preservation Commission will meet at:

4:30 P.M.
Thursday, April 11, 2013
at
City Hall, Bever Conference Room
101 First Street SE, Cedar Rapids, Iowa

AGENDA

Call Meeting to Order
1. Approve Meeting Minutes
2. Action Items
   a) NEW Demolition Applications
      i. 1221 3rd Street SE – Private Property (10 minutes)
3. New Business
   a) Demolition Ordinance Definition Update (15 minutes)
   a) Replacement of Historic District Markers (10 minutes)
4. Old Business
   a) Kirkwood Preservation Program Funding (20 minutes)
   b) Preservation Showcase (15 minutes)
   c) MOA/LOA Updates
5. Adjournment

FUTURE MEETINGS

Items for future agendas:
   a) Update on 1st Street Parkade Demolition MOA
   b) Potential Local Historic District Nomination
   c) Feasibility Studies for 1018 2nd Street SE and 101 3rd Avenue SW
Call Meeting to Order
- Amanda McKnight-Grafton called the meeting to order at 4:31 p.m.
- Seven (7) Commissioners were present and two (2) absent.

Barbara Westercamp joined the meeting at 4:31 p.m.

1. Approve Meeting Minutes
- Corrections were requested to the January 31st minutes to correct the name of the man accompanying Richard Sova in his presentation for item #3bi-iii. Corrections also included removing the portion of the minute stating ReStore did not have access to 2739 1st Avenue SE, item 4a1ii.
- Corrections were requested to the March 14th minutes to state the property is in the Czech NewBo Overlay District for item 2ai. It was requested discussion regarding the Carriage House containing architectural salvage items, when it was demolished, be included in the minutes for 4b.
- Jon Thompson made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Todd McNall seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with none opposed.
2. New Business
   a. Appointment of Secretary
      • Todd McNall made a motion to appoint Bob Grafton as Secretary. Barbara Westercamp seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with Amanda McKnight-Grafton abstaining.
   b. 2014 Preserve Iowa Summit
      • Jennifer Pruden, Main Street, provided an overview of the Preserve Iowa Summit and explained that Cedar Rapids will be the host in 2014. Ms. Pruden went over the conference schedule for August 21 through August 24, 2014 and pointed out the costs and responsibilities of the host community.

Jon Thompson left the meeting at 5:45 p.m.

   • Discussion included the idea of the HPC combining their Preservation Showcase for 2014 with the Preserve Iowa Summit. Discussion also included whether to participate in the Preserve Iowa Summit and not have the Preservation Showcase or to have both. It was discussed that 2014 will be the 3rd year for the Preservation Showcase and is a key year in the success of the showcase. Discussion also included costs of the 2014 Preserve Iowa Summit and it was pointed out the costs are unknown and there would be a better cost estimate after a venue is determined.
   • Todd McNall made a motion to nominate Amanda McKnight-Grafton as the HPC contact regarding the 2014 Preserve Iowa Summit. Barbara Westercamp seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
   • Bob Grafton made a motion to table the discussion until information regarding costs and other aspects of the summit can be provided. Barbara Westercamp seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
   c. Kirkwood Historic Preservation Curriculum Plan
      • Mr. Smith stated staff is looking into funding the curriculum plan through the Memorandums of Agreement (MOA) or Letters of Agreement (LOA) through FEMA and the State based on demolitions that happened after the flood. In 2012 the City started meeting with different local preservation groups to discuss options for bringing together a better preservation ethic in the community and to identify missing elements. One of elements identified was that the majority of communities that had successful preservation programs generally had an institute nearby that offered curriculum that benefited and impacted the community. In Iowa, there are no universities or colleges that have this type of program. Kirkwood has created an initial curriculum focused on preservation and would be a Continuing Education Program with 112 hours purposed for the course work within 8 different courses.
      • Maura Pilcher pointed out this topic started with the HPC in 2008.
      • Discussion included having an architectural history course in the curriculum as it would be beneficial. It was pointed out, students would receive a certificate for completing each class and an overall certificate after completing the curriculum. It was also pointed out, SHPO would have to review the curriculum and sign off on it if the curriculum was included in a MOA or LOA. Discussion also included incorporating landscaping into the curriculum.
      • Mr. Smith went over four options for including the Kirkwood Curriculum into the MOA’s or LOA’s. It was pointed out option #1 as a strong contender and option #2 was not favorable.
• The commission did not make a decision as additional information was requested. The item will return to the next scheduled meeting for further discussion.

d. Chapter 18 Demolition Ordinance Update Forecast
• Mr. Smith stated there is currently a 10 day wait period for demolitions of properties that are 50 years old or older and the HPC has to meet within the 10 days to review the demolition application. Staff has been discussing the options of changing the ordinance to have a 15 day wait period instead which would mean the HPC would meet every three weeks instead of the second and possibly fourth Thursdays of the month. Other changes to the ordinance could potentially include the definition of a demolition and requiring photos of all potential demolition properties.
• The item will return to the next scheduled meeting for further discussion.

e. Section 106 review – 4200 1st Avenue NE
• Mr. Smith stated the Section 106 review is for a cell tower in the Cedar Memorial Cemetery and the tower would be located next to a commercial building. Mr. Smith requested the commission look through the documentation provided and asked any comments or concerns be sent to staff via email by the end of the following week.

3. Old Business
a. GIS Database for Historic Properties Inventory Examples
• Mr. Smith requested the commission look through the four links provided in the agenda packet and asked any comments of what is liked or disliked about the sites be sent to staff via email by the end of the following week.
• Discussion included suggestions of incorporating links to the City Assessor’s website and also including any write-ups in the media pertaining to historic structures.

b. Preservation Showcase
• Details of the showcase were discussed, commissioners signed up for hours they would attend the showcase and job assignments were made.

• Additional discussion took place about the importance of obtaining quorum for the meetings as demolition applications come in and if they are not reviewed within 10 business days the property is released for demolition. There were some demolition applications that were released due to lack of quorum and one of the properties was a church. The church could have potentially been placed on a hold and attempts could have been made to save the church.

4. Adjournment
• Barbara Westercamp motioned to adjourn the meeting at 6:54 p.m. Moira Blake seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Alicia Abernathey, Administrative Assistant II
Community Development
ACTION ITEMS
Historic Preservation Commission Agenda Item Cover Sheet

Meeting Date: April 11, 2013

Property Location: 1221 3rd Street SE
Property Owner/Representative: Vondracek Properties
Year Built: 1910

Description of Agenda Item: ☒ Demolition Application ☐ COA ☐ Other

Background and Previous HPC Action: None.

Historic Status: Contributing ☒ Not Contributing ☐ Unknown ☐ N/A ☐

Explanation (if necessary):
This property was included in the Bohemian Commercial Historic District (boundary increase) nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. It is listed as one of 43 contributing structures out of 68 total properties in the district.

If contributing, which criteria is met:
☐ Associated with significant historical events
☐ Associated with significant lives of person
☒ Signifies distinctive architectural character/era
☐ Associated with lives of persons significant in our past
☐ Archaeologically significant

Other Action by City: Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A ☐

Explanation (if necessary):

Reason and Future Plans:
- Contact with the property owner has been attempted, but no reply received as of April 10, 2013.

Time Sensitivity:
# DEMOLITION PERMIT APPLICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address of Demolition:</th>
<th>1021 5th St Se</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPN:</td>
<td>14234-04000-0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason: (optional)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Plans: (optional)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owners Name:</td>
<td>VONDRACER PROPERTIES LC - SERIES 911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td>319-566-6898 Cell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owners Address:</td>
<td>City / State / Zip Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor's Name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor's Address:</td>
<td>City / State / Zip Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Building:</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Building:</td>
<td>40' x 50'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building has Basement:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISPOSAL OF DEMOLITION MATERIALS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Cedar Rapids Landfill</td>
<td>Private Landfill – Contact:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone #:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is the Responsibility of the Permit Holder to adhere to all Local, State And Federal Regulations regarding proper Inspections and Removal of Asbestos prior to any Demolition.

# UTILITIES INFORMATION

All utilities shall be abandoned in accordance with City requirements and verified and/or inspected before Demolition Permit is issued and demolition begins.

I hereby certify that I have read and examined this application and affirm the above information as true and correct and also agree to comply with the provisions of the City of Cedar Rapids Codes and any other applicable Federal & State laws concerning the demolition process and/or disposal of demolition debris. I also certify that I am authorized to demolish this building as owner or agent of the owner and agree to assume complete responsibility for any liability arising from demolition of the above building. I also agree that no burning or burying of materials shall be done within the Corporate City Limits of Cedar Rapids.

**APPLICANT’S SIGNATURE:**

**DATE:**

---

## OFFICE USE ONLY

**UTILITIES DISCONNECTION INFORMATION & APPROVALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water:</th>
<th>Alliant Energy:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sewer:</td>
<td>Mid-American Energy:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works:</td>
<td>MediaCom:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CED:</td>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning:</td>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PERMITTING INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demolition Permit Number:</th>
<th>Date Issued:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition Permit Fee: $</td>
<td>Date Paid:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning District: Date All Utilities Were Disconnected:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Issued by: Date Signed:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised 09/2010 dlcf
Appraisal Summary - GPN: 14284-04008-00000

(142840400800000)

Property Address: 1221 3RD ST SE
Cedar Rapids, IA

Class: Commercial

Tax District: 285 CR-
RIVERSIDE/OAKHILL

PDF: Warehouse/Storage

Neighborhood: WAREHOUSE

Plat Map: 2524

Deed Holder: VONDRACEK

PROPERTIES LC-
SERIES 9

% JEAN

Mailing Address: VONDRACEK,
OPERATING MGR
1228 3RD ST SE
CEDAR RAPIDS IA
52401

Legal Description: CARPENTER'S 3RD STR/LB 7 31

Homestead: Military:

Forest Reserve: Last Chg:

Plat Desc: Plat Year:

Click map to see neighbor's summary

View complete GIS map.

LOT INFORMATION

Scroll down for sketch.

Disclaimer: Assessor's lot sizes are for assessment purposes only and may NOT represent actual dimensions.

For more accurate, complete data refer to GIS maps, plat maps, or legal documents.

SEGMENT #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Rear</th>
<th>Side 1</th>
<th>Side 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sq. Ft. W/Dimensions</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS

Store - Retail Small: 2,205 SF (Built 1910)
Metal Warehouse - Pole Frame: 2,904 SF (Built 1980)

YARD ITEMS

Sheds: 200 SF, Metal, Low Pricing (blt-1960)

NOTES:

FuncDesc: UT.

05/21/2002 ROOF REPAIRED ON 1680 SF BLDG. NO OTHER UPDATES. FRONT PART OF BLDG USED AS WOODWORKING SHOP. BALANCE OF BLDG IS RETAIL AREA. INTERIOR IS DATED-70'S. LOW COST. NOT VERY WELL MAINTAINED. POOR CONDITION.

525 SF WAREHOUSE IS USED FOR STORAGE. NORMAL CONDITION. 2904 SF WAREHOUSE-NO RECENT UPDATES.

http://www.cedar-rapids.info/assessor/pmc/appraisal_report.asp?pid=142840400800000
INTERIOR NORMAL CONDITION. MTL SHED WAS OLD COOLER. BLDG 2 GIVEN LOCATION OBSOL DUE TO ALLEY ACCESS.

DWELLING LISTING WAS ESTIMATED ON REVIEW. MEASUREMENTS AT REAR ESTIMATED DUE TO DOG. DWELLING HAS NEW ROOF AND SIDING, BUT INTERIOR APPEARS TO BE IN VERY POOR COND. CK -1-2004 FOR INTERIOR REMOD.

OWNER OCCUPIED-SINGLE TENANT. LAND SF=8400. BUILDING SF=6081. L TO B RATIO=138. RETAIL AREA=1488 SF (29.13%). STORAGE AREA=192 SF(3.75%). WAREHOUSE AREA=3429 SF(67.12%). 52764 CF

1-2009 FLOOD ADJUSTED PROPERTY C-2010 ADJUST FOR FLOOD DAMAGE AND REMOVE/WRECK RESIDENTIAL DWLG/SP

1-2009 FLOOD ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT -35%

1/1/2010-NO CHANGE-SP

1-2013 COMM REVAL 11/26/2012 SP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013 ASSESSMENT</th>
<th>2012 ASSESSMENT</th>
<th>2011 ASSESSMENT</th>
<th>2010 ASSESSMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>$25,200</td>
<td>$21,773</td>
<td>$21,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>$34,778</td>
<td>$36,617</td>
<td>$36,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$59,978</td>
<td>$58,390</td>
<td>$58,390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Volume/Page</th>
<th>$ Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/1/2005</td>
<td>Deed</td>
<td>6388/607</td>
<td>$127,404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SALES

PERMITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/14/2010</td>
<td>2008 FLOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/2009</td>
<td>2008 FLOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/3/2008</td>
<td>DEMOLITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/2008</td>
<td>WORK ORDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/2001</td>
<td>SIDING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sketch

Disclaimer: The information in this web site represents current data from a working file which is updated continuously. Information is believed reliable, but its accuracy cannot be guaranteed. The maps and data provided by this web site, represent data from the Cedar Rapids City Assessor's Office, as used for assessment purposes. No warranty, expressed or implied, is provided for the data herein or its use.

Property photos or data incorrect? Click Here
NEW BUSINESS
To: Historic Preservation Commission  
From: Thomas Smith, Planner and Alex Sharpe, Planner  
Subject: Demolition Ordinance Definition Update  
Date: April 11, 2013

Background:  
At the February 28 Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) meeting and in meetings prior, Commissioners expressed concern about a gap in the City’s existing historic preservation ordinance that allows a property owner to remove the majority of a structure from a potentially-historic property without review by the HPC. The City’s current definition of a demolition is the complete removal of a structure and its foundation, and the clearing of the site.

Recently, a potentially-historic home was deconstructed down to the foundation and chimney and then rebuilt with new materials. Had the contractor given a full accounting of the work to be performed on the structure, it technically would not have been considered a demolition based on the City’s current definition of a demolition.

Staff has reviewed demolition definitions used by other municipalities and governmental bodies and is returning with examples to consider in the creation of an updated definition for properties 50 years old or older in Cedar Rapids.

Best Practices Research:  
The following example definitions taken from communities around the United States have been found by staff:

Cambridge, Massachusetts  
The act of pulling down, destroying, removing or razing a building or commencing the work of total or substantial destruction with the intent of completing the same. The City’s Inspectional Services Commissioner has provided further guidelines to outline what actions require a demolition permit. In addition to complete demolition of a building, the following actions may require a demolition permit:

- removal of a roof (for example, raising the overall height of a roof, rebuilding the roof to a different pitch, or adding another story to a building),
- removal of one side of a building,
- gutting of a building's interior to the point where exterior features (windows, etc.) are impacted, and
- removal of more than 25% of a structure.

Los Gatos, California  
Demolition (historic structures) means:

1. Removal of more than twenty-five (25) percent of a wall(s) facing a public street(s) or fifty (50) percent of all exterior walls; or
2. Removal of more than fifty (50) percent of the interior structural elements unless the Building Official determines that the removal is the only reasonable means available to comply with the standards for seismic loads and forces of the Uniform Building Code; or

3. Enclosure or alteration of more than fifty (50) percent of the exterior walls so that they no longer function as exterior walls; or

4. A proposed alteration, which in combination with other alterations of the building authorized within the preceding five (5) years will represent a change defined in subsections (1), (2) or (3) above.

**Indianapolis, Indiana**
Demolition shall be defined as the razing, wrecking or removal by any means of the entire or partial exterior of a structure. The following examples are meant to help define demolition and are not all-inclusive:

1. The razing, wrecking or removal of a total structure.
2. The razing, wrecking or removal of a part of a structure, resulting in a reduction in its mass, height or volume.
3. The razing, wrecking or removal of an enclosed or open addition.

**Sacramento, California**
The removal of an aggregate of fifty (50) or more linear feet of exterior wall OR more than fifty percent (50%) of the footprint of the structure, whichever applies.

**Philadelphia, Pennsylvania**
The razing or destruction, whether entirely or in significant part, of a building, structure, site, or object. Demolition includes the removal of a building, structure, or object from its site or the removal or destruction of the facade or surface.

**Next Steps:**
Commissioners are encouraged to review the above definitions and perform additional research to identify any other preferred definitions. A final definition will be determined at the April 25 HPC meeting and recommended to the City Council. Additional steps leading to Council approval of a demolition definition for structures 50 years old or older is as follows:

- April 11 – Initial review by the Historic Preservation Commission
- April 25 – Final review and creation of definition by the Historic Preservation Commission
- May 22 – Review of the recommended definition by the Council Development Committee
- May 28 – City Council motion setting a public hearing
- June 11 – City Council public hearing

At the May 9 HPC meeting, the Commission will review the current 10-day wait period between the time a demolition application is received and the time that the HPC is required to review the application. Currently, if a demolition application is not reviewed within 10 days of filing, it is automatically released to the applicant. Staff is currently researching how long other communities allow for review of demolition applications for potentially-historic buildings.
OLD BUSINESS
To: Historic Preservation Commission
From: Thomas Smith, Planner
Subject: Funding of a Historic Preservation Program at Kirkwood Community College
Date: April 11, 2013

Background:
At the March 28 HPC meeting, Kirkwood Community College and City staff presented a plan to implement a historic preservation continuing education curriculum at Kirkwood. This would be the first Historic Preservation Program in the State of Iowa. While the Commission indicated support for the concept, no determination was made about how to fund the project. Kirkwood does not have funding to create and market a new program on its own.

Four funding options were discussed at the meeting, all of which involve switching out projects listed in the FEMA Memorandums of Agreement (MOAs) and/or the Letter of Agreement (LOA) with the State. Discussion at the meeting made it clear that reallocating funds from the Comprehensive Historic Preservation Plan was likely not a viable option. Questions were raised about the remaining options.

Staff is returning with information requested about the existing MOA and LOA projects, and a recommendation based on discussions with FEMA, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), and City officials.

Timing:
Support from the HPC at its April 11 meeting is critical to ensure that the program can be implemented in fall 2013. Due to deadlines and requirements related to potential funding sources, if a funding determination is not made at the April 11 meeting, the program will likely not be funded.

Kirkwood Program Overview:
Attached are documents that provide more detail for Kirkwood’s program. The Kirkwood Historic Preservation Program is offering an 8 class curriculum that would provide a certificate for each class completed and an overall certificate for completing the entire program. This program will target trade professionals that do the actual work, but everyday homeowners may be able to take some of the classes as well. Below is a summary of the classes.

1. Architectural Investigation (pre-requisite)  12 Hours
2. Historic Masonry Buildings 16 Hours
3. Maintaining the Exterior of Historic Buildings 16 Hours
4. Weatherization and Historic Structures 12 Hours
5. Repairing Historic Plaster Walls and Ceilings 20 Hours
6. Preservation and Repair of Stained Glass 8 Hours
7. The Repair of Historic Wooden Windows 20 Hours
8. Lead Safe Renovator Training 8 Hours

TOTAL: 112 Hours
Budget:
Most of the cost to start the Kirkwood Preservation Program is for the development of the curriculum, which needs to be done by a professional. Because this will be a continuing education program, the time to develop and start the program will be less than one year. Kirkwood has also included budget items for marketing and scholarships. Below is a draft summary of the budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$40,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommended Funding Option:
As previously mentioned, the only available funds for assisting Kirkwood with this program would come from MOA and LOA projects. Based on preliminary discussions between the City, FEMA and the State Historic Preservation Office, the following option has the support to move forward. The other options previously discussed do not have sufficient support to move forward with the agreement of all parties.

Reallocate Funds from the 2nd Avenue SE Auto Row Historic District project.

Pros:
- The draft documentation and nomination forms completed for the Auto Row Historic District have significant gaps and do not meet the expectations of the SHPO. Re-work of the documentation and completion of the full nomination process would take a number of additional months and require funds beyond what was originally anticipated for the project. SHPO expressed serious doubts about continuing the nomination process with the current consultant. Replacing the historic district nomination with the Kirkwood Preservation Program may be a shorter route to satisfying the FEMA Memorandum of Agreement, which expires less than one year from now.
- Property owners in the proposed historic district are concerned about the boundaries and implications of the district and may express opposition. If enough opposition was expressed, the nomination could be endangered. The Kirkwood Preservation Program has strong initial support from all parties at this point and would alleviate the concerns of some landowners in the proposed historic district.
- The demolition of a contributing structure to the proposed district recently took place and complicates the existing study. By the time the nomination process would be complete, additional demolitions may take place, bringing further uncertainty to the overall project.
- The State has indicated that funding a Kirkwood Preservation Program could also count toward 15 technical assistance workshops that the HPC is responsible to host. Funding the Kirkwood Preservation Program could satisfy multiple MOA and LOA projects at once and reduce the overall workload of the HPC.

Cons:
- The nomination of the Auto Row Historic District would not occur at this time and the related incentives for preservation would not be available for property owners in the area.
- Funds have already been spent on the Auto Row Historic District study and nomination. Additional funds would be needed to switch projects and begin work on the Kirkwood Preservation Program. The costs for these particular projects are being incurred by the City, not FEMA.
Information Requested Related to Other MOA and LOA Projects:
HPC members requested additional information about other MOA and LOA projects at the March 28 meeting. The information is provided below.

Project: Nomination of at least 12 Individual Properties within the 2008 Flood Inundation Area to the National Register of Historic Places.

- Cost Estimate: $50,000
- Anticipated Start Date: August 2013, following completion of the Comprehensive Historic and Architectural Survey, commonly referred to as the “Citywide survey,” which is currently underway.
- Properties are to be chosen by City and reviewed by SHPO and the Iowa Economic Development Authority (IEDA) for concurrence.


- Cost Estimate: $237,000
- Anticipated Start Date: 2013
- Seven structures are to be examined and receive reports. Two of the reports are already underway. The seven structures and their report statuses are:
  - People’s Savings Bank (Wells Fargo Bank Building, 101 3rd Ave SW) – Flood-proofing, elevation, or relocation feasibility study; adaptive reuse study – REPORT UNDERWAY
  - 1018 2nd Street SE – Structural and financial feasibility study for relocation – REPORT UNDERWAY
  - P. Hach Building (1318 2nd St SE) – Flood-proofing feasibility study; historic structure report – NOT STARTED
  - Smid Hardware Store (219 14th Ave SE) – Flood-proofing feasibility study; historic structure report – NOT STARTED
  - Herda House (Brick Fachwerk House, 1113 3rd St SE) – Flood-proofing feasibility study; historic structure report – NOT STARTED
  - Filling Station (310 14th Ave SE) – Flood-proofing feasibility study; adaptive reuse study – NOT STARTED
  - Kadlec Building (Salvation Army Building, 41 16th Ave SW) – Flood-proofing feasibility study; historic structure report – NOT STARTED