

Cultural Heritage Board

TO: CULTURAL HERITAGE BOARD MEETING DATE: December 18, 2013

FROM: HISTORIC PRES. SR. PLANNER ITEM NO: 3

SUBJECT: DRAFT CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT ANNUAL REPORT, 2012-2013

BACKGROUND:

In order to maintain certification, Certified Local Governments (CLGs) are required to submit reports annually to the State Office of Historic Preservation (SHPO) that detail their historic preservation programs' accomplishments and actions. The annual reports cover the federal fiscal year, October 1 – September 30. The City's CLG agreement requires the draft Annual Report to be transmitted to the Cultural Heritage Board in advance of its transmittal to the SHPO.

ANALYSIS:

The Annual Report contains various sections reporting on each city's preservation programs, including preparation of historic contexts and surveys; historic site and district designations; projects reviewed for Certificates of Appropriateness and Section 106 consultation; Commission or Board members and their areas of focus and attendance records; required training received by staff and Board members; public outreach, education and incentives; progress on previous as well as new goals for the upcoming year; and a summary about each city's overall preservation program. Part of the report also includes a separate component report to the National Park Service.

The Annual Report is in draft form but will be finalized for transmittal to the SHPO by the December 31, 2013, deadline.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

That the Cultural Heritage Board receive and file the draft Certified Local Government Annual Report, providing any appropriate input as necessary.

Prepared by: Teri Delcamp, Historic Preservation Senior Planner

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

INSTRUCTIONS: This a Word form with expanding text fields and check boxes. It will probably open as Read-Only. Save it to your computer before you begin entering data. This form can be saved and reopened.

Because this is a WORD form, it will behave generally like a regular Word document except that the font, size, and color are set by the text field.

- Start typing where indicated to provide the requested information.
- Click on the check box to mark either yes or no.
- To enter more than one item in a particular text box, just insert an extra line (Enter) between the items.

Save completed form and email as an attachment to <u>Lucinda.Woodward@parks.ca.gov</u>. You can also convert it to a PDF and send as an email attachment. Use the Acrobat tab in WORD and select Create and Attach to Email. You can then attach the required documents to that email. If the attachments are too large (greater than10mb total), you will need to send them in a second or third email.

Name of CLG City of Riverside

Report Prepared by: Teri Delcamp, Historic Pres. Sr. Planner

Date of commission/board review: 12/18/13

Minimum Requirements for Certification

I. Enforce Appropriate State or Local Legislation for the Designation and Protection of Historic Properties.

A. Preservation Laws

1. What amendments or revisions, if any, are you considering to the certified ordinance? Please forward drafts or proposals. REMINDER: Pursuant to the CLG Agreement, OHP must have the opportunity to review and comment on ordinance changes prior to adoption. Changes that do not meet the CLG requirements could affect certification status. The City of Riverside amended the certified local ordinance during the reporting period. This change was anticipated in last year's report. It implemented an additional preservation incentive section for a historic preservation fund that has been established, and minor changes to the Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness process. The draft amended sections were transmitted to SHPO for review and comment prior to the City's adoption of the ordinance.

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

2. Provide an electronic link to your ordinance or appropriate section(s) of the municipal code. The current amended version of the certified local ordinance is located on the City's website at the following link: http://www.riversideca.gov/municode/title20.asp.

B. New Local Landmark Designations (Comprehensive list of properties/districts designated under local ordinance)

1. During the reporting period, October 1, 2012 – September 30, 2013, what properties/districts have been locally designated?

| Property Name/Address | Date Designated | Number of Contributors in District | Date Recorded by County Recorder |
|-----------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| None | Type here. | Type here. | Type here. |

REMINDER: Pursuant to California Government Code § 27288.2, "the county recorder shall record a certified resolution establishing an historical resources designation issued by the State Historical Resources Commission or a local agency, or unit thereof."

2. What properties/districts have been de-designated this past year? For districts, include the total number of resource contributors.

| Property Name/Address | Date Removed |
|-----------------------|--------------|
| None | Type here. |

C. Historic Preservation Element/Plan

| 1. Do you address historic preservation in your general plan? | □ No |
|--|---|
| ☑ Yes, in a separate historic preservation element. | \square Yes, it is included in another element. |
| Provide an electronic link to the historic preservation section(s) o | f the General Plan. |
| http://www.riversideca.gov/planning/gp2025program/G | P/16_Historic_Preservation_Element.pd |

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

| | 2. | Have you made any updates to your historic preservation plan or historic preservation element in your community's general plan? Yes No If you have, provide an electronic link. Type here. |
|-------|--|---|
| | 3. | When will your next General Plan update occur? Not for several more years. |
| D. Re | view | v Responsibilities |
| | 1. | Who takes responsibility for design review or Certificates of Appropriateness? |
| | | \square All projects subject to design review go the commission. |
| | He mi Hi an lin or an Pla an to | ☑ Some projects are reviewed at the staff level without commission review. What is the threshold between staff-only view and full-commission review? The design review responsibility is completed by either the Cultural eritage Board for major projects or Historic Preservation Officer or qualified designated staff for more inor projects. The types of projects subject to administrative staff review only are outlined in the City's storic Preservation Ordinance (Section 20.25.030). Generally, staff-reviewed projects are minor in nature and include in-kind replacement of materials, re-roofing, painting, walls and fences, small additions with mited or no public visibility, paving, landscaping, and signs. Per the recent update to the certified adminance, review or oversight for administrative cases occurs by qualified staff designated by the HPO, and all cases are subject to final review by the Historic Preservation Officer or Historic Preservation Senior anner. Staff may refer any of the above referenced types of projects to the Board if deemed necessary and does frequently when recommending denial or controversy is involved. All other projects are subject review by the full Cultural Heritage Board. Staff decisions are appealable to the Board. Appeals of Board accisions are made to the Land Use Committee of the City Council, and then on to the full City Council. |
| | 2. | California Environmental Quality Act |

• What is the role of the staff and commission in *providing input* to CEQA documents prepared for or by the local government? Cultural Heritage Board staff has complete input into all planning projects that may potentially affect historic properties in accordance with CEQA review processes and the City's Cultural Resources Ordinance. Projects subject to CEQA review are handled in two ways. If potential impacts to cultural resources are one of a number of potential impacts, then the Initial Study and proposed mitigation are heard and commented on by the Cultural Heritage Board as part of the

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

public hearing process. The Board's decision and comments on the IS are then forwarded to the Planning Commission. Under the City's Cultural Resources Ordinance, the Board has the authority to deny a project which may impact cultural resources. In cases where the only potential impact of a project is to a cultural resource, the CHB is the approving body. All decisions can be appealed ultimately to the City Council as noted above.

What is the role of the staff and commission in *reviewing* CEQA documents for projects that are proposed within the jurisdiction of the local government? See above. In addition, there is a review of cultural resource studies that are prepared in support of planning projects that occurs early in the project review. This review will determine whether a CR report is required, whether the CR report is sufficient for purposes of the certified ordinance and for CEQA in regards to cultural resources, etc. Approved studies are then typically used as the basis for any CEQA exemptions and/or as appendices to MNDs or EIRs.

4. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act

- What is the role of the staff and commission in providing input to Section 106 documents prepared for or by; the local government? Cultural Heritage Board staff has complete input into all planning projects that may potentially affect historic properties in accordance with Section 106 review processes and the City's Cultural Resources Ordinance. Section 106 reviews for HUD-funded projects are completed in-house in accordance with the City's Programmatic Agreement (PA), which has been in effect since July 2002. For all other Section 106 projects which are funded through the City, documents are prepared in house or by qualified consultants to forward to SHPO for concurrence.
- What is the role of the staff and commission in *reviewing* Section 106 documents for projects that are proposed within the jurisdiction of the local government? **See above.**

II. Establish an Adequate and Qualified Historic Preservation Review Commission by State or Local Legislation.

A. Commission Membership

| Name | Professional Discipline | Date Appointed | Date Term Ends | Email Address |
|----------------|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| Nancy L. Treen | Public | Dec. 3, 2008 | Mar. 1, 2013 | <u>N/A</u> |

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

| Charissa J. Leach | Engineering | Jun. 23, 2009 | Mar. 1, 2013 | cleach@adkan.com |
|-------------------------------------|--|---------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Robert C. Garáfalo resigned 8/15/13 | Social Services and Religious Studies | Mar. 1, 2010 | Mar. 1, 2014 | rogarafa@riversidedpss.org |
| Hector R. Murrieta | Education, Folk Art, History and Traditional Dance | Mar. 1, 2010 | Mar. 1, 2014 | hector.murrieta@sbcusd.com |
| Genevieve Preston- Chavez | Art History, Curation, Archivist | Apr. 5, 2011 | Mar. 1, 2015 | Gbennybean@aol.com |
| Michelle Gilleece | Law | Apr. 19, 2011 | Mar. 1, 2015 | mhgilleece@gmail.com |
| Monty Van Wart | Public Administration, Education | Mar. 6, 2012 | Mar. 1, 2016 | mvanwart@csusb.edu |
| John Field | Riverside County Board of Supervisors | Feb. 17, 2009 | Mar. 1, 2017 | jfield@rcbos.org |
| David Peery resigned 9/6/13 | Construction Project Management | Mar. 5, 2013 | Mar. 1, 2017 | N/A |
| Rosemary Heru | Marketing, Customer Service | Mar. 5, 2013 | Mar. 1, 2017 | Rheru2@hotmail.com |
| Kenneth Sutter | Architecture | Apr. 18, 2013 | Mar. 1, 2017 | kensutter@gmail.com |

Attach resumes and Statement of Qualifications forms for all members.

- 1. If your do not have two qualified professionals on your commission, why have the professional qualifications not been met and how is professional expertise being provided? **See chart.**
- 2. If all positions are not currently filled, why is there a vacancy, and when will the position will be filled? One of the two resignations late in the reporting period is already filled and will appear in the annual report for 2013-2014. The other resignation will be filled during the City Council's annual Board and Commission appointments since the term ends in March 2014.

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

| R | Staff | to the | Comm | iccion | ICI G | etaff |
|----|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------------|-------|
| D. | SIAII | 10 1110 | COIIIII | 1551011 | / (- (- | SIAII |

| 1. | Is the staff to your commission the same as your CLG coordinator? X Yes | ☐ No |
|----|---|------|
|----|---|------|

2. If the position(s) is not currently filled, why is there a vacancy? N/A

Attach resumes and Statement of Qualifications forms for staff.

| Name/Title | Discipline | Dept. Affiliation | Email Address |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Erin Gettis - Historic | Historic Architecture/ | Community Development | egettis@riversideca.gov |
| Preservation Officer/Staff to | Architectural History/ | Dept., HP, Neighborhoods | |
| CHB | Architecture/ | & Urban Design Division | |
| | Historic Preservation | 1/2006 to Present | |
| Teri Delcamp - Historic | History/Architectural | Community Development | tdelcamp@riversideca.gov |
| Preservation Senior Planner | History/Historic Preservation | Dept., HP, Neighborhoods | |
| | | & Urban Design Division | |
| | | 11/28/11 to Present | |
| Barbara Bouska - | Architectural History/Fine Arts/ | Community Development | bbouska@riversideca.gov |
| Associate Planner | Planning | Dept., HP, Neighborhoods | |
| | | & Urban Design Division | |
| | | 5/1979 to Present | |

C. Attendance Record

Please complete attendance chart for each commissioner and staff member. Commissions are required to meet four times a year, at a minimum. See attached charts.

| Commissioner/Staff | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep |
|--------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Type here. | | | | | | | | | | | | |

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

D. Training Received

Indicate what training each commissioner and staff member has received. Remember it is a CLG requirement is that all commissioners and staff to the commission attend at least one training program relevant to your commission each year. It is up to the CLG to determine the relevancy of the training.

| Commissioner/Staff Name | Training Title & Description | Duration of Training | Training Provider | Date |
|------------------------------|---|------------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| Nancy L. Treen | Type here. | Type here. | Type here. | Type here. |
| Charissa J. Leach | Type here. | Type here. | Type here. | Type here. |
| Robert C. Garáfalo | Solar Panels/Historic bldgs | 1 hr by MP3 | CLG Staff | 10/13 |
| Hector R. Murrieta | Solar Panels/Historic bldgs | 1 hr | CLG Staff | 10/13 |
| Genevieve Preston- Chavez | Sustainable Preservation Practices webinar series | 1 day equivalent | Image Permanence Institute | Jan-Feb 2013 |
| | Digital Preservation webinar series | 1 day equivalent | Society of Amer. Archivists | Jan-Apr 2013 |
| | Society of California Archivist annual meeting | 2 days | SCA guest lecturers | 4/11-4/13/13 |
| | Seizing Destiny/Meas AViewed MP3 Solar Panels | 2 hrs 1 hr | Al Zelinka, FAICP CLG Staff | May/June 2013 10/13 |
| Michelle Gilleece | Solar Panels/Historic bldgs | 1 hr by MP3 | CLG Staff | 10/13 |
| Monty Van Wart | Seizing Destiny/Meas ASolar Panels/Historic bldgs | 2 hrs 1 hr | Al Zelinka, FAICP CLG Staff | May/June 2013 10/13 |
| John Field | Seizing Destiny/Meas ASolar Panels/Historic bldgs | 2 hrs 1 hr | Al Zelinka, FAICP CLG Staff | May/June 2013 10/13 |
| Rosemary Heru | Seizing Destiny/Meas A Solar Panels/Historic bldgs. | 2 hrs 1 hr 2 hrs | Al Zelinka, FAICP CLG Staff NPS, OHP, etc. | May/June 2013 10/13 10/13 |
| Kenneth Sutter | Various HP tutorials Seizing Destiny/Meas A Solar Panels/Historic bldgs. | 2 hrs 1 hr | Al Zelinka, FAICP CLG Staff | May/June 2013 10/13 |

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

| Erin Gettis | Historical Symposium/ Japanese American Pioneers | 2 days | IES/APA, Museum guest lecturers | 10/19-10/20/12 |
|----------------|--|-------------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| | Disaster Planning webinarEnvironmental Leadership Academy | 1.5 hrs 40 hrs | CPF guest speaker CSU presenters | 10/31/12 Sep-Dec 2012 |
| | CPF Annual Conference | 3 days | CPF guest lecturers | May 2013 |
| Teri Delcamp | Historical Symposium/ Japanese American Pioneers | 2 days | IES/APA, Museum guest lecturers | 10/19-10/20/12 |
| | Disaster Planning webinar | 1.5 hrs | CPF guest speaker | 10/31/12 |
| | CPF Annual Conference | 3 days | CPF guest lecturers | May 2013 |
| Barbara Bouska | Historical Symposium MSHCP Training National Register Preservation Grants Year in Review webinar | 1 day 2 hrs 2 hrs | IES/APA guest lecturers IES/AEP guest lecturer NPS staff | 10/19/12 11/13/12 12/18/12 |
| | Solar Panels/Historic bldgs. | 1 hr | CLG Staff | Oct 2013 |

III. <u>Maintain a System for the Survey and Inventory of Properties that Furthers the Purposes of the National Historic Preservation Act</u>

A. Historical Contexts: initiated, researched, or developed in the reporting year NOTE: California CLG procedures require CLGs to submit survey results including historic contexts to OHP. If you have not done so, submit a copy (PDF or link if available online) with this report.

| Context Name | Description | How it is Being Used | Date Submitted to |
|----------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| | | | OHP |
| University Avenue Specific | Survey in support of Specific Plan | Context and some DPR forms | Portion of draft DPR |
| Plan Context | preparation. Specific Plan completed | available to CHB staff for | forms, draft context, |
| | but not adopted. Draft survey properties | questions and inquiries regarding | December 2013 |
| | matrix previously submitted to OHP. | significance of potential | |
| | Draft context and DPRs in progress. | properties within the project area. | |

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

| Context Name | Description | How it is Being Used | Date Submitted to OHP |
|--------------|-------------|---|-----------------------|
| | | Approx. 70% of DPR forms have been drafted. The preliminary matrix provides initial information for CHB staff to advise other staff and the public about significance. In addition, several of the Modern properties were re-surveyed in the CLG grant funded Modernism Intensive Survey during 2013. | |

B. New Surveys or Survey Updates (excluding those funded by OHP)

NOTE: The evaluation of a single property is not a survey. Also, material changes to a property that is included in a survey, is not a change to the survey and should not be reported here.

California CLG procedures require CLGs to submit survey results including historic contexts, to OHP. If you have not done so, submit a copy (electronic format preferred) with this report.

| Survey Area | Context Based- yes/no | Level: Reconnaissance or Intensive | Acreage | # of Properties Surveyed | Date Completed | Date Submitted to OHP |
|---|-----------------------------|--|-------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Marketplace Specific Plan Survey | Yes | Reconnaissance and Intensive | Approx. 200 acres | 147 | Revised DPR forms in progress | Revised DPR forms, 12/13 |
| University Avenue Specific Plan Survey | Yes | Reconnaissance and Intensive | Approx. 179 acres | Approx. 50 | In progress | Draft DPR forms, 12/13 |
| Brockton Avenue Historic | Yes | Intensive | Approx. 30 | 61 | Draft | December |

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

| Survey | acres | completed | 2013 |
|-----------------------|-------|-----------|------------------|
| Chicago/Linden Survey | | | December 2013 |

How are you using the survey data? See response regarding University Avenue Specific Plan in table above under Contexts. The Marketplace final context was submitted to OHP last year, and it as well as the draft and revised DPR forms have been used to update the historic inventory database. The Brockton Avenue Historic Survey has guided an effort to create a set of Mid-Century Modern Commercial Design Guidelines. The Chicago-Linden Survey was prepared to help guide a new Strategic Plan for the project area that will be the focus of future neighborhood quality of life, infrastructure and/or housing improvements. The latter two surveys will be input into the database in the near future, but the information, as with Marketplace, is available to CHB staff for questions and inquiries regarding significance of potential properties within the project areas.

C. Corrections or changes to Inventory

| Property Name/Address | Additions/Deletions to Inventory | Status Code Change From - To | Reason | Date of Change |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------|----------------|
| None | Type here. | Type here. | Type here. | Type here. |
| | | | | |

IV. Provide for Adequate Public Participation in the Local Historic Preservation Program

A. Public Education

What public outreach, training, or publications programs has the CLG undertaken? Please provide copy of (or an electronic link) to all publications or other products not previously provided to OHP.

| Item or Event | Description | Date | |
|---------------|-------------|------|--|
|---------------|-------------|------|--|

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

| Item or Event | Description | Date |
|--|--|----------------|
| Looking Back on Local Stories of Social Justice and Civil Liberties | 3-day community event including historical symposium, panel discussion, walking tour and book signing focused on ethnic histories. | 10/19-10/21/12 |
| Grand Avenue Neighborhood Meeting | Presented Grand Avenue Bluff Context and Survey to community group meeting. | Nov. 2012 |
| University outreach | Harada House Tour and Art Museum designs critique, Cal Poly Pomona students; presentation, UCR history careers panel | Nov. 2012 |
| Riverside's History @ Bryant School | 4 days, 2 hour presentations/hands on with elementary students | March 2013 |
| Camp Anza History | Public outreach/info gathering on historic context of the Camp Anza Officer's Club at community meeting | 4/27/13 |
| Cable Access Show: Riverside's Historic Destinations | Hosted by City HPO. Additional episode completed for total of 7. Evergreen Cemetery: http://www.riversideca.gov/videos/historicdestinations.asp | 7/13/13 |

V. National Park Service Baseline Questionnaire for new CLGs (certified after September 30, 2012).

NOTE: OHP will forward this information to the NPS on your behalf. Guidance for completing the Baseline Questionnaire is located at www.nps.gov/hps/clg/forms.html.

A. CLG Inventory Program

1. What is the net cumulative number of historic properties in your inventory as of September 30, 2013? This is the total number of historic properties and contributors to districts (or your best estimate of the number) in your inventory from **all** programs, local, state, and Federal. Type here.

| Program Area | Number of Properties |
|--------------|----------------------|
| Type here. | Type here. |

B. Local Register (i.e., Local Landmarks and Historic Districts) Program

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

| | 1. | As of September 30, 2013, did your local government have a local register program to create local landmarks/local |
|----|---------|---|
| | | historic districts (or a similar list of designations created by local law? Yes No |
| | 2. | If the answer is yes, what is the net cumulative number (or your best estimate of the number) of historic properties (i.e., contributing properties) locally registered/designated as of September 30, 2013? Type here. |
| C. | Local | Tax Incentives Program |
| | 1. | As of September 30, 2013, did your local government have a local historic preservation tax incentives program (e.g. Mills Act)? \square Yes \square No |
| | 2. | If the answer is yes, what is the cumulative number (or your best estimate of the number) of historic properties whose owners have taken advantage of those incentives as of September 30, 2013? Type here. |
| D. | Local ' | 'Bricks and Mortar" Grants/Loans Program |
| | 1. | As of September 30, 2013, did your local government have a locally-funded, historic preservation grants/loan program for rehabilitating/restoring historic properties? Type here. |
| | 2. | If the answer is yes, what is the cumulative number (or your best estimate of the number) of historic properties assisted by these grants or loans as of September 30, 2013? Type here. |
| E. | Local | Design Review/Regulatory Program |
| | 1. | As of September 30, 2013, did your local government have a historic preservation regulatory law(s) (e.g., an ordinance requiring Commission/staff review of 1) local government undertakings and/or 2) changes to or impacts on properties with |
| | | a historic district? |
| | 2. | If the answer is yes, what is the cumulative number (or your best estimate of the number) of historic properties that your local government has reviewed under that process as of September 30, 2013? Type here. |
| F. | | Property Acquisition Program |
| | 1. | As of September 30, 2013, did your local government by purchase, donation, condemnation, or other means help to acquire or acquire itself some degree of title (e.g., fee simple interest or an easement) in historic properties? |

Certified Local Government Program -- 2012-2013 Annual Report (Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

| □Yes □No | | |
|--|--|--|
| | the cumulative number (or your best estimate of the number) of historic pr assisted or carried out by your local government as of September 30, 201 | |
| ditional Information for Nation | nal Park Service Annual Products Report for CLGs (certified before O | ctober 1, 2012). |
| | oformation to NPS on your behalf. Please read "Guidance for completing the state of the state | ne Annual Product |
| A. CLG Inventory Program | | |
| During the reporting period (Octoadd to the CLG inventory? This | tober 1, 2012-September 30, 2013) how many historic properties did your les is the total number of historic properties and contributors to districts (or you ntory from all programs , local, state, and Federal, during the reporting ye | ur best estimate o |
| During the reporting period (Octoadd to the CLG inventory? This the number) added to your inverinclude National Register, Califodesignations. | s is the total number of historic properties and contributors to districts (or you ntory from all programs , local, state, and Federal, during the reporting yellornia Register, California Historic Landmarks, locally funded surveys, CLG | our best estimate our best estimate our best estimate of the series of t |
| During the reporting period (Octoadd to the CLG inventory? This the number) added to your inverinclude National Register, Califodesignations. Program | s is the total number of historic properties and contributors to districts (or you ntory from all programs, local, state, and Federal, during the reporting yearnia Register, California Historic Landmarks, locally funded surveys, CLG Number of Properties added | our best estimate our best estimate our best estimate of the series of t |
| During the reporting period (Octoadd to the CLG inventory? This the number) added to your inverinclude National Register, Califodesignations. | s is the total number of historic properties and contributors to districts (or younterly from all programs, local, state, and Federal, during the reporting yearnia Register, California Historic Landmarks, locally funded surveys, CLG Number of Properties added This has not been reported correctly over the | our best estimate our best estimate our best estimate of the series of t |
| During the reporting period (Octoadd to the CLG inventory? This the number) added to your inverinclude National Register, Califodesignations. Program | s is the total number of historic properties and contributors to districts (or you ntory from all programs, local, state, and Federal, during the reporting yearnia Register, California Historic Landmarks, locally funded surveys, CLG Number of Properties added This has not been reported correctly over the last three years of annual reports. Previous | our best estimate of ar. These might surveys, and loca |
| During the reporting period (Octoadd to the CLG inventory? This the number) added to your inverinclude National Register, Califodesignations. Program | s is the total number of historic properties and contributors to districts (or you ntory from all programs, local, state, and Federal, during the reporting yearnia Register, California Historic Landmarks, locally funded surveys, CLG Number of Properties added | our best estimate of ar. These might surveys, and loca |
| During the reporting period (Octoadd to the CLG inventory? This the number) added to your inverinclude National Register, Califodesignations. Program | s is the total number of historic properties and contributors to districts (or younterly from all programs, local, state, and Federal, during the reporting yearnia Register, California Historic Landmarks, locally funded surveys, CLG Number of Properties added | our best estimate of ar. These might surveys, and loca |
| During the reporting period (Octoadd to the CLG inventory? This the number) added to your inverinclude National Register, Califodesignations. Program | s is the total number of historic properties and contributors to districts (or you ntory from all programs, local, state, and Federal, during the reporting yearnia Register, California Historic Landmarks, locally funded surveys, CLG Number of Properties added | our best estimate of ar. These might surveys, and loca |

Certified Local Government Program -- 2012-2013 Annual Report (Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

| | 2. If the answer is yes, then how many properties have been added to your register or designated since October 1, 2012? 0 | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| C. | C. Local Tax Incentives Program 1. During the reporting period (October 1, 2012-September 30, 2013) did you have a Local Tax Incentives Program, such as the Mills Act? Yes □ No | | | | | |
| | 2. | If the answer is yes, how many properties have been | | | | |
| | | Name of Program | Number of Properties that have Benefited | | | |
| M | ills | Act | 2 | | | |
| D. | Lo | cal "bricks and mortar" grants/loan program | | | | |
| | 1. | During the reporting period (October 1, 2012-Septer preservation grant and/or loan program for rehabilitation | | | | |
| preservation grant and/or loan program for rehabilitating/restoring historic properties? ✓ Yes □No 2. If the answer is yes, then how many properties have been assisted under the program(s) after October 1, 2012? Financial incentives for preservation are administered through the Housing Division and/or the Riverside Housing Development Corporation (RHDC), a non-profit corporation sponsored by the Redevelopment/ Successor Agency. They administer numerous low interest loans, federally funded CDBG grants and the Neighborhood Stabilization Program for low to moderate-income families. These grants/loans are primar for repairs and upgrades of single-family residences, as well as the acquisition and rehabilitation of foreclosed and/or distressed properties for re-sale to moderate to low and moderate income families. So owners of historic properties benefit from the grant program because they fall into the low-moderate income bracket, even though preservation was not the focus of the grant award. Some of the NSP projects invol historic or potentially historic properties. The City recently created a Historic Preservation Fund that may provide additional bricks and mortar opportunities, but that is yet to be defined by the Committee overse the fund. For this reporting period, no historic properties were assisted under any of these programs. | | | | | | |
| | | Name of Program | Number of Properties that have Benefited | | | |
| Ty | /pe | here. | Type here. | | | |

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

E. Design Review/Local Regulatory Program

| 1. | During the reporting period (October 1, 2012-September 30, 2013) did your local government. | vernment l | nave a historic | |
|----|---|------------|-------------------------------------|----|
| | preservation regulatory law(s) (e.g., an ordinance requiring Commission and/or staff | review of | local governmer | nt |
| | undertakings and/or 2) changes to, or impacts on, properties with a historic district? | | □ No | |

2. If the answer is yes then, since October 1, 2012, how many historic properties did your local government review for compliance with your local government's historic preservation regulatory law(s)? During the reporting period, a total of 10 historic properties were reviewed by the Cultural Heritage Board for Certificates of Appropriateness. Approximately 51 historic properties were reviewed by CHB staff for Administrative Certificates of Appropriateness.

F. Local Property Acquisition Program

- 1. During the reporting period (October 1, 2012-September 30, 2013) did you have a local program to acquire (or help to acquire) historic properties in whole or in part through purchase, donation, or other means? ☐ Yes ☒ No
 - 2. If the answer is yes, then how many properties have been assisted under the program(s) since October 1, 2012? Type here.

| Name of Program Number of Properties that have Benefited | |
|--|------------|
| Type here. | Type here. |

VII. In addition to the minimum CLG requirements, OHP is interested in a Summary of Local Preservation Programs

A. What are the most critical preservation planning issues? A critical issue that Riverside has previously reported and continues to face is new development and redevelopment pressure in historic areas throughout the city. The loss of the Redevelopment Agency funding means that more private monies will be required for development. This may result in more parcel consolidation so that private developments without public subsidy pencil out, but this may place additional pressure or threat on historic buildings. The actual effects have yet to be realized given the slow economic recovery. I will add that due to the slow recovery and doubtless other factors, profit margins seem to be tight on projects too so we are experiencing more push-back on preservation concerns if they are perceived as increasing costs or reducing the profit margin. However, in some cases, the cost to rehabilitate rather than demolish and

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

construct all new buildings has had the opposite effect of saving a building where it might have been lost in a booming economy.

Mid-Century Modern architecture also continues to be a critical preservation planning issue, but the public understanding and acknowledgment of these resources is gaining. Through last year's survey of the Grand Avenue Bluff post-war residential tract, the completion of the recent Modernism intensive survey, approval of the vastly reduced scale expansion to Riverside's New Formalism style downtown library, the pending sale, adaptive re-use and Landmark designation of the Mid-century Modern Marcy Library and the WW II Camp Anza Officer's Quarters, the public's understanding and appreciation for these resources continues to increase.

Another area of concern is related to recent increased pressure for student housing in the vicinity of UC Riverside. While the concerns about cut-ups and overcrowding are for now focused in the University Neighborhood directly around the campus, future solutions to address the ongoing demand for student housing may expand issues into the Eastside Neighborhood. The Marketplace Survey only covered a portion of this area, and the City's Eastside Survey is out of date. While some properties in the survey were not deemed eligible for designation then, today these properties are 10 years older with integrity, and possibly associated with recent ethnic history contexts and appear to meet thresholds for at least local designation. On the other hand, due to the demographics of the area, staff perceives there may have been modifications affecting integrity of several properties in the Eastside area that were not submitted for CHB approval for various reasons. As the economy picks up, and/or as pressure for solutions to student housing deficiencies start to spread toward downtown from the UCR campus, more and more changes may be coming to this area. We have realized that an updated survey of this area will be critical in the next couple of years.

B. What is the single accomplishment of your local government this year that has done the most to further preservation in your community? The successful completion of several public projects, some of them related to Mid-Century Modern buildings, has done the most to raise awareness and further preservation in Riverside. The process and completion of the Downtown Library project, which resulted in very minimal alterations to the building's exterior compared to the original proposal to demolish it, combined with the marketing and pending landmark designation of the Marcy Library as well as the pending marketing and future re-use of the designated Mid-century Modern Downtown Fire Station, have greatly

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

heightened awareness and appreciation for Modern architecture. The completion of the beautiful restoration and rehabilitation of the Riverside Municipal Auditorium, a board-formed concrete Revival style building from the early 20th century, has also gained awards and appreciation of the community. These high profile projects have put preservation in the forefront of people's minds on a fairly regular basis for a couple of years and preservation does not always take such a front seat.

- C. What recognition are you providing for successful preservation projects or programs? See the Public Education section above and Goals section below. We also featured the Municipal Auditorium project at the CPF Three Minute Success Stories and plan to submit more CPF award nominations for some of our projects in the future.
- D. How did you meet or not meet the goals identified in your annual report for last year? The goals identified in the annual report for last year follow, along with a status update:
 - Work with Historic Resources Group to complete the CLG Grant funded Modernism Intensive Survey project.

Successfully completed.

• Disseminate historic preservation newsletter integrated into the Neighborhoods electronic newsletter to residents citywide.

This year saw the reorganization and merging of the Development into the Community Development Department, and the creation of a new Division called Historic Preservation, Neighborhoods and Urban Design. This will facilitate integrating the newsletter, but the reorganization and implementation of new strategies and work units meant that the electronic newsletter did not go out to residents this year. It is hoped that this will be accomplished, along with other innovative methods of outreach like the Landmark Connect phone app that will be developed with the current year's CLG grant.

- Complete revisions to the Japanese American context and MPS to address SHPO comments, take the survey to the CHB and City Council for approval, and integrate it into the Planning process. Successfully completed revisions and obtained SHPO approval. Coordinating consultant's calendar with City meeting calendar to schedule the survey for CHB and Council review and approval. Anticipate this will occur in the next reporting period.
- Complete and integrate the Grand Avenue Bluff Survey, and Marketplace and University Avenue surveys, into the Planning process.

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

The City's IT department has a workflow item to merge the Cliffside and Modernism Intensive survey databases into the Citywide database, and we expect that to occur soon. The Marketplace and University Avenue Surveys are still in process, but the context and status codes at least are already integrated into the database and planning process.

• Initiate various historic district designations, which may include the Mile Square NW, Brockton Avenue and Grand Avenue Bluff areas, etc.

These will continue to be a goal for next year and are partly dependent on citizen and Council priorities.

- Continue working with the Cultural Heritage Board to update the Historic District Design Guidelines and any necessary amendments to Title 20 Historic Preservation ordinance, with SHPO review.

 Title 20 was amended, as noted previously, and the Design Guidelines update is an active case now and will be
- Continue to research and potentially implement a Historic Preservation Fund for enhanced education and awareness, additional focused area/district surveys, and possible bricks and mortar restoration and/or rehabilitation opportunities, etc.

Completed. Will continue to report on progress in future reports as Committee establishes by-laws, criteria, and procedures, etc.

• Continue to coordinate with other departments and agencies to foster and promote cultural resource preservation goals and outcomes.

Staff has successfully coordinated with many departments and agencies during the reporting period to foster and promote cultural resource preservation goals and outcomes.

E. What are your local historic preservation goals for 2013-2014?

made a priority over the next two years.

- Coordinate and supplement the Economic Development Dept. to complete the CLG Grant funded Landmark Connect phone app.
- Continue to find creative methods of outreach for preservation education through integrated historic preservation and neighborhoods e-newsletter to residents citywide, other electronic and web presence modes, community meetings and symposiums, targeted outreach to real estate and contractor industries and television programs etc.
- Schedule numerous surveys for CHB and City Council approval, including Japanese American context, Grand Avenue Bluff, Modernism, Brockton Avenue, Marketplace and University Avenue.
- Initiate various historic district designations as department, citizen and City Council priorities allow.

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

- Continue working with the Cultural Heritage Board to update the Historic District Design Guidelines, including thought regarding guidelines for mid-century neighborhoods and architecture.
- Staff the Historic Preservation Fund Committee and assist in the development of bylaws, procedures, criteria and methodologies for applications to utilize funds.
- Continue to coordinate with other departments and agencies to foster and promote cultural resource preservation goals and outcomes.
- F. So that we may better serve you in the future, are there specific areas and/or issues with which you could use technical assistance from OHP? Additional training on identification, preservation and peer review of archaeological sites and studies and how informal consultation (when not required under SB 18 or Section 106) with Native American representatives can be effectively managed. In addition, training by qualified individuals who have successfully completed rehabilitation credit projects and/or any case studies of agencies who have utilized the Marks Rehabilitation Act.
- G. In what subject areas would you like to see training provided by the OHP? How you like would to see the training delivered (workshops, online, technical assistance bulletins, etc.)?

| Training Needed or Desired | Desired Delivery Format |
|----------------------------|---|
| See above | Combination of formats may work best depending on the desired participant audience. |

| H. XII Attacl | Would you be willing to host a training working workshop in cooperation with OHP? ments | ⊠Yes | □ No |
|------------------|--|-----------------|------|
| | Resumes and Statement of Qualifications forms for all commission members/alternated | tives and staff | |

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013)

| Drafts of proposed changes to the ordinance |
|--|
| \square Drafts of proposed changes to the General Plan |
| ☑ Public outreach publications |

Email to <u>Lucinda.Woodward@parks.ca.gov</u>