

**Summary Minutes**  
**City of Sedona**  
**Historic Preservation Commission Meeting**  
**Vultee Conference Room, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Building 106, Sedona, Arizona**  
**Monday, September 25, 2017 – 4:00 p.m.**

**1. Call to order, Pledge of Allegiance, roll call**

Chair Unger called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m., led the Pledge of Allegiance and requested roll call.

**Roll Call:**

**Commissioners Present:** Chair Brynn Burkee Unger and Commissioners Jack Fiene, Kurt Gehlbach arrived at 4:12 p.m., Allyson Holmes, Derek Pfaff, and Steve Segner arrived at 4:11 p.m. Vice Chair Ann Jarmusch was excused.

**Staff Members Present:** Warren Campbell, Cynthia Lovely, Rob Pollock and Donna Puckett

**2. Commission and Staff announcements**

Warren Campbell announced that we received a 'save the date' email from SHPO regarding the conference in Scottsdale from June 6 - June 8 at Hotel Valley HO, so please get in touch with Donna at your earliest convenience, if you are interested. It is easy enough to reserve a room and cancel later, so if you are interested just let us know. There is a limited supply of rooms available.

Chair Unger noted that she has her condo, so she wouldn't need a room and Commissioner Holmes noted that the Valley HO is historical; however, the Chair then indicated that it might not be landmarked, and then announced that the Guidelines from the Secretary of Interior Standards were updated in 2015 and is online, so it would be good to skim through it again, but one that was handed out a number of years ago is older than that. Interestingly enough, they have never talked about it at the Historic Preservation Conferences, but it might be a good idea to go online and glance at it. Commissioner Fiene noted that the Commissioners received it at the HPC training.

Warren Campbell announced that there are some written comments [provided to the Commission] from Vice Chair Jarmusch who could not be present today, but she did want to provide some comments with her thoughts and ideas on each of the items. Chair Unger asked if this would be read into the record, and Warren indicated that he did not plan to, because the document is part of the record now, but if you as the Chair want to make any statements from it that's up to you.

**3. Approval of the May 8, 2017 minutes**

Chair Unger requested a motion to approve the minutes of May 8, 2017.

**MOTION: Commissioner Holmes moved to approve the minutes. Commissioner Pfaff seconded. VOTE: Motion carried four (4) for and zero (0) opposed. Vice Chair Jarmusch was excused and Commissioners Gehlbach and Segner were not present.**

**4. PUBLIC FORUM: (This is the time for the public to comment on matters not listed on the agenda. The Commission may not discuss items that are not specifically identified on the agenda. Therefore, pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.01(H), action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study the matter, responding to any criticism, or scheduling the matter for further consideration and decision at a later date.)**

Chair Unger opened the public forum and, having no requests to speak, closed the public forum.

**5. Discussion/possible action regarding a request for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness, pursuant to Section 1509 (Certificate of Appropriateness or Certificate of**

**No Effect) of the City of Sedona Land Development Code (LDC) to construct an exhibit shade ramada at the Jordan Historic Park located at 735 Jordan Road, Sedona.**

Chair Unger introduced this agenda item and indicated that staff will make a Staff Report, and then we can question staff. Then, we will ask if the applicant wishes to speak, and the Commission can then ask the applicant questions. Following that, we have the public speak, and then any Commissioner that wishes to respond to any questions posed by the public can do that. That is then closed, and we go into discussion and once we have gone through the discussion, motions can be made and she has provided sample motions.

**Presentation:** Warren Campbell referenced the packet of materials that the PowerPoint presentation will summarize, and explained that the request is for a Certificate of Appropriateness for an exhibit shade ramada at the Jordan Ranch. The Jordan Ranch has three building designated on both the National Register of Historic Places and the local. They are the Jordan House, the fruit-packing shed and the tractor shed. There are undesignated structures on the site, and those are the modern free-standing bathroom and the telegraph office. Their request is specifically for a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct the new shade ramada, so pursuant to Article 15, the HPC will review any submitted application for appropriateness with regard to preservation and historic integrity of the site, location selection on the site, material and color selection, size, scale, massing and orientation, and we get into the details of all of those specifics in the memorandums.

Warren indicated that some of the materials they are hoping to put in this new shade ramada is a pump and some other artifacts, some wood pipes, etc. Ms. Trevillyan can speak more to those particular items, but maps of the historic irrigation, etc., that to date has been sitting on that trailer under that tree, and they would like to make it a little more presentable and put it on display.

Warren referenced the map and a little white circle designating where this is proposed to go. You will see it is right behind the modern restrooms, and its closest historic building is the tractor shed and it is about 35 ft. from that historic building, so the applicant did propose a location that they hoped would maintain the historic integrity of the other buildings, but still be visible as you are meandering around the site looking at items, but also would have minimal impact to some of the existing vegetation on the site in terms of the sizable vegetation.

Warren indicated that in the sort of teal-colored platted area; he clouded it, because it is a little hard to see, since they have done a great job of trying to blend it in and tuck it around behind some existing trees, but in that kind of brownish-color, they tried to show a rendering of what this shade ramada might look like as you are standing in that kind of tractor yard. Again, kind of zooming in on it, you can get another perspective of it. It backs up to that modern restroom facility behind that tree. He then referenced some sketch drawings of it and indicated that the materials are proposed to be kind of a weathering corrugated metal roof and heavy timbers and, depending on engineering's suggestions, there might be some turnbuckle type of structural supports, and then a concrete slab. Again, it needs some engineering design for final detailing, but this is what they anticipate it to be. The roof would be, at its highest point against the modern restroom building, at about 11 ft., and would diminish to about 7½ ft. at the front edge. He then described where you would be looking at the materials.

Warren stated that there are five criteria for review, and they are in your packet. A suggested motion was provided and he will leave the criteria on the board.

*Note: Commissioner Segner arrived at 4:11 p.m.*

Warren indicated that concludes his presentation. There are a lot of materials and you will notice materials that did go to the City Council first, because the City Council, as the property owner, needed to grant the some approvals for it to move through the process.

*Note: Commissioner Gehlbach arrived at 4:12 p.m.*

Warren continued to state that the City Council did see this as a bit unique in terms of what comes before you, but they did authorize, as the property owner, that this move forward.

Chair Unger explained for those Commissioners who arrived late that Warren has made his presentation, and she wanted to mention that as she went through the packet, she noticed that there is one thing missing in terms of the previously approved Certificates of Appropriateness. The Commission approved the statue that is in front of the -- so she doesn't know if we want to add that to it. That is the only thing that she saw was missing; we did that a number of years ago. It's a cowboy standing in front of the building, and we approved that before we were brought the information on the telegraph office. Warren indicated that would be put in the record.

The Chair then indicated that she read through Vice Chair Jarmusch's statements, and she was asking about the cement in terms of the floor of the building, because she feels cement is much more difficult to remove if it were to be removed, and part of what we were led to believe is that we are approving this with the possibility of actually removing it if it impedes it, and it would not affect the area. Maybe we need to talk to Ms. Trevillyan about, if that is something we should be asking her? Warren confirmed that the Commission could speak to her about the design and potential modifications.

**Applicant/Authorized Agent Janeen Trevillyan, representing the Sedona Historical Society:**  
Ms. Trevillyan indicated that she would answer the Commission's questions or concerns.

**Commission's Questions and Concerns:**

Commissioner Fiene referenced the slide that has the clouded area and asked which way the land slopes. Ms. Trevillyan explained that it is pretty flat until you get to the back of the restroom building, and then it drops off severely in an arroyo. It is basically flat over to the top of the arroyo. The Commissioner indicated that he is trying to understand Vice Chair Jarmusch's issue with using gravel instead of concrete, and he always thinks drainage first, because if you have an exhibit that is subject to flooding that could be a problem. He then asked Ms. Trevillyan if she thinks that could be a problem, and she explained that this is going to have an impervious, impermeable roof, and it does slope some, but it is not very big. We're talking 10x20 or 12x21 or something like that, the roof will be slightly bigger than the pad, so you are already going to have rain hitting the roof and sliding off, going somewhere. Nothing is going to hit that floor, whatever floor surface we choose. It is not really going to perk there anyway, it is going to perk on the edges, so the permeability, she thinks they have already addressed that -- the roof comes first, so she is not sure there is an issue. From an appearance point-of-view or removability point-of-view, tentatively from the engineers, it is not going to be a very heavy slab and it is not going to be a very big slab -- not very thick, and it is probably not even going to have rebar, so from a removability point-of-view, it would not be costly and probably wouldn't take more than a couple of hours to lift it up and haul it out of there.

Commissioner Fiene then asked from an aesthetic point-of-view, and Ms. Trevillyan stated that there are a couple of thoughts. From a functional point-of-view, having that harder surface to set these kinds of heavy metal pumps on, they are thinking that they are going to have to put them up on blocks or something anyway, so even if they go with the gravel idea, these things are going to have to be up and they are going to have to be on something solid as a minimum. They were just thinking that, and because there might be some rain at some point in time that goes a little this way or that way, from an access point-of-view, maybe it would be better to just go ahead with a surface that people could have a very even footing on, so that is kind of the thinking -- it is a better surface to support the exhibit items, the heavy equipment, and it is probably a better, more even surface for people to walk on to view them.

Commissioner Segner pointed out that the apple barn has a poured concrete floor, and Ms. Trevillyan indicated that what they are proposing is, in terms of what the floor looks like, when the Park was developed, the City came in and put some sidewalks in, and those sidewalks are just plain concrete, very plain, which is what the historic floor is in the packing shed, but then they inlaid some red rock, so it is obviously a modern sidewalk, and they thought they could imitate that, which

is already on the property and obviously new, and they would want this to look different, so they know it is not an old historic structure that they tried to imitate. Their only thing is now-a-days, what they would probably do is just work with a concrete guy, and he would probably do an embossed stained rock look. Chair Unger added it would probably be a stamped look, and Ms. Trevillyan agreed, but with just a rock here and there.

Commissioner Fiene asked Commissioner Segner about the floor in the apple shed and Commissioner Segner said it is a little rough in spots and . . ., Ms. Trevillyan stated that this will be a little more rough than that, because it is an outdoor pad. The Chair added that you want it rough. Commissioner Segner suggested that when you pour it, just throw some dirt and trowel some dirt on it, and it just turns it a little bit red and makes it look funky.

Chair Unger explained that it is not for us to determine exactly how this is constructed, although she can understand the finishes, and that is where we need to look at it. Vice Chair Jarmusch's concern was that it could be removed, and she can see if you were actually doing a 6 in. or 8 in. pour on that, but she can't imagine that you need to do that. You might have to in the corners of the posts, but she can't imagine that the whole thing would be 6 in. or 8 in.; it just wouldn't make sense. She doesn't know that it makes a difference in terms of the visual; the building is there, and when the telegraph house was put there that was the site that we had thought would be a good site for that in terms of being away from the rest of the buildings and on its own. Certainly, this with the look and everything, and it is obvious that it is there to display something, and the people owning that place originally wouldn't have done that, so altogether, she thinks even the concept is such that it really does make itself different from everything else.

Commissioner Fiene noted that it is adaptable to the function of the site, and Chair Unger agreed and added that having the metal roof, rather than the asphalt roof that everything else is – doing those things actually makes it – and just having the slanted roof, although she thinks the tractor shed is a slanted roof too.

Commissioner Segner stated that there is a technique that you can use; you put the date in the concrete. Commissioner Gehlbach then asked about the color of the roof, and Ms. Trevillyan stated that they were proposing to use a corrugated and treat it right off, so it turns rusty, like if you look at the front porch of the building. They are just thinking that even though the roof of the tractor shed is a corrugated tin, when you look at it, you can see where it is barely rusted -- maybe 15% of that roof is rusted or maybe 20%. She then referenced the silver roof to the left and stated that roof is from 1929. Commissioner Segner stated that everybody in town buys it un-zincd, and then they throw acid on it.

Ms. Trevillyan explained that they are proposing that this would not be too shiny and too new at first. It is up to you; they are totally fine leaving it shiny and new, because treating it actually takes a few years off of its life, and theoretically, if something happens in the future and the City takes over this property and decides to run the museum itself or lease it to somebody else, the City would have to replace it in 75 years, but they are going to buy the thicker galvanized, not what they stock. They are shipping in something that will be over twice as thick, so it will have that extra life, and they just figured they would treat it to take some of the shine off for the neighbors and make it look a little more complementary, but without exactly imitating anything on the property.

Commissioner Segner stated that you can order it without zinc and it will treat better; otherwise, you have to strip the zinc off, and then go back and do it. Ms. Trevillyan commented that their roofer will hopefully . . ., Commissioner Segner interrupted to say just ask . . ., and Chair Unger interrupted to suggest getting back to the Commission's directives. It would be better to actually do the treatment, because it will then look different from the other buildings, and the understanding will be that it was created at a different time than the other buildings. Also, you may find out that the City does not like a shiny roof, so you are better off going with the treatment. Her thought would be go ahead and treat it, because that would be a better way to go with it, rather than leave it shiny.

Commissioner Gehlbach referenced the weight of the structure, and asked if they have taken that into consideration regarding the thickness, and Ms. Trevillyan nodded yes. He then asked about drainage, and Ms. Trevillyan indicated that as they previously said, she is not sure there is a whole lot of drainage issues other than what they are going to get off of that slope, and she can see where coming off of that sloped roof, they are going to get a rain pattern kind of thing, natural trenching, and what they did around the tractor shed is probably what they will do in the front, which is create a French drain and that is a depression filled with gravel, so the water won't build up there, and it will just fill-in and be routed probably towards the arroyo. Off the tractor shed, they have a French drain on it, and it catches into a pipe that goes over into a natural ditch.

*Chair Unger opened the public comment period and, having no public present, closed the public comment period.*

**Commission's Summary Discussion:**

Commissioner Fiene asked how everybody feels about Commissioner Segner's suggestion that they make sure there is a date on the slab. Chair Unger stated that it is not a bad idea; that way it states it clearly. Commissioner Gehlbach then suggested coming up with an historical preservation stamp and use that from this point on for any kind of structural (could not be heard). Chair Unger indicated that she doesn't know that the Commission -- really that is sort of going beyond what we can do. We have control over what we ask them to do, if it is going to affect the actual area, but in terms of having a stamp added, she doesn't think that . . ., Commissioner Segner interrupted to say that when you walk up to it, your natural question is when was it built. You look down and it has 10-17-17. Commissioner Gehlbach explained that he was thinking more of a stamp for the site itself, just showing progress over time (could not be heard).

Chair Unger indicated that we have had additions, etc., and that maybe is something we can discuss in the future. We might have to ask SHPO what their call would be on it for the future, but she doesn't think we can in this instance ask to do that. Ms. Trevillyan asked if they are proposing a stamp in the concrete or a bronze sign. Warren Campbell indicated that the suggestion is some sort of more formalized stamp in the concrete, but there is also a difference between an addition, new improvement on a city-owned property, and someone's private property. You could make the suggestion, but he is not hearing that it is critical, although if you want to make the suggestion or make it a Condition of Approval, the applicant could say yes or no. Commissioner Fiene stated that it is the easiest way to do differentiation; he thought it was a great suggestion. Commissioner Pfaff asked if it needs to be an official stamp though; it seems that we don't need to spend money, when you can take a nail and carve the date into it. Chair Unger indicated that if we wanted to formalize this and make sure that it is done, then it probably has to be part of the motion. If somebody wants to make a motion including that, they can, but . . ., Commissioner Segner interrupted to say that when you make a motion just make sure the date of the pour is plainly visible in the lower left-hand corner or front left-hand corner. Commissioner Gehlbach added something that the tourists could look at and say, oh, got it.

***MOTION: Commissioner Segner moved to approve with conditions case number CA17-02 (CoA) to install an exhibit shed ramada at the Jordan Historical Park as presented by the Historic Society based on the findings that it is in compliance with the provisions of Article 15, Historic Preservation Ordinance, LDC, and applicable Sedona Land Development Codes. Said shed shall have a prominent date marked on the lower left-hand side of the front of the shed that designates the date of the pour of concrete.***

Warren Campbell stated that is in addition to the conditions staff recommended about them needing to get a building permit, and Commissioner Segner stated yes. Chair Unger indicated that is not included in this, but that is implied. Warren again stated that was staff's recommended condition.

***Commissioner Fiene seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried six (6) for and zero (0) opposed. Vice Chair Jarmusch was excused.***

**6. Update/discussion regarding any Certificate of No Effect approvals**

Warren Campbell indicated that no Certificates of No Effect have been done since the last meeting.

**7. Discussion/possible direction regarding the development of a Historic Resource Recognition Program**

Chair Unger referenced the packet and indicated that basically it follows our landmark designation, except it allows for a more liberal view of it. Warren Campbell stated that it is quite a ways back in the packet as item #7. Chair Unger then restated that it follows almost all of the things that our landmark follows, except it allows for with a more liberal understanding.

Warren Campbell suggested that Commissioner Fiene speak to it; he, Commissioner Pfaff and Vice Chair Jarmusch worked on it. Commissioner Fiene stated that the genesis of this document was a memorandum that Vice Chair Jarmusch produced last year about special places, and we determined that the first thing we would have to do is establish criteria. He had reviewed what other HPCs had done and settled on the Boulder, Colorado model, and they didn't lay it out quite like this. Boulder approached these ideas as case studies, so to do the initial draft, he summarized the major concept in each case study and made somewhat of a personal decision as to whether or not it applied to Sedona. There were certain things that were more Boulder than Sedona, so that was changed. Then, he sent the initial draft to Vice Chair Jarmusch and Commissioner Pfaff, and they provided input on what they came up with, and then he sent a final draft out, and Vice Chair Jarmusch had some additional changes that he has incorporated, so this is our first step.

Chair Unger asked if everyone has read this and if they have questions. Commissioner Segner stated that basically if we found a building that we weren't going to landmark, but we wanted to do something else with it, this would be the criteria. Commissioner Fiene stated right, and they tried to make it as inclusive as they possibly could. Commissioner Pfaff indicated that properties that are eligible for landmarking should not be eligible for this; we don't want to incentivize people to go for the lesser, but he wanted to be sure everyone on the Commission agrees. Commissioner Holmes stated that she questioned that, because there might be an owner who doesn't want the restrictions of landmarking, but does have a significant building, and she sees your point though about it being an incentive not to list, so she doesn't know.

Chair Unger stated that it is a hard scenario, because there are quite a few buildings that can't be landmarked that they really want to landmark, so that is a funny balance. We have Relics, for example, that really, really – and now that they have it up for sale, she doesn't know, but he wanted the back-end of it landmarked, because it is an historic building. She thinks he would be really happy to have this. In Vice Chair Jarmusch's note to us, she expressed that maybe the Cowboy Club would be one; we have a lot of history in that place, but it does not look at all like it did, even when she first got here. It was a little scary when she first got here; you didn't want to go in there at night on your own. Now it is gentrified and very different, but it does have a history that we should recognize.

Commissioner Fiene indicated that he heard through the grapevine that they asked for a change of zoning. Commissioner Segner stated that they are trying to put an apartment building on it, and Commissioner Fiene stated that he has heard two things; he heard an apartment building and a hotel. Commissioner Segner stated no, an apartment building. Chair Unger pointed out this is off of the agenda.

Commissioner Segner indicated that we don't have to be that strict; there are not that many buildings we can do anymore, and if the group decides that it wants to landmark this or not landmark it, that is what the Commission is for. He doesn't know that we have to lock it in tight here. He understands the concept and it makes total sense, but there are always exceptions, and that is what the Commission is for.

Chair Unger stated that given the fact that we want to recognize that we have a history here and that so many buildings that have been here for fairly long time cannot be landmarked, it would be

good for us to be able to say that these are historic, but not landmark worthy. Commissioner Gehlbach indicated that with that said, how does everybody feel, using the Cowboy Club as an example, about a different level or another level of historic recognition? Chair Unger explained that is what this is, so when we do it, basically this is just the first part of jumping into doing this, then the decision is how that gets recognized. Do we do a plaque or something else? Commissioner Gehlbach added that as this evolves and those get more involved, like the Cowboy Club and possibly even Relics, we could offer suggestions to them and say Relics take down the front and let's see if we can get you more of a status there. It offers an opportunity for them to consider that also with regard to what would be appropriate for them – a plaque or whatever.

Commissioner Segner stated that he likes that idea; you know it is a significant building, and then there is a little history. You walk by – you go to Nantucket and they say Captain John's house 1750; he was a captain and lived here. Commissioner Gehlbach added that is fun, because that extends the whole Hollywood thing; take them around town.

Chair Unger pointed out that what we had needed is something that we could recognize it by; it can't just be open-ended. It really has to have some kind of significance in order to actually recognize it, because anyone could step up and say we want to recognize it. We still have some buildings that we can landmark, and we still need to be thinking about those. There are not as many, and as everything gets older and we accept some things more, there are going to be some other things that we can landmark in the future, but she has always thought it was a really good idea to keep the energy up about our past, and this will help do that.

Warren Campbell recalled that at a previous meeting, we discussed wanting to limit it to a certain number per year, but he doesn't see that in here, so he didn't know if we want to give some direction or if you want it open-ended. Commissioner Fiene stated that is not part of the criteria; that is why it is not there. Chair Unger stated that she is a little worried about doing that, because we lock ourselves in both ways like we are going to do two this year. When we do our work plan every year, we look at it that way, but in terms of the criteria, she knows that with the state and the federal with historic preservation, and SHPO, they ask us to be looking and landmarking a certain number. They want us to try to landmark at least one a year. She doesn't know that we really need to do that, but that is not incorporated into our requirements for landmarking. We could probably just do that on a work plan basis.

Commissioner Segner stated that you could take Uptown as part of our walking district, find buildings that are significant, designate them, build a plaque, put it on the building, and as you walk Uptown, it would say this is the old camera shop, this is used to be the gas station, etc. again, that is what the Commission is for; don't lock ourselves in. He thinks this is excellent; we should go with it and not pick it over, and then as we get into it, if we need to modify it, you modify it, instead of sitting here trying to come up with every way this could go wrong; this is an excellent document.

Commissioner Gehlbach stated that this is a great foundation; he is thinking exactly what you said, and then also consider a possible historical map, because we have a tremendous amount of pedestrians, and we could literally circulate it around Uptown and create more revenue. Chair Unger noted that Ms. Trevelyan had that for our historic landmarks; she actually had a walking tour and maybe we could regenerate that. Commissioner Fiene noted that we have the Uptown Rangers who could be very helpful.

Commissioner Segner indicated that would be a good project for one year to get Uptown done and that could continue the History Walk. It all becomes part of it and eventually take them all the way up to the historic museum. Chair Unger asked if this has to be in the Land Development Code; we don't have to do that do we? Warren Campbell explained this would be more of a policy, and the Chair indicated that she doesn't know if she wants to get into the legalities, and Warren continued to say that he will confirm that with the City Attorney. It sounds like there are a few more pieces that the group has; this is just a criteria element, and he will confirm it, but he thinks you would just

vote and adopt this as a policy. If you choose to enact it every year, great, and if not . . . , Commissioner Segner interrupted to suggest voting on it.

Chair Unger asked if the Commission could vote on it now, and Warren pointed out that the agenda says for direction on the criteria piece; there are other pieces to it, and they were looking for feedback on this element.

Chair Unger indicated that this is perfect, and whatever else you need to do going forward, in terms of the development of it; she would really like to see this on the table next time, so we can start working on it. Commissioner Segner stated not to over think it. We've got a committee; let them do it and bring it back. Let's look at it, vote on it and move it forward, because we could spend hours trying to change a word and we don't have to, this is excellent.

Commissioner Fiene asked what their mandate is for the next step, and Chair Unger indicated that the next step is probably passing this. We set it up on this agenda for discussion, but we can pass this, and Warren Campbell has to go to the City Attorney to make sure we are in keeping with what the City wants us to do. That happens, and then we actually vote on it next time, when we start looking at it. Warren Campbell stated to remove words like 'draft' and put in the other pieces you want. Let him know that you believe you have a document ready to be voted on, and he will notice it for that and, in the meantime, he will confirm with the City Attorney that there is nothing more formal than you just saying you want to do this. Commissioner Fiene stated that Warren could just take the word 'draft' off of the Word document he provided; that is it. Chair Unger thanked the group for putting this together, and stated that it is really an important thing and we have been talking about this for about three years.

Commissioner Segner stated that some money needs to be put in next year's budget for plaques, and let's design a plaque, and maybe Commissioner Fiene can look at others and see what people have done. Then, he can get a sample worked up and that can become a model, so when we do it they get the plaque. Chair Unger pointed out that we are kind of getting ahead here and Commissioner Fiene suggested not doing that, because there are a lot of different things we can do. Warren asked if when we bring this back, the Commission wants to have some examples of the different things we could do, and Chair Unger stated yes. Warren explained that he asked, because depending on what different things you choose to do, as we begin talking about the budget, which is right around the corner, we will need to know what we think we want to do, so he can price that, and we may be limited by budget on the number of plaques we can purchase. Commissioner Segner stated that they are \$300 or \$200 each, we know we can do two or three.

Chair Unger then stated that is what we are going to charge you with before we meet again, and Warren clarified that the take-away task is to come back with ideas on how you recognize. Commissioner Fiene stated that we have several options, depending upon which property theme we are going with, and for example in Prescott, there are some significant places, and they imbed a brass plate in the concrete to describe the site where something happened, so that is a possibility versus telling a story on a wall. There are different possibilities and we need to think about this.

Commissioner Holmes asked if the Commission takes the initiative on all of this or can owners apply to be included, and Chair Unger stated that is a good question.

*Chair Unger opened for public comment period.*

**Janeen Trevillyan, Sedona, AZ:** Ms. Trevillyan indicated that the map and the walking tour still exist that the Commission created a number of years ago, and the Chamber of Commerce Visitor Center makes photocopies of them and hands them out when people ask, so it is still in use. She does think that you should consider that, and she will read your document before the next meeting, but you should consider that if a property qualifies for landmark, then they cannot do this, because you are sending mixed messages, but we do have places like the Cowboy Club, even Relics where the front has been so changed, and there are other places that people do enjoy the site of, even if



there is nothing there, so essentially you are kind of doing that. You are kind of saying something happened here, because now all of a sudden, the Cheers store at the corner of Forest and S.R.89A probably qualifies, because Elvis made a movie here, but that building has changed enough that it would not qualify even once it gets to its 50-year date. Ms. Trevillyan stated that one other thing, regarding designing a plaque, there was a point in time when the Commission did go through Uptown and put 10 or 12 bronze plaques on buildings that were not landmarked, but did have a story, so if you are going to do more of that, you might actually look at those plaques that are already there and see if you want to leverage that look, and as Commissioner Fiene mentioned, sometimes there will be a story about why the plaque is here and maybe sometimes it will just say, "The site of . . .", but anyway those are just some things to think about, because there are some materials available maybe to help you get kick-started.

Chair Unger stated that if the Commission hasn't read this, actually what Ms. Trevillyan explained is in here; it says Sedona landmarks are not eligible, so if it is eligible for a landmark, it is not eligible.

*Chair Unger closed the public comment period.*

Commissioner Segner stated that he doesn't know why it has to be 50 years. The idea is they shot a movie here; it was on a corner and it was significant like Elvis, so why does it have to wait 50 years. Commissioner Fiene explained that there are two points. First is Ms. Trevillyan's point, if it is eligible for landmarking, it is not eligible for this. Second, we do recognize properties that are less than 50 years old, because of unique circumstances. Chair Unger added that we already do landmarking too, but before we vote on this, everybody should go through this and look at it again, but they did a really good job of focusing in on what we want to do.

#### **8. Update/discussion on the Ranger Station Park Master Plan project**

**Presentation:** Cynthia Lovely indicated that this portion of the update is to update you on what has been happening on the site, and then what they have planned. You probably saw some movement there. When the City did the stormwater project in Tlaquepaque, they took all of that material and stockpiled it on the Ranger Station property, with the idea being that we might be able to reuse some of that material in the park construction, so that project ended in the last few months, and they have been sorting and screening all of that material to decide what they can reuse and what they need to get rid of, so they just finished that process. On the Capital Improvement Program budgeting, they set aside \$120,000 for this fiscal year, and that would include grading and some utilities, so next is utilities. The next step that should happen in the next couple of months would be utilities, so they will be extending wastewater and water as well. Then once that is in place, they can do the rough grading with material that is there now, and when they finish that, it will be a much-improved appearance, so it won't look like a construction site after that, and it will also be usable for events parking, etc., and that should happen this fall, and it will all get cleaned up.

Commissioner Segner asked what happens when they extend Soldiers Wash, will they need to use that property again for storage of material, because as he understands that saved them a lot of money. Cynthia Lovely stated that they have not mentioned that, but that is a question. . . , Commissioner Segner interrupted to say that he would ask, because they might say they planned on using the park again, and you are going to say you just graded it. Cynthia explained that if they are working on both projects, they would know, but we can ask. Cynthia noted that there is coordination with that even on the wastewater; they are working on that, but we can ask that question.

Commissioner Holmes asked if we got the barn roof, and Cynthia stated the roof is on. Commissioner Gehlbach asked about the plan for the wastewater, and Cynthia explained it is just to bring in the line probably up to where we have the restroom. In the past, when the Forest Service used the property, the house and barn were not on sewer. The older green building is now gone, so there is no point to grade and do utilities later; they are trying to do everything in order. Chair Unger asked about the trees that needed to be removed, and Warren stated that is under the next item and noted that there is no action on this item.

9. **Discussion regarding the Ranger Station House and Barn Building Rehabilitation Recommendations and Cost Estimates Report 2017**

**Presentation:** Warren Campbell referenced a document provided to the Commissioners from Mr. Otwell, and a set of plans. The genesis for this item is a concern over the state of the buildings and the budgeting process, and what is and isn't budgeted in the near-term, so it was done from the money we had left last year, and it was money that had to be used for this type of thing, so we did this document. You will see some recommendations on the costs, the order of things, etc., and how we should approach rehabbing these buildings, with the goal and thought that this will help us as we go into budgeting cycles to ask for money to do this project, etc., and we can speak intelligently about the costs. It doesn't mean we are going to get it, but we have the tools to say here is the cost, so could we get money to do this

Warren noted that there was also concern about some of the tree removal that has been occurring. We've discussed with Vice Chair Jarmusch and Chair Unger why we have been doing some things out there. As a little background, there are two designated structures there, and the landmark designation was put on the property before the City purchased it, as well as the National Register designation. We purchased it in 2014 and adopted the Master Plan that we are all working on in 2016. When he started thinking about this, he realized that we did a lot of work out there in the last year. We demolished the green home/office building, we demolished some sheds and a garage that were not designated or historical; some were really dilapidated and an eyesore. We reroofed the barn and that was done just before then end of the budget cycle, so the barn has been reroofed. We installed Plexiglas on many of the windows to protect them. Some had window panes falling out, weather issues, etc., so the vast majority of the windows now have a Plexiglas minimally attached, so we don't cause damage, and they are allowed to drain. We removed a number of invasive tree species – the Tree of Heaven. Steve loves to rant about how awful those are, and we are starting the grading on the southern end, which Cynthia just discussed with the utility improvements. In the material from Mr. Otwell, there are estimates, and they break down various tasks into some that are a little more expensive and some that are bite-size, and he tried to say that we should prioritize these over those, and you wouldn't want to do this before doing that. Again this tool has some numbers in it, some of the numbers are scary, but they will allow us to have an intelligent conversation about what we should put into a program budget cycle as we move forward. Again, it was broken out to the house and barn, that is why you see two different numbers and lists. He included both lists, and he did take some recent photographs last week to see the new roof. It looks very nice, and if you remember the shingles were blowing off and it had lost a lot of the aggregate.

Commissioner Gehlbach asked if that is 20 or 35-year, and Warren stated that he doesn't remember. It is not super-duper thick, but he can ask. He thinks it is more like 30-35, but it isn't the 50-year shingles.

Warren noted that something that Vice Chairman Jarmusch speaks to in her written comments and to Chair Unger and him was that she has a great concern about the bottoms of the doors rotting, and we have talked to some individuals and they are going to have to be reconstructed when we get to that, so that is a big concern of hers. You can see on the left, the Plexiglas over the window and the door rotting. Commissioner Gehlbach referenced the estimates and asked if they include the windows, and Warren stated that they include everything. Those estimates include, other than some little detail somebody missed, the major stuff that would get these buildings restored pursuant to the guidelines and get them largely operational. The Commissioner then asked if when they do replace them, will they put the Plexiglas back in to protect them, and Warren stated that when we replace the windows, he would image that would be the windows.

Cynthia Lovely explained that the purpose of the Plexiglas was because we can't afford to replace the windows right now. Once they are replaced . . . , Commissioner Segner interrupted to say that you can't even rebuild them. Chair Unger indicated that they don't need to do any more than that, because you will be maintaining them over time.

Commissioner Segner referenced the conference in Tucson, and that they talked about restoring older buildings and said the problem that happens is that in adobes, they used to have a slope away, and then as time passes, it builds back up, so the water flows back into the building, so as part of your drainage, if you were to pull back from there a bit. Cynthia Lovely stated that was done, but you can't see it. There is a concrete apron in front of the doors and it is like a trench, but what had happened over the years is it had filled with sediment and sand, so before the last event we had, the maintenance guys cleaned that out, but they may need to keep it up, because it looks like it is starting to fill-in; Commissioner Segner agreed.

Commissioner Gehlbach asked about having ADA accessibility, and Warren Campbell stated that when we get to that point it will have to meet ADA regulations. There will be an access point for individuals in need, but it may not be on the side. It is not something we are ever allowed to forget.

Commissioner Pfaff asked if these numbers assume that everything is mobilized and the work is done as one project or can they be done separately. Cynthia Lovely stated that it is assuming one project, which was his recommendation because of cost savings. Warren Campbell added that there was probably some increase in doing some things individually.

Commissioner Fiene asked what latitude we have on the bottoms of the doors. A lot of reconstruction is being done these days that is a composite and looks exactly like the old wood; do we have that kind of latitude or do we have to reconstruct it as it was originally? Warren Campbell stated that he would imagine that when you reconstruct them, he is proposing with true wood, but he hopes efforts would be maintained to keep drainage away from them. Those doors are 100-years-old and that is as far as they rotted in 100 years. Commissioner Segner clarified that is not a 100-year-old door, and is the '30s. Commissioner Pfaff stated that he doesn't remember the specifics, but some of the guys from the Ranger Station south of the Village mentioned building materials that they have, like original building materials. Warren indicated that they were suggesting siding, and Commissioner Pfaff asked if we are taking advantage of that. Warren stated that as he recalled, he was going to ask his supervisor about providing that to us, so we will follow up. Commissioner Holmes asked if that was stored in Beaver Creek, and Commissioner Gehlbach indicated that he believes so. Additionally, Commissioner Gehlbach indicated that he confirmed that on the fiscal year budgeting committee that just finished, the budgeting is in for this under Recreation, but they don't have the numbers, so that might be something you want to get them to remember at this point.

Warren Campbell showed a slide of the current state of the site as of last week and indicated that it sounds that in a couple of months, the site will largely be graded out, but you will still see some piles of materials that they think they can use later, like boulders and rocks for landscaping, but in a general sense, this site will not look like construction site.

Warren then indicated that something that caused Vice Chair Jarmusch to start questioning what we were doing was these two rather large trees were removed about three or four weeks ago. They were that Tree of Heaven, and they had just not come down yet; we were lucky we had them for the party, but these were the trees that are invasive and many people consider them a weed tree, so we have begun cutting these down and they are now treating the roots and new sprouts. Some interesting facts that Cynthia gave him includes that they are short-lived -- about 30-50 years. They can get 60 ft. to 80 ft. high, they can put out over 300,000 seeds per year and new sprouts can grow 10 ft. to 15 ft. per year, new sprouts and suckers occur 50 ft. to 90 ft. from the parent tree off of the roots, and complete control can take one to five years of continuous management. That is why we take these trees down, hoping to get them under control by the day we are implementing other elements of the park, so the trees are down and are going to be gone soon. He then pointed out that the slide shows more of the Plexiglas on the house, and you can see where the garage and another Tree of Heaven were removed.

Warren indicated that another tree that caused Vice Chair Jarmusch some concern was a tree in the back that was literally growing out from under the foundation. It was removed, because not only

were we concerned about the foundation, but we also learned that the cistern in the bottom, so we had that removed, but there was some concern about these things happening without the full involvement and knowledge of the HPC, so we will be better at informing you of what is going on out there in the future. There is another evergreen tree not too far from where this tree was, and it is full of mistletoe; it is not coming down immediately, but it is not likely to survive. By the time it is all said and done and we get to this end of the park, there probably isn't going to be a lot of original trees there, because most of them are the weed trees or they are quite infested with mistletoe.

Warren then showed a photograph of another door that concerned Vice Chair Jarmusch that comes out the back area, and he wanted to inform the Commission of what is going to happen. APS has been going through the community in their three-year cycle where they clear underneath the power lines, so to the back of the site on the north end, close to where you would look down into the parking lot of Tlaquepaque, they are going to clean out about 10 ft. on each side of the power line. Cynthia walked around with the APS guy and they are going to help us with the spraying and maintenance of those Tree of Heaven trees, so they don't keep coming back. He didn't want anyone to think there is a clear-cutting process occurring, but it will potentially look like that, although from many perspectives, you may not even know it is occurring, because there is a significant grade change there, and many people might have thought it was on Tlaquepaque's property, but there will be some tree removal, and he is sure they have talked to some of the other property owners going down the line. Cynthia added that there is a Siberian Elm that they will probably just cut some branches off of.

Commissioner Segner indicated that he had those trees on Schnebly with hundreds of sprouts coming up, and he sprayed them about four times, but you can spray them and get rid of them, so cut them and spray them, and when they just start to come back up is when you spray. Then, you can get rid of them in a couple of years. Warren stated that it does look very thick and lush, so it will be a bit shocking, but he wanted to inform the Commission. Cynthia noted that there is an oak in one picture and they are not going to cut those. Commissioner Holmes then pointed out that APS does this for free, and Warren stated yes; they asked us and got our thoughts, but there is really no option – they are going to do it, but they were polite enough to walk with us and we learned a lot of things about the trees. Chair Unger noted that they actually call them 'cancer trees' in Cottonwood and Jerome, and they have them in Bisbee too; they are hard to get rid of.

Warren then indicated that another element of this in Vice Chair Jarmusch's comments was that she was interested in having conversations even today about how to fund some of these elements, and make sure the buildings don't fall into further disrepair, a little from coming from the mindset that there is nothing budgeted in the coming year, but he will commit to start the conversations with Public Works, because they are the ones that take care of all of the city-owned properties. It is okay to say we want to run out and start looking for grants, but we need to make sure the other side, the City's side, is prepared to administer it, to have the matching funds, etc.; there are other pieces that we need to consider, so at a future meeting, we may bring in the head of our Public Works Department. We can't run off in a direction that he isn't prepared to support, but we will use these tools to begin some budget conversations, and then there may be some volunteer opportunities for certain things. Commissioner Segner tends to talk about the possibilities of volunteers if we do it right, but again, he can't promise anything or that there will be any money put in any budget, but at least we can have some intelligent conversations, and he feels he is better prepared to advocate and make sure this doesn't get lost.

Chair Unger noted that in order for the Commission to go after any grants, the next item is about the Historic Preservation Conference, but we need to know what the grants are for. You have to have that down sometimes to even more than Otwell's report. You can't just go for a grant to go for a grant; they won't give you anything if you do that.

Commissioner Gehlbach stated that he doesn't know what the process would be, but there is \$65,000 in donations that comes through town every year, so why couldn't some of those donations be used, not to mention the 1% tax that is hopefully going to be implemented in a let's pay as we go

idea. We have this cash on hand and the budget was considered, but we didn't know numbers, so when talking about grants, etc., they seem to take time, where this money is already there. We just need to find it in the right places. Commissioner Segner stated that it is 5% tax on jeep trips, which brings in \$800,000 per year. Chair Unger pointed out that this is sort of outside of the agenda, and Warren indicated that it would be agendaized for a better conversation about funding, etc., but a lot of things compete for the dollars.

Commissioner Segner asked if you are going to have water to the site pretty soon, is there any chance of putting some trees in to get them a head start. It would be nice to get some decent trees in, even along the back wall or something; maybe get some Catalpas or something that will grow and look good. Cynthia Lovely stated that we can ask, and Warren noted that this item didn't need any formal action.

#### **10. Discussion of State Historic Preservation Conference experiences**

Chair Unger stated that she got a lot of information, and the first part was the grant part, and she was given a huge list of grants. This is something that she would like to have a meeting on, but it may have to be, and she and Commissioner Fiene have been thinking about doing this, generated by going to the City Manager and discussing these grants. SHPO would help determine if they would be possible, especially surrounding the USFS buildings, but there are a lot of them, and she was fascinated by how much they said we probably could get, but again, the City would have to know exactly what we want to do with them, because we are not going to get anything unless we have it detailed out as to what we are asking for. The Chair indicated that in the CLG all of us that went learned something, and even if it wasn't learning something, it is refreshing ourselves with all of the stuff we need to know, and they talked about a conservation easement for rehabilitating facades, etc., so again, those are things we could look at when looking at grants, and that is something we can discuss further. They also talked about how to make historic preservation a bigger part of what brings in our tourists, and they basically said that we need to distinguish ourselves different from our competitors, and they are talking a lot more about viewsheds, which we don't really do; we talk more about buildings, but they were saying that as historic preservation, we should also be looking at our viewsheds, because that is such a big part of Sedona. One of their recommendations was that as we are designating landmarks, we should think about the viewsheds of landmarks too. The other thing was that they talked about the Arizona Memory Project, and they have a newspaper story on different things that have happened in different areas, and this is a website where you can find things that we might not know about, and we can use those when we are looking at landmarking. Interestingly, one section that they went into was how you decide what to landmark and make that decision. They said the first thing you need to do is come up with a story and understand the story even before digging deeper into the physical background, because the story is what is going to drive you in making a landmark; not so much how old the building is, etc. Do the story first, and then from there look into the background details that you need to ensure it is a landmark. It sounds obvious, but sometimes we look at 50 years or other markers we set for ourselves, where they were saying if it has a story that is going to create the ability to do the landmark. They also have federal grants for state preservation, and Local First Arizona has some grants, and we have discussed having a meeting, but it is hard with the City Council, although we probably can meet with individual Councilors about that. They also discussed that if you were going to want this to be something to bring people in as a tourist drive; they call it the Power of 10, and you need more than one thing to draw them in, and we have enough now that we could consider those kinds of things. They also talked about dividing the City into character areas, and they were talking about that with social media, every Sunday in May we should probably be doing a piece on a different place in Sedona, because that is what a lot of organizations were doing and that draws tourists in too.

Chair Unger stated that those were the main points, although there was more in terms of architecture and contemporary versus older buildings and restoration of different pieces of history, in different parts of the state.

Commissioner Segner stated that the opportunity is that we have a historic building and a park that we are trying to put together. We have budgets to fix them, but we have no money, so the logical thing is that we should concentrate on grants and get that process to pay as much to maintain and fix those buildings as we could, so what if we were to say we want to find \$60,000 to \$100,000 to stabilize and fix the building, all we really need to do is identify the grants, get some money from the City for a grantwriter and make that a focus for a year. Chair Unger again indicated that is something to put on a future agenda, because we are really supposed to be talking about what we learned from the Conference. Commissioner Segner stated that he is saying that we learned that grants are available and on a future agenda we can say these five grants look good and continue to talk about the need and cost for a grantwriter. Chair Unger added that for all of these years, the Historic Preservation Conference has talked about how we could do grants. There are also other things that will become available; some of the federal grants are coming back a little too.

Commissioner Gehlbach indicated that he went to 'Building a Case' and that was quite enjoyable. Regarding building a case, be flexible; one individual could change the entire policy, and they discussed things like the National Treasure Program, which is [savingplaces.org](http://savingplaces.org), and they spoke about the relevancy and the importance in how we associate with the general public in regard to many of these things. Hope Hands, on preservation experience, is more for high-schoolers to create an appreciation for our history and community, but also they are using these volunteers for learning a trade, and they are learning the Secretary of Interior Standards for rehabilitation projects, and educational grants are also available. The National Trust, apparently there is a great (audio unclear) that we could speak to.

Commissioner Pfaff referenced the conservation easements and indicated that may be something we tie in with our recognition program. If there is a property and we like the way it looks or its historic significance, if it is part of that process, we could get a conservation easement to maintain at least the appearance or the front. The guy from the City of Tempe was talking about using that, but they were giving people money to restore their facades, where we would be looking more at recognizing the building the way it is, and we would like for you to keep it the way it is and maybe try to use some of those easements or get inventive about how we can preserve the appearance, and that would be a step short of recognition or landmarking rather; for example, if we could get an easement for Relics (audio unclear).

Commissioner Fiene indicated that he found 'Building a Case' to be exceptional, especially since they handed out the lists of potential funding and the fact that it is statewide. Also, the two planners from the City of Tempe talked about place-making, and we have those opportunities here, so he was especially interested in that and that they were using social media as part of it, incorporating younger people into the dialogue, which is extremely important. They are also making places in landscaped areas, no buildings, just park benches and views, and the smell of coffee from a vendor. There are all kinds of things that bring out a memory of a place.

Commissioner Fiene stated that he also wanted to bring up the field trips – the Steam Pump Ranch was great, but the part he appreciated the most was the demonstration projects they had onsite, and we have the opportunity to do those things on our properties. He did not get a lot out of the general meetings, except for Friday morning's meeting with Bill Dole – that was very well done, incorporating more archeology, which is all around us, so that was excellent. Something that he is not sure anybody else wants to discuss is the idea of creating contacts for resources, networking, and the opportunities at that conference were terrific. On his way to register, he ran into Eric Vondy and he asked about Sedona. He also met Kathryn Leonard, so those experiences are important for us and it is important for the Council to recognize how important these things are for the City. The booths and vendors were terrific and he is glad that he purchased this document, and also the bookstore; it is amazing to him. A lot of his undergrad work was in Sociology, and this is a terrific updated text on Urban Sociology. This is called, *The Past and Future City* and it begins with a lot of what Jane Jacobs did in the City of New York, and it is updated into other urban areas and a lot of it has to do with place-making, which is terrific in the fact that the restoration of older buildings is

more economical and enjoyable than putting in new structures. The book was written by Stephanie Meeks and it is a wonderful book, and he looks forward to stopping by that bookstore next year.

Commissioner Holmes stated that the demonstration garden at the Steam Pump is something she would like to see at the Ranger Station. It was the exact -- it formulated her idea into the exact thing, and to know that there is the expertise of needed seed research right there with all the seeds and history. She has ordered seeds from them since then, and it is a great way to have agriculture be a lesson to all of us without getting into a community garden complex situation. She also ran into some people from this area that has done that sort of thing in different sites around the Verde Valley and we might be able to enlist their expertise in helping set this up.

Commissioner Segner said that he knows how to fix adobe buildings. He took two days of adobe and it was excellent. He doesn't know how factual it was, but it was really interesting; he learned a lot about it, and we have a couple of older ones. They told you how to identify cracks and foundations, and stabilizing, so that was really good. As far as the building of a place, he has been trying to get the History Walk all the way down to the bridge, and the bridges were where the cowboys used to come up in the 1880s to go fishing, so there is all kinds of history there at the bridge, but he can't seem to get the City and the state to get behind finishing that walk. We could put plaques there; it is one of the prettiest places to see over Oak Creek Canyon. The City of Sedona was designed around Oak Creek; we forget Oak Creek was probably our major historic draw. We think of buildings and vistas, but it was the creek, so he is still working on that with the City, and they are trying to work with the state; but at some point in time, he might need a letter from the City to get things going; it's been a year now. Let's don't forget the creek; it is really important to us. Chair Unger noted that could be put on a future agenda; those are the kinds of things that are generated out of this, like talking about the grants. It is probably appropriate for us to go to the City Council and the City Manager and show them what we have found. Then, we need to bring it back and help with an understanding of that, but it needs to go on the agenda for one of the other meetings. Warren Campbell pointed out that it is still on our work plan, and he is working to get it accomplished through the joint meeting.

Warren Campbell stated that he enjoyed every aspect he has heard and the demonstration garden, but again, grants are great, but there are usually lots of rules with a grant, and we need to make sure we are all aligned before we invest time and effort in pursuing one.

Commissioner Gehlbach stated that he had one more class he wanted to mention, and it was "Reaching the Next Generation". They had some really good statistics -- State Parks and Trails increased tourism 26% for 2016. Desktop and mobile - 60% are accessing from mobile, and online bookings have increased, social media, and they are all responding more to creative design. It is interesting when you think that Oak Creek and such are attractions for the younger crowd, even college students, so these are areas we could create additional revenues for ourselves, if it is possible, but also maybe create a relationship with the Chamber of Commerce to be part of maybe a mobile app that is really going to be used with regard to the younger generations, because they go directly there; just some ideas from an economic potential. Chair Unger noted that when we go to the conference and come up with ideas, we then can put them on an agenda, one of the things is maybe to go into the next item, which would be #11.

**11. Discussion regarding future meeting dates and future agenda items [Bring your Calendars]**

• **October 9, 2017 – canceled**

Chair Unger stated that we may want to talk about how we might figure out if there is something we can do with the City's website to help us promote historic preservation. Another item would be the grant thing, and maybe pointing more to Oak Creek -- that idea would not only be landmarking vistas, etc. . . ., Commissioner Segner interrupted to say that you can take that area and change its name a little and call it Oak Creek Vista -- make it a historic junction. The History Walk comes down to it and then we pull it together, and what is good about that is there is a meeting place. You could have vendors and people talking -- what better place in the evening to walk, if it was lit.

The Chair indicated that in terms of future ideas, when might we need another meeting? Warren stated that after today, he doesn't have anything in the queue for any Certificate of Appropriateness or Certificate of No Effect. We canceled October 9<sup>th</sup>, because we did this meeting in the middle, but we could begin talking about -- it is always nice to pair few things together, and since the budget is coming, it might mean let's have this conversation in January or December. He will talk with Audree about how soon we need to begin having that. The Chair suggested doing it earlier in terms of the new recognition program. It might be good for that to be part of looking at the budget, and maybe have a meeting in November. December is always a hard meeting to have, and she would like to have a launching point, before we go into the final decisions about budgeting. It scares her to go all the way into January without having started that conversation. Warren indicated that is fine; we can certainly have a meeting in November, but remember our budgeting is not until June-July, so we are only halfway through when we start talking about it again. It is not a December-January date. May-June is when they are making the final decisions.

Chair Unger stated that if we are going to start generating this, she would like . . . , Commissioner Segner referenced the budget and said it is not that big of a deal. What do we get \$2,000 a year and we don't spend it? Chair Unger stated no, we have gotten quite a bit and staff has been really good about doling out things we had for the grant, but she is concerned that if we are going to have this project completed and all of the ideas filtered in, she wants to make sure that we're ready at the beginning of the year to start looking at how we might look at that and roll it out. We are probably going to want to roll it out in May, and she would rather have it set and start looking at it in January. Last year, it took us from January to May to get it done, so she would rather have this as a solid base for it, and then at the beginning of the year, we can say this is what it is.

Commissioner Gehlbach indicated that he seconds that; he would like to get things accomplished. The Chair then indicated that maybe in November we could look at a couple of places – Babbitt Ranch is one to look at as a landmark, and Commissioner Segner stated that we need to look at the museum. We haven't surveyed it in a long time and it needs a lot work. It is our responsibility to keep that building in shape. The City doesn't have any formal process; we are responsible for historic buildings and we should survey that building to say what needs to be fixed.

Donna Puckett explained that these items should just be mentioned for a future agenda and not discussed today. The Chair stated that we could readdress our Resource Recognition Program and a survey of some of the buildings we are responsible for; that was on our work program too. Commissioner Segner then added the budget, and Warren indicated that he has a healthy list of items. The Chair then again stated that we should have a meeting in November; most people are not around in December, and Warren stated that staff will confirm it.

## 12. Adjournment

Chair Unger asked for a motion to adjourn.

***MOTION: Commissioner Holmes moved to adjourn. Commissioner Pfaff seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried six (6) for and zero (0) opposed. Vice Chair Jarmusch was excused.***

*The meeting adjourned at 5:47 p.m.*

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission held on September 25, 2017.

---

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

---

Date