

Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Historic Preservation Commission Meeting
Vultee Conference Room, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, Arizona
Monday, December 13, 2021 – 4:00 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, & ROLL CALL

Chair Unger called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m., led the Pledge of Allegiance and requested roll call.

Roll Call:

Commissioner members present: Chair Brynn Burkee Unger, Vice Chair Kurt Gehlbach and Commissioners Jack Fiene, Bob Huggins and Derek Pfaff. There are two vacancies.

Staff Members Present: Cynthia Lovely, Jess McNeely, Megan McRae and Donna Puckett

Guest Participant: Janeen Trevillyan representing the Sedona Historical Society

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS & SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS BY COMMISSIONERS & STAFF

Cynthia Lovely indicated that work has been started on the Ranger Station Barn. The north side of the exterior is the one with all of the barn doors and that is being renovated now and should be done in a couple of weeks. They had to replace some of the siding, most of the doors had to be rebuilt, and they are adding gutters. The other side will come right after that, so hopefully by July 1st, the barn exterior will be completed.

3. APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING MINUTES:

a. October 11, 2021 (SV)

b. October 11, 2021 (R)

Chair Unger indicated that she would entertain a motion to approve the October 11th site visit and meeting minutes.

MOTION: Vice Chair Gehlbach moved to approve the site visit and office [meeting]. Commissioner Huggins seconded the motion.

VOTE: Motion carried five (5) for (Fiene, Gehlbach, Huggins, Pfaff and Unger) and zero (0) opposed. There are two vacancies.

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 at 4:03 p.m. and, having no request to speak, closed the public forum at 4:04 p.m.

5. REGULAR BUSINESS

a. Report on the annual State Historic Preservation Conference on October 27-29, 2021

Chair Unger explained that she was the only one available to attend the HP Conference, and they didn't have as many classes this time, but they had an incredible CLG series. It was broader and covered more of what CLGs are. She took notes, and she will send them out to everybody but will briefly go through some of this. The community responsibility and our responsibility to the community was a lot of what they wanted to convey, and that we needed to preserve the right of

the owners and work in the best interest of the community. Then, the process with open records, etc., and they pointed out that we need to progress and grow over time. Our Commission has been stalled over the past two years, because of COVID, but they want to make sure that we are still moving ahead and doing things that need to be done.

The Chair indicated that they have a list of the preservation responsibilities and you can review those, and of course professional conduct, treating everyone fairly, respecting the framework, participating, disclosing conflict of interests, being consistent, raising any ethical issues and being prepared for every meeting. There is more and she would like for the Commissioners to go over it. It is not really long, but she doesn't want to take time today to review all of it. She has more notes and things they sent her if you have any questions. They also covered no gifts, no personal agendas and not misrepresenting facts.

Chair Unger stated that they reviewed the Standard Guidelines for Design, and we all should review it, because there are four different ways a building can be looked at. One is Preservation meaning leave it alone and just maintain it. Restoration is taking it back to a specific time using historical records. Rehabilitation and Adaptive Reuse is what we do most, so we can redo the buildings. Reconstruction is the fourth, which is infill using historical materials and records. We have covered all of these in detail in our handbook and pamphlets, but rehabilitation is the one we are doing with the Forest Service buildings. They did say to remember to update our guidelines and the character. One thing they hadn't mentioned in the past is the character-defining features actually include the landscape around the buildings, and we have always looked at that and felt that was a big part of what we were doing, but they hadn't really emphasized that in the past like they did this time.

The Chair stated that another new item they really wanted to emphasize was community engagement, and the way we are set up, we speak to landmarking and saving the landmarks and HPC being part of that, and they were saying we can engage the community to understand what historic landmarking and preservation is, because that is different than the history. What we do is very specific to maintaining and making sure the buildings are there, but they were saying that we need the public to understand the importance of that and we should develop partnerships for instance with the library and other departments of the city government, plus state and federal entities, and we will be getting into another item on the agenda that will speak to that, because that is something we need. Some of the things they talked about were going to local events, making sure we have social media following us, doing a quarterly letter perhaps, and a lot of these things are really time consuming, so what we will be talking about in agenda item 5b. will be talking to that. They were adamant in the fact that too often groups like HPC are not recognized and understood by the public, so that is what we need to be doing.

Chair Unger again mentioned that there is a list for the role of Commissioners, and we have most of those things and need to be doing them according to the City and our documentation. They also have the roles of the Chair and staff like training the Commission, explaining the process to applicants, working with the applicants, supporting the Commission, briefing the Commission about things and issuing minutes, all of which staff really takes care of here.

Chair Unger indicated that she will send this out, and this was probably the most important part of it. They also said that there are monies now available to the city governments if you are a CLG for some of the projects we are doing. She has talked with Cynthia and the city about requesting a grant from the Federal Government to help us with the U.S. Forest Service buildings.

Vice Chair Gehlbach asked where the money would be designated to, and Chair Unger explained that the city has to come up with something. There are narrow paths you have to follow to get those monies, and she has given the City some of the information and we will be communicating back and forth about where the money can come from and go, but it is very narrow. Basically, the only project we have on hand would be the U.S. Forest Service buildings. The Vice Chair stated that confuses him, because of all the other things we were working on like the walk. The Chair explained that before we couldn't get anything for bricks and mortar and now, they are only doing

bricks and mortar, so she is working with someone with the City to see if they would be willing to help write a grant.

b. Discussion and possible action on potential partnership with Sedona Historical Society

Chair Unger stated that to fulfill our obligation as a CLG, we need to make the public aware of what we do, and she spoke with Karen Osburn and Cynthia regarding how we need to be thinking about how we can do this without impacting the amount of money needed to keep HPC going. It would be good for us to think about a relationship with the Sedona Historical Society to help us get our message out to the public with all of the components they have, like mailing lists. We have only done one event a year and possibly another when we started the recognition program, but the one time is usually in May for Historic Preservation Month, so we haven't really had anything else, and they were talking about us having more interactions with the public, so she wanted to see what the Commission's feelings might be in terms of us partnering with the Historical Society to ensure our message gets out there.

Commissioner Huggins asked if the Historical Society had been approached on this, and the Chair stated yes and Janeen is here. She then invited Janeen Trevillyan to speak to this. Cynthia Lovely added that at the same time, the city is working on a service contract with the Historical Society and Heritage Museum, so we thought there might be a way to include some of HPC's community outreach in the contract.

Janeen Trevillyan stated that the Society is open to the partnership; we've always been partners with the Commission like co-oping on events in the past and research, etc., so they are open to trying to define something specific instead of just opportunistic, which is kind of how we have operated up to now. So if you have some goals, we would entertain and discuss those, then put together what structure and resources it would take on our side to provide those services and partner on them or if you want to hand over three things that we would do and describe them, then we could look at our resources to do those and under what conditions if any, to try to define the expectations a little so we would all be happy in the end. Chair Unger added that if we are going to have you help us if we were having an event, there would be some monies needed from us to ensure that those could be accomplished. It is going to take a little bit of doing; it isn't going to be done overnight, and there are some parameters that we want to draw.

Cynthia Lovely stated that the other piece of the service contract is being worked on by Megan. Vice Chair Gehlbach asked for an explanation of the service contract, and Megan McRae explained that the service contracts or Provider Agreements are done for organizations that provide services to the municipality such as the library, Sedona Recycles, Humane Society, Verde Valley Caregivers, and the Sedona Community Center, so she and Janeen have started talking about bringing the Historical Society in to have a Provider Agreement, and we are working through that process. Typically, those agreements are for three years, and all five of the existing ones will expire at the end of FY23, so what she and Janeen have discussed and Karen Osburn has blessed is that we are going to do a one-year contract. The City, Heritage Museum and Historical Society is learning what the best performance matrix will be in those agreements, so we will be taking an agreement forward to Council and liaising with this group, which is happening now, but between now and the next fiscal year.

Chair Unger suggested that since Commissioner Huggins has worked with the Historical Society in the past, it might be good for us to have somebody sit as our regular liaison if that is something Commissioner Huggins would be interested in doing. The Historical Society can't be in all of our meetings, and we can't be in all of theirs, but if we had somebody to speak for us to them and a communication back and forth, would that work with the City's structure? Megan indicated that she believed that would work -- to have a liaison between the two organizations makes sense.

Chair Unger said in terms of who would have the most history in what we are doing, she thinks it would be Commissioner Huggins. Janeen Trevillyan indicated that in venturing into this new

relationship or enhanced relationship with the City, we do have this one-year opportunity, so we want to take advantage of that to try to put down what we think, but we will have this year of practice, so that is what we need to do with the HPC. We need to put down what your top three priorities are or what you came back from the CLG meeting with, then you would say that if the Historical Society would do one tour, one landmark social, and one HPC Month or something like that, that would be our first year and our experiment. Then, we will all be able to look at it and say the timing was bad or we got lost in what was doing what, so we can fix all of that before getting into the next phase of the relationship. It is a matter of the Commission defining what you think would be good goals that wouldn't be too aggressive for the Historical Society to take on in the first year. It would work both ways for us not to be too aggressive on either side, but effective. What would be two or three things that would be effective activities? Then, let's define them and put them in the contract.

Chair Unger stated possibly Historic Preservation Month, the recognition program because that is something we need to step-up again, and she agreed that we don't want to jump in and drown in too much detail. There are some things that can happen, because we had sort of an agreement with the Chamber, although it might be different now, in terms of printing a walking tour and those are things that would be better handled by the Historical Society. What we would like to see with that is have the recognition program buildings and some of the landmarks designated in the walking tour. Those are the things that would be important going forward. The Chair then asked for the Commissioner's comments.

Commissioner Pfaff said that we can try it. Vice Chair Gehlbach indicated that he just wants to see progress, and he would love to see the recognition program. He will pay for the plaques if we can do more recognition in Uptown, because one plaque at a time is so slow for him that he just wants to go to sleep, so he wants to get more recognition, and we are also planning on this walk, so if we want to create a professional walk of history, what a great way to do it, because we wanted to go all out with our cell phones and make sure everybody has their information on them, click on the plaques and you've got all the information you need. We also wanted to create a walking tour that got all the way up to the Historical Society. Obviously, the preservation month would be fun too, so if we could accomplish those three things the program would work well with the walk. For the preservation month, he would love to get together and have a party and community gathering. Chair Unger noted that is what they usually were. We had something at the Barn and the big one with the Hummingbird House, and she sees us doing those things together. Right now, all we are speaking to is just how we feel as HPC and whether we want to enjoin the Sedona Historical Society and have them help us in this fashion – that is the discussion for today.

Commissioner Huggins thinks Vice Chair Gehlbach brought up some good starter things. His projects are too big and will involve staff for things like Hands through History, but he would be happy to take it on if Janeen will have him. Chair Unger indicated that we are just getting our feet back under us now, but one thing we want to assure ourselves of is that we stay a CLG, because it is important that we do that and that we don't overburden staff, but this can be part of something that can ensure we accomplish one portion of what the CLG is asking us to do, and it is important.

Commissioner Fiene suggested an agenda item for the next meeting to concentrate on one of these things we have discussed. Chair Unger stated that since we need to come up with an agreement between the City and the Sedona Historical Society and staff needs to move on this, getting together as a Commission again might be hard to do, so what should we do so we can accomplish putting this together? Cynthia Lovely noted the three things per year and pointed out that the Commission listed an event for Historic Preservation Month, something with the recognition program, and a walking tour, so you could tentatively discuss those three projects in more detail in the next meeting.

The Chair invited Janeen Trevillyan to attend the next meeting and Cynthia noted that their board probably needs to meet and discuss them as well. Janeen noted that the City has the fiscal year budget starting, which the whole city will be cranking down on by the end of January, so we need to scope this out and see to what extent things are going to be done, so you know what you are

going to need for your role, and they need to know what their contribution or obligation will be, so January is a hit it hard time.

Chair Unger agreed that the Commission is going to need a January meeting, and Janeen indicated that to bring up the whole where we are in terms of those meetings and if you need to take some action to appoint Commissioner Huggins and if he accepts that, then he and the Society can work in January and come back prepared for the HPC January meeting.

Chair Unger then asked if it would be important to have more conversations before the Commission's next meeting in terms of details. The devil is in the details, and she worries about the timing and making sure we have an idea of the cost, and if we are going to put that in the budget for January. We're not going to be voting on the budget right now, we're just approaching the ideas on it, but is there a way for a couple of us to get together. . . , Vice Chair Gehlbach interjected the magic word is two, right? That is our loophole so we can couple off and cover subject matters by coupling off. Cynthia explained that the main subject matter is what we are going to contract, and Megan's goal is to have this contract figured out for the budget. Megan agreed and stated that we will probably start looking at numbers, but if she is understanding, money will come out of the Commission's budget for the three proposed items and go to the Historical Society in that agreement.

Chair Unger agreed that she could see that with some of the money, and she is trying to figure out how we can make it as easy as possible for the City to look at a budget that concerns the Commission and the Historical Society, and if you want to in that contract have that as part of the budget from the City to them, then that is different than if we need to come up with a number that you will need from the Commission to do that. Megan indicated the former; the Historical Society would formulate their proposal to us as to what it would cost them to take over these three items. Chair Unger then stated that the Commission needs to decide, if it is just two of us talking about it, so we don't want to create a public meeting, and then take it to the Historical Society and Megan for review, but if you want it incorporated into that, then we need to have given you the input, because Janeen is going to have a much better idea of the cost of those things, so we need to have Cynthia assign two of us to look at what we are doing for Historic Preservation Month, etc.

Donna Puckett stated that the Commission might want to consider the boundaries or what the scope is going to be for each organization. For example, is the Historical Society going to be involved only in the creation of the walking tour with a one-time expense or are they going to be conducting the tours and have an ongoing expense, because we may have some things in ongoing accounts as well as one-time accounts.

Chair Unger agreed that each one has different components that we are going to have to look at carefully and then get with Janeen. Commissioner Fiene indicated that this gets us into the agenda item 5c., but the second Monday in January is the 10th, which gives us a limited amount of time.

Commissioner Huggins asked if a work session requires as much staff time as a meeting and do they need verbatim minutes? Donna replied yes. Cynthia added that another thing to keep in mind is that most of these things HPC has done before, so she can pull files to see how much it cost for the recognition program and the cost per plaque; HP month always had at least one event.

The Chair then indicated that she would think that would include advertising, because we oftentimes had advertising and she used to do some of the ads for them. It is not just food, etc., there are other components and that probably is in that, and it would probably be one of the more important things for Janeen to review in terms of the contract, and it is true in that are we going to set these three things as things we are going to do every year, or will they be something else after this one-year contract? That gives us a year to see if it works.

Janeen indicated that one or two Commissioners, her and possibly another person from the Historical Society have to be able to talk, because we have to toss the ideas around and come

forward with a proposal to bring back to the HPC. Chair Unger agreed and added that having the numbers that Cynthia has because we've done them different ways, like Steve Segner brought ice cream and the City didn't have to pay for it, so Janeen is right, we are jamming this up against the budget at the end of the year, so in order for us to be sure that we have something, she would like to see Commissioner Huggins start this role and work with that, because he understands both organizations. Then the determination is who else is involved in that.

Vice Chair Gehlbach expressed interest in being involved with that, because he would like to get more involved with the budget. It is important that we take a good look at everything you have brought up to us. He would love to know the cost of the plaques, because when he looks at the walk from a business aspect, how are we going to generate revenues around the City while offering our history, offering referral businesses, and how are we going to balance those revenues out and get everyone around town? Those are all the things that pop through his head – not just a walk where they pull up paper and it is this crappy looking thing. He has looked at apps that can be designed to follow everyone around the city, and it will show us where they are spending money and what they are doing. Maybe things that we can accomplish.

Cynthia pointed out that is beyond Historic Preservation, and Vice Chair Gehlbach said that is what we need to bring our city into the future. Chair Unger added that she doesn't see that the plaques are something that will have to go through the Historical Society, that is our budget item and not in the one that goes to them. We still need to stay in our own lane and our lane is doing these things. In terms of what the City wants to do to promote a walking tour, we can be a part of, but she doesn't see that as even what the CLG is talking about. A walking tour is not what they are concerned about; that has a broader history. Certainly, if the City has a contract with the Historical Society, it may be part of that contract, but we can certainly tell the Historical Society if there are things that we would be interested in them doing. Vice Chair Gehlbach stated that it basically incorporates the entire history of our city; however, the Chair again indicated that our lane is here, and their lane is there, and in terms of people understanding what is going on, the Historical Society is much better at that and always will be, and that is why she thinks we want to partner with them.

Chair Unger explained that in 2012 we worked on a tour. . . Vice Chair Gehlbach interrupted to say that we never really did anything with it. Chair Unger stated that was one of the most difficult things to put together, and Janeen noted that was the house tour. The Chair then explained that a lot of people who own historic homes don't want people going to their home. There is a balance we have to find and that may be what we need to define in what HPC is going to ask of the Historical Society.

Cynthia Lovely indicated that staying on the agenda item, which is the partnership. . . Vice Chair Gehlbach interrupted to say that is what he thought we were doing. He thought it was a collaborative effort, not one is going to be doing this and we are going to be doing that. Cynthia continued to say that it sounded like there was agreement on what the three items would be, then on the budget piece of it, she will look back to see what they cost. The tour brochure was already pretty much defined, so she doesn't think at this point, we would want to expand that, but complete what was originally proposed.

Vice Chair Gehlbach indicated that we had initially thought of expanding it, but it was never taken that far. It was just turned into what it is now, so that is not something that we actually finished; we had some great ideas and wanted to make sure people could get around. What he was actually getting at is we need people to work with the Historical Society, two others to work with the walk and two others to work on the recognition program to make sure we are not overstepping the boundaries of the Open Meeting Laws.

Cynthia explained that the Commissioner might be over-complicating things. Right now, what we want to walk away with is what are the three events, outside of the meeting she will look at the budget for previous events, so we can put numbers to those items, and we agreed that there would be one liaison with the Historical Society, which would be Commissioner Huggins, and that is pretty much all we need to know, and because we have done these things in the past, she doesn't know

that we need to hash out what it will involve. Chair Unger added that the details of what we might want to do, like what we want the theme to be in May, is not going to change the budget or the agreement. In the future, we can talk about those other things, but right now we are trying to get something on the books so we can go forward with the relationship.

Vice Chair Gehlbach restated that he thought that was what we were talking about, but he is confused at this point, because he thought we were talking about three items we needed to discuss and have in front of us for the next meeting. Chair Unger explained that we understand what the three things are, and we can discuss the details of those things in the next meeting. We don't need the details right now, but we need to know what we are going to do and if we understand the basis, like a box, we can fill the box as we go along. What we want here is to agree to the fact that we are going to partner with the Sedona Historical Society and the city is going to engage in a contract that will allow them to help us in this fashion. Those are the things we are really voting on right now. The rest is going to take time to hash out, and she doesn't think that will be done by the 10th.

Cynthia again stated that we don't need to have those details; we just need to know there will be three event activities and one liaison. The Chair added that in terms of the plaques, that is in 5d, because that will come out of our budget. They shouldn't be responsible for our plaques; those come from us and that is a different scenario that we can talk about in item 5d. We can't put the number into the budget until Cynthia has a chance to look at that.

Cynthia Lovely recapped that we want to know that HPC supports the concept of partnering with the Historical Society on three activities, and if that is something the Commission supports, then Janeen goes back to the Historical Society. . . Chair Unger interrupted to say Janeen would see if that is okay with them. We aren't talking about closing the doors and not talking again; we are just trying to get the decision that we are actually going to be partnering with the Sedona Historical Society and the City will be contracting with them to make that partnership work.

The Chair asked if a motion was needed, and Donna Puckett stated that they could do it by consensus or a motion would make it more formal, and they are agendized for possible action.

MOTION: Commissioner Fiene moved that the Commission supports developing a partnership with the Sedona Historical Society to take on educational activities and events. Commissioner Pfaff seconded the motion.

VOTE: Motion carried five (5) for (Fiene, Gehlbach, Huggins, Pfaff and Unger) and zero (0) opposed. There are two vacancies.

c. Discussion and possible action on Commission meeting schedule and number of Commissioners

Chair Unger explained that the Commission has been seven members since it was established, and she and Cynthia have discussed it. She likes to have a mix of people, so the question is whether to narrow the Commission down to a five-member commission, which presents the possibility that we will have less voices on the Commission, but the other issues are how hard it is for all of us to find time to get together and the difficulty in getting people to join the Commission. She has a couple of people who are now interested, but we have had at least one vacancy, possibly two. . . Cynthia interjected that we have had one vacancy that has been open for a year and a half, and one applicant was disqualified because she didn't live in town. Now we have two to fill and if it is that hard to fill one, it may not be possible knowing we have waited so long.

Commissioner Pfaff asked if there is a minimum number of Commissioners, and Cynthia explained that for the CLG, if you want to stay certified, the number is five, so if the Commission agrees to go to five members, we would go to Council to change the original. The City set forth the number seven; the CLG says five. If HPC and Council supports it, then we could change that. The Commissioner then asked if it could be a minimum of five and maximum of seven, and staff

indicated that it had to be a fixed number. Chair Unger agreed that she thinks for the City it has to be a fixed number.

Commissioner Huggins stated that it seems sad that a city that has such a current rich history can't get anybody involved to be on the Commission. It is pitiful, but he doesn't have a solution other than maybe some campaign. He has just been through the thing with the Park Rangers that spent \$7,500.00, and he didn't get a single Ranger so he can see the problem, but it is so sad.

Chair Unger indicated that Steve Segner said he would be willing to come back on, and she has talked with several architects. One of the problems is that she is from out of town, and we can have one other person. She has involvement in town, so that is why she can be here, but we can only have two now, and the City will have to look at if they would still allow two to be on the Commission or whether only her or one other person would be allowed on it. She has two people in the Village, one did historic restoration and building in Chicago and he couldn't be on because Steve Segner was on it too. We have these limitations and she doesn't know how comfortable the City is, but she doesn't think there is a requisite for the CLG other than living in the vicinity. One time we had four people that wanted to join and we had to turn one person down. Cynthia Lovely noted that there is a limited number of people to volunteer and are interested, so if the Historical Society has membership that is one reason to combine or share and not compete.

Commissioner Pfaff asked if the City could expand the qualifications to where they are in the CLG, and Cynthia stated that she thinks they are pretty open; it is a City requirement, so it would be something that would be good to get input on. Right now, it allows for two people that are not city residents. If you drop to five, they may want to say only one.

Chair Unger stated that she would love to have an architect on the Commission, but the problem is that they are so busy. Commissioner Fiene said that normally when we advertise for a position, it is a small ad that is buried in the newspaper, so he wonders if there is something that we can do to bring it to the attention of the public. Chair Unger indicated that right now with COVID, people think they don't know that they want to be involved until it is over. If she was out there, she would probably not be thinking about joining something until everything is settled. That year and half that we've been waiting may be one reason we haven't gotten anyone.

Commissioner Pfaff suggested putting up a poster at the Heritage Museum, at least then you are getting people that are interested in the subject, and a resident may go in that is interested. Commissioner Fiene mentioned the Red Rock Neighborhood thing on social media; there are activists in that group, and it might be interesting to see what that would bring.

Chair Unger indicated that she doesn't know that we need to make a decision today, but we may want to take the next step before making this decision. She wouldn't want more than seven, because having been on boards, you really don't want them big, because it gets out of hand, and one of her issues is we have been talking about how all of us can take a project and work with it. How many projects are we going to have? If we get seven people, and two people have no projects, we will lose them. That is one thing we have to think about; she wants everyone to feel they are engaged for a reason and not just sitting here with nothing to do, and we want to make sure each of us have something that is a project to move forward and that we can bring back to the group, but we don't have to make the decision right now if each of you want to reach out, and she will reach out some more. If Steve came back and we had someone else, we would be full again, but we have to consider this as something we may have to do. She would put it on next month's agenda, because she doesn't want this to be a small committee.

Cynthia Lovely stated that she will ask the City Clerk how they advertise. Vice Chair Gehlbach stated that it is tough for him to spend so much time and we haven't done much; he likes to accomplish things, so that is why he is beating at the bush saying let's get this stuff going. He wants the relationship; it would be a great relationship and we could work well together. He could have the entire recognition program done by next month by walking around Uptown taking notes and

presenting it to the Commission. Chair Unger stated that is the kind of engagement she hopes we can start doing, and that can energize us more in terms of our interests. Commissioner Gehlbach then added that while we are up there, we can create great relationships with all of the store owners to see what they are thinking too.

Chair Unger again asked to put it on the next agenda and repeated that she doesn't want two more people and have them say they aren't doing anything. Commissioner Huggins asked if there is a chance that there could be something in the City's newsletter, and Cynthia said yes. She thinks they just started working on it. Commissioner Pfaff noted that there are two members of the public present and we could see if they are interested.

d. Discussion of FY23 budget

Chair Unger stated that Cynthia will be thinking about what the City will need in terms of the budget for the relationship with the Sedona Historical Society, but that is not going to be our budget. In the past, we have set how many things we wanted to do over the year, and she would like for us to spend some money in landmarking some projects. Tlaquepaque is almost 50 years old, so we can start thinking about that and we have had other things on the plate since Kathy Levin was here. We tried to get in touch with people, and it has been a little awkward with COVID. She doesn't know how much money we would need to do some research on one of the projects that we want to landmark.

The Chair added that the other part we talked about is the recognition program and we had talked about maybe two properties during the year the last time we scoped it out. Commissioner Fiene agreed and added that we haven't finished one that was started two years ago – the Cowboy Club needs to be finished, and we have questions left to be answered. Chair Unger indicated that is something that we may need to work on with the Historical Society in terms of getting that together.

Chair Unger restated that in terms of the budget this year, we need to look at enough money to look at a possible landmark and at least two recognition plaques. If Commissioner Gehlbach wants to look into donating them to the City that would be something. Steve Segner donated all of the signs down SR 89A to the City.

Cynthia stated that they don't cost that much, so you have money in your budget now. The reason the recognition stalled was having somebody coordinate with the Cowboy Club, and then do we want to have an event? The Arts Center had an event that went with the plaque, but we didn't have a good turnout at the Arts Center. The Chair agreed and added that is why she wants to be involved with the Historical Society, because they have ways of touching base with people that we don't. As President of Chamber Music Sedona, she has a list of 1,000 people she can get in touch with. We don't have that, but the Historical Society does, so that is another reason it will be good to be partnering, because if generated by us and them that will change.

Cynthia noted that some of the things can be combined with an existing event, so they don't always have to be separate. Commissioner Gehlbach asked how many plaques we are allowed to consider, and Cynthia said you would have to decide which ones are eligible. Chair Unger then asked to have that in the next agenda. The Commissioner then said that if we can bring enough together, then we can have a party because we have more than one. Donna Puckett suggested that the Commission identify how many you have, because you couldn't get agreement on that last time and the Chair agreed that the Commission needs to make a list.

Chair Unger then asked Commissioner Gehlbach if that could be his goal for the next meeting to put that together, and the Commissioner stated sure. Commissioner Huggins asked about the thing he put together, and Vice Chair Gehlbach added that he would like to agendize that also, because that is all part of it.

Commissioner Fiene noted that we also have replacement plaques, and the Chair noted that those weren't ours. Commissioner Gehlbach then asked if he should go into more detail in regard to cleaning and those that would need to be brought up to date.

Cynthia asked if she missed something, because we jumped from the recognition plaques to something different. That is separate than the recognition project and Commissioner Huggins agreed, it is inventory. Chair Unger asked to do the plaque part and put it on the agenda, and we don't need to discuss that now in the budget, if that is something that is already there.

Chair Unger stated that she would like to ask if in the next year the City will have any money for a grant for some of the homes. With COVID, there have been instances where people needed to do some renovation and it would be less expensive to do it not historically correct, and she wonders if there is any way the City would consider having a grant that would only cover half of the cost between something that is normal versus replacing it with something that is historically correct. For example the doctor's house, she wanted to replace all of the covering over that, but the only thing she could afford was lattice work that was not going to be in keeping with historic preservation, so we said no she couldn't do it, and sometimes we jumped in and said we would do half of the cost of the roof, but you have to replace a roof; however, if the roof is a kind that is much more expensive than it would be to just put asphalt shingles on it, it would be nice if we could step in and say we will take the cost of the difference between what it would cost to do it normally versus the cost of doing it historically correct. Do you think the City Council would think about that?

Cynthia indicated that we would have to discuss it with the City Council, and she was thinking which landmark owners have approached us when we have to do a Certificate of Appropriateness, etc., and do any of those fall into that category. Chair Unger replied no, those generally don't because they aren't going to be changing anything, but when they are doing something like she was, and she doesn't know how many there would be, but there are probably some out there where people need to do the work. Steve Segner's thing was if you buy a house, you are going to have to fix the house, but if you have to go over and above what it would cost to fix the house and we had a grant that could help, that is where we could do it. Paying for half of a roof, you are going to have to replace that roof anyway, that is part and parcel of owning a house, and she understands the argument that the City shouldn't be investing in it that way, but if we are asking them to keep the house in the condition of a landmark and it would cost them a considerable amount more than if they did what was a normal repair. There might be a Commissioner that would argue it down; that is just her case.

Cynthia stated that at this point, it is too soon to list it as a potential budget item, but it could be on next month's agenda with a little research, because it might entail more than you might think. Are you going to advertise it or research and have your own list? Commissioner Gehlbach added that when they find out that you want to subsidize their repairs, they are all for it. Chair Unger indicated that is what she does not want to do; she only wants us to subsidize them if the cost is going to be more. If they could do it for \$1,000.00 and it will cost \$1,200.00 and they can't afford the extra \$200.00, but with the doctor's house, it was going to be considerably more. The lattice she was going to put up might have cost her \$25.00 each, but to put wood up there would have probably cost about \$1,000.00, so she didn't do anything.

Commissioner Gehlbach asked if that should be agendized for discussion, and Chair Unger stated that writing it out and making it a contract that worked would be a lot of work. Cynthia then asked how it would differ from the previous grant.

Commissioner Pfaff stated that we would have to make sure with the City Attorney that it is not a problem in giving away public money, and Donna Puckett asked if that is anything that could be included in the federal grant. Chair Unger said she didn't know, but the thing that was interesting was it almost said that whatever it is that they would give us money for has to be a city-owned project, not this type.

Commissioner Pfaff said that you don't advertise it. If somebody comes to you and asks for a Certificate of No Effect, you tell them and if their reaction is okay, they will take care of it fine, but if the reaction is that they can't afford to do anything, then ask if they want to apply for it. The Chair agreed that she wouldn't advertise it either. Vice Chair Gehlbach stated that it would help retain them instead of saying they are done or couldn't do the work. Chair Unger added then they are endangering the property. Commissioner Pfaff added that you would need criteria for under what circumstances we would do that, and Chair Unger then said to agendaize it for the next meeting.

Commissioner Fiene indicated that one consideration is that he believes the city had difficulty finding someone that had the expertise to deal with these issues, and he doesn't know if we have developed resources that we can refer to. He thinks the guy from Flagstaff is the only one that we've really been happy with. Cynthia noted that there is one out of Prescott and as far as . . . Chair Unger interjected that we luck out in that the building is not that old; we're not looking at a 100-year-old building and asking how to fix that, so it is a little easier and whoever is working on the Barn is really good. Cynthia Lovely added that one thing she has for the budget is researching potential landmarks, and that would potentially be a big budget item depending on how many.

Commissioner Gehlbach asked if we would want to focus on specific areas, and Cynthia responded no, we would want to look at our survey list and we found out about a new Madole home, so if we budget for survey two or three properties, she can see what that cost, but that should be a focus.

6. FUTURE MEETING DATES AND AGENDA ITEMS

a. Monday, February 14, 2021; 4:00 pm (tbd)

Chair Unger indicated that we are talking about the need to meet in January, and she will be here, but she doesn't know about anybody else, so Cynthia Lovely will send out a note. Vice Chair Gehlbach asked to also discuss how to incentivize people to landmark on the next agenda.

7. EXECUTIVE SESSION

a. If an Executive Session is necessary, it will be held in the Vultee Conference Room at 106 Roadrunner Drive. Upon a public majority vote of the members constituting a quorum, the Commission may hold an Executive Session that is not open to the public for the following purposes:

- i. To consult with legal counsel for advice on matters listed on this agenda per A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(3).
- ii. Return to open session. Discussion/possible action on executive session items.

No Executive Session was held.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Unger requested a motion to adjourn.

MOTION: Commissioner Pfaff moved to adjourn. Vice Chair Gehlbach seconded the motion.

VOTE: Motion carried five (5) in favor (Fiene, Gehlbach, Huggins, Pfaff, and Unger) and zero (0) opposed. There are two vacancies.

The meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission held on December 13, 2021.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

Date