

Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Historic Preservation Commission Meeting
Vultee Conference Room, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, Arizona
Monday, February 14, 2022 – 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:

Commission Members present: Chair Brynn Burkee Unger, Vice Chair Kurt Gehlbach and Commissioners Jack Fiene and Bob Huggins. Derek Pfaff was absent and there are two vacancies.

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

City Councilor(s) present: Vice Mayor Scott Jablow

Guest(s) present: Janeen Trevillyan, President Sedona Historical Society

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

Cynthia Lovely indicated that there had been questions about the driveway at the Ranger Station Park, and Public Works said the contract was approved by Council a week or so ago and the driveway will go in in May. The second update is that the north side of the barn has been renovated and looks fantastic. All of the doors are fixed, and it looks good. They put up the gutters and it looks good. There was some debate about the color, but it turned out really well. The next round is already started, and that will be the other three sides of the building, and it is a different contractor, but they did at least one side of the house, and she thinks he said that they are working on some of the items at the shop, because they have to fabricate the doors. It looks like they have accelerated the timeline for the park, which is really not much more than the original schedule, because by the time we finish the barn, they will move to the park, so it is pretty close to the original schedule. She thinks the ETA on the park is 2024. It was going to be 2025, but she thinks 2024.

Commissioner Fiene stated that he is getting correspondence from residents upset about the driveway coming out of Los Abrigados to Brewer Road. He talked to Cynthia about this, and the reason they are so upset is the article in the paper indicated that the Commission approved that design, which we had not. Cynthia said that the journalist misspoke, and he would like to see something in the paper that indicates we did not approve it. Commissioner Huggins added that at the City Council meeting, they asked if it was approved by the Commission and Andy said yes, it was approved by the Commission, but we didn't.

Chair Unger indicated that she was also sort of panicked by the article, and she called SHPO, and they said depending on where in the park it would go, we may or may not have a say, but it doesn't mean that we can't speak to it. Her feeling is that given the fact that it affects the visual of the area, it does have something for us to say something about. SHPO said yes, that we should make our voice known, but it doesn't mean that, for the landmark or registry situation, it will make a difference, but because of who we are, we should at least talk about it and we have. The article in the paper was not right, and she is sorry that the City Council feels we approved it, because we didn't. As long as it is on the record that we didn't, she is more comfortable with it. She is hesitant for any of us to go to the paper with it; she is uncomfortable with that and thinks it wouldn't be appropriate for us to

do that, but that is her feeling about it. Commissioner Huggins added that it seems that someone should tell Council that there was an error, because these things have happened before.

Donna Puckett interrupted to say this item is for announcements, not for discussion.

3. APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING MINUTES:

a. December 13, 2021

Chair Unger indicated that she would entertain a motion.

MOTION: Vice Chair Gehlbach moved to approve the minutes. Commissioner Fiene seconded the motion.

VOTE: Motion carried four (4) for (Fiene, Gehlbach, Huggins, Unger) and zero (0) opposed. Commissioner Pfaff was absent and 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 4:07 p.m. and, having no requests to speak, closed the public forum at 4:08 p.m.

5. REGULAR BUSINESS

- a. Discussion and action on a recommendation to Council regarding Commission meeting schedule and number of Commissioners**
- b. Discussion about the Historic Resource Survey and identifying potential landmarks and sites for recognition.**
- c. Discussion about a partnership with Sedona Historical Society**

a. Discussion and action on a recommendation to Council regarding Commission meeting schedule and number of Commissioners

Chair Unger indicated that the Commission discussed this in the past and came to some semblance of an idea. We had talked about regular meetings, and we were originally scheduled to have one meeting a month, but we backed it way off with COVID and she thinks we only had one meeting in 2020. In 2021, we had three or four.

Cynthia Lovely stated that she looked back about 10 years and the average was about 6 meetings. On the high end, there were 11 in 2018 or something and on the low end, we had one or two during COVID. Chair Unger indicated that we probably had more in like 2012, when we did everything for the Centennial. There have been reasons for them going up and down in numbers. She then asked what the city was proposing, and Cynthia stated that the city was proposing to go with four meetings per year at a minimum. If something comes up, then we would have more than four. At least on the staff end, it is so we don't have to scramble every month to see what should be on the agenda. If we settle on the four, then everyone can get them on their calendar instead of it being a question mark as to whether there will be a meeting that month.

Chair Unger noted that we always did not meet in August and December because most everyone was away, so those already would be outside of the four we want to consider. It turned out that even if we thought we had something going on, we couldn't get a quorum in those months, so those would be two months. She then asked what the recommendation is for the four months,

and Cynthia indicated that is something that we would want to hear from the Commission, if you have a preference.

Chair Unger indicated that her preference is that we really need to have a meeting before the end of the year, probably in November, to speak about the budget for HPC, because when we get into January, we are almost too late to do that, so at least in November unless other Commissioners want to move that back to October, but by the time we hit November, we know what has happened in the past year and say these are the things we need to move forward with and need more money for. November, for sure, would be a month we need and going into the new year, we want to work on planning and think about what we are going to do for our May event. That really needs to be driven as much by us as the Historical Society, so hopefully November and January, then we can pick up in January where we were in November and probably at least in April before the May event.

Commissioner Huggins stated that we didn't have any discussion on the budget this year. It was brought up and he issued a thing to Cynthia, and she said it was pretty well already set, and the idea of an exhibit is a good idea. He then asked if we had any discussion on the budget and Chair Unger indicated yes. Cynthia added that we did have a little bit, and we ended up keeping it the same as last year knowing that next year could change depending on the partnership.

Chair Unger agreed that part of it was integrating our ideas in terms of what was going to happen with the Historical Society and what we would need with them. She then stated that she is on board in saying that we should do this, but this year, we talked about the things that have been on our budget for quite a while, which is landmarking and the recognition program. Those are the things we discussed a little, but every year, we have had a sheet of what the budget was going to be and that is why in November, she would really like to go back to that to make sure we have the things on there that we need to cover.

Commissioner Fiene stated that in terms of focusing on the budget for Historic Preservation Month, he agrees but added that we also need to formulate some goals to accomplish during the year and establish some small action groups to accomplish those goals, and then bring it to the Commission. The Chair asked if that should be addressed in November or if maybe in July; most organizations usually do it almost a year in advance, then moving into the fall we can adjust it if needed. Commissioner Fiene noted that dealing with a fiscal year, we have to accommodate that, so he agrees, but we really need to outline what we want to do and find a way to facilitate that.

Chair Unger asked about July; she really wouldn't want to get into November. It is February and we are looking at what we are going to do between now and the end of the year, and we are going to have to discuss what we are doing between now and the end of this fiscal year, but when we get to July, we are going to have to discuss that full year plus into the following year. We want to start overlaying it, we don't want to be behind the 8-ball and looking at something that we should have thought about long before that timeframe. The Chair then stated that she is looking at November, January, April and July, but that it doesn't mean that we won't have more meetings. Cynthia is worried about what happened last year. Every month something was sent out to figure out whether we were going to be here or not, and if we focus on that, it also gives us a drive with timeframes and if we give ourselves something to do in July, we have an idea of what we have to do before the next meeting, possibly in November. In reality, we probably will have a meeting between those two dates, but Cynthia and everybody is concerned that we are just going to keep skipping them and not have a goal to get to before the next meeting. If you don't know the next meeting, you don't know that you need to get something done by then. Commissioner Fiene commented that is his point basically.

Cynthia Lovely asked if we tentatively want to say January, April, July . . . if you are going to have an event in May and want to plan for it in advance, she would think maybe March, and Chair Unger agreed that maybe March would be better, because it gives us more time. In the past, we actually started in January, but we can start it in January and follow-up in March.

Vice Chair Gehlbach asked why we couldn't have five a year – January, March, June, September, and November, and throughout those create our goals. We didn't discuss the budget, we just touched base on it, but we didn't discuss it. The Chair said we didn't have a real discussion; we just talked a little bit about it. Vice Chair Gehlbach then stated that as an example, he would like to have all of these done in 30 days and asked if we could do that? Cynthia stated that she didn't know what "that" is and the Vice Chair indicated that it is everything that Commissioner Huggins put together regarding the Uptown plaques. Some are in mothballs; others need to be replaced and others need to be shined – basically getting things back in order again. It would be easy to do and simple to accomplish. Do we have a budget to handle it?

Chair Unger pointed out that we don't have this on our agenda, but Vice Chair Gehlbach stated that it was on the agenda for January, but we canceled that, so it should be on today's agenda. Donna Puckett stated, but it is not. Chair Unger indicated that it doesn't mean that we can't move ahead with this; Cynthia can call us, but it is not for discussion now; however, Vice Chair Gehlbach stated that he is not going to discuss it. What he is talking about is part of our goals, and we might be able to establish a few things for a couple of months anyway.

Chair Unger suggested that on every agenda, we need to look at our goals, where we are with them and what we need to discuss to accomplish them. If we don't do that, it is sort of our downfall for the last couple of years; we haven't done that from the standpoint that on every agenda we have something to assess where we are and where we are going; we don't do that just once a year. When we get to July, we have a bigger overall picture for the year, and then do it step-by-step monthly. She looked back at some of the things this Commission has done, and our last landmark was . . . Cynthia stated about 10 years ago, but then we lost one.

Vice Chair Gehlbach suggested pairing off, create our goals and just do it. If we wait for city employees, we aren't going to get anything done. These meetings are so drawn out. Donna Puckett explained that if the Commission appoints sub-committees, they are subject to agendas, noticing requirements, having public meetings and minutes. Vice Chair Gehlbach stated that is not what he is talking about; he is talking about pairing off and Donna stated that she is talking about the state law regarding you pairing off if the Commission is appointing them.

Cynthia stated that we really aren't on the agenda; we have to focus on this and make a motion on this today, because it is the second or third time we've talked about it, and then how many members, and we don't have to decide on exactly when those four meetings will be.

Chair Unger agreed, but maybe Vice Chair Gehlbach's idea of five instead of four is a better idea, so we don't have as many gaps in the year. Parts of the year, we have gaps anyway like in August and December. Vice Chair Gehlbach added that these are times when we don't have the holidays interrupt. The Chair then asked Cynthia if she thought five instead of four would be acceptable to the City Council, and Cynthia indicated yes.

Chair Unger then suggested going with five; last time we talked about six meetings for every other month, but those five months are what she would recommend. Cynthia Lovely then asked Vice Chair Gehlbach to repeat the five months, and he stated January, March, June, September, and November. Chair Unger added that in June we can look at how everything went with the Historic Preservation Month to decide if what we did was appropriate. There are some things

coming up that we will probably need meetings for outside of those months. There can be situations where we have to see each other more than that.

The Chair stated that it was time to decide if there should be five or seven commissioners on the Commission, and Commissioner Huggins indicated that he is still concerned about the number of meetings. He would prefer six meetings; we have so much that we could get done. He has outlined the buildings, which need to be recognized. He has ideas for landmarking; he would love to see these things get done. They will never get done if we say we will have five meetings and at this meeting we will talk about this, etc. He is just going on record that he is against that. As far as the number of people on the Commission, he thinks it is a very sad situation that we can't get people, but if it ends up that we can only have five, he guesses that he could live with it. It sure cuts down the amount of input you get from people.

Chair Unger stated that what she is finding it difficult in terms of getting people involved is we have lost so many citizens that have been people she has worked with, even probably 10 of the top people with Chamber Music, and what needs to happen now will take time, but it is to get people who are moving into town to understand what these things are. We have a good chance of finding people who are interested. People coming into town from parts of the country where these things happen and are more important. For people who have lived here for a long time, historic preservation sounds like something that they are interested in, but we are losing those people. We are going to have to look at how to attract the other people; that is what she is having to do with other organizations. It is tough, but we need to get the paper on our side, etc., but we need an uneven number. Right now, the city has tried to put things in the paper to draw people, but it might take a team of us to look at how we might appeal to people coming into town, but we don't want too many of them, because they aren't going to understand the issues here. She doesn't want three people who are going to out balance the rest of us when they don't know what Sedona is about. That worries her as much as going down to five. We had one person call from Prescott who thought she was going to move here, and she said that she will just be part of it, but that is not somebody who will understand where we are. Her feeling is that for us to get five solid people, and Steve Segner said that he will come back with us, but if we start rolling and getting people interested in what we are doing, how hard would it be to shift back to seven. How difficult is it to move the numbers?

Cynthia Lovely indicated that she would check with the attorneys, but maybe just a shift in the language to say five from seven. Donna Puckett stated that she believes it would go to the Council for approval of the change, because Council created the Commission. Cynthia added that now it is worded as seven, and maybe if you change the language to five. Chair Unger then pointed out that Commissioner Fiene is an example of someone who came here with a tremendous amount of knowledge that is incredibly valuable and there may be others, but it may need to say something about it being an uneven number, because she has been trapped in the middle of six, so it would have to be five or seven.

Vice Chair Gehlbach stated that it should be kept at seven; we're going to have some pretty serious changes this year with elections coming up, so you are going to be busier in the future, and he would like to have seven people. If the city doesn't pay for things, he will pay for them and put people to work. That wouldn't be out of his jurisdiction or stepping out of his boundaries, would it? Cynthia Lovely indicated that he could do that on his own outside of the Commission, and Chair Unger cautioned him in that you can't get three commissioners in the room together even if we have seven. You are going to have to keep it at two even with seven of us. It could be five of us now and if you decide that you want to talk to some of us about doing some of these things and then bringing them back, the problem is if you get two other people committed and you are working together, that is three of you.

The Vice Chair stated that all he needs is the number of the person to polish and replace them, and he will take care of it himself. Chair Unger stated that it is like Steve Segner did all of those things up and down the road, and that was actually something that came about from HPC, but he decided that instead of having the City do it because it looked like it would take too long, he just did it, but he did talk to the city about all of those things, because they can't just be done – you have to come back and explain where and how you are going with it and it has to be reviewed by the Commission in one of the regular meetings. Vice Chair Gehlbach then commented that two of us could hang out and do this and have it done, keeping you up to date on everything and not overstep the boundaries.

Cynthia Lovely indicated that we should get back to the numbers. Vice Chair Gehlbach, Commissioner Fiene and Commissioner Huggins stated seven, and Chair Unger indicated that she sort of looked at five, but we will just leave the wording. The difficulty is if we say seven and can't get seven, but we get six, then we are stuck with six and that is where she starts looking at it in terms of trying to make sure whatever we do, we move forward with it.

Commissioner Fiene indicated that he thinks it is a matter of public outreach. One of the things we discussed was that he belongs to a breakfast group and there are about 25 all together, and they are interested in this topic, so he is hopefully going to be able to make a presentation next month about what we do, and he may be able to get at least one of those people to apply. Chair Unger stated that she can talk with some of the architects again; it would be nice to have an architect involved.

Commissioner Fiene added that Commissioner Huggins was involved with the Rangers for years, and there is another voice out there with the Rangers walking around, so there are all kinds of things that can be done.

Chair Unger summarized that for item 5A, she is hearing that the motion would be that we want to have five set meetings a year and we want to continue with a seven-member Commission.

Motion: Vice Chair Gehlbach moved to recommend that we move to five meetings a year -- January, March, June, September, and November and also consider a seven-person team on the Historic Preservation Commission.

Commissioner Huggins stated again that we should have more meetings, so he will be against it, and Commissioner Fiene asked if "a minimum of" five meetings was used, and the Chair stated yes, and Commissioner Huggins stated that for the sake of the Commission, then he will vote for it, but we have too much work to do and we don't have enough meetings.

Revised Motion (based on the discussion and clarification above): Vice Chair Gehlbach moved to recommend that we move to a minimum of five meetings a year -- January, March, June, September, and November and also consider a seven-person team on the Historic Preservation Commission.

Chair Unger indicated that what we will always be able to do, and it will always be on our agenda when the next meeting is, and if we feel we need another meeting during the year and collectively we see that we aren't getting enough done, we certainly can do that. This isn't trying to push us into only five meetings. It is trying to make sure that we have at least five meetings. Vice Chair Gehlbach then said we need to make sure we agendize things to get them done, and the Chair agreed, but explained that the City is concerned that we don't really have anything come up right now, so let's not have that meeting. She wants to be here in this room at least five times a year, and we could say in June that we need another meeting in July. We can always do that and insist that whoever feels that is the case should voice that opinion.

Vice Chair Gehlbach commented that if we were to do the five meetings and agendize between those meetings and paired off to accomplish everything, then we could get a lot more done. Chair Unger agreed and added that when we don't have the ones set in stone, we are wandering and letting it slide. You almost need a goal we are striving for, and she is hoping we will have more than five meetings. If we have things to do, we can get them done. It also doesn't mean we have to have a meeting that is 1½ or two hours long, because that is where we start putting stress on the staff. If we are doing things outside, we can come in and have a short meeting and be done. This meeting is going to go over what she would hope to have; she likes to have them in less than an hour if she can, but she understands where you are coming from and would want you to voice at the end of each meeting if you feel we are not making it and not getting done what we expect. You should voice that opinion.

Point of Order: Commissioner Fiene seconded the motion.

VOTE: Motion carried four (4) for (Fiene, Gehlbach, Huggins, Unger) and zero (0) opposed. Commissioner Pfaff was absent and there are two vacancies.

Cynthia Lovely suggested that the Chair go to item c and the Chair agreed without objection.

c. Discussion about a partnership with Sedona Historical Society

Cynthia Lovely stated that she would give a brief update on what they have been discussing since the last meeting. Chair Unger, Megan McRae and Janeen met, and Megan is working on the Provider Agreement with the Historical Society. From that meeting and still under discussion was that it would be a one-year agreement with the intent to see how things work, and then it could be modified. There were three bullet points that were important to share with the Historical Society and collaborate with them on, and they were 1) To provide annual training to HP Commissioners, 2) Provide annual education and/or recognition for current and potential landmark owners, and the type of events is to be determined, but at a minimum it could be what we have been doing if you have a recognition award, and 3) Provide annual awareness activity for the community to increase awareness of historic preservation in Sedona. That is what we have narrowed it down to, and then from the Commission's side, designating a Commissioner as a liaison to the Sedona Historical Society to report back to HPC, so they would need to attend both groups, and when there are events, Commissioners could volunteer at those events as needed. That is where we got to in our meeting, and we can open it to discussion or Megan and Janeen may want to add something before our discussion.

Chair Unger mentioned that when we are talking about training, it is not like training from SHPO. This is sort of an overview of what history is here. They are not responsible for teaching us what we are supposed to do legally; that is not their job. If we want, we can bring in somebody who will do the CLG training. It is really to give a broader view of some of the history and we are talking about bringing in some people who haven't been in town before or newer members. There is a real value in having them understand some of the history of the city, so it is more of a training in that respect.

The Chair indicated that she had a question and asked if we would have direct contact; she is thinking that Commissioner Huggins will take this on, but do those meetings have to be agendized and everything if we have a meeting with the Historical Society and a number of Commissioners or do they just come to our meetings? Cynthia Lovely explained that if there is an event and four commissioners volunteer, we would put out a notice to say that a quorum might be present at the event. We don't want to discourage Commissioners from being involved, and that is what the Council does when there is a ribbon cutting, etc.

Chair Unger indicated that in our April meeting when we talk about Historic Preservation Month, we would have our members and probably invite Janeen to go through what we are thinking, and then she confirmed that is the thinking in terms of it.

Vice Chair Gehlbach asked, in terms of the educational program, if that is for everybody or something they are creating., and Janeen Trevillyan explained that the discussion was this would be for Commissioners. So, if you get a new Commissioner that has only lived in the city for six months, like her when she had lived here for six months when she got on the Commission, at that time, there was a formal training program that included driving them around town and showing them everything, walking them through the book and telling them about the survey, and walking them through the HP element and code, so the commissioner was getting up on the learning curve when they went to their first, second or third commission meeting, and we would design that program. It gets a new Commissioner up fast.

Chair Unger noted that it doesn't involve the city staff. If we had several people come in, basically Janeen could come in, and it might be good for Janeen to show the Commission the first one to show us what that is all about once they get it together. She also suggested that the Commissioners look at the link for all of our landmarks that Cynthia sent out, and that is something she is going to talk about in item b. on the agenda. She doesn't think that everybody understands all of the components in why we are doing this. We simply could have staff do that with us; however, if we can short circuit this a little more, she would like to see Janeen, before we put it into play, bring it to the Commission so we can all look at it.

Cynthia Lovely indicated that because Commissioners have not had training, it would be great if the first one was for the entire Commission; we could do a field trip and drive around. Chair Unger stated that the other thing is that they will also do a training program for people who are not on the Commission. They are also going to be talking to the public about what historic preservation does, so there are two components on that list.

Janeen Trevillyan indicated that she wanted to clarify that of the three things, we talked about annual training for Commissioners, and that annual might flex a little if you had a new Commissioner come in mid-year or a month after some training; there could be some flexibility. The annual recognition and training for current and potential landmark owners might take any number of different forms. It could be anything from having a party to recognize a new landmark in town, with a moment during that event when you can teach by handing out your collateral materials or have a speaker making specific points like Chair Unger saying why it is valuable to do HP. You can turn a walking tour into an education moment or just have a fishing expedition to find people who might be interested in landmarking, and when you get to the annual awareness activity, HP Month, or something else, that will also be chocked full of education.

Chair Unger indicated that she would like the four of them to get together a little more to talk about a few more things related to that and talking to owners of potential landmarks, because she would worry a bit about not having a Commissioner involved. Janeen clarified that they are not taking over talking to landmark owners; you would still be doing that, but if you came up with a list of people you have spoken with and you said that we need to get them in a room and it might not be an SHS person that would be the one doing the education, but the SHS person might coordinate getting a SHPO person. Chair Unger added that what she likes about that is sometimes people don't know the history of the building, and SHS can give that to them.

Vice Chair Gehlbach stated that also through us they can get an idea of how easy it can be to get through the process and get work done for their property, etc. The Chair indicated that she has always felt this was something that we should be doing. It can actually make us more viable and when she talked to Eric Vondy at SHPO, he thought it was a brilliant idea.

Vice Chair Gehlbach asked if the barn is available for events, and Janeen stated yes. He then asked if it would be possible to do more than one educational event in a year, and Janeen replied yes as a venue. Janeen explained that the whole thing about our new relationship is trying to define our scope of work, and right now, we are talking about an annual event. She sees a little flexibility in that, but she doesn't know that they could move from those three activities to four, five or six events, if there is any complexity, for the same fee. It is like you can't hire a guy to build a one-car garage and then say you want three-car garage for the same price. We just have to work through that this first year. Certainly, in addition to whatever the SHS does for the HPC, the barn is there, and we are partners, so if you decided to do your own thing one time and just needed a venue and volunteers to help with parking or set-up, we are obviously there.

Chair Unger noted that there wasn't anything requiring a motion, and Cynthia added that we are still working on the agreement and asked if Megan had anything to add or update.

Megan McRae indicated that from the perspective of what is in the Historical Society and HPC partnership piece of the agreement, that is the key component. A lot of the other things that she and Janeen are working on together is the operation of the museum and how the lease moves into the Provider Agreement, who maintains the park, and who is paying, etc., so from the HPC and SHS perspective, it is a one-year agreement, and the goal is to keep it relatively simple and take strides from there or if after one year, we find that it has worked fantastic and the three annual items outlined in the scope worked great, HPC wanted to use the barn a couple of times, and that went off without a hitch and a bunch of extra cost, and if not, we will re-work it when all of the providers come back to re-negotiate for fiscal year 2024.

Janeen Trevillyan added that in the first year, it will be really important to have access. You didn't open for public input during your discussion about how many times you will meet but meeting in April to approve what the Historical Society is going to do in May for HP Month is not going to cut it. Chair Unger indicated that is why they backed it off to March, and Janeen noted that you didn't limit it to five meetings either, so it is possible that even if it is a short meeting, you would at least have to have a quorum available to sit down and give guidance, because SHS is not going to do things that you aren't on board with, and a liaison will be good, because the liaison will be at a meeting where they have a sense of what is happening or changing. It will be the liaisons job to come back to SHS and say looking forward to HP Month we want to have this kind of theme or focus, etc. Then they will have to do all of the planning and get your approval.

Chair Unger added that the other thing that the liaison can do is let staff know that another meeting is needed. It is going to be a job, but it will expand what HPC is doing and help us fulfill what we need to do as a CLG.

Janeen Trevillyan requested a copy of that information if there is something in writing, and the Chair indicated she may have more that they sent her, but she will see what she can find and send it. It was the CAMP thing they did. Cynthia Lovely then reminded everybody that you can pair off and get a lot more done outside of meetings, and it could be where two Commissioners and two from SHS get together to brainstorm ideas, and then they can report back to the Commission.

All Commissioners voiced agreement that the partnership is a good way of going forward.

b. Discussion about the Historic Resource Survey and identifying potential landmarks and sites for recognition.

Cynthia Lovely indicated that she wanted to review what the Historic Resource Survey is, how it relates to landmarking and how it relates to one of your goals, which is to look at potential landmarks and/or recognition awards. We have this document on the website, it is the 2014 Historic Resource Survey, and this is an inventory of historic sites that have been surveyed, and

this type of document has been around since 1992. The first one was done by volunteers, the HPC, went out and looked at all of these sites and filled out all of those numbers. At the time, the survey was a little different than what we use today. You can look at the bottom and see who filled out the survey on each year. Going to a random page, the first time this woman surveyed was in 1991 and it was resurveyed in 2014, so that is how this came about. Pretty much all cities have these, and she believes it is a CLG requirement that we have something like this, and it is periodically updated. Our changes were that we broke this one into three pieces. The first section is the Inventory of the Landmarks; the 23 designated landmarks. The third section is the Surveyed Sites that are not landmarked and may or may not be eligible, and the second section is titled Additions to the Survey, so in 2014, the Commission came up with a list of properties that the Commission wanted to survey, so we could learn more about them and determine if they were eligible to be landmarked, and we had a consultant working on these re-surveys and added these to the list, and she did a full survey of those eight new ones. Chair Unger noted that subsequently we did landmark one of them; it was the one on Color Cove.

Cynthia then indicated that the other change in 2014 was that we changed the survey form that was used from 1991 to 2010 to match SHPO and the National Register's updated forms, and the reason we wanted to do that is if we want to go for a National Register designation, we are surveying for the same information they will be looking for. It is a little more thorough than the older surveys. The key points when we do the survey, and lately we have hired Historic Preservation Specialist Nancy Burgess out of Prescott, who did the 2014 survey, and when they determine if it is a landmark at the National Register level, they are looking for two main categories – the significance of the site and the integrity.

Cynthia Lovely explained that on significance, they look at three different things – historic event or trends, a person, or the architecture, so the site may have something for one or three of those categories and we have a lot of examples where it may meet three different things. An example is Jordan Ranch as the Jordan family would be a person, the architecture of the barn and house with the red rock, and then the historic events while trends would be that it was an apple orchard, and the city was founded when most of the industry was in apple orchards.

Cynthia then explained that when you get to integrity, this is where most sites fail to meet the criteria. The Art Barn is a good example of that. When they look at integrity, they look at 1) The location - is it the original site or has it been moved? 2) The design – like if somebody wanted to put on a new style of roof that is not what we want to see, we want to see the same architecture and original look, but there are some exceptions if they are minor. An example would be if you have two different time periods, so the Ranger's House at the Ranger Station that didn't have any patio when it was first built, then they had the patio and eventually screened it in, and then turned it into a room, but it is still considered historic, because that change was more than 50 years ago. 3) Materials – is why when we are looking at a site like the most recent one had a pergola over the patio, and she wanted to change the material which could affect the appearance and architecture aspect of the house if you were going from wood to aluminum. Chair Unger clarified that she was going to use meshed wood used for growing vines – a trellis, and she had wooden slats, so we said that is just not going to hack it, because it is so different. She could have brought it to the whole Commission, but she decided not to and just go back and have it repaired.

Commissioner Fiene asked if it was a lath and Chair Unger indicated that it was like a lath, but it was really differently built with like 2x4's on their edge all the way along and they had a space between them so it was open, and she doesn't know exactly what they did to that, but they may have put cloth over it or something during the summer, but the change was not going to be appropriate.

Cynthia Lovely added that this type of stuff comes into play if you are looking at a building; for example, the Nininger House is a Madole house with a lot of windows that really aren't insulated, so a Certificate of Appropriateness was allowed to replace all of their windows, and HPC basically looked at the window design to approve the windows, and that is the type of thing where we want it to be energy efficient, and they could do the double pane windows but the appearance is what we would be looking at, not necessarily even the materials, and that is where this all comes into play when someone wants to change their house or do maintenance.

Cynthia then explained that workmanship is getting at distinctive elements or craftsmanship, so those are the details that you would find on a building. They could be small or large details, and once this is filled out, then our consultant does the next section - Recommendation of Eligibility, and if it is found to be eligible, then you would talk to the owner to see if they would like to landmark their building.

Cynthia stated that the point of this discussion is that if you are going to go out and look for properties that you think should be landmarked or be recognized, you would start with this survey book to see if it has already been surveyed, and if it has been on one of the older surveys, most likely you would want to do a new survey, but you would also have to meet with the owner and see if they are willing to have it surveyed, which doesn't obligate them to landmark. The importance of this is to document the building and learn as much as you can about it, because it could get renovated to where it is no longer recognizable or it could be demoed which has happened, but we would at least have a record.

Cynthia indicated that the segue to a project for you is to start thinking about properties that may need to be landmarked. We learned about a new Madole house and she, Brynn, Janeen and Jess looked at the house. Chair Unger then referenced a note from Nancy Burgess indicating that we should consider a non-contiguous district of Madole homes and that would be the only district we have here. We've already got two homes listed, so that would be the third, and Cynthia then added that with the Commission focused on landmarking that could spin off to maybe have a Historic Preservation Month event on Madole homes if you haven't already done that.

Commissioner Fiene stated that we haven't done that and Vice Chair Gehlbach commented that is a good idea; we have a barn now that we can have an event in. Chair Unger pointed out that we did one home that is near there. We have not been able to convince the people to landmark it and the home has been preserved phenomenally. We actually did an event there and it focused on that piece of property rather than doing a non-contiguous district, but that might be something we could do.

Cynthia Lovely indicated that since it has been about 10 years since the last landmark, it is a time that we might want to look at new landmarks. Vice Chair Gehlbach asked if that would be 1972 and prior, and Chair Unger explained that 50 years is one of the marks, but we can do it sooner than 50 years if something has some significance. It doesn't necessarily have to be 50 years. SHPO says that you can actually do it earlier, but there has to be a lot of other significant parts to it if it isn't 50 years old.

Chair Unger asked about redoing the survey, and Cynthia Lovely indicated that she talked with Nancy Burgess, and to be more realistic would be to select less than five because of budget reasons, but a few, and we would pay to have her survey them, and for the first one, she did ask the owner of that Madole house and he would be interested and willing to have it surveyed, and then if you could identify a couple more. She threw out a couple of examples to try to get an idea

of the cost, and they were all so different she couldn't give a number, so we would have to say here are the properties that we would like to have surveyed.

Chair Unger indicated that Nancy also went over the landmarks and made notes as to some of the issues we were having with them, and one of our projects has to be looking at all of those if we are not going to have her do that. We need to go back out and look at some of them. Some are in places where people might not notice that something has been done to them or they may have some damage that the owner needs to be made aware of, and she can think of three of them that we definitely need to look at. Cynthia Lovely asked if normally it is about 10 years that they want it updated, and Chair Unger indicated it is about 10 years, so we are looking at another couple of years, but it wouldn't be a bad idea for one of the projects to be for two of us to look at them. The other thing that is nice about that is maybe we take a couple of different people like Janeen was talking about going around and seeing these places. Not everyone has been to all of these places, some of them are really buried, and some are not really public places either, so you are going to want to approach with caution and call the homeowner prior if you are going to look at the whole property. She wouldn't want to step onto somebody's property without having them understanding that we are there.

Commissioner Fiene asked if we have the criteria needed to get certification as a surveyor, and Cynthia stated that she doesn't think there is a certification. Chair Unger stated that she didn't know. Commissioner Fiene indicated that he was curious as to what you needed in order to qualify to do the survey for landmarking. Chair Unger stated that she doesn't know that you have to have that, but the reason we have someone like Nancy Burgess who has a reputation for doing that is that it makes it that much more viable, even though we could possibly do some study, we usually like to have someone on the outside look at it. It is also interesting that KSB was asking if there is any way the Pushmataha building could get on the National Register of Places, but they have to ask for it; the city can't ask for them to do that, and it will depend on how much time they want to dedicate to it. Cynthia Lovely added that one reason we hire somebody like Nancy Burgess is that she can train people, but it is very time consuming, takes some skill to fill out building information with the year it was constructed, who was the architect and builder, and she goes to the County Recorder to research all of that and goes to the library. She delves into the research as much as possible and that is something that if any of you are interested or already know how to do that, then you could be doing that independently.

Cynthia Lovely explained that we have had places surveyed, and most recently what we called the Cook house that was where Biddle's nursery was, and it was in the book on one of the older surveys done by volunteers, so when the developers wanted to demo the building, we said before doing that we want to survey it, and we hired Nancy to do the survey of the building. She did a lot of research and that referenced the cliff house and developers wanted to demo the building, and we said she wanted to survey it including the Cook family and she found that it was not a Cook's family building, so she corrected the survey form. Chair Unger added that it wasn't as old as we were told either. Commissioner Fiene noted that the oldest parts were significant, but the Chair added that no matter what we came up with they were going to tear it down. The property would be more valuable without it.

Cynthia Lovely stated that one of her points is that to do a thorough survey, it takes some research, and it could be trying to track down the family or anyone associated with the building and the County Recorders, etc. There is a lot to it and that is why when we talked about the core focus of the Commission being around landmarks, that could easily occupy the Commission's time and that is the central mission, whether it is going back like Brynn said and resurveying them. You will notice that it says survey history and most of them have been surveyed at least four times, and they have added something that we were not aware of. Chair Unger added or

there has been some damage that we weren't aware of. On one of them, Nancy had said the windows are damaged and probably need to be replaced, and on another one, she said it was so overgrown you couldn't see the building, but she doesn't know that we can actually tell them to cut the stuff down

Vice Chair Gehlbach asked if they could go out in teams of two and survey, and Chair Unger stated yes, but if it is not a public property because you are going to have to walk around it, then do not do that without getting permission.

Janeen Trevillyan stated that her last understanding, subject to change in public laws, was that we used to survey from the street for the most part, if you can see the property from the street, you can probably fill out the survey, so you could take the book, find every one of those addresses and do 75% of them, and you are doing it from public property. If you are going to enter, then yes, you either need to send them a letter in advance to say you are coming or just knock on the door, identify yourself and ask if they mind, as long as Cynthia knows that would be your intention, in case somebody calls the city to say there is a strange man in the front yard. You can even go with a letter from the city saying who you are. Chair Unger referenced the Da Voss property that you can't see from the road and indicated that there are two or three like that. Vice Chair Gehlbach noted that he would rather contact them anyway, and Cynthia Lovely added that we usually know the owners of the landmarks, but the owners of the others surveyed change, and the Chair indicated that if there is one that we really want to have a look at we will have to contact them. One of the properties is the Babbit property, and she is not sure that it is still their property.

Vice Chair Gehlbach commented that we have two good ones, but they are very skittish; they are afraid that people will drive by. Commissioner Fiene confirmed it is the one on Copper Cliffs; he also likes that property, and he commented that the Hart Store is for sale. Chair Unger stated yes, and it is being advertised that it can be an Airbnb in the Phoenix paper.

Chair Unger indicated that it would be good for the Commissioners to review the surveys again and what Nancy Burgess came up with, because there are certain things in there where she said there was some deterioration at that point, and if we are looking eight years later, there may be more deterioration.

6. FUTURE MEETING DATES AND AGENDA ITEMS
a. Monday, April 11, 2021; 4:00 pm

Chair Unger noted that the next date is April 11th, but asked if that will give enough time for HP Month, or can we have the conversation start with Janeen, but she hasn't signed the contract yet? Cynthia Lovely indicated that wouldn't start until July 1st. The Chair again asked if we are going to have time if we start in April to do something in May. Cynthia Lovely suggested that you pair up again with two people outside of the meeting to come up with the ideas and bring it back to the Commission. The Chair noted that it doesn't have to be something really fancy either, and we could find out if the Cowboy Club is still interested; that might be the way to go.

Donna Puckett asked when they are implementing their motion, since it was for March, not April. Chair Unger indicated that they would have to wait to see what the city approves and Janeen won't be doing it this year.

Vice Chair Gehlbach asked if that is to designate the Cowboy Club and Commissioner Fiene clarified that it is for recognition. The Vice Chair then asked if we could agendize some things for the next meeting, so we can get on track as far what we are going to be coming together to achieve. Chair Unger indicated that we usually have something on the agenda talking about the agenda, and Cynthia

stated that you can talk about agenda items you would like to see. The Vice Chair then stated that he would like to finalize the Uptown plaques and talk about who we are going to designate in Uptown – the Cowboy Club, etc., the Uptown walk, and plan for the event, so when we come together, we can finalize them.

The Chair then asked to have something on the agenda to always talk about where we are and where we are going with projects. Vice Chair Gehlbach stated that is what we will end up doing in the next meeting. The Chair explained that she is talking about on every agenda we would have the things we planned on doing, if it is finished and what happened, or does it have to be more specific? Cynthia Lovely stated that sounds pretty specific. The Vice Chair said that we could do that on the next agenda, because he would like to just complete the plaques in Uptown, the cleaning and everything of that nature to see if we can get farther ahead on the walk. Chair Unger then added that if we put that on each agenda, we have something that speaks to that on each agenda, then we will stay on track and will have a record of what we are going to do. Cynthia indicated it could be project status.

Commissioner Huggins stated that he still has this, and it seems to be something that is fairly simple to do and go through that and figure out those that will be recognized. Chair Unger stated that can be on the next agenda as one of the projects, then we could go through it and check them off and she would like for it to stay on the agenda, so the next time around, if there is something that needs to be followed up, we will know we are gaining on it.

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: Vice Chair Gelbach moved to adjourn. Commissioner Fiene seconded the motion.

VOTE: Motion carried four (4) in favor (Fiene, Gehlbach, Huggins and Unger) and zero (0) opposed. Commissioner Pfaff was absent and there are two vacancies.

The meeting adjourned at 5:38 p.m.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission held on February 14, 2022.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

Date