

**Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Historic Preservation Commission Meeting
Monday, May 13, 2013 – 4:00 p.m.
Vultee Conference Room – 106 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona**

(15 minutes, 4:00 - 4:15 p.m. for items 1 - 3)

1. Verification of notice, call to order, roll call and Pledge of Allegiance.

Chairman Unger called the meeting to order at 4:08 p.m.

Roll Call:

Commissioners: Chairman Brynn Burkee Unger, Vice Chairman Allyson Holmes and Commissioners Catherine Coté, Jane Grams, and Steve Segner arrived at 4:20 p.m. Commissioners Ann Jarmusch and Charlie Schudson were excused.

Staff: Audree Juhlin and Donna Puckett

Council Members: Councilor Dan McIlroy and Vice Mayor DiNunzio

2. Public forum for items not on agenda. Limit of 3 minutes per presentation. (Note that the Commission may not discuss or make any decisions on any matter brought forward by a member of the public.)

The Chairman opened the public forum at this time.

Janeen Trevillyan, representing Sedona Heritage Museum, Sedona, AZ: Indicated that she wanted to let the Commission know that the Heritage Museum is working on projects from their Strategic Plan and one of the focus areas is how to build relationships between the Museum and local businesses. One idea is to create a walking tour that is delivered via smartphones through QR (Quick Response) Codes. Janeen then distributed a handout and indicated that she had previously left information for the Commission about this program that they found in the National Trust Magazine.

Ms. Trevillyan then referenced a group that created a website with a URL address for every QR Code, and each one represents a location and historic building or site in the town. When people walk around, it doesn't matter where they start; they see the QR sign in a store and shoot it with their tablet or smartphone and it goes to a page where there could be a photo, audio and some text. The museum sees that as a way to build a relationship with businesses in Uptown, and maybe as far as Tlaquepaque, because those are on the site of historic places.

Janeen indicated they would go to the businesses and ask if they want to participate and put it in their window. It may have some value to the businesses, because people are stopping in front of their storefront. The historic walking tour that the Historic Preservation Commission created is being photocopied and printed by the Chamber of Commerce Visitor Center in Uptown, and they would basically be talking about a lot of those same locations, but if people didn't get that brochure, they could still participate. It doesn't matter if you do one or all; they will just have an iconic look to them, so people will be able to identify them.

Janeen explained that they are working on getting a meeting with the City staff to ensure they understand the Sign Code and what it would say about another square foot of signage rights being taken from the businesses, because they are only allowed X number of square feet per business, and there are also ordinances about things in windows, so they have to go through that with the City staff to see if this can be viewed conventionally within the Code or if there are any educational waivers, etc. They decided to come to the Commission first as a courtesy to let you know that they are exploring the program, and they will be going to City staff, and then going to the businesses, so

this is just informational, and there might be another time in the future for co-sponsoring, because it has a lot of flexibility behind it, so something could be put up in May each year or it could talk about an historic home tour, etc., and people can get to it instantaneously. They don't need anything from the Commission at this time; they just need to know the rules to figure out how it might work.

Chairman Unger indicated that this might be an item to agendaize for further discussion, once they are farther along. Janeen added once they actually decide to go through with the program and determine if there is any significant cost and know a timeline, then they will no doubt come back to the Commission as a courtesy again. She would also be open to suggestions, if anyone has seen this in another town.

Having no additional requests to speak, the Chairman closed the public forum.

3. Commission and staff announcements and summary of current matters.

Chairman Unger reported that the Commission has two events in the coming week. On Thursday May 16th at 2:00 p.m., we have the dedication of the Dorothy Philips Home and a map has been provided. It should be a nice dedication; the Commission landmarked this home last August. On Monday, May 20th at 1:00 p.m., the Commission is going to be donating the quilt to the Sedona Historical Society at Jordan Park. Once that quilt has been donated, the City will no longer be picking up the insurance on it, so the evaluation of it has been provided to Janeen Trevillyan. Donna Puckett added that some flyers about the quilt presentation and the home dedication are available if Janeen wants to take them for distribution.

4. Discussion regarding the current condition and structural integrity of the Sedona Ranger Station – Historic Landmarks No. 7 and 8. (Note that this discussion is not for the purpose of discussing any land acquisition.) (10 minutes, 4:15 – 4:25 p.m.)

Chairman Unger indicated that the Commission is not going to be discussing the land acquisition. The Commission went to the site and Commissioner Segner had much more to say about the condition of the building; however, she thinks the Commission felt that the structures are in very good condition. There were some drainage issues and issues with the roof on one side of the barn and some windows, plus some paint conditions.

Note: Commissioner Segner joined the meeting at this time.

Commissioner Segner indicated that the building itself was pretty good, but it is getting to the point, especially on the roof on one side that it is going to have to be done. Chairman Unger pointed out that the roof being referenced is the one on the south side of the barn. If you are facing the barn from Brewer, it is the right-hand side. There is also an issue between the lower part of that structure and the upper part of the structure; some paint work probably needs to be done, although it doesn't look like structurally there is anything really wrong there.

Chairman Unger noted that the Commission walked through the interior of the buildings and there were a couple of places where there might be some consideration for rodent damage that might occur, but it didn't look like it has yet.

Councilor McIlroy indicated that he thinks the City has talked about the possibility of buying that property through the Park & Rec. Fund or something, and he asked if that has moved forward in anyone's mind. Chairman Unger explained that is not something the Commission can discuss on the agenda, but no, the Commission hasn't heard anything; however, there isn't really any way the Commission can discuss that. Commissioner Coté added that the Commission is not allowed to.

Audree Juhlin explained that at the last City Council meeting when this item was discussed, Council gave staff direction to enter into the appraisal process, so staff is in that process now. The Councilor then noted that it is a little premature then and out of the Commission's hands.

Chairman Unger indicated that there are also some trees that may need to come down, but they aren't structurally . . . Commissioner Segner interjected that there is nothing that has to be fixed today or tomorrow. It is in pretty good shape compared to where it was five years ago, except for some windows. When the windows are done, the sashes all have to be rebuilt at some point in time, and they will all be hand-made, so it will be fairly expensive.

Councilor McIlroy asked how old the building is and Chairman Unger stated that the barn was built in 1937 and the ranger house was built in 1917. Commissioner Coté asked if those are the oldest structures still standing in town and the Chairman was told that the house is the oldest structure in town. The Chairman then noted that she doesn't know where this report goes from here or if this is just for the City's record as to what the Commission sees that needs to be done.

Audree Juhlin explained that staff will compile notes to indicate the outstanding issues, depending on where the whole City's process of purchasing goes. If that wasn't in place, a letter would be sent to the property owners indicating what the Commission determined to be problems and ask for their correction of those issues. For now, the notes will be put in the file as a matter of record until we have a better idea of which way it is going.

Commissioner Segner asked if there is any reason the Commission should discuss now what the Commission would recommend, if the City was to get it to be more than stable. The things we discussed were to get it just stable, but if we want to bring it to 100% standard . . . Audree explained that would be an item that the Commission should discuss and it would be agendaized, if we get down that path.

Donna Puckett pointed out that part of the assessment today was to practice completion of the resource survey form, and it might be good for someone to do an official update for the survey. Chairman Unger agreed and explained it would just be going back over the form, because this is what the Commission will be responsible for and she would urge all of the Commissioners to review it. The Chairman indicated that she will complete it with someone else and bring it to the next meeting for review. It would be good to have it in hand and discuss the issues and how they show up on one of these forms, because there will be properties in the future that may fall off of the survey, so we will bring that up at the next meeting.

Commissioner Segner noted that normally the Commission would do a survey to bring it up to the standard that we got it, so should we do another survey at the same time to get it to where we want it to be, so the City can't say that the Commission didn't show all of these problems, but in this survey, this is what it would really take to get it to where it should be. The survey is usually just maintaining, but he would hate to have the Council say the survey didn't say anything about stripping the building to bare wood and rebuilding every window, etc. He then suggested completing two surveys - one to maintain it and one to bring it to standard.

Chairman Unger indicated that she would think that the City will probably bring in somebody to look at doing that. Commissioner Segner expressed concern that they may not know how to do it, since they have to rehab to our standards. Audree Juhlin explained that once the appraisal is done, it will be taken to the City Council for further discussion, and staff will get direction at that time. Staff envisions that based on that discussion staff will also get direction for the Commission's involvement, and it would be staff's recommendation to the City Council that this is where we can use the Commission's expertise to do what Commissioner Segner is suggesting, but the Commission needs to wait until that time.

5. Discussion regarding City Council's discussions on the roles and responsibilities of City Commissions and possible alternatives to the structure of existing Commissions. (10 minutes, 4:25 – 4:35 p.m.)

Audree Juhlin recapped that in January the City Council discussed what the Commissions' roles and responsibilities looked like, and Council's direction was for staff to look at all of the

Commissions and the structure, what is working and not working, and then provide solutions to City Council to address those areas that were not working. At the January meeting, staff presented the issues related to the Commissions and previously met with all of the Commissions' Chairmen. The issues identified at a staff level were all pretty much supported by the Commissions' Chairmen and Vice Chairmen, so there was no disagreement as to what the issues were. The disagreement came about with what the solutions were to fix those issues and what the structure would look like if changes were made.

Audree explained that staff presented two options -- Option A and Option B. Option A was to completely eliminate the Commissions and in their place have a pool of volunteers that would work on specific projects, so if a survey for historic preservation was one of the projects that Council identified as a work program, then staff would put a call out to the pool of volunteers to work with staff to complete the project. It was a project-driven process using volunteers, but not having the official Commission's roles. Option B was to keep the Commissions at a reduced number of meetings per year and change how the work programs were established, basically saying that the City Council would establish the work programs, and the Commissions would then work on those programs. With Option B, there was a price tag of two staff members and approximately \$200,000. It also was recommended that the Commissions would be broken into two areas. One staff member would work on Arts & Culture and Parks & Recreation; the other staff member would work on Housing, Sustainability and Historic Preservation. Neither of those options was supported by the City Council and staff was told to agendize another discussion on what Council thought would be appropriate options to address the issues.

Audree Juhlin explained that recently Council met again and provided some direction for staff to look at eliminating the Commissions, but with a more informal structure, rather than just a volunteer pool, so we would have staff working teams to work on each one of the issue areas of housing, historic preservation, sustainability, parks & rec. and arts & culture and figure out how that would work and take the plan back to the City Council for further discussion and consideration, and that is where it is at right now. Audree then pointed out that this item is on the Commission's agenda today to discuss the various options and any ideas the Commission may have as staff is putting this together.

Vice Chairman Holmes indicated that it seemed that the Mayor made a pretty specific recommendation of what he thought should happen, and Audree indicated that the Mayor basically said that he would like to see staff-led working teams. One would be arts & culture and historic preservation; the others would be housing, parks & rec., sustainability -- that is all of them she can think of right now. The Vice Chairman then asked if staff is formulating a plan to implement the Mayor's description and Audree indicated yes, plus if staff has any other ideas or recommendations to go along with that. For instance, if arts & culture and historic preservation aren't a very good fit for staff, there would probably be a recommendation regarding how they do or don't work together.

Commissioner Coté stated that this Commission would be abolished, and asked if they would then ask the Commissioners to be in that pool of volunteers. Audree Juhlin explained that details of that are being worked out. As she understood the Mayor's direction that Council supported, it was to establish staff working teams, so staff would pull a team of volunteers together to work on specific work programs, but she isn't sure how that will be addressed in the recommendations. Commissioner Coté then asked if all of this is because of time and expense for Commissions and Audree explained that is part of the reason, plus some Commissions that have been together for a number of years aren't able to be very effective or their work program isn't necessarily aligned with the Council's priorities.

Commissioner Segner indicated that the way they are approaching it is wrong. When you form any Commission or body, it tries to do a lot to look like it is doing something, so we end up doing a lot of make work things, as opposed to things that are really important. A lot of what this Commission does is PR, doing things for the Historic Society, etc., and we do it because we tell the Council all the wonderful stuff we are doing to justify ourselves. Then the Council says, one Commission

doesn't know what the other Commission is doing -- nor should we. The Council should know what is going on and if the Council doesn't know what the Commissions are doing, the Council isn't listening. If he is duplicating something in this meeting that someone is doing in another meeting, it is the Council or staff that should catch it, not the Commission. We specifically go through our work programs.

Commissioner Segner pointed out that we went through two meetings and he sat with the Council and told them about our project on S.R. 89A and he was told that was great and asked when he can get it done. Then, he met with the Mayor and City Manager and they asked what project? They didn't remember it, so don't pile on all of the stuff at the Council meetings and say it will be sent to a committee. Make a decision at the Council level and just give what the Council wants done to the Commissions, then the Commissions can meet less.

Commissioner Segner then stated that this Commission is bound by certain codes to make certain decisions, so it takes a little bit of knowledge. Can everybody do with less, absolutely, but it is a management problem. He doesn't think the City Council really understands what Commissions do, and they aren't coming back saying no, they don't want the Commissions to do that or you shouldn't be doing that. Maybe Housing doesn't do anything for a couple of years, but you probably still need it at some time, because you are collecting money. Throwing out the baby isn't going to help. Saying that the Commission needs to do all of this PR work, etc.; if you don't want the Commission to do it, fine, the Commission will work around it. Audree Juhlin indicated that is pretty much right on with Option B. Staff basically said that the Council needs to look at all of the Commission's work programs as part of the budget process.

Chairman Unger explained that her problem with it is that about three years ago, when we had a general meeting with the Council, it was indicated that the Commission should be doing more. She had thought the Commission had a very narrow path, such as landmarking, watching for destruction of landmarks, finding new landmarks, etc., and that the other issue was the Historical Society's. Maybe the Commission would do the Endangered Places things, but it was drawn to her attention that the Commission wasn't doing enough, so this comes as a blow, because she was pushing to find other things to do, to make sure each Commissioner was engaged in doing something, since she thought that is what the Council wanted. Then, they come back and say the Commissions are wasting staff's time and the Council doesn't want all of this stuff done, and things are being duplicated, so to her there is confusion.

Audree Juhlin indicated that she understands, but she doesn't think Council said that the Commission is wasting staff's time; that wasn't ever said. The issue is if we have the Commissions, how do we provide the resources, meaning staff and budget, to support the Commissions' work programs, so we are able to help the Commission move those items forward. She just wanted to clarify that she doesn't believe the Council ever said that the Commission was wasting staff's time.

Commissioner Segner indicated that he agreed with Chairman Unger. It seemed like they were told to take on more, and the answer now is to tell the Commission exactly what you want to have done. If every Commission knocked 30% or 40% off of the table, maybe the whole thing would become manageable, and he understands that the City has to manage to its resources. Chairman Unger agreed and expressed that one of her concerns is if the Commission is asking too much of staff. Personally, she feels that the Commission should have taken more responsibility in terms of doing research, etc., instead of finding something else that we have to okay with staff and the City Council, because we are then building work instead of reducing it.

Commissioner Segner indicated that he sees a hidden elephant, not so much staff time, but the hidden work behind the scenes. We have to record this, do notes, and as a public entity, we have to follow the rules and it is a giant pain, but if you let staff drive everything, staff is about getting things done and what you need is a beginning, middle and end. The beginning is the people who have a passion for something, and staff makes sure it gets done, but if you let staff pick the people, you sometimes won't get the best ideas, etc., so be careful not to alienate the people that are

driving projects. If you internalize them, staff will find the easiest and quickest way to get them off of their plate.

Councilor McIlroy stated that when they had their Council meeting and Option A and B were presented, the room was pretty well filled with a lot of Commissioners, and he had decided to go with Option A, which was to eliminate the Commissions and Boards, but there was so much resistance from the audience with members saying they were going to resign and that it was an insult, etc., he was stunned by the reaction, so he voted against everything and talked about a hybrid. As Audree stated, they brought it back to the Council and it is still in process, but this Commission, he thinks, is going to remain intact and Sustainability will remain intact. Some of the others will be hybridized in some fashion, like Housing and Parks & Rec. may be kind of on call.

Councilor McIlroy explained that Karen Daines was asked to solve the Uptown parking problem, so she got different stakeholders together offsite, no meeting notice, no minutes -- none of the open meeting complications, and they are doing the work wonderfully. We are getting private parking lots contracted with the City so the public will have access, and there are no open meeting complications, minutes, etc., and that became kind of a model. Maybe we should adopt more of that and less of the notices and recordings, and all of the complications that go into this kind of stuff, and we're working on that process now and will end up with something better. It won't be A or B; it will be something else that may satisfy everyone.

Commissioner Segner stated that part of the City's motto is to encourage participation. Vice Chairman Holmes stated "spirit of volunteerism" and Commissioner Segner indicated that is read before every meeting, and then in the meeting, they say you guys are a pain and we are going to cut it back. What Councilor McIlroy is saying makes total sense; it is how you go about it. The City Council is great at doing nothing for a long time and pushing things, and then suddenly, they say they are just going to do this, and it blew everybody away. It was too quick and not well thought out, and you need to look at each Commission.

Commissioner Segner then gave an example of the Budget Commission asking questions that staff didn't know and the Commission helped staff and saved a lot of money. It was time consuming for the staff, so he understands, but that is the problem. The idea isn't necessarily bad, but it was a slap in the face to the volunteerism.

Audree Juhlin indicated that is why one of the recommendations was that if we are going to have the Commissions let's give them the staff they need to move the projects forward. We have been adding Commissions and reducing staff, so we don't have enough staff to man the Commissions.

Donna Puckett explained that one of the key points was to give the groups more flexibility, because two or three times today, we have said we can't discuss things, and when you are limited to a monthly meeting, it is going to sit for another month and hopefully hit all of the points in the next meeting, and it is time consuming. There have been times during this month helping this Commission that probably 70% of her time has been working on the HP Month events, and there is a lot of behind the scenes activity that is really not productive work in terms of the Commission being able to deal with what the Commission wants to address. When you are doing field projects, there are times that it might be conducive for two or three people to work on a staff project and be able to set your own times. Additionally, when doing minutes for a maximum of 13 groups, she was the link that verbally shared information, and an example was when HPC had the Centennial directive and said that you were going to be looking for a Legacy project, and she had just left an Arts & Culture meeting, when they were talking about commissioning art for the roundabouts, so it was suggested that the two Chairmen get together, but those aren't things that the Council would necessarily see by reviewing work programs. The Council knew you were working on the Centennial, but they might not see the natural linkage in timing, so those two things could fit together, and the same thing was happening with P&Z and Housing, etc., but even if you reviewed all of the work programs, you wouldn't necessarily see those linkages.

Chairman Unger agreed that there is a communication that we have to have; she would like to see how it would work. We are all curious about how we are going to be involved. Her biggest worry is the reaction of people who say, "I am on this Commission and you are getting rid of me, so I don't want anything to do with it anymore". She doesn't feel that way; there is a way to get around this and make it work, but she worries about the reaction of the people involved. We have all put in a lot of time; she has put in nine years figuring out all of the stuff she knows and Janeen put in all of that time before that. The Chairman also indicated that she actually paid at least \$500 to go to conferences each year, so she would have knowledge that possibly staff didn't have, and we do feel a little affronted by this and worried if we are just going to be discarded. She would love it if the Commission could be more agile and that is one thing she hates about this. Her concern is if she can get three people together to do a project, because there is always the worry of if that is going to be something the Commission will get nailed for, because of the Open Meeting Laws. We want a balance and we want this to work, but there is a concern and she doesn't want the volunteers to feel that maybe they shouldn't have spent the time; she would hate for the City to lose the public's input that way.

Commissioner Segner indicated that part of it is just management style and referenced how it would work in the private sector. He then indicated that direction is needed from the Council or staff. In the past, we felt obliged to do as much as we could and it may need to be a lot more focused, so if each Commission told you in 20 minutes what the Commission was going to do and you put it on a spreadsheet and identified what wasn't needed, then you could give the Commissions their marching orders. Audree Juhlin again stated that was Option B, and the Commissioner stated that Council should ask how, when and at what cost it can be accomplished and by cost, he means in time for support.

Chairman Unger restated that a lot of things the Commission has taken on really haven't been related to what the Commission was established to do. She loved doing them and she thinks the Commissioners have loved them, but she doesn't know how much time the Commission has invested in things that could have been done by the Historical Society. Commissioner Segner expressed that the Commission is also going to be needed on the Brewer Road project and the Commission will have to answer questions and, if the City acquires them, discuss what the City can do with those buildings. The Chairman pointed out that the Commission is educated about that, and that is her worry about dumping it onto another Commission, because it would be imperative that we educate them; it is constantly a training program.

Audree Juhlin pointed out that it seems to be lost in the discussion that in City Council's discussion and in staff's presentation and recommendations, not once was it said that we do not need volunteers. We absolutely need the expertise, time and assistance of volunteers, but how can we better utilize your expertise and time in a way that is much more effective. If we go to a different model, we still want to involve every one of you in whatever is being moved forward. She wanted to stress that we do not want to eliminate the volunteers, because staff cannot do their jobs without you, and Council relies on the expertise of the volunteers as well.

Commissioner Segner indicated that it went down the wrong path when the comment was made that staff would pick the people that they want to work with, because that becomes a self-serving group of people that want to get something done. They absolutely will be efficient and they will be questioned, like the Uptown project, he would ask who had the oversight, etc., so those things could come back and bite you. The Open Meeting Laws are a pain, but they do protect you from that. He then gave a Budget Commission example of budgeting capital requests and noted that the City goes through a pretty good vetting process for Commissioners.

Commissioner Coté pointed out that the discussion is starting to be repetitive; however, Vice Chairman Holmes wanted to say that even though staff's intent was not to make the Commissioners feel redundant, it does feel kind of embarrassing, when you are made to feel that you are a pain in the neck to someone, and that wasn't the intent, but it is a response that happens, and maybe that is something you can work with to better state your case, because you are problem

solvers and see the problems clearer than everybody else. She also believes that the transparency is imperative in a small town and conflict of interest is a fact of life, even when you try to get away from it. We need to be very careful about that. Chairman Unger agreed that she knows staff didn't mean for it to sound like we are redundant, but the way it came out, it sounded that way, and that is why she thinks there is that reaction.

Vice Chairman Holmes then indicated that she understood the Mayor recommended that HPC be combined with the Arts Commission and that doesn't make sense to her. HPC might fit better with Planning & Zoning, because it is about land use. HPC is not art; it is land use, etc.

Councilor McIlroy indicated that he thinks what the Mayor said in the meeting, which is no longer on point, was that he wanted to combine Art in Public Places, Arts & Culture and Historic Preservation as one. That is what he talked about, but that is no longer the issue. Historical has been pulled out and is going to be its own Commission as he understands it now, subject to change.

6. Discussion and update on the proposed self-guided "History/Movie Walk". (10 minutes, 4:35 - 4:45 pm)

Commissioner Segner reported that he met with the Mayor and City Manager and showed them the prototype and they both liked the idea, but he had to remind them of what the project was and they thought it was a good project. He explained that there would be no City funds involved and we were trying to do this with our own money and ask for volunteers.

The Commissioner indicated that they weren't getting much help from the Main Street group, but they are just going to proceed, and then pull them back into the loop. The City Manager indicated that he will meet with the ADOT Engineers to get their approval, because we weren't sure if the City or ADOT has to approve it, and then the City Manager will get back to him.

Councilor McIlroy indicated that he doesn't think ADOT is a player in this, because the City bought the road from L'Auberge to the end of town. Commissioner Segner agreed, but explained that the City Manager indicated that he wanted to meet with ADOT first. The Councilor then indicated that it shouldn't take long to resolve who has jurisdiction. He then suggested that the Commissioner come to the Council meeting tomorrow and ask who owns the road. Commissioner Segner explained that he doesn't want to go behind the Mayor's and City Manager's backs at a Council meeting; however, the Councilor pointed out that the Commissioner would be seeking clarification. Commissioner Segner explained that they had said they would get back to him after their meeting and the Councilor asked how long ago that was. The Commissioner stated about three weeks and Councilor McIlroy then indicated that chances are that it has dropped off of their radar. Commissioner Segner indicated that he may email the Mayor and the City Manager tomorrow.

7. Discussion/update on this month's "National Historic Preservation Month" activities. (5 minutes, 4:45 – 4:50 pm)

Chairman Unger thanked Janeen Trevillyan for the event with Howard Madole; it was fabulous. The Commission has the dedication of the Dorothy Philips House, and thanks to Commissioner Jarmusch, there was an article on it. Donna Puckett indicated that both articles have been in Sedona EYE, Sedona.biz and Sedona Red Rock News ran the Dorothy Philips House last Friday. Kudos has the quilt article, so they are getting good coverage.

The Chairman noted that we have the Endangered Places Brochure and we want to roll that out, so she will ask Commissioner Jarmusch about an article on that for the end of the month. She has redone the brochure; the old one had the Jordan Packing Shed, but since they made so many alterations to that, she pulled it out and rearranged everything. All of the wording is the same as the last one, but Donna was so good as to let her know that she needs to change it to say 2013 - 2014. If there is anything else that needs to be included, please let her know, but her feeling is that the Commission just needs to get it out and next year take a closer look at adding or putting some

other buildings in it. The Chairman then asked if everybody is okay with that and the consensus was yes. Chairman Unger added that it will be on the website and noted that she is also covering agenda item 8 here too.

Commissioner Segner indicated that it would be excellent to have a button on the website about the history of Sedona. Now, we talk about the current city, but it could do a better job of saying Historic Sedona or what there is to do in Sedona, etc. We leave it all up to the Chamber and not everybody makes it there. Chairman Unger pointed out that there are some things on the website about the Commission, but maybe it could be on next month's agenda to talk about the City's website. Commissioner Segner added that it could tell about the movies made here and everything else.

Commissioner Coté noted that this is a prime example of the problem that staff is feeling. Yes, it is exactly what needs to happen, so we are going to put it on the agenda and we are going to say it is a great idea, so let's get it on the website, but then we don't have a clue as to what that entails, so maybe the Commission should be taking more responsibility for writing things, etc., and giving it to staff. The Chairman indicated that she has created the things on the Commission's website and we have the people to do it, but we have to discuss it. She has done most of the PowerPoints on the website, and legally, the Commission can't put it on the website, but Commissioner Coté is right.

Commissioner Segner stated that if the Commission put it all together and said what a great idea it is, it would still take 120 days for the City. Nobody ever stands up and says yes, put it on there Thursday and that is part of the problem. Why does it take so long to make it happen, when something has been decided? Donna Puckett stated that part of it is 51 to 1 odds with just the Commissions.

Chairman Unger indicated that the website can be put on the next agenda and she has always believed that is what the Commission needs to do, and that is why she likes Ann doing the articles. The City shouldn't have to write all of those -- that should be the Commission's responsibility, but we do have to pass it through the City.

8. Discussion/review of Endangered Places Brochure for possible changes. (5 minutes, 4:50 - 4:55 pm)

There was no discussion on agenda item 8, except as shown in the latter part of the discussion in agenda item 7.

9. Discussion/review of Commission's roles and responsibilities related to Landmark Designations and Certificates of Appropriateness. (10 minutes, 4:55 – 5:05 p.m.)

Chairman Unger indicated that the Commission hasn't received a Certificate of Appropriateness for the Telegraph Station, but Ron Maassen discussed what they want to do and the Commission needs to take a closer look at what that means and what a hearing is about. The Chairman then asked if that isn't set up for the next agenda, and staff explained that next month's agenda hasn't been discussed, but since we have new Commissioners, today was for the Commission to go through the processes for landmarking, removing from landmark status and Certificates of Appropriateness, and to make sure that Commissioners are aware of the Standards for Rehabilitation. It was really to familiarize everyone with what happens when items come before the Commission, so you are aware of those processes.

Commissioner Segner asked if that would be a perfect example of something the Commission could do offsite and not in a meeting, but at a committee meeting that wasn't recorded and agendaized. Donna Puckett explained that if everyone did their homework; these documents were emailed to you over a week ago. Vice Chairman Holmes asked if the Commissioners could just say they read them and Donna Puckett indicated that is really up to the Commission, but some Commissioners said they wanted a meeting to discuss the processes and that is what this is, so if you have questions on the processes, now is the time to ask them.

Chairman Unger indicated that on the designation process, the Commission has a hearing and goes through, point by point, the Staff Report, which she hopes the Commission will be doing a lot of the research for and giving it to staff, instead of staff having to do all of that research. In the process, they submit a landmark request. She just met with Lynne Leakey and the Commission will probably be doing a landmark hearing for her in the fall. They submit the application, the research is done and it is put on an agenda for a hearing. The hearing has a process, and before the hearing, she sends out something saying how the hearing will go, and we allow the public to speak, so that is why these are so important and why we don't want to prejudge them. We want the public to have a say as to whether or not they want it, and it is the same process to remove the landmark from a property as it is to landmark. Once an application and fee payment is received, the Commission goes through the process of researching it and bringing it to the Commission to make the decision to landmark or remove from landmark, whichever the case may be. In that process, we notify the public and the property will be noticed, and we go through the Commission's hearing. It is sort of a rigid hearing that we go through step by step and the Commission votes at the end, and it either passes by a majority or fails by a majority vote.

The Chairman indicated that she likes to have as many of the Commissioners there as possible; she doesn't like to do it with a minimum, so we try to schedule them when we are all there. The Chairman then asked for the Commissioners to let Donna know of their availability. The next one will be on the Block House and it will be up to the Commission to decide if there is justification for the removal of a landmark, and we may have another hearing for a Certificate of Appropriateness, which is a little different.

Chairman Unger indicated that there will be a Staff Report and there are some issues. She sent out the Secretary of Interior's Standards, and there are a couple of things that might be awkward about moving the Telegraph Station. She will talk with SHPO to ensure we have everything lined up and work with staff on that report. Commissioner Coté asked if hearings become part of the Commission's regular meeting and the Chairman indicated yes and she prefers doing it then, but we need to let staff know of our availability.

Commissioner Segner noted that on the Telegraph Station, they asked if we could expedite it, and the Commissioner then asked if, since it is a non-designated building going to City park land, does the Commission really need to get involved. Chairman Unger explained yes, because the Standards for Rehabilitation says that each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historic developments, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties will not be undertaken, so she is not sure and needs to check with SHPO. It is a procedural thing.

Commissioner Coté asked what happens to the building if the Commission doesn't support the relocation of the building and Chairman Unger explained that would be up to Historical Society to decide. The Commissioner then asked if it can get too technical and lose the whole building and the Chairman noted that if we lose the landmarking . . . ; we have to go through this process. Commissioner Coté then referenced Standard #3 and asked how far you take that -- to where you aren't able to preserve things, and the Chairman explained that the questions have to be asked and she is not making a decision now at all. We aren't holding the meeting to make that decision; we are just talking about some issues that are probably going to come up, and she is going to the people at the top to find out what they think, because this is a National Landmark and she wants to ensure that we aren't endangering anything. For example, if you wanted to put a Rococo decoration on an historic building, you couldn't do that, but we have to take each step and ensure that we aren't making a mistake.

Chairman Unger opened the public comment period at this time.

Janeen Trevillyan, representing Sedona Heritage Museum, Sedona, AZ: Indicated that the topic on the agenda was to discuss training for the new Commissioners to understand the process and know what is involved, but also until you get an application, don't go places that you don't need

to go, because you don't know what somebody is going to ask for. The Museum is very conscious of the Secretary of Interior's Standards and is definitely thinking about what they will ask for, and we don't know yet. There have been things batted around, but until you get an application, she doesn't know that you can prepare for a response. You can prepare yourself for the process, when an application comes forward, and she doesn't know when that application is going to come forward -- it may not be right away, because they do have some things to consider.

Chairman Unger clarified that Ron told the Commission that he wanted it here this month, and we do have to wait.

Janeen Trevillyan, representing Sedona Heritage Museum, Sedona, AZ: Explained that it is all coming at one time and everyone is getting on board with what it takes to do this, so you can prepare yourselves for the Commission's responsibilities.

Donna Puckett explained that what is agendized is the Commission's training session and the Commissioner that specifically requested it is not here today unfortunately, but it was go get everyone comfortable with the process and what the Commission has to do when those things come up.

Janeen Trevillyan, representing Sedona Heritage Museum, Sedona, AZ: Recalled that there used to be a "cheat sheet" for Commissioners and Chairman Unger indicated that the Commissioners will receive that. Janeen then stated that from the Museum's point of view, when the application comes through, it will be reflective of study, counsel and more research.

Chairman Unger commented about there being more research, because Ron gave her what it was going to be and indicated that is it and the Commission better get it through. Staff pointed out that the Commission needed to get back on the agenda.

Having no additional requests to speak, the public comment period closed.

The Chairman advised the Commissioners that they would get the "cheat sheet" of steps and other paperwork with a Certificate of Appropriateness to review, and sometimes, we have had hearings when people haven't read everything, so Commissioners should make sure they read it, and obviously, we aren't going to be pushing it as hard as Ron . . . ; we're still waiting for it.

Donna Puckett asked if there are any questions on Article 15 and Audree explained that the Commission needs to stay on the process. Vice Chairman Holmes indicated that she would like to make a motion that the Commission delay this until Ann can benefit from the discussion, and aside from that, she would prefer to train from a real project rather than go through it as a group. Chairman Unger explained that her first meeting was a Certificate of Appropriateness and she felt awkward about it, and she thinks that is what Ann felt, but it is a fairly simple process. Vice Chairman Holmes indicated that she learns best when we experience something.

Commissioner Segner commented that when the City has major land developments, they do them once a year now, if you are going to do a major change. and we need to get to the point where we do these every January or June, then in our June meeting, we would do three of them. We don't do them ad hoc and everybody has a chance to know that we are getting ready and they are done at a certain point in time. Chairman Unger indicated that the problem is that when somebody asks for their home to be landmarked, we only have a certain amount of time to have the hearing; however, we could change that.

Audree Juhlin explained that in the Certificate of Appropriateness portion, it is very specific, and under the landmarking, it does say within 60 days of receipt, so it would just be a modification in the Land Development Code and that is a great idea. Chairman Unger agreed it would be a lot easier. Commissioner Segner restated his concept and noted that when two of them overlay each other, it kind of gets confusing.

Chairman Unger agreed that is a very good idea, because she is now dealing with Lynne Leakey and when she can do it, and that is a better idea if we can do that. Commissioner Coté pointed out that a year is a long time to wait, so when someone applies for landmark designation, are there things like grants for enhancements to the property available to them?

Commissioner Segner explained that the Commission pretty much has to convince the owner to do it; we photograph the house and talk to them, so if the Commission knew that we do it every April, and if we all gear towards that time, we would just do three of them if we had three of them. Commissioner Coté asked about twice a year and Chairman Unger indicated the Commission could possibly do that, but the other thing is somebody could turn the paperwork in and if they want to do work on the home between the time they hand in the paperwork and we landmark it, then we would have to look at the home and reevaluate it. If we keep the grant program, it could be a problem.

Audree Juhlin explained that it actually might fit in very nicely, because if we do it around April as part of the budget process, we would know how much money we would anticipate needing for the Small Grant Program. Chairman Unger repeated that it is a great idea, and Audree pointed out that it also goes along with Council's discussion on the Commission structures. This would consolidate a work program item rather than spreading it throughout the year.

Commissioner Segner then stated that we could then have three or four meetings a year and it all ends with doing that. If something pops up in-between, then we would call a special meeting. Chairman Unger pointed out that there may be Certificates of Appropriateness that we will just have to do, because we have to have a lot of flexibility with those, because we don't know when somebody is going to come up with a project, but she likes that idea for the others. She just doesn't know how we put that together.

Audree Juhlin indicated that we need to have a staff working team with a couple of Commissioners working with staff to see what we would need to change in the Code to make this happen, and that would be taken forward to the Planning & Zoning Commission and City Council. Chairman Unger volunteered to work on that and Commissioner Segner stated that he will help too.

Commissioner Segner then indicated that if somebody wants to be listed, it would say they have to have the application in 90 days before April 30th and we do it once a year, so everybody understands the flow, and then we have them all on the same day. We also wouldn't have to advertise three times; we would do it once. Chairman Unger added that we also don't take as much staff time, plus it gives the Commission time to do the research over a longer period of time.

Commissioner Segner stated that there is functionality and then there is fluff. For functionality, we can lay it out for certain dates. The fluff is National Historic Week, etc., and we have to decide how much of that we want to do. If you spend a lot of time putting on the Madole thing, etc., should the Commission be doing that or should the Historical Society do that? Chairman Unger agreed that there are a lot of things that could be shifted, but it may be awhile before we have this set up. Commissioner Segner suggested setting up a formal date for next year.

Chairman Unger indicated that she will send out the "cheat sheet" of steps for this item, but it is not as complicated as it sounds, and she will send it to Donna for distribution. Councilor McIlroy asked how much the Commission is asking for in Small Grants and Chairman Unger indicated that the budget was submitted for \$4,000.

Commissioner Coté asked what happens now with the annual thing and Chairman Unger explained that she and Commissioner Segner will meet with City staff, and then it will have to go through the process to change the Land Development Code, but we can't do that with Certificates of Appropriateness. Vice Chairman Holmes indicated that with the new focus on simplifying things, a lot of stuff like this may happen organically to help staff.

10. Discussion/possible direction related to the Historic Preservation Small Grant Program. (30 minutes, 5:05 – 5:35 pm)

Chairman Unger suggested having a smaller group review this and start writing something up. It gets awkward and she agrees with Commissioner Segner that we should allow people with an emergency to come to ask us for grant money after it has happened, which we don't do now. We have to restructure that and it is going to take more than 30 minutes in a session to really come up with some good ideas for that. She doesn't know what is possible for the Commission to do.

Audree Juhlin indicated that staff's recommendation was going to be to ask for volunteers to work with her or Donna to draft it and bring it back to the Commission. The Chairman added that it is too cumbersome and we are going to waste everybody's time.

Commissioner Segner stated that for the amount of staff time that the process takes, for \$4,000 you are spending \$5,000, so put a stake in its heart and get rid of it. We did it to encourage people to list their homes, and people shouldn't be listing their homes for a greed issue, because they come back and ask what we can do for them. They should be listing it, because they have a great house and they want to protect it. When people come after the fact and say they need \$2,000, because their roof might leak in two years, we send two people out, write a report and bring that back, type it up, file it -- it is too much. He would rather see that money put aside so we can do a simple grant system if we need it; that building on Brewer is going to need windows.

Chairman Unger noted that Commissioner Segner is saying make it only an emergency grant system instead of a grant system to get people to landmark. Commissioner Segner indicated that we are saying to people going in that if they need a roof, then come and see us. Then, they put a \$12,000 roof on and we give them \$800.

Vice Chairman Holmes added that it gives them a false sense of what we can do for them and she thinks that is what partially caused this last misunderstanding, and it has ended up being bad PR instead of good PR. It is not that much money to really make a huge difference. Commissioner Segner noted that the rules were in place and we followed the rules, but we still came off looking bad. What he doesn't like about it is the time it takes staff, and if his new mantra is take it off of staff's plate, then we have to start doing that.

Chairman Unger pointed out that the Commission can't build up a fund. If we ask for a fund for a year, that fund disappears at the end of the year. If we want to rewrite this for real emergencies, her biggest concern has been with the Hart property and the amount of money that the City is going to end up paying for that property, and if that is going to set precedent for other people to come to the City for big amounts of money too. She is uncomfortable with a lot of this, but if the Commission decides that we want a fund, like \$4,000 for emergencies for someone who has an historic house, does that make sense?

Commissioner Segner stated that you do something to help them mitigate an emergency until they can fix it, but not fix it necessarily. Chairman Unger agreed, but asked how hard it is going to be to delineate that and Audree Juhlin pointed out that is why we need to get the working team together. Chairman Unger agreed that if we are going to change it that much, she definitely is willing to be on the team and Commissioner Segner stated yes, absolutely.

Commissioner Segner indicated that if somebody says a leak is going to do damage, then we have a meeting and vote to give them \$1,500. Chairman Unger stated that when we had \$15,000, it was more legitimate, but now it is down to \$4,000, so we may be better off doing something that doesn't take that much paperwork.

Commissioner Coté stated that she supports the idea of the emergency fund, but we ought to look further too. If you look at the Weatherford Hotel in Flagstaff, the people have been trying to restore it to its original condition and that is money well spent, so if people try to restore a property . . .

Chairman Unger explained that is what the grant is for now and Commissioner Coté noted that in the last couple of meetings, she has heard that somebody wanted a new roof and came to the City. Commissioner Grams explained that it is maintenance, not restoration. Commissioner Coté agreed that we don't need to be paying for the maintenance of people's homes, but for emergency things to help restore the properties.

Chairman Unger indicated that she likes Commissioner Coté's idea too, because restoration will allow us to bring things back to where they were. She does agree with Commissioner Segner in that they should maintain their house. Commissioner Coté noted that people buy a landmarked home, because they are proud of the history of the property and want to restore it. They want to maintain it and that is not the City's responsibility to pay that tab, but we will give them a small amount to help them restore it. Commissioner Segner indicated that a prime example, if it had been a designated building, would have been the Art Barn when they put the new windows in. Then, we could say not to put in the steel-cased windows, come for a grant and we will put in three of the windows this year, etc. That way it is proactive and if a tree took out a pilaster and it will cost \$1,200 to have it remade, then that is what we are here for.

Chairman Unger indicated that the federal tax grants are based on restoration, not anything else and that follows more the whole idea of what they do, so she likes that. Commissioner Coté noted that it doesn't have to be the whole tab; it could be up to a certain percent and Chairman Unger noted that is how the grants always were, but we can call it restoration or emergency rather than just maintenance.

Commissioner Grams noted that it clearly states eligible rehabilitation, preservation and restoration and it doesn't talk about remodeling or reroofing, but we let it slide as it became public knowledge that there is \$4,000 in the kitty. Chairman Unger suggested pulling preservation off, because that can easily fall into repair.

Donna Puckett noted that if you look at the property owner letters that were given to the Commission as samples. In 2009, we had \$12,000 appropriated and in the middle of that it says, "Eligible rehabilitation, restoration or repair includes but is not limited to: roofs, windows, doors, siding, porches, foundations, etc. Commissioner Grams stated that should be destroyed and Donna Puckett added that some of it may have been prompted more by correspondence rather than the grant itself.

Note: Commissioner Coté left the meeting at 5:44 p.m.

Chairman Unger agreed and noted that people then come in wanting a heater for their house. Donna Puckett also suggested that some of it is not using the grant as a carrot to get them to landmark, because then they think you are going to help subsidize the maintenance of that house.

Audree indicated that staff will set up a meeting; Donna will set that up.

11. Discussion/possible action regarding timetable for updating the Historic Resource Survey. (15 Minutes 5:35 – 5:50 pm)

Chairman Unger indicated that she doesn't know with the City Council's discussion, when the changes will be made to the Commissions. Audree explained that staff is telling the Commissions to continue operating as if nothing is changing, so move forward with everything you would normally be moving forward with, and that is what staff will take back to City Council. If we did eliminate Commissions, it would be the end of December, and if there is something in process, staff would ensure that didn't stop that project, so business as usual.

Chairman Unger indicated that she would like to see how many we have in the survey to start breaking it down. Over the summer, each individual can take a few properties and she will probably go out with some Commissioners, so everybody understands what we are looking for and not

looking for, but by the next meeting, she will see how many and start breaking them down, and maybe suggest that people take some of them each month.

Commissioner Segner indicated that when this was done years ago, it was a pain, so we went to the County and got records, and then got through it. Chairman Unger agreed, but explained that this is to determine if some should be removed or have been demolished, etc. It shouldn't be a long process, because we aren't looking for additions, this is just editing what is there. Since it is going to be summer, we can just do it rather than doing it as a group.

Donna Puckett indicated that planning how you are going to break them out is the strategic part, because last time multiple people were going to the same neighborhoods, etc., and the Chairman agreed that was a disaster. Chairman Unger then asked if Vice Chairman Holmes would mind helping break those down, because last time it was awkward. Commissioner Segner indicated that they will be in pockets anyway.

12. Discussion/possible action regarding future meeting dates and future agenda items. (5 minutes, 5:50 – 5:55 pm)

Chairman Unger asked the Commissioners to notify Donna about their availability for next month's meeting, because there may be hearings; however, Audree Juhlin noted that there most likely won't be any public hearings on June 10th, because we don't have applications and there are 15-day noticing requirements.

Vice Chairman Holmes then noted that the conference is that same week.

Commissioner Segner asked what the two are that might be coming in and the Chairman referenced Ron Maassen's; however, Commissioner Grams indicated that could take three or four months. Audree Juhlin added that the other one may be the consideration of the removal of a landmark, but we don't have time to post it for June.

Chairman Unger indicated that next month the Commission can look into the survey, the grant and the annual landmark thing too. Also, don't forget Thursday and Monday. Thursday is for the dedication of the Dorothy Philip's House and Donna gave the Commission a map.

13. Adjournment.

The Chairman called for adjournment at 5:54 p.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission held May 13, 2013.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Recording Secretary*

Date