

Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Historic Preservation Commission Meeting
Vultee Conference Room, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Building 106, Sedona, Arizona
Monday, July 13, 2015 – 4:00 p.m.

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

Chair Unger confirmed the meeting was properly noticed and called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

Roll Call:

Commissioners Present: Chair Brynn Burkee Unger, Vice Chair Ann Jarmusch and Commissioners Allyson Holmes, Charlie Schudson and Steve Segner. (Commissioner Jane Grams was excused and one position is vacant).

Staff Members Present: Warren Campbell, James Gardner, Audree Juhlin, Cynthia Lovely and Donna Puckett

Council Liaison: Councilor Scott Jablow

Per the Chair's request, James Gardner and Warren Campbell introduced themselves.

2. Commission and Staff announcements

Audree Juhlin indicated that we are still recruiting a replacement for the Commission's vacant position.

3. Approval of the March 9, 2015 and May 18, 2015 minutes

Chair Unger requested a motion regarding the approval of the March 9th and May 18th minutes.

MOTION: *Vice Chair Jarmusch moved for the approval of the minutes for March 9th and May 18th. Commissioner Schudson seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried five (5) for and zero (0) opposed. (Commissioner Grams was excused and one position is vacant).*

4. Discussion/possible action regarding the City's Preservation philosophy and possible amendments to the Sedona Land Development Code, including but not limited to adding a section for a "Certificate of No Effect" and language to address emergency repair work situations. (40 minutes, 4:05-4:45)

Chair Unger explained that James Gardner would be giving a PowerPoint presentation, and there were materials provided by Commissioner Schudson and Vice Chair Jarmusch for the Commission to review.

Presentation, James Gardner: James summarized that he would be discussing why we are here, the current language in the ordinance, the research done, his recommendations for the update of the ordinance, and the proposed alternatives to the current process. James then explained that we are doing this because there is a Council directive and the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions (NAPC) recommends that there be an annual review of practices. There is one issue that impacts all historic properties in Sedona. What we don't want is loss or damage of historic sites, and we are talking about natural disasters, but also talking about a lack of maintenance among property owners of historically-designated properties, so . . .

Commissioner Schudson stated, "Excuse me", and asked, "What is the Council (audio unclear)?" James indicated that the Council directive was to take a look at our current processes for approving changes to historic properties, and that is why we are here. The Commissioner then stated, "Well

let me understand; we started moments ago with the subject of a philosophy of preservation and the question was why are we even looking at that. The Council directive then was not to review or draft a philosophy of preservation, but rather what you just said, correct?" Audree Juhlin stated that it is both, if she may. . . Commissioner Schudson interrupted and said, "Well just a second". James then stated that from his understanding of it, we are looking at, at least his presentation is focusing on how to change our current process for allowing people to make changes to their historic properties, and that could sort of fall under our philosophy, in that we have a philosophy that seeks to preserve our current historic properties and honor our history, and if we allow for people to go forward with repairing their properties and maintaining them properly that achieves that maintenance and preservation of the historic properties.

Chair Unger added that it is part and parcel of why we are doing this; we have to know our philosophy in order to make sure any changes don't impact the philosophy. At this point, we are going to see some ideas that might impact the philosophy, then Commissioner Schudson and Vice Chair Jarmusch can discuss the information given to the Commission. The philosophy would impact how we decide to approach things, so we are trying to show the problems, talk about the philosophy, and make a decision as to how we take care of the problems.

Commissioner Schudson indicated that may make sense, but he just didn't want the Commission to have the misunderstanding that we have embarked on this review of preservation philosophy, because the City Council directed us to do so. Donna Puckett pointed out that James' opening slide said "Sedona Historic Preservation Ordinance" and that is what he is trying to focus on. Audree Juhlin then clarified that this is a Council directive; however, Commissioner Schudson responded that to be clear, there is no Council directive that says, "Commission review, revise and redraft your philosophy of preservation". Chair Unger stated that in so far as the philosophy is going to impact the ordinance, yes. The core of what we are doing is we don't want to be impacted by a change in the ordinance, so we have to look at both.

Audree Juhlin explained that when it became a Council directive, there was concern that there was not a cohesive understanding of the philosophy and the Commission's mission and preservation, plus the need to readdress some sections of the ordinance, so the Council directive was to ensure everybody is on the same page, and then make the changes in the ordinance where necessary. The directive really comes into play in how you deal with emergency situations, administrative reviews and Commission reviews, so those are the three directives.

Vice Chair Jarmusch suggested rather than saying it not negatively impact the ordinance, we want to positively impact the ordinance by change, and that is her goal. Chair Unger agreed and Audree Juhlin added that to also clarify that there is no contradiction between the ordinance and the philosophy. Commissioner Segner indicated that the Commission doesn't really have to do anything; we are just reviewing it at this point.

Presentation, James Gardner (continued): James discussed the current Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) process used for alterations to historically-designated properties and explained that it is required for any exterior improvements, including restoration, etc. that would fall under repairs. The application requires nine separate elements, but any of them can be waived by the Director. It sounds onerous, but it can be or not, and then the HPC Chair places it on the agenda for a hearing within 30 days, which leaves a timeline of 30 days plus whatever it takes to come to the next hearing. Chair Unger added that it could be 60 days or more.

James then provided a summary of the research done that was put in a matrix showing the jurisdictions and their processes. The CoA is in every jurisdiction and the CNE is the Certificate of No Effect. Commissioner Schudson asked what those stand for and James explained that the CoA is the Certificate of Appropriateness and the CNE is the Certificate of No Effect. The Administrative Review is the review by staff, which can be an administrative review of a CoA or a CNE, depending on the jurisdiction. HPC Review is a review of either a CoA or whatever that jurisdiction has in

place in their ordinance. The timeframe for each jurisdiction also is included plus the items that are exempt from the Certificate of Appropriateness.

James then reviewed the research for the following Arizona Certified Local Government (CLG) jurisdictions that follow SHPO's rules:

- **Phoenix, Arizona** allows for a CNE, which is an over-the-counter, staff-approved certificate issued for minor work, such as repainting the home, which doesn't require a permit and no staff approval, unless you are in an historic district. Chair Unger added it is staff-approved and does not go through the HPC. She then showed a picture of a repainted historic building as an example and indicated that it is a little shocking, but is allowed, because staff allows anyone to paint any color, and we may not want to do that; we may want to restrict it more. She spoke with the woman who is the head of historic preservation there, and she indicated that what they do there works extremely well.

Commissioner Segner indicated that if you fall within a district, you are signed-up automatically if you are in the district, and there are certain things that you can and can't do, but with us, the people have signed up to protect the home. Chair Unger added that there are individual homes in Phoenix also and it basically works the same for both; they go through the same process.

Donna Puckett asked if they think that a coat of paint is nothing that couldn't be changed later, and Chair Unger indicated yes, one of the things was how impactful is the item, and when you look at Phoenix and their huge neighborhoods and historically-designated areas, their decision was that to have each of those details going through the Commission wasn't worth doing. Donna Puckett indicated that they also don't have a color code that is as strict as Sedona's, and the Chair agreed.

James indicated that another point was that if each property went through their Commission there would be a backlog like Santa Fe, New Mexico. Another thing to note is that a CoA is also an option as in every jurisdiction he reviewed. Phoenix is the largest in the state and requires more staff, Commission and HP Officer time, so they decided to go with an over-the-counter process that is friendly to both staff and customers, in order to process their large volume.

- **Flagstaff, Arizona** has something similar to a Certificate of No Effect that is called an Administrative Review and is available over the counter. They have one Historic Preservation Officer to process all applications, and over the counter is a misnomer in this case, but it does allow for all small scale projects. The impact is determined during the Administrative Review, and then approved over the counter or by a full review of the Historic Preservation Commission. The approval is often given the same day for small scale projects, but if it can't be approved over the counter, an in-depth Staff Report is forwarded to the Commission for a CoA.
- **Glendale, Arizona** has the same two options as Phoenix, the CNE and CoA, and both are reviewed by the HPC for a determination of whether a Certificate of No Effect can be issued or if a Certificate of Appropriateness is required, and they have up to 60 days to conduct a hearing, which is one of the longer timelines in the state, so it is not over the counter. The property is posted 15 days prior to the hearing, and they have a lot of historic districts, so they have a big backlog. All applications are reviewed by the HPC and each case has public exposure. For Glendale, historic preservation is one of their really big tourism drivers, because people from Phoenix, etc., often go to the historic downtown for big events in Glendale, and that is why they want to keep a tight hold on their historic properties and their process is very transparent. It takes at least 30 days and can take 60 days before a decision is rendered. It can cause concerns by nearby citizens, because each property is posted and neighbors are notified, and some citizens may believe that something big is changing in their neighborhood. Their process is also cumbersome to applicants, and staff indicated that it ends up being a big time commitment for each and every application.

Commissioner Segner stated that he knows staff is in the business of trying to be pleasurable and make everything go well, but sometimes jumping through hoops is what it is about. We don't want to go down the road where everything is going to be easy, over the counter and user-friendly, because sometimes it just is not. They are trying to say that they don't want the area to change, and they want to make sure that the experts are involved, and we should keep in mind that fast and easy isn't necessarily what we are trying to do.

James agreed and indicated that in the changes he included in the ordinance, the Director or a designated staff person could determine that a CNE is appropriate or that further review is needed, and there would be hoops to jump through. Chair Unger added that part of this discussion is how much leeway we want to give that staff person, and Audree Juhlin has come up with a way that will keep it a lot tighter, but allow an emergency repair to happen, and she doesn't think anyone else has that process, but Audree's idea is a good one in terms of being more restrictive in terms of staff saying yes or no. Sometimes it could work both ways -- the staff person doesn't want to make the decision or the staff person decides it is okay, and then the Commission is uncomfortable with it afterwards, so we probably want to be a little more controlling, since we don't have as many to look after, but we could make it a little easier for the staff person, while making sure we stay on track with how the Commission feels.

- **Scottsdale, Arizona** has the two options as well, and the CNE process states that it shall be issued or denied within seven days of the receipt of the application, and if it is not issued or denied within that time, it is automatically approved. The automatic approval is not something we included, although we did put in a seven-day time limit, because we only have a few properties. If a CNE is not allowed, a hearing is scheduled for a CoA within 30 days after receiving the application, and the hearing is posted 10 days in advance. Their application is similar to what we are looking at with a CNE issued within seven days by staff or a CoA to follow, which kind of gives a balance in the process between the Administrative Review and the HPC hearings, and from what we are hearing from the Commission, we need a balance between giving staff some leeway and making sure that we are keeping historic properties in good condition.
- **Mesa, Arizona** requires a CoA for all proposals that would make any material changes in the architectural character, which is pretty much what is in our ordinance now, but we also require a CoA for things like repairs. Their Historic Preservation Officer makes all determinations and currently that is a staff planner. The Officer can issue a clearance, which is similar to a CNE that basically says it has no real effect, or a CoA can be issued or denied. Their Historic Preservation Officer is one person who has all of the power, which is a very strange way to do it, because the only recourse is to go to the City Council for an appeal.

Commissioner Segner indicated that Sedona doesn't require a permit to rebuild a roof, so if somebody has an historic property and wants to put on a new roof, it is not flagged, because they don't have to get a permit. A roof is probably one of the most important things we try to make sure is done right and probably the one thing that can be done wrong, so he is worried about staff at the counter knowing that. He would like to see a staff person and one or two Commissioners meet within 48 hours or something and get back to them, and having that balance means that you don't have to worry about training the people at the counter. Audree Juhlin noted that she wouldn't want the people at the counter doing that. Commissioner Segner then added that we could do it in those timelines, but the Chair or a designee would be on a conference call. Audree indicated that it would be like what was done with the Nininger property. The Commissioner stated that he is worried about roofs, because it is easy to slip through, and Chair Unger explained that in the picture she showed from Phoenix, that roof was the original roof and if it had been a different kind of roofing, a building permit would have been required, so it automatically gives them an opportunity to say yes, no or it needs a CoA.

Commissioner Segner then stated that there is a loophole, and it has to be identified that on a historic building that is designated, any changes have to go through a permitting process or something. Somehow we have to close that loophole.

James Gardner indicated that his research included five of the top ten out-of-state jurisdictions for historic preservation policies and practices that were identified by the National Association of Preservation Commissions as follows:

- **Columbus, Ohio** requires a CoA for all proposals that would make any detrimental changes that would alter the character of the property. An Administrative Review determines when that is required; otherwise, an administrative bypass is allowed, which is similar to a CNE. If a CoA is not required, it goes through quickly and takes from zero to seven days for the administrative bypass; otherwise, it can take significantly longer. The staff person didn't have a timeline, because they have had projects take from 30 days to several years, because of specific issues in certain neighborhoods where that change would affect everything in the district, such as lighting or sidewalk curbs, etc., so that really isn't one of our concerns, since we don't have districts.
- **Richmond, Virginia** has a lot of small scale alterations approved over the counter, and they are listed in an architectural review chart that shows exempt improvements, and he created a similar chart for Sedona that was based on items of importance for historic properties, but it is just an example for the Commission to review and think about, and if you have any items to add, concerns or suggestions, please give them to Warren, because we hoped this would be an asset to customers who want to propose alterations for their property. It would quickly relay information about what is and isn't allowed, and there are several disclaimers on the bottom stressing that they need to talk to staff. It is also a good way to weed out what needs a CofA.
- **Boulder County, Colorado** has an Application Review Subcommittee that is similar to what Commissioner Segner suggested, with staff and members of their Preservation Approval Board working together on each application. It encourages the staff and Board to discuss each application and determine if a CoA is needed.
- **Santa Fe, New Mexico** doesn't have a clear process in the ordinance, so he talked with staff, and all alterations must be approved by the HPC, except in-kind alterations like replacing a roof tile with the exact same roof tile, and that would be submitted for a building permit, which would be determined to be in-kind or not in-kind. The exceptions provide a quick process for repairs, but the Santa Fe HPC has a limit of ten historic properties per meeting, because they have such a large volume of applications, and they have a backlog for the foreseeable future.

Commissioner Segner noted that again they have districts and that is a big district, and almost anything that happens downtown is going to have to go through this. James agreed and indicated that there are almost as many historic projects as non-historic projects in Santa Fe.

- **San Antonio, Texas** has an over the counter review and any significant changes have to be reviewed by the HPC that determines if the application is eligible for a CoA or if it is to be denied, and their review is within 30 days, so if it is beyond the scope of a pre-approved project, then it is forwarded for review.

James explained that his research resulted in the following proposed alternatives as to what might be a streamlined process for Sedona:

- A mechanism would be created for staff review, which would be the CNE, and staff would determine whether or not that request could be a CNE or if it would need to be forwarded to the Commission for a CoA, and that would be one application, to be friendly to the customer, that would include all of the changes they want to make. They would complete the application and staff would determine if it is a small enough scale that a CNE could be done or it would be flagged to be sent to the Commission. The CoA applications would continue to go through the same process as now and the CNEs would be issued over the counter or within seven working

days; however, over the counter is a misnomer, because it may require a longer amount of time, but we would want to give the customer a determination within a reasonable amount of time.

- It would also be good to create a table of repairs, maintenance and alterations in this chart. If we are interested in the chart, it can be refined to fit Sedona.

Commissioner Segner stated that charts are okay, but they become bureaucratic. A lot of this is the process of how they are going to put a wall back together the way it was built in 1952, and that needs somebody to pull up old pictures to say that this is how it was done, so there has to be a compromise. Charts are good as guidelines, and if staff makes a decision, it puts staff on notice that they could do something wrong and be called on the carpet for it. If you have a couple of people work on it, like taking it to the Chair of the Commission, then a couple of people would sign off on it. It seems better that way, and there is a big elephant in the room that isn't up there, which is for example, if he owned the Gassaway House and wanted to redo it, and he didn't like what we required, so he would go to the City Council and say that he wants to be removed from the program, and the City did that, which he thinks was an extremely bad decision, but it was done. He doesn't see anything there about opting out, and if somebody wants to do something, what about opting out? Do we allow it or not and do these other cities allow it? We've done it, and now the easiest way to not do something would be to opt out.

Chair Unger agreed that is a reality and we could be faced with it again . . . , Commissioner Segner interrupted to say that if you don't like the processes, you are going to go to the City Council and complain, and the Council asks what the process is, so do we have a process? Chair Unger explained that we are discussing the CNE, because we don't want that to happen again, and if everything someone does ends up having to go through a CoA, people get angry, because they can't do anything. Commissioner Segner stated that he is not knocking the process, it is great, but it is missing that one element, which is what the process is when somebody says they want out of it. Chair Unger pointed out that is already written in the ordinance, and the ordinance says they have to go through the same process to opt out as they did to opt in. If somebody wants their home designated, which she has read elevates the value of the home, so there could be a lot of people wanting to do that, we might say that isn't feasible, but if we make that decision, they could go to the City Council and the Council could approve it, even if the Commission didn't, and the same thing happens when they want to opt out. They would come to the Commission first, and then it would go to the City Council. If that is something that needs to be changed in the ordinance, then we would have to think about that, because it would be beyond the CNE to look at that.

Commissioner Segner stated that he wants it onerous to opt out, because the Gassaway House is a prime example. They are going to take that land and build homes around it, and when they start working on that house, they will find there are a lot of restrictions on it, and we want them to follow the rules, not get around the rules. Chair Unger noted that is part of why we are reviewing this and why SHPO wants the Commission to review this periodically. We haven't done that, and after that happened, we should have had that discussion, because if we lose some of the other homes, and we could have lost the Jordan Sales Building, so it is not beyond what we need to review, but this conversation is going to go into the future, and that certainly impacts our philosophy more than this. Commissioner Segner noted that if we are going to rewrite the ordinance, now is the time to discuss that and it should be onerous to opt out or they will just bypass the Commission.

Chair Unger added that we also have to be cognizant of Prop 207, which has made it difficult for anybody wanting to do historic preservation, because unless we can prove that it is not going to have a financial impact on the owner, we have to allow them to do what they are going to do, like opt out, etc., but it is worth reviewing. Vice Chair Jarmusch then pointed out that we then need to make it sweet for them to get in and onerous to get out, and the sweet part is probably going to have money attached, but we hope there are higher virtues guiding people to designate.

Chair Unger asked if there were any questions for James, and Commissioner Schudson asked if James reduced this to a 60-second summary, what the key changes would be. James Gardner

summarized that all of the research led him to see a Certificate of No Effect as a process that would be streamlined for the customer, staff and the Commission. It removes some of the onus put upon the Commission to look at each application. The CNE would be a good process to implement in Sedona, in order to allow for a roof or other emergency repair and in-kind repairs that wouldn't be detrimental to the historic character of the property. If that were handled by staff and possibly in discussion with a Commissioner, it would really streamline the process and make it less onerous and less like a process that people would want to opt out of.

Commissioner Schudson then asked if that would be an over the counter, staff-implemented process and James stated yes. The Commissioner then asked if there is anything about it that is incompatible or inconsistent with the ordinance or the Commission's mission. Chair Unger noted that is getting into the philosophy and there isn't anything in here that talks about the Commission's mission statement that says, "The Historic Preservation Commission identifies and preserves Sedona's historic places and fosters civic pride in the accomplishments of the past", and we have discussed possibly changing that.

Commissioner Schudson then stated that he didn't hear anything about that statement that is inconsistent or incompatible with what James recommended. James agreed that there isn't anything blatantly incompatible, but he would say . . . , Commissioner Schudson interrupted to say that he is hearing a consistency there, and if that is so, let's assume that everyone likes where you are going and appreciates the value of this streamlined, staff-administered process of the Certificate of No Effect, then what is needed to do it? Do we have to vote on it or incorporate it in a statute? Audree Juhlin explained that it is an ordinance in the Sedona Land Development Code and it is spelled out in the state statute and the Land Development Code as to how it is amended, so once the Commission is ready to recommend all of the changes, and we want to make sure we have all of the proposed changes you want, because it is a lengthy process of about six months, we will then make them available to the public and hold a work session and public hearing with the Planning & Zoning Commission, and then a work session and public hearing with the City Council.

Commissioner Schudson asked if there is a draft of proposed amendments and Audree Juhlin recapped that several months ago, the Commission had an assignment to look at different sections of the Land Development Code to determine what needed to be changed and if a complete overhaul of the Land Development Code for historic preservation was needed or if there were just small pieces that needed to be amended, and the Commission hasn't made that decision, so staff decided that we would help the Commission by looking at this one piece to get the Commission started, so this is just a first step. We may make a lot more changes, but staff did this first step on behalf of the Commission to give you a jumping out point, and in front of you, you have a draft amendment with changes, but it is not all inclusive and you will see strikeouts and additions. In Section 1509, you will see the Certificate of Appropriateness or a Certificate of No Effect and as you go through the ordinance, you will see the recommended changes based on the Certificate of No Effect, but that is the only changes you will see, and we are not saying that is the only change to look at.

Chair Unger indicated that she went through the ordinance and felt that was the main thing, but we also could talk about what Commissioner Segner said. Everybody should go through it again and see if there is anything else. We could wordsmith it again, but she doesn't know that is necessary as much as cause and effect things we might want. Audree Juhlin added that the homework for the Commission is to determine what you see working well, what needs to be clarified, and what is missing and needs to be added. Those were the questions asked of the Commission.

Commissioner Schudson asked how staff sees the process being accomplished, because the Commission was given homework months ago and only one of us did the homework, and that process was to some extent interrupted and possibly misunderstood, but given our current pace and the years needed to accomplish a section-by-section review, discussion and recommendation, how do you see this being accomplished, other than by saying we have confidence in staff, so please give us your drafts and recommendations. If some changes will stir some controversy, then

help us identify those. Without people who are willing and able to devote hundreds of hours and come back for more hours of discussion, how do you see this possibly being accomplished other than with a complete deference to our able staff.

Chair Unger indicated that she spent a lot of time on this and looked at other ordinances, and the only thing she really saw was that we don't have anything like a CNE. At the time, she looked at it as purely a CNE, although James has come up with other kinds of things done. She agrees if we were to rewrite this whole thing, it would probably take another year to get off of the ground with it, but her suggestion would be to look at this and Commissioner Segner's suggestion and work it that way. She then asked Commissioner Holmes for her thoughts, but Commissioner Schudson interjected that we need to avoid the "bite off more than we can chew" syndrome, so there is a specific that would be a valuable addition that would help maximize the Commission's efficacy without disrupting anything else. Sometimes to be able to focus narrowly and accomplish that is a real achievement, and doing that with one subject also gives us information and experience, so if we then go to the next step and think something else needs attention, we will be better able to do that effectively. As much as he appreciates the value of the overview, etc., he also is fearful of the "bite off more than we can chew" within our lifetime. He wants to bite off what we can thoroughly chew and make a real contribution, and that is why he asked if we have a draft of a possible amendment that makes a constructive addition. If so, let's go with it.

Chair Unger referenced Vice Chair Jarmusch's information from San Diego's ordinance, and her comment was that we need to be more positive about what we say in our ordinance to make sure people think this is a great thing to do, so that is a different aspect and is that something we can do without making it so big that it becomes something we can't chew?

Commissioner Segner indicated that he liked Commissioner Schudson's concept. We all know there are things that need to be fixed, which is what do we do when somebody says the roof is leaking and we can't wait six weeks. The CNE makes sense and would help; we don't have to rewrite the whole thing. We should have a 48 hr. turnaround; it doesn't happen often, so in 48 hrs or 72 hrs. and with two signatures -- staff's and somebody else's. If you don't get two signatures, then it goes to the Commission; it is that simple.

Chair Unger referenced Commissioner Schudson's philosophy and Vice Chair Jarmusch's suggestion to be more positive about things, but indicated that they are two different things plus Commissioner Segner's suggestion about opting out, if we want to change that. Commissioner Segner indicated that in his experience, we would have a meeting and find out what is wrong and say how we would fix it, then we would write it and we would be done, so let's fix that and move on.

Audree Juhlin pointed out that what Vice Chair Jarmusch brought up was part of the direction from the Council. The feeling was that people in our program are prisoners of the program and we want them to be partners in the program, so it is creating an atmosphere like Vice Chair Jarmusch talked about and how we can create a partnership and not a prisoner. Chair Unger indicated that ordinances are written in such language that no matter what, it makes you feel that you are a prisoner of the language, so is there a way to change that language so they don't feel they are a prisoner? She doesn't know if Vice Chair Jarmusch would like to look at the ordinance and make some suggestions at the next meeting as to how we might do that, but she doesn't know if it is that or the way it is approached outside of the ordinance.

Commissioner Segner stated that in most districts, you are trapped if you buy a house in an historic district. This program is voluntary, and the way it was in the past, we sold it. We probably made some promises and said some things we shouldn't have said, and maybe we did some properties that shouldn't have been done, but that is how we approached it. We don't have to change the law for that; he thinks we went out to everybody and promised them the world and maybe they didn't quite understand what they were getting into, but once you are in it, you are trapped a little bit. The idea is, if he comes back to his hotel 70 years from now, would it still be in the same shape as when he designated it? Yes, you are trapped and when you go to a district in Santa Fe, they are trapping you and saying they want things to happen this way.

Chair Unger asked Vice Chair Jarmusch if she had any ideas as to introduce this idea, and Vice Chair Jarmusch stated that she would like to look at that. She had not thought of that, what she was going for was . . . , the Chair then interrupted to say that she could hand out the information. Vice Chair Jarmusch continued to explain that this partly arose when she went to the Historic Preservation Conference and received a packet from SHPO regarding how to nominate something to the National Register, and there was a one-page chart of pros and cons saying that if you are listed on the Register, this could happen and this could not happen, and 80% of it was driven by fear of property rights lawyers coming after you. It was not framed in the way that we would hope, like this is our heritage and something we could learn from and be proud of and share, and that is where she is coming from. That vibe has to be in the ordinance and the community, if we can get it beyond the Commission.

Commissioner Holmes asked if the effort should be in the face-to-face contact with our owners and our community, to make it feel positive and like a privilege. She wonders how many people actually read this. If a CNE makes it easier for the owners and it is a smoother process, and they would feel better about it, then the words don't matter that much. Commissioner Schudson stated that one pizza party could go a long way. If we invited all of our folks to express our appreciation, answer any questions, and let them know about a new streamlined process we are considering . . . , Commissioner Holmes interrupted to say she loved that idea. Chair Unger indicated that as much as she really likes Vice Chair Jarmusch's idea, that is the better idea in terms of ending up with good relations with the people. It is really hard when we have to say the hard things that an ordinance has to say, so it may be better to do that, but maybe our mission statement could be a little friendlier and if we had something like that, we could plaster it on things. It might be something we could wordsmith, so the mission statement says that.

Commissioner Segner indicated that the pride in ownership is where we got lost in the past; it was sold with we'll help you out, but what does that mean? It really comes down to them having a great house and we would like for them to join the group. We all love our homes and the idea of getting together once or twice a year, buy them some pizza and thank them, and then maybe give a slide show on each of their homes to talk about why they are significant. The other thing that could be layered on top is some home that is significant. We don't have to landmark it, but do a significant layer first to say it is a significant property, to get them thinking about the property. Chair Unger then pointed out that wouldn't have to be in the ordinance, and we don't have the mission statement in the ordinance, but we could have that in there and if we got something that was a little warmer and fuzzier, it might be something we could put in there. It is more the way we look than the ordinance.

Audree Juhlin stated that this is going back to the beginning of the conversation, and Commissioner Schudson did do the homework on it, and that is what is the philosophy of the Commission and its preservation mission? Chair Unger suggested possibly taking what Commissioner Schudson had written and let people know that is our philosophy; that is the warm and fuzzy about what we are doing and there is a lot of strength in that. Maybe we have that on our website so people understand that is what we are doing. Phoenix has their preservation philosophy on their website, but it tends to be a little more technical, and that is not what we want. Commissioner Segner restated that they have districts which are forced into it. We aren't going to do any more homes to speak of; we might find a few more, but what we have is what we've got, so let's clean this up and put in the Certificate, bring it back to us, and let's nod our head and get it done.

Commissioner Segner then indicated that he and Commissioner Schudson could get together and have the designated property owners over to El Portal, and he would sponsor a dinner; we'll put together a slide show and thank them. Let's start building community; that is what we haven't done. Chair Unger noted that there are all kinds of things we can do and get it in the paper, so it feels like something. The Land Development Code does everything it needs to do, except for that, but we could also talk about the opting out part of it. Commissioner Segner stated that if it is in there and there is a process, he is okay with that. He just doesn't want people saying that it happened before,

so let's just go to the City Council and complain. City Councils in the past have always been like, well gee, why are they unhappy?

Commissioner Holmes stated that the only reason we are having this discussion is because of that event, so if what we do addresses that event and those situations, we don't need to do much more. Having a process to get out is reassuring to the ones that go in, whether it is onerous or not. Chair Unger then added that the way the Land Development Code brilliantly does it, it is not on the first page, but it is in there, and instead of making a huge deal out of this, let's do that in terms of how we make us more warm and fuzzy to the public. We possibly should have the thing that Commissioner Schudson wrote in the paper or something, and we can talk about that and our philosophy and why it is important to us and the community, although she doesn't know that it needs to be in the Land Development Code, although it is important to keep that in mind as we go forward.

Commissioner Holmes asked if we are allowed to make a motion today, and Audree Juhlin stated that it was agendaized for a motion, and asked what the motion would be. Commissioner Holmes indicated that she would like to make a motion that we accept the changes presented to us today; however, Chair Unger then indicated one more thing is the brilliant thing that Audree came up with, although it would mean more work for the Commission. She then distributed the form that would be filled out when the Commission goes out to look at homes to possibly designate, and noted that on the sheet there are places that say what you need to look at, so maybe there should be a bar added to talk about the very specific things in that house, because that is a brilliant way to ensure that when somebody walks in and says what they want to do, we say the roof is a parapet roof, so you can do whatever you want to it. We only have 24 homes that are landmarked, and we could easily go look at them and say these are the critical parts of them. Commissioner Segner stated that is a no brainer; it comes down to just do the CNE with two people to sign off and let's move on. Staff then pointed out that the form distributed was an old form.

Commissioner Schudson asked who those two people would be in what had been drafted for the Commission's consideration, and Audree stated that is not in the draft. Chair Unger then indicated that it needs to be drafted with a couple of those elements in it, so we could make a motion that staff write it up. Audree Juhlin explained that the ordinance doesn't necessarily have to include the process and this is a policy process. As we go along, we may tweak it a little, but you don't want to have to tweak the ordinance to allow flexibility in your process, so her recommendation is not to include it in the ordinance; that is the policy and procedures that the Commission adopted formally.

Commissioner Schudson then asked what the Commissioners would think if in the streamlined staff-administered, over-the-counter process, approval would depend on the review and approval by a member of staff and the Chair of the Commission or her designee, so that in every case, there is the staff review and a second person who is on the Commission. Conceptually, that seems to keep the Commission's responsibility involved. Commissioner Segner added that it also protects staff.

Chair Unger then asked Audree if that could be put in the wording for the CNE, and Audree referred to Section 1509 on the CNE. James Gardner then explained that he took the existing Certificate of Appropriateness section and added an option for the Certificate of No Effect and described how that would be administered; however, maybe the entire process shouldn't be in the ordinance, so we can be flexible. He had in the draft, "Building permits for exterior work on landmarks that are deemed to be of no effect by the Director or her designee may be eligible for the Certificate of No Effect, which can be issued administratively. A determination of whether exterior work can be issued a Certificate of No Effect shall be required of the Director within seven working days of receipt of a complete application."

Chair Unger indicated that the proposal might be the Director or her designee and a member of HPC; however, Commissioner Segner pointed out that Audree is saying that could be in the

policies, and Audree indicated that the policy would be that the Director is going to work with the Chair and one other Commissioner.

Warren Campbell stated that it is simply saying that you may make a determination that it is administratively approvable, but not how you go about doing that. Chair Unger stated that the Commission's concern will be that it doesn't just end up with staff doing it every time and no one ever sees the Commission. Commissioner Schudson stated that to ensure that, there is no reason the ordinance can't include that by inserting the additional words, and it protects the staff.

Commissioner Segner referenced the little rock house in Uptown that was going to put in metal and a battle kind of got worked out, but that wouldn't have happened in this case, because a couple of calls could have been made, and if one said that metal is okay and another said wood is okay, then it would have to go to the Commission, so everybody would be covered.

MOTION: Commissioner Schudson moved that the Commission today approve the amendment to 1509 as stated in what we have right in front of us now with these additions: Line one, ". . . deemed to be of no effect by the Director", and here is where the insert is, "and the Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission or his/her designee". Commissioner Holmes seconded the motion.

Audree Juhlin pointed out that the motion needs to say that it is to recommend to the Planning & Zoning Commission and City Council, but that can just be added. There was no objection.

AMENDED MOTION: Commissioner Schudson moved that the Commission today recommend to the Planning & Zoning Commission and the City Council the amendment to 1509 as stated in what we have right in front of us now with these additions: Line one, ". . . deemed to be of no effect by the Director", and here is where the insert is, "and the Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission or his/her designee". The second accepted the amendment.

Commissioner Segner again referenced the loophole regarding roofs, because they don't need a permit, and asked how we close that loophole. That is a big deal, because anybody can put on a roof and it doesn't need a permit. There needs to be something that says if you own an historic property, any work over X dollars needs to go to the Commission. Audree Juhlin suggested deleting "Building Permits for" from the first sentence of the draft of Section 1509, so it would read, "Exterior work on landmarks that is deemed to be of No Effect by the Director . . ." Chair Unger then asked if that is an amendment to the motion and Audree said yes, as amended.

Vice Chair Jarmusch asked if someone could go over that again, and Audree Juhlin then stated that the second paragraph under 1509 would delete the words "Building permits for", so the sentence would start with "Exterior work on landmarks that is deemed to be on No Effect by the Director and Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission or designee shall require a Certificate of No Effect."

Commissioner Schudson asked if would say "shall" rather than "may be eligible for" and the Chair indicated that may be eligible for is better, because if we put shall in there, then somebody coming in that needs a CoA will think . . ., so the way that is stated is correct. Commissioner Schudson stated that he liked it; we delete the first three words in the paragraph and add the words after the Director, "and the Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission or designee".

SECOND AMENDED MOTION: Commissioner Schudson moved that the Commission today recommend to the Planning & Zoning Commission and the City Council the amendment to 1509 as stated in what we have right in front of us; we delete the first three words in the paragraph and add the words after the Director, "and the Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission or designee". The second accepted the amendment.

Chair Unger noted that this has to go to the Planning & Zoning Commission and asked if the HPC would have a meeting with them. Audree Juhlin stated no, staff will carry it forward and indicate that this is the Commission's recommendation. HPC is welcome to attend, but staff will move it forward. Vice Chair Jarmusch noted that she hasn't read all of the type in grey, so she is concerned about sending it on without reading it. Commissioner Segner indicated that it will come back; we'll see it and they will send it around; however, Audree Juhlin stated no, if the Commission makes a motion to move it forward.

Chair Unger indicated that this is the biggest part of it; the rest . . ., Commissioner Schudson stated that right now the motion only applies to 1509, paragraph two; it doesn't preclude us from considering other things later. Audree Juhlin then explained that there are other associated areas in the Code that need to be amended to reflect this, including adding a definition to another section, and there are other sections that this affects. Commissioner Schudson responded that there is always redrafting of conforming portions of a statute, and Audree Juhlin then explained that staff won't be able to move it forward until we have that formal communication.

Chair Unger asked if the Commission could have the motion that we agreed with that and incorporate in that motion that staff double check the rest of the ordinance. Commissioner Schudson stated sure we can, with the preface that says, "Subject to conforming language throughout the statute". Audree explained that it is in here; it is just that the Commission hasn't thoroughly reviewed it. Vice Chair Jarmusch noted that it is just fine-tuning it like Commissioner Schudson insists upon, and Audree indicated that is what staff expected. We didn't expect a motion out of this meeting; we expected to go through the recommended changes and do the tweaking like taking off "Building permit for". We also want to discuss repair and maintenance; we added a number of sentences to repair and maintenance, because what staff has seen come before the Commission is the number of landmarks that have been ignored maintenance-wise, so you are seeing deteriorated buildings, and our general maintenance as written in the existing Code is very weak and doesn't give much direction for maintaining these buildings in the way the Commission and the City wants, so we have modified that section as well.

Chair Unger noted that can be seen in Section 1510; it has all been rewritten. Commissioner Schudson stated that there is a motion, and the motion now is, "Subject to confirming language throughout the statute, exterior work on landmarks that are deemed to be of no effect by the Director and the Chair of the Historical Preservation Commission or designee may be eligible for a Certificate of No Effect, and the balance of this as now offered to us in this paragraph of 1509."

THIRD AMENDED MOTION: Commissioner Schudson moved that subject to confirming language throughout the statute, exterior work on landmarks that are deemed to be of no effect by the Director and the Chair of the Historical Preservation Commission or designee may be eligible for a Certificate of No Effect, and the balance of this as now offered to us in this paragraph of 1509. (There was no response from the second.)

Commissioner Schudson then stated that if later on, we find that we have produced an explosion in some other portion of the statute, it will be corrected; however, Chair Unger noted that there is one other issue, and Vice Chair Jarmusch asked if this closes the loophole or if this is one step of closing the loophole and will we have a red flag for roofs somewhere else in the Code? Commissioner Segner explained that in theory, anything they do exterior-wise has to have to come to the City to be approved, so that pretty much closes the loophole. The Vice Chair then asked if it had to say, "Any and all exterior work", and Commissioner Segner stated that he is not an attorney.

Donna Puckett suggested that the Commission read it before voting on it, and Chair Unger indicated that maintenance and repair is very different; it clearly is another subject. Commissioner Segner suggested just working on this subject, vote on this subject, and then move on to the next one, and Audree Juhlin again explained that staff will hold it and not move it forward until we have all of the changes.

Chair Unger agreed with getting this one done, and Commissioner Schudson then asked if there was a second and Chair Unger stated that Commissioner Holmes had seconded it, and we have had the discussion, so we can vote on this part, but staff can't move it forward until we get the other parts together, and if needed, she will send them to you to double check them or you can read them through here, because a lot of it will be impacted by 1509. When you get to maintenance and repair, we have talked about that a lot, so we will discuss it at the next meeting, and she would suggest that anything else that needs to be changed be looked at too. She would like to at least feel that we have accomplished something today, and this makes us feel that we have gotten through a fairly big step.

Audree Juhlin then suggested that the Commission not recommend its approval, but just have consensus that the motion is that you accept this in theory, because you haven't looked at all of the changes, and you may make changes at the next meeting after you have had time to read it, and then you could make one formal motion to the Planning & Zoning Commission and Council that says this is the ordinance proposed in its entirety.

Commissioner Schudson stated that it is not going to happen; we get homework assignments and people don't do them. There is no one here with the possible exception of the idiot lawyer who is sitting here who will go through it line by line, word by word. Let's be realistic and get this accomplished, and if later, staff and attorneys say you missed something three paragraphs later, we will correct it, but let's accomplish this.

Chair Unger indicated that in this instance, she agrees that what we should do is say that part of it, we accept, and we have to look at the rest of it next time. The maintenance . . ., Commissioner Schudson interrupted to say there is a motion on the floor. He is willing to lose; if he loses the vote, he loses the vote, and he has another motion after this one, which will please you all. Let's vote.

The Chair asked that those in favor of accepting this, and Audree clarified it is recommending approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council as amended today, not as amended in the future, but as amended today.

VOTE: Three (3) for and two (2) opposed. Chair Unger and Vice Chair Jarmusch were opposed. (Commissioner Grams was excused, and one position is vacant.)

Commissioner Schudson then stated that he had another motion.

MOTION: Commissioner Schudson moved that we provide an event of appreciation for all of our certificate holders, to be developed under the loving guidance of Commissioner Segner.

Chair Unger explained that motion could not be made, because it is not on the agenda, but we can agendaize it for the next meeting. Commissioner Segner stated that he will put together an idea, and we will agendaize looking at the maintenance and repair, because that is another big part of this that we need to look at carefully.

Commissioner Segner then complimented James Gardner for doing a good job on this and the way he laid it out. Vice Chair Jarmusch also wanted to thank James for all of his work. The Chair then also thanked James, because it got it on the table and got the Commission to think about it.

Chair Unger then asked Audree how critical the other agenda items are, and Audree Juhlin indicated that the most critical one is the input on agenda item #5, because she wants the Commission to have a lot of time to think about possible uses, and the homework is to brainstorm all of the ideas before the next meeting, then we can spend five minutes on the Geotourism, because it doesn't have to be a Commission item. Chair Unger then indicated that she and Vice Chair Jarmusch can move the conference onto the next agenda; however, Donna Puckett pointed out that Vice Chair Jarmusch may not be available.

5. Discussion regarding the City's Master Planning efforts related to the City-owned historic USFS House and Barn and possible uses (30 minutes, 4:45-5:15)

Audree Juhlin indicated that Cynthia Lovely and Commissioner Holmes are both on the committee that is working on this project, and her memo basically says that we bought the property and now we are beginning the master planning effort. A group has been formed to work on this project, and we are now getting input on how everybody in the community thinks this site should be used. The Commission is extremely important in that input process, because it is an historic landmark.

Chair Unger distributed copies of the memo, and she indicated that she had a question on it, because she didn't understand; is it that we can't do anything with those buildings? Vice Chair Jarmusch also noted that it says you cannot do these things. Audree Juhlin explained that this is how the Development Impact Fees for Parks & Recreation are governed. Parks and Recreational facilities on properties up to 30 acres, which is this property. . .

Chair Unger then read the second line, ". . . or parks and recreational facilities larger than thirty acres if the facilities provide a direct benefit to the development. Park and recreational facilities do not include vehicles, equipment or that portion of any facility that is used for amusement parks, aquariums, aquatic centers, auditoriums, arenas, arts and cultural facilities, bandstand and orchestra facilities, bathhouses, boathouses, clubhouses, community centers greater than 3,000 sq. ft. in floor area, environmental education centers, equestrian facilities, golf course facilities, greenhouses, lakes, museums, theme parks, water reclamation or riparian areas, wetlands, zoo facilities or similar recreational facilities, but may include swimming pools."

Commissioner Segner indicated that means that the Park Department really can't do anything cultural with it, so it seems that it is okay for a park, but not okay for things outside of a park's boundaries like music, arts and all of the things we all thought it was going to be used for. Audree Juhlin added that is because the Development Impact Fees were used to purchase the property and the state statute says what the Chair just read. We are restricted and that is why she wanted to be sure everybody understood that we are restricted on its use.

Commissioner Holmes stated that Cynthia runs a great meeting and she appreciates that, and the event at the site with the community included a set-up so people could write their ideas and stick them on the wall, and people who agreed had dots to vote, so you could get a visual idea of what the community wanted. Then Cynthia boiled it all down into a list of ideas by categories, and we are going through them at length and discussing what we think about those possibilities. Some of them are totally out of the question based on this, but Cynthia has made it clear from the beginning and is very wise to say that we need to ensure that all members of the community feel that they have been heard. It is an involved process and a very diplomatic process, and we are going to be meeting with the pickle ball people.

Vice Chair Jarmusch asked if that is fair or honest; we have this in black and white. Commissioner Holmes explained that it is giving them some credibility and recognizing their desires, and taking the time to explain to them. The Vice Chair and Commissioner continued to express their differing points of view, and Cynthia explained that they are getting hung up a little too much on the state statute about the Development Impact Fees. We spoke with our attorney and the idea is that this will be a park. There might be some elements within it and some of the ideas are things like leasing out the house to be whatever, a coffee shop or what not, and the rest would be an open public park. This list is talking about things that typically might charge fees or be more exclusive uses, we are not proposing something like an aquarium, but we received about 120 comments and they are on the website, and the work group is going through all 120 ideas. There isn't a lot in conflict with the state statute, but there is a question about the arts and cultural facilities, and the idea when talking with the attorney sounded like it would be more like a museum and you were going to charge a fee, etc.

Chair Unger then asked if it is all tied to fees. and staff stated no. Audree Juhlin explained that is why the state statute is not necessarily the best thing for us, but it is what we are governed by, and the attorneys will be the ones that interpret if what we propose meets the intent of the state statute. The Chair agreed that it probably has to be the attorneys, because to her she would say that you should just knock the buildings down, because you can't use them.

Cynthia referenced the 120 ideas and indicated that most of them are eligible, so she wouldn't worry about this, and Audree pointed out that realistically we aren't going to do an aquatic center or a bathhouse or an equestrian center or a golf course, etc. Cynthia also added that it is not saying that we can't hold . . . One of the ideas we are getting is the barn could be renovated and be a theatre at times or rented for wedding events, and this isn't saying that we can't have a theatre performance.

Commissioner Segner suggested that the Commission not go down this road now, because there are 120 ideas. He is the neighbor to it and he got involved years ago, and we have also seen it as a cultural piece, so we would like to have a cultural element. He talked to the people across the street that have 55 parking places, which is the school system, and they also have a two-acre park behind them, and they said they would be happy to let you use their parking for an event. He also knows the City doesn't throw money around and there is probably not a lot of money for development, so the easiest thing to do is scrape it, put in a lawn and get people to use it. Make it in phases; it doesn't have to come out fully formed as long as you are working there, because right now the bike group that came to Tlaquepaque was talking about using that next year for auxiliary parking. In the meantime, can't we think about some auxiliary things until we finally get it fully formed?

Audree Juhlin explained that is exactly the conversation that staff is wanting, and Commissioner Segner stated that is his piece. Cynthia explained that the idea of a master plan is to say what we want in the future, and most likely because of funding, we are going to have to phase it. Right now as the work group is going through all of the ideas, on some of them we have questions and on some we are going to meet with other groups and ask those questions, but right now, the way it is leaning is for a picnic area as the number one thing, and that could happen immediately, but the work group is looking at the assumption that we are going to go in and redesign. We have people saying that they don't think there is enough parking, and we would probably have an agreement with across the street, because we already do that at Posse Grounds, but the idea is to try to make people imagine the best it could be and not assume that because there is a gravel parking area that is where the parking is going to be.

Chair Unger indicated that the only thing that could affect it historically would be if you were to pull up all of the trees, etc. Doing grass, etc., wouldn't have a negative effect. Audree Juhlin explained that it is greater than just the historic scope, so we want as much community involvement as we can get. We want the historic perspective included, but your additional layer of input is wanted too. Are there 123 things with two more things we hadn't thought of, etc.?

Cynthia Lovely added that perhaps another way to structure this better is that right now, you can tell us if you have any concerns or anything that we should be keeping in mind, and then for a future meeting, we could present the top ten ideas and you could evaluate those, but right now, it is wide open. Chair Unger stated that she thinks it is a little too broad for the Commission; we can go online and look at the list, but maybe if you bring the ten back, one concern is that the building get a new roof and the building be taken care of, so the building doesn't come down.

Audree Juhlin explained that staff wants the Commission's input as the master planning is done; we know that preservation is important. Commissioner Segner indicated that every group says they want some grass to put on some events, and we could put on evening events in June and July. There are no homes around there and it is a fairly rural area; he is the only neighbor, so if you can keep it rural with a lot of grass, and in the upper right-hand side, there could be gardens for humanity, but keep it rural. Audree restated that is the input that we want from the Commission.

Commissioner Segner then stated that the worst thing you can do in marketing is ask for everybody's input; it drives you nuts. There has to be one or two ideas that you drive; however, the Chair acknowledged that is something the City has to do. Commissioner Segner then summarized rural, used at night, with or without lights, have a little play and do something low key, park across the street. In the Design Group's original plan, they thought the park was too big and would be better functionally if it was a little smaller. Their recommendation was to sell the lower half off and use that money to help pay for it. Cynthia Lovely noted that there were people that said to sell the whole thing, remove the buildings, and relocate them to Jordan Park.

Note: Commissioner Schudson left the meeting at 5:50 p.m.

Commissioner Segner indicated that the land was zoned for park lands, non-commercial use, and we have been through that battle. Commissioner Holmes then suggested that Cynthia show the drawing she had at the last meeting when she talked about the size, because she had brought up the Heritage Park in Flagstaff, and Cynthia drew it to get an idea of all of the different sections we could have. Audree Juhlin suggested bringing that to the next meeting, and the Chair asked that if it is narrowed down, that be brought to the Commission, because it would be more constructive. Audree Juhlin noted that staff will send the Commission the link.

Commissioner Segner stated that the Owensby Ditch is within 20 ft. of there and that would be a great water source, because people will question putting in a lawn. He has Owensby Ditch water and he would be more than happy to pull from his ditch to irrigate that.

Audree Juhlin indicated that staff will bring it back in a more structured way; we won't be doing a brainstorming session necessarily, but we will get the look and feel of what you want as far as character goes, and then you can comment on some of the list to help whittle that down.

The Chair indicated that would be great and referenced agenda item 7 next.

7. Discussion regarding the Sedona Verde Valley Geotourism Council and possible sites to nominate for inclusion in the Geotourism MapGuide (15 minutes, 5:30-5:45)

Chair Unger indicated that the Sedona Historical Society is doing this and there are other cultural groups that are thinking of doing it. She then asked what was going to be done for the City, and Audree Juhlin explained that we just wanted to make the Commission aware of this opportunity, and individually you can go on the website that gives the criteria of what they are looking for as far as nominations. So individually, look to see what is already there, so you don't duplicate. The Chair then circulated some information and Audree pointed out it is also in her memo, and they can just individually add something; it doesn't have to be from the Commission.

6. Discussion/highlights of the 2015 State Historic Preservation Conference (15 minutes, 5:15-5:30)

Vice Chair Jarmusch indicated that she attended the grant writing boot camp and it was really good. There was a room full of people with projects that they were eager to get funding for, including her, so they each started a grant proposal with help from the facilitators who gave them pointers individually. Hers was about the Ranger Station and Barn's stabilization, restoration, rehabilitation and possible upgrade in utilities, etc., and the roof. They also gave a number of funding sources to try, and told them what the sources are looking for or that we need to do that homework. One of the banks gave authority to most Bank Managers or District Managers to give \$1,000 to any non-profit that has a good idea, so we could ask for that for the get-together. There is some easy and some hard money out there, but there are some foundations that don't even give any address or much information about people, so the speaker knew someone who knew someone and ended people on someone's doorstep and got the money. It was fascinating and very useful, so she has those resources, if anyone wants to see them.

Commissioner Segner asked if we know what is needed to stabilize the property and Vice Chair Jarmusch stated no. Cynthia Lovely clarified that there have been two different studies. One was a structural assessment, and then there was a very detailed assessment done in 2006. Commissioner Segner asked if that could be shared with the Commission, because we could go to the Community Foundation; there is money out there and we aren't stepping on anybody's toes to stabilize it.

Chair Unger agreed that we could get some grants, and she encouraged Ann to attend that session, because she attended it last year. Vice Chair Jarmusch added that it was presented by two private consultants -- one was based in Pasadena, California and the other was from the Phoenix area. She was kind of dreading it, but she loved it, because it showed so much potential and they were so good and professional, so thank you to the City for sending her to that.

The Chair asked about the City's grant writer, and Audree Juhlin explained that person looks for grants. The Chair suggested that Vice Chair Jarmusch give the grant person those things and talk to her about what she learned, because it is worthwhile, and she is going to put her own input about the conference on next month's agenda.

8. Discussion regarding future meeting dates and future agenda items (10 minutes, 5:45-5:55)

Chair Unger indicated that we need to continue today's discussion on different parts of the ordinance, and we want to go over the survey that was distributed today. She would have liked to go through it before it was published, but we had the money last year, so the decision was made to go ahead with it. The binders can be taken apart if we find anything, and a lot of it is online. Audree Juhlin clarified that the landmarks are online, and that portion of the document had been approved by the Commission essentially, but on a future agenda, we will go property by property to talk about those distinguishing features and update the list to include that. This is meant to be a living document, not a stagnant document, and it needs to be updated and modified as things change.

The Chair noted that this one is a much nicer looking document too and much more complete. Audree then noted that since it is not agendized, we will discuss the sections in another meeting. The Chair expressed thanks to Nancy Burgess who put so much time into this. At some point, she would love to get SHPO here to give a CLG presentation, but that is probably not going to be right away. Audree Juhlin suggested that might happen when we have the new Commission member.

Audree then indicated that the next meeting is August 10th. Commissioner Segner stated that he doesn't think he will be available, and Vice Chair Jarmusch confirmed that she is not sure.

9. Adjournment (5:55)

The Chair called for adjournment at 6:04 p.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission held on July 13, 2015.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

Date