

**Summary Minutes**  
**City of Sedona**  
**Historic Preservation Commission Meeting**  
**Vultee Conference Room, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Building 106, Sedona, Arizona**  
**Monday, December 12, 2016 – 4:00 p.m.**

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

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

**Roll Call:**

**Commissioners Present:** Chair Brynn Burkee Unger, Vice Chair Ann Jarmusch – arrived at 4:05 p.m. and Commissioners Jack Fiene, Allyson Holmes, Derek Pfaff and Steve Segner. Commissioner Kurt Gehlbach was excused.

**Staff Members Present:** Warren Campbell, Audree Juhlin and Donna Puckett

**2. Introduction of new Commissioners**

Chair Unger asked Commissioner Fiene and Commissioner Pfaff to provide a brief introduction of themselves. Commissioner Fiene indicated that he was first introduced to Sedona in 1972, and he and his wife fell in love with the place. It took them a while to move here permanently, but they did and his experience with historically-significant properties goes back to 1980, when he was working on valuations and façade reconnaissance on properties taken for the Phoenix Civic Center expansion. Then, it took him to Mill Avenue properties in Tempe and significant properties all over the country. He hasn't demonstrated his passion for these type of properties yet, but he will.

Commissioner Pfaff stated that his family moved here in May; they visited the year before and loved it, so they moved here. He studied archeology and considered being an archeologist, but decided to become a lawyer instead. He still has an interest in historic preservation of old buildings and archeology sites, etc.

The other Commission members then briefly introduced themselves to the new Commissioners.

**3. Commission and Staff announcements**

*There were no announcements.*

*Note: Vice Chair Jarmusch joined the meeting at 4:05 p.m.*

**4. Approval of the October 10, 2016 minutes**

Chair Unger requested a motion to approve the minutes.

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Segner moved that we approve the minutes. Commissioner Holmes seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried four (4) for and zero (0) opposed. Commissioner Gehlbach was excused and Commissioners Fiene and Pfaff were not on the Commission as of October 10<sup>th</sup>.*

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

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

6. **Discussion/possible direction regarding the Commission's Work Plan for 2017/2018**
  - a. **Pursue eligible properties for inclusion as Historic Landmarks**
  - b. **Develop a Historic Resource Recognition Program**
  - c. **Other**

Chair Unger stated that we have two items and she has added another idea. She then asked Warren Campbell to speak to the first two items. Warren referenced a handout with a pie chart that was prepared last year about this time for the City Council. He then referenced the Historic Preservation Commission on page 171 and explained that we are now identifying performance metrics and discussing goal setting, etc. to annually report on those goals. Under Fiscal Year 17, we had three bullet points that we hoped to accomplish, and we are about half-way through the year, but we took care of Article 15 and made a recommendation on that. It goes to the City Council on January 10th. The other two items are discussing the update of some of the historic surveys and using some of the properties as a learning experience, while making sure the surveys are up-to-date. The other bullet point was to create a Historic Resource Recognition Program.

We are now working on the budget for Fiscal Year 2018, so if we discuss anything that would have implications, like staff over one FTE 20% of the time, we will have to prepare associated budget requests.

Chair Unger stated that the 2016 accomplishment is basically the appreciation open house for landmark properties, but we are going to do one in May of 2017. She then asked if that is something we are discussing. Warren explained that we are talking about the two other items that we anticipate achieving before the end of June. If you want to discuss an appreciation party, it might come up under item #7 with the Ranger Station.

Chair Unger referenced the Work Plan for 2018 and indicated that she thought those things would be started at the end of June or July, and then expressed some confusion. Warren explained that he anticipated that things would rollover and continue. We want to discuss what we want to be doing next year and how we are going to complete the two on here. The Chair then asked if it is correct that we are going to complete them next year, not this year. For item 6.a., the Commission will have to review what properties we have as possibilities for new landmarks; there aren't many on that list, but she doesn't see the Commission doing more than one or two. She then asked if that sets with the staff's thought process, and Warren Campbell pointed out that it is the Commission's Work Plan, so however many you choose to pursue.

Commissioner Segner stated that the Commission should take one-half day this year to review what we have and also drive by any locations we think we want to look at. It would be a good chance to train everybody, because he hasn't been out in five years. We also can discuss how we do landmarking and look at a couple of new properties. We could knock that off this year. The Chair agreed and indicated that in terms of the Work Plan, we are talking about how much we are going to ask the City for in Fiscal Year 2017-2018.

Audree Juhlin clarified that staff is looking for what the Commission's Work Program will be. Staff will figure out the dollars and staffing, and we will put a Decision Package together if it is over the staff time allocation. The Commission needs to figure out what you want to do, and then staff will take it to the City Council for you.

Chair Unger stated that Commissioner Segner is saying that in terms of pursuing an eligible property, it is something that we would like to look at next year and review the properties this year. Commissioner Segner then repeated his desire to review all of the properties this year and if we decide there are any new properties, we can pursue them next year. Chair Unger then stated that would go on the Work Plan for next year, and there is one that she thinks all of the Commissioners would agree to, but there would probably only be the one.

Vice Chair Jarmusch stated that the Commission had also discussed reviewing the survey done by the consultant, and she would like to propose that for either the rest of this year or next year. Commissioner Segner stated that is the same thing; we should take the survey and go to each property. The Vice Chair indicated that she thought the Commissioner had said only landmarked properties, and Commissioner Segner asked if that isn't what it is. Chair Unger explained that it also contains other properties, and Commissioner Segner then stated, "Let's do them".

Chair Unger asked if that is a possibility in terms of staff's time; we spent a lot of time this year working on Article 15. Audree Juhlin indicated for that to proceed forward in a time-efficient manner, staff would form working teams to take certain sections of the survey, and then the teams would report back at a Commission meeting.

Commissioner Holmes asked if staff working teams would include Commissioners, and Audree Juhlin stated yes and explained that staff would ask those who want to be part of that update to send an email to staff, and staff will assign survey properties to review. Chair Unger confirmed it would not be something where the whole Commission would be there, and Warren stated that staff would ensure that there is no quorum. The Chair then pointed out that she and Steve are probably the most senior, so other Commissioners would probably be assigned with one of them.

Commissioner Segner then repeated his idea of the Commission going out one day to survey some and do the paperwork, so we all do it the same way. Make it as a normal meeting to do a couple. The Chair agreed, but probably not in January, to do that as an assessment to ensure that we are all together on one of them. We have 23 landmarks and a lot of other significant buildings, so for all of the Commission to go to all of them couldn't be done in one meeting, but we may take half of the landmarked buildings, so we can all give our viewpoints.

Donna Puckett suggested doing it after everyone has had a chance to read the Secretary of Interior Guidelines, because it shouldn't be based just on preference, but rather the actual guidelines used to evaluate. Chair Unger agreed everyone should review that before that meeting, even if you have read them before.

Commissioner Segner pointed out that one time the Commission discussed trying to find all of these locations, and we spent years looking before going to the County Recorder to find them, so with technology today, we could each take five and go out and photograph them, then we could shoot them on the wall and fill out the paperwork. Commissioner Holmes noted that forming common ground is important.

Chair Unger then indicated that there is a reality that we had a professional do the survey that knew what we have, but it is not a bad idea for the Commission to take a second look at that. We can easily say that it would be good for the Commission to look at a few of the landmarks, so everyone knows what gave us the right to landmark them. There are some in the survey that could possibly be landmarked, but there are others with a big possibility that they couldn't be. To proceed, maybe we can take one meeting to do what Commissioner Segner and Vice Chair Jarmusch were suggesting. We can certainly take pictures and bring them back to get the group's view, but there might be members of the Commission who aren't comfortable doing that on their own yet.

Donna Puckett asked the Chair if she recalled what the problem was when the group split up like that before to take pictures and they all had to be redone. Chair Unger noted that was a little more complicated, because we have the surveyed ones and that was when Commissioner Segner brought in all of the homes over 50-years-old, and that became burdensome, because the Commission was looking at so many. She and her son looked at about 20 homes and none of them could have been put in the survey. Donna Puckett noted that there was something with the photographs and they all had to be re-photographed. Commissioner Segner indicated that this wouldn't be an official survey; we're just training and seeing what we have done. They were just done one year ago, so it is almost make work although it would be good for the Commission to look at them every couple of years. If you take a picture and see the garage is gone . . ., Chair Unger

agreed and indicated it is a much more limited number, and we had the City's cameras while trying to register the address with the pictures. Commissioner Segner added that the Commission basically knocked out every house over 50-years-old and identified those worth doing something with, and there was one or two that might be something to pursue.

Chair Unger indicated that Vice Chair Jarmusch was trying to bring up that when the survey was revisited, the Commission was in the midst of doing a lot of other things, and it was done by a professional. The Commission never looked at what was approved by the professional and the Vice Chair is staying that it would be worth the Commission looking at it again. The Vice Chair agreed, because it was described as a work in progress to the Commission, because it was expedient to get it done within the budget that was available.

The Chair stated that she doesn't object to that, but we need to make sure that we don't make too much work for staff. Audree Juhlin recalled that the Commission had also talked about identifying the contributing features of the landmarks and non-contributing features, so when we have repairs and maintenance come forward, we know that those are items that are not important, etc. Chair Unger agreed and indicated it is important for the Commission to do all of the ones on the survey. We had a tremendous number on the original survey in the late 1990s, and a professional found that a good number of them had been changed and we couldn't keep them on that list.

Commissioner Fiene noted that we can include landscapes, and Chair Unger indicated that the Commission would be discussing that; we have yet to include landscapes in any of them, but it is something going forward. Commissioner Segner then added that it could be a significant wall or tree. If it is an important piece of the property, we should note it on the paperwork. Chair Unger then clarified that they can actually be landmarked now and the Federal Government has set up a whole new register for landscapes.

Commissioner Segner suggested that the Commission just say that we are going to take one meeting to go out for a half-day and do some. Audree Juhlin clarified that this item is only to say what your Work Program is and if you agree that you want to look at the survey -- yes or no? The consensus of the Commission was yes.

Chair Unger then referenced item 6.b and indicated that it might tie into the first item, because a lot of people would like for their property to be recognized, but we can't add them to the survey, because they have been changed. There is the possibility of maybe a couple of Commissioners coming up with some wording about what it would take to have a Resource Recognition Program that doesn't landmark or call them out in our survey. There are a lot of properties in town like the Cowboy Club that would love to have recognition, but we can't recognize them as a landmark, because they have changed the façade too much. Commissioner Segner noted that it could be a significant property due to its location, history, people or effect on the neighborhood. Keep Sedona Beautiful does that annually with their awards, and we could do that and put it in the paper.

Chair Unger asked if staff expects the Commission to come up with the wording and Warren Campbell stated ultimately, but from what he just heard, you would like to consider issuing a plaque to those properties, so we need to figure out the cost and how many you want to do in a year. Chair Unger stated that she wouldn't want to do more than two a year; if you do a whole bunch, it is going to wash out and nobody will recognize them much.

Audree Juhlin explained that first the Commission needs to decide if the recognition program is something the Commission wants to do, and she is hearing yes. At the next meeting, we can discuss what that would look like or, if you are interested in developing that program, email staff and we will form a committee to bring it back to the Commission at a later date.

Vice Chair Jarmusch stated that, months ago, she drafted a proposal for this that was just for the Commission's reaction, and she wondered if she would dig that up again and send it to staff. Commissioner Segner stated yes and the Commission should plan to have a meeting on it to see

what everybody thinks. The Commissioner indicated that we could say \$1,500 for three plaques; however, Warren explained that there is a new type of sign that is not true bronze; it is cold cast bronze. Chair Unger added that her suggestion would be to do maybe two each year. Commissioner Segner then suggested having one for commercial and Commissioner Holmes added one for residential. Warren Campbell noted that staff would estimate what the staff time would be, and Commissioner Segner noted that it would tie into the once a year welcome thing at his place.

Vice Chair Jarmusch stated that she had questions about the handout and asked why the Commission was not allowed to review this; we have a target for FY 17 total number of landmark properties, but at the last meeting we spoke about a specific property that we would like to pursue, so why don't we raise that target to 24 at least to show the Council we are actively pursuing that landmark? Donna Puckett explained this was a staff report for this current budget during the budgeting process in the first quarter of each year. Vice Chair Jarmusch then asked if this couldn't be corrected and Audree Juhlin stated no and explained that the Commission is talking about what you want for the next budget year. The Vice Chair then stated that the target would be 24, not 23, and Warren Campbell noted that even the number of new properties landmarked would go from zero to one, and Commissioner Segner added that you would up it by one for the next budget.

Vice Chair Jarmusch pointed out that she knows she had mentioned before that Article 15 says we evaluated proposed amendments, but we worked for more than a year, and in the past, she commented that we not only evaluated, we drafted, discussed and evaluated the proposed amendments. We're being shortchanged in this summary. Audree Juhlin explained that wasn't the intent of this at all. During that year that was your project, and if you want to change the words for the upcoming year that is okay. This was a project staff was given by the City Manager, and we were given a week's notice to prepare this document.

The Vice Chair repeated that she had mentioned it in the past, so maybe it would have triggered a memory; it is just not correct. Chair Unger explained that she thinks the Vice Chair is trying to say that the Commission committed a lot more time and energy to it than what is recognized here, and Audree again stated that definitely was not the intent. The Vice Chair then stated that she is sure it wasn't the intent, but she would like to have it corrected if possible.

Audree Juhlin explained that Fiscal Year 2017 accomplishments are now going to have the adoption of Article 15, and it will be updated to reflect that, plus we can expand it to say this was a 3-year project that took extensive research, evaluation, etc., but it literally has to fit in a bullet line. Commissioner Segner indicated that he agrees with the Vice Chair and indicated that is when the Commission goes in front of the Council. He doesn't think they get anything from bullet points.

The Vice Chair then stated January 10<sup>th</sup>, and asked if P&Z passed it with any changes; however, Audree Juhlin explained that the Commission couldn't discuss it, because we are off the subject. The Vice Chair then indicated that staff brought up the January 10<sup>th</sup> meeting and the Chair explained that was under announcements, so if you need some information on that just call Warren; however, the Vice Chair commented that the whole Commission should know. Audree Juhlin then indicated that staff will send an email.

Donna Puckett stated that for the Commission's planning discussion today, it might help to keep in mind that we are currently in FY 2017 and you are planning for Fiscal Year 2018. Fiscal Year 2017 is half over, and that was planned the end of 2015. Fiscal Year 2018 is not in this report.

Audree Juhlin indicated that if the Commission wants to add to the Work Program the preparation of an annual report to the City Council, then you could get into the specifics of what you have done, like you had Article 15 and spent nine months of research, nine months of going through the public hearing process, etc., so that report might be beneficial in providing details to Council. Vice Chair Jarmusch then asked if that could be the same report we send to the state and Chair Unger

indicated yes, but she doesn't know if we want to make a presentation in front of the City Council annually.

Commissioner Holmes asked if the Commission still has a Council liaison and Audree stated no. Commissioner Fiene then asked if there has been a drafting process ongoing for FY 18, and Chair Unger stated no, this is the meeting where we usually start talking about it, because the Council makes determinations about the finances in the beginning of the year, so we start discussing it in December. Commissioner Fiene indicated that he is used to fiscal year, so that isn't a problem, but he wondered if we had already determined certain items for FY 18, and the Chair stated that is what we are doing right now.

Commissioner Segner stated that if it was a business his question would be if 2018 is going to be any different than this year; is there any big thing on the agenda, and can we work within the number of meetings you have already had. Chair Unger stated that given the fact that we are a Certified Local Government, CLG, we have to consider bringing in a landmark every year, so in essence, 6.a will probably always be on our Work Plan. In some prior years, we had four landmarks, but she doesn't see that happening that much anymore.

Commissioner Fiene explained that the reason for his inquiry is that in business, they often do a five-year plan and solidify it as they go. Chair Unger stated that the Commission hasn't done a longer-term plan. They have some things that we have to look at almost every year, and then we've added a few things to them. Commissioner Segner then added that the Commission is usually reactive in the sense that we have to act on something, and then what we are going to do in the future is landmark buildings and review landmarks. Next year, we need to see every landmark building, landmark a building, have a party, pick two things that we give awards for and be ready in case staff wants the Commission to come to a meeting, and that is pretty much it. Budget the same as last year and you will probably be fine.

Chair Unger indicated that the Commission has talked about the Resource Recognition Program, but not delegated time to it, so that will be a little bit new. Under 6.c, she had training and review of the current landmarks, because in the last few years, we had to rewrite a lot of Article 15, which took the Commission away from other things, but we already have a lot of things set-up to look at every year.

Audree Juhlin indicated that to help simplify, the handout is a guide. She graphically depicted that we currently want to look at Article 15, update landmark information and create a historic resource survey, so those are things we want to do this year, but do we want to continue those into the next budget year? The next one, performance measures, we have the table with FY 15, 16 and 17, but we are focusing on a column for FY 18, so what are the numbers you want to target for those performance measures, and are there any other performance measures you are looking for. For the total number of landmarked properties, we have a target for this year to maintain the 23, because we didn't anticipate any new landmarks, but she is hearing that you want to do another one, so the target becomes 24 for the number of landmarks next year, which means that the number of new properties will have at least one new landmark as the goal. On the number of public meetings, we think we can probably do eight meetings this year, but do you think we are going to need more? How many civic pride educational events do you want to do? We will plug that number in; whatever you are targeting, we want to show that in a new column on that table. Under the objectives for '18, we will then call out anything specific, like doing the survey or doing training, etc., so the objectives for FY 18 will be modified to whatever it is that you are looking for, and we will do a Decision Package if it requires more money. She hopes that helps focus what we are trying to do.

Chair Unger stated that may help Vice Chair Jarmusch, because that is what is awkward about the fiscal year calendar. We said 24 landmarks; 8 public meetings, but we can have more . . . Commissioner Segner interrupted to say let's go 24, 8, one new landmark, one civic pride; however, Audree Juhlin reminded the Commissioner about the 100-year anniversary at Ranger

Park, and the Commissioner stated fine, put two in. Chair Unger pointed out that actually is going into agenda item 7, but it has to be in there. Commissioner Segner stated that today the Commission only needs a rough number, and then we will figure it out. For awards, put down five or six, and then we can back off; however, Vice Chair Jarmusch pointed out that Chair Unger had stated to just do two. Audree Juhlin indicated that the Commission could be conservative, and then if that is exceeded . . . , Chair Unger interjected that when we are talking about Certificates of Appropriateness, it is difficult to know the number. Audree Juhlin stated that at a minimum she would put one, but we will update it for this year, we will change the targets for FY 17 to be actuals, and it may be zero or three.

Chair Unger referenced the educational training exercise; we still have six months, but she would keep it at two to three. Warren Campbell noted that is number eight; however, Audree pointed out that it is also part of the budget for the performance measures. The Chair indicated that realistically, we only have eight meetings; how many of those meetings can we actually do that type of thing? Audree Juhlin stated that when you are going out and looking at properties and surveys, that is an educational opportunity for the Commission members, so that qualifies for this and if we are going to talk about things the Commission did with the new members that also qualifies as training to bring them up-to-speed. It is not just going to the conference. The Chair then stated that if we plug in at least three, she could see that.

Commissioner Fiene asked, in backing up to number one, if we are going to issue two awards, and Chair Unger indicated yes. If we exceed that . . . , but we will only have the money in the budget for two also. Audree explained that it really depends on your program; you can still recognize people without the monetary budget having an effect. Commissioner Fiene then asked if we are going to generate an annual report, and Audree Juhlin stated that could be another objective, and Commissioner Segner stated that the Commission should. The Chair agreed that the annual report isn't a bad idea now that we do not have a Council liaison, because they reported back to the City Council what we had done. Audree Juhlin added that the Commission can also have an objective to have the joint meeting with the City Council, and Commissioner Segner stated that is where you would make your presentation, but also you go to the City Council and talk about the awards and what you are doing. Chair Unger indicated that the Commission should do that, because we used to do it every year and it would help Vice Chair Jarmusch in her understanding of what we are doing, because often they look at it and wonder if it is worth having the Commission. Vice Chair Jarmusch agreed that is her concern.

Audree Juhlin indicated that under the FY18 objectives, we will change it from "Create a Historic Resource . . ." to "Implement . . .", so whether you get any this year, it is not as important as next year, because you are implementing it.

Warren Campbell asked if there needs to be a category under Performance Measures for Certificates of No Effect. Chair Unger stated that is something we always have to do, but we don't have any way . . . Audree Juhlin noted that it is not a Commission program; however, Warren pointed out that it would involve the Chair. Commissioner Segner indicated that there should be something to say that the Commission is available to act on things that staff brings to the Commission. Warren then stated that he thinks it is worthy of tracking, because over time we can show how many we are doing; they would have all been C of A's before. Commissioner Segner commented that the Commission was meeting twice a month five years ago, and now we are down to eight. If we get our act together, we can get it down to six. Chair Unger then stated that the Certificates of No Effect should be in the list too.

Audree Juhlin then asked what accomplishments the Commission would like to see in the report, because we are in the process of developing this right now. We have the meeting with the City Council in January, so we can bring the draft back to the Commission in January. Chair Unger stated that one thing the Commission is going to do is the big event at the Forest Service buildings; we can't say that all components of that are going to be . . . , but that is the 100<sup>th</sup> year anniversary of

that building being placed there, and Audree added that it also would be the formal unveiling of the Master Park Plan.

Chair Unger then stated that we want to have a meeting to look at the surveys . . . , Commissioner Segner interrupted to say have a training meeting, the event and one meeting to rough out everybody's ideas for the awards next year, so we can get that done. This year will be about the awards, the guidelines for what we think are significant and what that means. Chair Unger echoed that those are the three things that we need to do.

Chair Unger noted that we may have some Certificates of Appropriateness to look at too. It is six months, but if we are having eight meetings a year, then we are only talking about four meetings. Audree indicated that for the draft plan, we are going to show that the accomplishments for FY17 will be the approval and adoption of Article 15, an open house, the 100-year party and Master Plan celebration, training, surveys and a recognition program.

Commissioner Segner asked why the 100-year party and the recognition wouldn't be done together, and Audree pointed out that the Commission said you are having two events. Commissioner Segner then suggested making them one event and Chair Unger agreed that would be appropriate in May. Audree Juhlin then asked if they are planning on doing two in the following year, and Commissioner Holmes stated to plan on doing one; it will either be at Commissioner Segner's or somewhere else. Chair Unger then agreed that the Commission didn't need to do two, because they would have to be at different times of the year and since the Historic Preservation Month is in May, let's just do one. Commissioner Segner then added that this year, we will do it at the park, and next year, we will do it back at his place.

Commissioner Fiene indicated that some work is ongoing at the Ranger Station now, so he guesses that he is shooting at a target date for completion of the interior of the house or barn; do we know? Chair Unger stated no; they are doing this in phases, so the event will only be unveiling where we are going with maybe an outline of when things are going to happen and in what sequence. She then asked Warren who indicated that he thinks the buildings will be open and there will be a large copy of the plan for the park, etc. The Commissioner indicated that he was thinking of an additional event for 2018 and how that might fit, such as an open house for completion of interior improvements on one of the buildings.

Commissioner Segner stated that there won't be anything; 2018 probably will be a parking lot and grass, but we may be stepping into the Parks & Rec. Department a little at that point, so we probably need to tie-in with them. He likes the idea of a 20'x10' sign out front with the plan, cost and completion date. Also, committees need to be formed now for planting, benches and donations, so we can help get things donated to the park. Audree Juhlin explained that staff has been charged to create a Decision Package that talks about finances, revenue sources, etc., for these different phases, and how we will accomplish the various tasks, so in that, we can discuss coordinating volunteers and efforts.

Commissioner Segner then stated to continue that in a bureaucracy, and each bureaucracy sees its own realm, how do we coordinate with Parks & Rec. so the Commission feels that the historic input is not being ignored; we need to work with them. Audree Juhlin suggested that one objective might be to coordinate and invite Parks & Rec. to a meeting. Chair Unger indicated that she could see the Commission doing that in 2018 and Audree Juhlin pointed out that it would also be whatever the City Council approves money for. There may not be any money in the budget for two or three years; we don't know, but one of the 2018 objectives would be to coordinate efforts with Parks and Rec, so they will be invited to your meeting.

Chair Unger indicated that the Commission might be able to help bring in volunteers, etc, but simplifying it in that sense and leaving it as part of that process, we can do. Commissioner Segner indicated that would look good on the Commission's Work Plan, then it will look like we are doing something and we will have input. The Chair noted that it might be that the Commission will have a

meeting with the City Council and Parks & Rec., and Commissioner Segner added that Parks & Rec could come to any meeting and we could talk for 10 minutes to give input.

Chair Unger then asked if the Commissioners are clear for this year and Vice Chair Jarmusch recalled that at the last meeting, there was consensus that maintenance of these buildings was to be a priority, and when she reviewed the minutes she saw something she didn't catch in person. Cynthia stated that the maintenance would probably occur in the spring, but Vice Chair Jarmusch wondered if that is wise, since we are talking about roofing. Commissioner Segner commented that they are in good shape; however, Vice Chair Jarmusch recalled that the Chair stated that they needed work. Commissioner Segner then stated that they need a roof down the line, but there is no leakage at this point.

Audree Juhlin stated that the Commission will see a Certificate of Appropriateness for a roof probably before the end of the budget year. We have savings in the demolition fund for the buildings that are leaving that site, and we are speeding that up to do some of that work while we have funds. After this budget year, we don't know if we will have any funds for maintenance, so with the leftover money this year, we are talking about doing the historic assessment of the barn and house to learn how much it is going to cost for renovations of both buildings. We know there is rotting wood on the barn, the roof, etc., so hopefully, we will have that assessment in this budget year. If not, we will budget for that assessment to be done.

Chair Unger asked if there is a need for the Commission to include time to look at that, and Audree stated that the Commission has to be involved. It is part of the process; it's a landmark. Commissioner Segner stated to put it down; however, Audree explained it probably would be an accomplishment, because we don't know what it is going to be until Council tells us in April. Under objectives, we could put to be involved with every phase of the Master Plan as it is unfolding.

Chair Unger then asked if there was anything else needed; we have a pretty clear understanding of where we want to go for the rest of this year and a lot of the things for the following year are things we are always going to be doing. The one big addition would be the Historic Resource Recognition Program, plus the City Council meeting. Commissioner Segner asked if staff or volunteers could look at other cities to see how they do their recognition. Audree Juhlin stated that if you are interested in that, just send staff an email.

Chair Unger indicated that she would like for Vice Chair Jarmusch to send her sketch of that to the City to be distributed before the next meeting. Commissioner Segner noted that Commissioner Fiene may also have some information.

## **7. Discussion/possible direction regarding the Ranger Station 100-year Anniversary/Historic Landmark Recognition/History Month celebration in May 2017**

Warren Campbell suggested that anyone who is interested in participating in the planning of the party send him an email, and we will create a staff working team. Commissioner Segner asked about the date and Warren stated in May; we had discussed doing the landmark recognition and this event. Commissioner Segner asked if the Parks Department would be involved and Warren stated no. Audree explained that Parks & Rec. would not take it over until it is open to the public. It is now really Community Development and Engineering's. Commissioner Segner asked who would put up the big sign and Audree indicated that Public Works will be the Project Manager with Community Development as part of the team. There are standards that allow for development signage, so here is your Brewer Master Plan, Ranger Station, whatever the technical term is, but we have that up and the details of that, who to contact for the project, etc.

Commissioner Segner then repeated his desire for a big sign for the event, and Audree indicated that staff will do a 20 sq. ft. announcement, a special banner for that. Vice Chair Jarmusch requested a sign that could go up soon and say "Future site of public park and restored historic buildings", because people don't know . . . Chair Unger interrupted to say that would be a good

idea. Audree Juhlin agreed, but explained it is a matter of finding money in the budget to have a sign done. Commissioner Segner stated that if staff can't find the money, he will pay for it; it needs a nice sign, but he gets to design the sign. He then indicated that staff doesn't hear all of the questions about what is going on there. Audree Juhlin explained that one of the Commission's objectives is to be involved in the planning of this park and another objective is to update your historic preservation website to give this kind of information as well. Chair Unger agreed that is not a bad idea.

Commissioner Segner stated that nobody has ever seen the website. Audree Juhlin stated that we can have a sign, but it is not going to answer all of the questions, but we are going to have a team working on this party and those are details they will figure out.

Commissioner Holmes suggested that the working committee that worked on the park be invited to participate in the planning of the party also. Audree Juhlin stated that would be in the specifics when the team meets. Chair Unger pointed out that the planning will not be done around this table; Warren has asked that you email him if you are interested. Audree then pointed out that there could be a standing agenda item at each meeting until May that says, "Update on the party-planning process".

#### **8. Discussion/possible direction regarding the 2017 annual Arizona Historic Preservation Conference**

Warren Campbell referenced the handout regarding the annual HP Conference June 14<sup>th</sup>–16<sup>th</sup> in 2017 and asked that the Commissioners look at their calendars and consider whether or not they would like to participate, then come back to the next meeting or email him to let us know. We only have so much money budgeted . . . , Commissioner Segner interrupted to say that he will go this year; put him down. Audree Juhlin advised the Commissioner to send an email, because no action is to be taken here. Warren then continued to say that if we have more people interested than our budget, we will figure out how we will prioritize.

Chair Unger indicated that she paid for this for a number of years in the past and asked if some Commissioners want to go and pay for it, could they get the discount, and Audree stated yes. Vice Chair Jarmusch asked if there should be a pledge for people to sign if they are going to the event to indicate that they really will attend. Warren explained that changes are being made at a different level regarding use of city funds to attend events. It won't be a problem in the future; there will be something in place to deal with it.

#### **9. Discussion regarding future meeting dates and future agenda items [Bring your Calendars]** • **January 9, 2017**

It was determined that a quorum anticipates being available on January 9<sup>th</sup>, but Vice Chair Jarmusch was not sure. The Chair then indicated that she and staff will look at what could be accomplished and suggested that Commissioners could do a final review of the Work Plan, if staff will have enough time before then. Audree Juhlin stated that the Commission will receive a draft of that page at the January 9<sup>th</sup> meeting. The Chair then suggested that the Commissioners calendar the date, but requested that the Commission notify staff if anything changes. We might also have Vice Chair Jarmusch discuss her thoughts on the Resource Recognition Program. She doesn't want to complicate things and would like to keep the meetings to 1½ hours at the most.

Vice Chair Jarmusch requested that the Commission have a standing agenda item for Commissioners to ask questions or make comments that are not agendized; however, Audree Juhlin explained that is illegal and why. Warren Campbell then pointed out that under the standing item for future agendas, the Commission can instruct staff to put something on a future agenda that the Commission wants to discuss. Chair Unger then reminded the Commissioners that they can also send things to Warren or her if there is something that needs to be looked at.

Audree Juhlin then summarized that for the 9<sup>th</sup>, there are three things – the budget Work Program discussion, the recognition program, and she is recommending adding the 100-year party planning as well. On the 10<sup>th</sup>, the City Council will be considering Article 15<sup>th</sup>, so you also could put that on the agenda for the 9<sup>th</sup> to discuss if Commissioners are going to attend, etc., and Chair Unger agreed.

**10. Adjournment**

Chair Unger requested a motion to adjourn.

**MOTION: Commissioner Fiene so moved. Commissioner Pfaff seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried six (6) for and zero (0) opposed. Commissioner Gehlbach was excused.**

*The meeting adjourned at 5:18 p.m.*

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission held on December 12, 2016.

---

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

---

Date