

DRAFT MINUTES HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION OCTOBER 13, 2021

Minutes of the regular hearing of the Historic Preservation Commission, of the City of Tempe, which was held virtually.

Regular Meeting 6:00 PM

| Present: | Staff: |
|-------------------|---|
| Chuck Buss, Chair | Steve Abrahamson, Principal Planner |
| Chris Garraty | John Southard, Historic Preservation Officer |
| Jim Garrison | Brittainy Nelson, Administrative Assistant |
| Elizabeth Gilbert | Jared Smith, Senior Curator |
| Gregory Larson | Ryan Levesque, Deputy Dir. |
| Laurene Montero | Shelly Seyler, Interim Director |
| Joe Nucci | Rosa Inchausti, Deputy City Manager |
| Reylynne Williams | Lisa Goodman, Procurement Officer |
| Kyle Woodson | Maria Laughner, Economic Development Prog Mgr |

1) City of Tempe RFP / RFQ Process

Presentation by Staff

Ms. Inchausti informed the commissioners that they are here to answer any questions or concerns that the commission has within the bounds of the legal requirements of the RFP process. More importantly the staff is here to make sure that the commissioners are aware of how important the Historic Preservation is which is an icon for the City. The City has been done the path before for the Hayden Flour Mill which was unsuccessful. But the City is determined to have the area developed/redeveloped but never without the input of the Historical Preservation Commission and Foundation.

Ms. Laughner informed the commissioners that the goal of the RFP is to identify a developer with preservation experience that can help the City preserve the site. When activating a site, it is the best way to prevent vandalism and disrepair both of which are occurring at the Flour Mill today. The Flour mill site is of tremendous significance. The City thinks that they owe it to the site to not leave it in its current condition. Instead, the Department is looking to preserve it and activate it. So that Arizona's history is brought back and once again accessible to the community. With this mission in mind City staff had a meeting with Katherin from the Historic Preservation Foundation Office and she has assured City staff that Tempe is a certified local government they would be able to provide any necessary assistance with the review process of the proposals. The City staff will continue to engage the Historic Preservation Foundation Office to comply with state and national historic preservation. They have also offered City staff Shipo contact with the archeology contact with the Mill and the Culture research compliant, as well as preservation outreach and communication. The City staff will also be engaging the Tribes once there is a valuable project. When City staff get to the review panel for the proposals, they would like to extend an invitation to the Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission to join the evaluation panel. The City staff would greatly appreciate the direct involvement on the panel to ensure that the city is working with the most valuable project to achieve the goals of RFP from a preservation perspective.

Ms. Goodman informed the commissioners that the RFP is issued, and proposal responses are due Thursday November 4, 2021 at 3pm. One addendum was issued to answer questions that were received by vendors and to share all information to the interested parties. Once those proposals are due the Evaluation Committee will be assembled to help access the proposals and interview the candidates that the committee feels is necessary. At any time, the selection can be canceled in its entirety. Or the committee may determine that the offers are not acceptable for award and not pursue. Once the Evaluation Committee evaluate the proposals and a recommendation of the most advantageous firm will go to City Council for approval to enter into negotiations for a development agreement. A recommendation will not be awarding an agreement but will allow for the City of Tempe Economic Development Department to enter into negotiations. The decision that is made and moved forward to City Council will not be final. If the recommendation is approved from City Council, then the negotiations will begin with the selected firm. Once it is finalized it will be presented to City Council for approval.

Commission Discussion

Chair Buss asked how long the timeline is to get to a selection committee.

Ms. Goodman stated that once the proposals are received, they will be distributed to the Committee members. The Committee members will be given a week or two to review the responses and start the evaluation process and go through a couple of meetings. There will be an initial kick off meeting as well as an evaluation meeting to get together to discuss the proposals. Decided if there are any items for clarification. The Committee will also have a chance to decide if there are any firms that the committee would like to bring in for interview. Once the interviews are done then the committee will have another meeting or two to make sure that there are not any items for clarification and if so get them answered. The entire process once it closes on November 4, 2021 is usually 6 to 8 weeks. There are some holidays in the timeline so it may take a little longer.

Chair Buss asked if it will 6 to 8 weeks for the commission to give their input on the project.

Ms. Goodman stated that the Commission would have input at the start of the Committee from the Chair.

Chair Buss wanted clarification on why the commission was not consulted in advance of the RFP. To get the Commissions perspective of what they would like to have put in the RFP. So that company's submitting the proposal knowing that they are not going to start with a blank piece of land. There is discussion on redeveloping the Food City strip mall off Apache and it would include a requirement in the RFP that there will be a grocery store included. With that said why couldn't there be a similar requirement that was included in the RFP in the Flour Mill that the Mill itself be preserved for instance.

Ms. Inchausti stated that she has been with the City for 29 years and has severed with staff Mr. Southard in his capacity and the Human Relations Commission. Where her understanding is that Mr. Southard was consulted. The City staff believe that the Commissions have a strong rule and say as serving as the selection panel. They do consult one another within the Departments while doing the RFP. It has been the experience that select Chair's form Commissions serve on the Evaluation Committee. The Department was consulted prior to releasing the RFP.

Chair Buss wanted to know why it would not have been possible to come to the commission first before the RFP. Wouldn't it save a lot of time down the road for potential responders knowing that historic preservation is something that the Commission really wants.

Ms. Inchausti stated that if they did not have an expert in house then absolutely.

Ms. Laughner stated that the City of Tempe legal team was part of the building of the RFP and was considering that the City needed to get Council Approval first for what they were looking for in the redevelopment. Since City staff was using the most recent 2012 RFP and the preservation of the site itself was included City staff believed that they were checking off that box of what should be in the RFP.

Chair Buss stated that the City Council wanted an advisory commission so they should have let the commission weigh in and put a sentence or two in the RFP regarding preservation for the site.

Ms. Laughner stated that Mr. Southard did have a lot of input on the proposal itself and they did have to pare down a lot of the things that Mr. Southard did provide. The RFP is meant to be general and broad and leave room for creativity. Where the proposals will be ones that understand redevelopment work and they understand preservation.

Commissioner Montero stated that she agrees with Chair Buss about the process. Where the Commission is here to review and give some input on these types of documents. Looking at the RFP there was a statement that indicated it is the City's preference that the National Register Values be maintained. Where she would want to know why that is not a requirement that they be maintained instead of a preference. It sounds optional. Would there be an opportunity to amend that RFP and make that one statement a little bit stronger.

Ms. Goodman stated that the City can issue an addendum any time before the due date. If it is getting closer to the due date the City has the option to extend the due date to allow for the information to be prepared in their response.

Chair Buss asked when will the proposal come to the commission for their input.

Ms. Goodman stated they will have the commission input on the Evaluation Committee if the chair agrees to be on the Committee. During the evaluation all the information will be kept confidential. The Committee can take the Chair input but until the recommendation is made everything is confidential. Once that decision becomes public and is presented to the Council for the recommendation then there can be additional input outside of the Evaluation Committee.

Ms. Laughner stated that what she has seen with other RFP that she is running. The proposals that come in provide significant questions to the panel so there is a going back and forth before it is determined as a panel if there is a valuable project. With the holidays coming up the Commission should be looking at maybe January for a more realistic time period.

Chair Buss asked if the City would be able to change the wording from preference to require in the RFP for preservation on the Flour Mill as Commissioner Montero requested.

Ms. Goodman stated the addendum can be issued by the end of the week.

Commissioner Williams stated that she is thankful for the City staff on clarifying the process. The Tribes see Tempe Butte as a culture property and any physical alteration to the landscape is important the Tribes and they wish to be consulted on. Whoever is selected would be helpful to be open to speaking with the Tribes and hear their concerns.

2) Voting of the Meeting Minutes

Motion by Commissioner Montero to approve the Meeting Minutes of September 13, 2021 ; second by Commissioner Garraty. Motion passed on 9-0 vote.

Ayes: Chuck Buss, Chris Garraty, Jim Garrison, Elizabeth Gilbert, Gregory Larson, Laurene Montero, Joe Nucci, Reyllynne Williams, Kyle Woodson

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Absent: None

3) Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage at Old St. Mary's Church (230 East University Drive)

Presentation by Staff, John Southard, Historic Preservation Officer

Mr. Southard informed the Commissioners that the sign package involves two signs on the South primary façade of the building and one on the non-historic wall enclosure for machinal units and things. Mr. Southard showed the commissioners how the two signs on the South façade would look. The two signs were designed to emulate the corner stone. In doing so they are compatible and distinct. The proposal calls for mounting the signage using 3/16 of an inch mounting hardware to be inserted into the joints. Mr. Southard went down to the site and took measurements and the average joint width for the historic joint is one quarter of an inch. Many are wider than one quarter of an inch. This is not something that adversely affect the physical material of the building. This something that is compatible, distinct, and reversible. It does not impair the integrity of the look. The façade is in scale with the building. Staff recommends approval.

Presentation from Applicant representative: Andrew Chi

Mr. Chi informed the Commissioners that in the report it says that the applicant wishes to paint the Tempe National Bank building. This is not the Tempe National Bank building. And the applicant is not repainting the old Church building. He also clarified that sign one and three do not illuminate. Sign two does light up at night and it is halo illuminated.

Commission Discussion

Chair Buss stated that it will be nice to see some signage on the church where right now it seems a little lost in history.

Motion by Commissioner Nucci to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage at Old St. Mary's Church located at 230 East University Drive; second by Commissioner Garrison. Motion passed on 9-0 vote.

Ayes: Chuck Buss, Chris Garraty, Jim Garrison, Elizabeth Gilbert, Gregory Larson, Laurene Montero, Joe Nucci, Reylayne Williams, Kyle Woodson

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Absent: None

4) Historic Preservation Plan Update

Presentation by Staff, John Southard, Historic Preservation Officer

Mr. Southard informed the Commissioners that the Plan is nearly complete. There have been several meetings with key stake holders. Most of the meetings have been held at the Pueblo Grande Museum. The most recent meetings have been with the consultants. Dr. Andy Darling submitted a draft of the Tribal component and the response back was no revisions suggested. There was a public meeting several months ago and there will be another public meeting on October 20, 2021 this meeting will be virtual. If it is moved forward it will come to the Historic Preservation at the November 10, 2021 meeting. And then submitted to City Council once the Historic Preservation Commission approves it.

5) Chair / Staff Updates

Mr. Southard informed the Commissioners that the HPC conference registration page is up. The Conference is scheduled for October 27 – 29, 2021. It will be held at the Double Tree by Hilton. At the Southwest corner of Priest and Broadway.

There are several sesquicentennial events that is to take place in the City. Mr. Smith informed the commissioners that October 13, 2021 the historical society invited Mayor Woods to come and speak. October 31, 2021 is the Double Buttes cemetery tour. The Exhibit opening, Tempe Gala reception on Friday November 5, 2021. Sunday November 7, 2021 is the big celebration of the sesquicentennial from 12pm to 6pm at Tempe Town Lake.

Mr. Southard informed the Commissioners that he will be sending out communication on the demolishing applications that were received for historic eligible properties. Located at 600 W 5th Street, and 606 S Roosevelt. Because the homes are classified as historic eligible the Historic Preservation Commission Ordinance calls for a 30-day review and comment period once a full applicant has been received. Both applications are in fact complete and during that 30-day period it is hope that the owners of the property will talk to stakeholders and others in the community to identify other options besides demolishing. If by the end of the 30-day period, an alternate to demolition is not identified and if all other city requirements are meet the issue of the demolition will be granted without Historic Preservation officer approval.

The November meeting may be a hybrid meeting which will be located at Hatton Hall. At the moment there are no action items on the agenda.

Ms. Seyler informed the commissioners that City Council will be meeting in person starting October 14, 2021. The direction has been to continue with a hybrid meeting option so that those that are able to attend in person can speak on any agenda. As everyone is aware Mr. Southard last day is November 17, 2021 would be nice to see him off in person.

Hearing adjourned at 7:03pm

Prepared by: Brittainy Nelson, Administrative Assistant
Reviewed by:

Steve Abrahamson, Principal Planner

SA:bn