

## DRAFT MINUTES HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION NOVEMBER 10, 2021

Minutes of the regular hearing of the Historic Preservation commission, of the City of Tempe, which was held at the Don Cassano Community Room, 200 E 5TH Street 2nd Floor, Tempe, Arizona.

### Regular Meeting 6:00 PM

| <b>Present:</b>   | <b>Staff:</b>                                |
|-------------------|--|
| 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                  |
| Laurene Montero   | Shelly Seyler, Interim Com Dev Director      |
| Joe Nucci         |  |
| Reylynne Williams |  |
| Kyle Woodson      |  |

#### 1) Voting of the Meeting Minutes

**Motion** by Commissioner Woodson to approve the Meeting Minutes of October 13, 2021; second by Commissioner Montero. Motion passed on 8-0 vote.

**Ayes:** Chuck Buss, Chris Garraty, Jim Garrison, Elizabeth Gilbert, Laurene Montero, Joe Nucci, Reylynne Williams, Kyle Woodson

**Nays:** None

**Abstain:** None

**Absent:** Gregory Larson

#### 2) Oidbađ Do'ag / Tempe Butte Trailhead, Revegetation, and Interpretive Element Conceptual Design Presentation

Presentation by Staff, John Southard, Historic Preservation Officer

Mr. Southard informed the commissioners that Peter Buseck will be given a presentation of the Tempe Butte Trailhead Conceptual Design. Peter and his late wife Alice were 1995 Tempe Volunteer of the Year. They came to Tempe in 1963 where they spent the bulk of their adult life, they raised their kids in Tempe where they attended Tempe Public Schools. They are looking to give back to the community ideally with something that combines their interest in nature.

Presentation from Applicant: Peter Buseck

Mr. Buseck informed the commissioners that Tempe Butte is known to all. The land turns out to be secret to the Four Southern Tribes and beautiful to the public. Looking at the Butte one can tell that it has been abused. The goal is to create a park on the west side of the Tempe Butte. The Park would be educational about the Four Southern Tribes. In 2018 spoke with Lauren Kurby and was referred to Steven Methvin. Sunday January 2019 at

8am Steven Methvin and Mr. Buseck visited parks around Tempe to get a sense of the project. May 2019 there was a Tempe Roundtable Meeting with Steven Methvin and department heads. The resolute of the meeting is that nothing can be done without the buy in of the Tribes. Two Years went by and nothing happened he started to reach out to the Tribes on his own with no luck. However, during those Two years he did some research at other sites and how they had signs that were educational. He then learned that Tempe had a Historic Preservation officer and met with Mr. Southard, Alex Smith, Jacob Butler, and Shane Anton. The next step in the process was to come up with a detailed plan. Logan Simpson was identified as a potential consultant. Mr. Buseck was willing to pay for the park out of his own pocket. SRP-MIC were on board with the ideal. Logan Simpson then prepared a plan and the proposed landscape and hardscape for a park were presented September 10<sup>th</sup> the landscape plan was completed. Mr. Buseck showed the commissioners the plans for the park. However, on September 10 Tempe issued an RFP for the area covered by the landscape plan. The RFP pre-empts discussion of park and thus Landscape report and proposal. Reached out to Tempe staff in September with no reaction so then sent an email to Mayor and City Council on October 4<sup>th</sup> still no reaction. Followed up with a email to City Council and Mayor titled extraordinary opportunity and ignored donation. This created a flurry of emails and phones calls. The RFP brought questions that he would like to know. For instance, was issuance of RFP at the same time as the Landscape plan coincidental? Why were SRP-MIC representatives not consulted? Wouldn't this contradict spirit of Tempe resolutions honoring tribal traditions? Was the Historic Preservation Commission consulted before the RFP? Was the RFP rushed? The Public park goal is enjoyment and betterment of the public. The private development is return on investment. The Goals are incompatible assuming identical land use, why not have a park to keep land in the public domain? In conclusion he believes that a new downtown park would be a source of civic pride. Beautiful setting with a native vegetation. Educational signage about tribal traditions. Place for Tribal demonstrations or cultural events in Downtown Tempe. Would give meaning to resolutions about respecting Tribal culture and traditions.

#### **Commission Discussion**

Commissioner Garraty asked what tone was the reply that Mr. Buseck received from the City in October.

Mr. Buseck stated that they were positive feedback, and he was happy that others were sharing in his vision.

Chair Buss stated that he is aware that the City will complete the RFP process in a couple of months not years, so he asks that Mr. Buseck be patient.

Mr. Buseck stated that there is limited time at this point and the best time for him to give.

Commissioner Montero stated that the Commission did express concerns about not having the RFP review before it went out. So that is not something the Commission can speak about. However, she really likes the presentation and as Chair Buss stated since the RFP did go out the Commission, they have to wait till the process is complete to revisit and work the plans together.

Ms. Seyler stated that she apologizes for not being there in person however she has come down with and Cold and did not want to expose anybody. However, she did reach out to those who issued the RFP and the attorneys office and was informed that there is limited information on what the City Staff can say. Only because they are still undertaken the RFP process. The response time frame did close November 4, 2021 and the City will be able to share information soon. Only the names to the respondent to the RFP can be revealed while the submittals are being evaluated. Which Chair Buss has been invited to and accepted being a part of the committee. She apologizes that she is not able to say more. She was on the call with Peter and Steven last week. The city does want to be responsive to the emails. Chair Buss is correct the process will not take years but a few months. She has participated in a few RFP processes and once the committee has a chance to meet and evaluate those and a selected party is chosen, and a selection is made that would conclude the process.

Chair Buss asked if she was aware if any one respondent to the RFP.

Ms. Seyler stated that she is sure the City will be identifying who if anyone did response however she is not sure if she can share that information.

Chair Buss clarified and asked in general if there was an RFP and no one responded then would the City indicate that no one responded.

Ms. Seyler stated that she believes that is correct.

Mr. Southard stated on the Procurement website there are two respondents to the RFP being Venue Products and Sunbelt.

Commissioner Williams stated that she would like to Thank Mr. Buseck for his efforts in reach out to the Tribe about his ideal and his vision for Oidbad Do'ag/ Tempe Butte. It may seem like a long process, but she is sure that the emails that were sent out were received and please understand that they are very busy. She is aware that they have read the email.

3) Recommendation to City Council Regarding Historic Preservation Plan Update

Presentation by Staff, John Southard, Historic Preservation Officer

Mr. Southard informed the Commissioners that there have been public meetings one on April 26, 2021 and October 20, 2021. There is a draft plan available and in addition to working with the Historic Preservation Commission and the Public. There was a meeting that was led by Salt River and Gila River. The Key points of the plan have been discussed several times. Would like the commissioners to consider if the plan is ready for Council to approve the plan. The commissioners should have received the information in their packets with the recommendations and key points.

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Woodson asked for clarification on if this is a motion to move this forward to council.

Mr. Southard informed the Commissioners that if the commission were so inclined to support the plan and move it forward to Council. If the Commission does not then his predecessor would have the option to bring it back at some point in the future.

Chair Buss stated he is like mined and think that it is ready to go to Council.

**Motion** by Commissioner Montero to approve the Historic Preservation Plan be sent to City Council; second by Commissioner Woodson. Motion passed on 8-0 vote.

**Ayes:** Chuck Buss, Chris Garraty, Jim Garrison, Elizabeth Gilbert, Laurene Montero, Joe Nucci, Reylynne Williams, Kyle Woodson

**Nays:** None

**Abstain:** None

**Absent:** Gregory Larson

4) Blanket Monitoring, Discovery, and Treatment Plan Project Update

Presentation by Staff, John Southard, Historic Preservation Officer

Mr. Southard informed the commissioners that he would like for Commissioner Garraty to give a brief update on the plan and the information that was disclosed in the packet that they received. Commissioner Garraty works with Logan Simpson and they are seeking a consensus and discussion on what they have received.

Commissioner Garraty stated that there are several goals for this project which where to identify cultural resources within the City and identify Tempe Cultural properties. Then also develop a management plan for the City. What Logan Simpson team is presenting is the problematic statement which has broad ideas about the City management of archaeological resources. The first part is a restatement of normal procedures. The Second part is dealing with areas that are known or strongly suspect contain archaeological resources, but they are not designated as sights

for the purpose of the plan they are called archaeological sensitive zone. Which the plan calls for the City to treat them as an established site. The reason is because the law is geared toward things that are in a site. There was an effort to drill down the guidelines to help with the TCP. The last part of the plan is to have the City commit to a full resource of the City. Aware that the Urbanized areas will be difficult one still can look at the green spaces.

### **Commission Discussion**

Commissioner Montero stated that she is pleased about the identifying archaeologically sensitive areas and putting them in sections. This is done in Phoenix for certain sites.

Commissioner Garraty stated that the goal is to widen the sensitivity zone to encompass more of the ASM sites.

Mr. Southard stated that the ASM site was the area that was focused on by the expedition in which the boundary was drawn. But it is a much larger site or collection of sites. The value is to identify areas that are suspected to be so looking strictly at ASM sites there is an exclusion of ASU sites, Pablo Site, Sites that were documented by others through the years.

Chair Buss stated if there were no objections then it will be a consensus.

Commission gave a consensus in favor of the plan.

#### 5) Discussion of Demolition Permit Application for 600 West 5<sup>th</sup> Street

##### **Presentation by Staff, John Southard, Historic Preservation Officer**

Mr. Southard informed the commissioners that there are two applications that were submitted for Demolition that are eligible as historic properties. Under the Tempe Preservation Ordinance historic eligible properties are properties that have been classified as potentially eligible in the Tempe Historic Property register by the Tempe Historic Preservation Commission it is not a designation. So, alterations to or demolition of does not require a HPC or HPO approval. In the case of historic eligible properties there is a 30-day comment period that is open once a complete application has been submitted. The 30-day period ends Wednesday November 10, 2021. The owner of the property has indicated that he has no intention of retaining the building as 600 W 5<sup>th</sup> Street. The second property at 606 S Roosevelt has a proposal in the works for 11 attached homes. It would not need to go before the City Council. Mr. Abrahamson would be able to know more this matter.

Mr. Abrahamson stated that Mr. Southard is correct. It will need to go before the Development Review Committee, but it is by right.

Mr. Southard also informed the commissioners that the 30day review period expires on November 12, 2021. Outreach has been done for both owners and documentation has been suggested and documentation has been planned but is not required.

### **Commission Discussion**

Commissioner Woodson asked if these properties are a part of the inventory that was completed.

Mr. Southard stated that there are property inventory forms both from the 1980's. There is some information but not a comprehensive documentation. It is Mr. Southard understanding that both property owners desire to redevelop the property.

Chair Buss stated that he is very sad to the properties go and wish that there was something that could be done.

6) Discussion of Demolition Permit Application for 606 South Roosevelt Street

Agenda Item 5&6 were discussed as one item.

7) Approval of 2021 Historic Preservation Commission Annual Report

Presentation by Staff, John Southard, Historic Preservation Officer

Mr. Southard stated that the information needs to be presented to the City Clerk's office by December. This is also a way to generate a smoother transition to the next person to take office.

**Motion** by Commissioner Montero to approve the Historic Preservation Commission Annual Report; second by Commissioner Woodson. Motion passed on 8-0 vote.

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

**Nays:** None

**Abstain:** None

**Absent:** Gregory Larson

8) Election of Vice-Chair

Presentation by Staff, John Southard, Historic Preservation Officer

Mr. Southard informed the Commissioners that Vice Chair Ball resignation became official in June of 2021. This has been several months now, and it is having left an open Vice Chair position. Chair Buss terms out with 8 years in March of 2022.

Chair Buss stated he started that he was appointed in 2014 where someone has started a three-year term that and only served about a year of it.

**Commission Discussion**

Commissioner Montero nominate Commissioner Nucci.

Commissioner Nucci stated that he would like to nominate Commissioner Montero.

Commissioner Garrison stated that he seconds the nomination of Commissioner Montero.

Mr. Southard did inform the Commissioners that generally the protocol is that the nominee is asked if they are willing and able to serve.

Chair Buss asked if the Vice Chair will be there till march and then move to Chair or would there be another election in March to elect a Chair and Vice Chair.

Mr. Southard stated that it would depend on when the Commission would like to hold the election. It has been normally at the beginning of the year.

Commissioner Montero stated that she is not able to serve in Vice Chair capacity at the time.

Commissioner Nucci stated that he is going to have to decline the nomination as well.

Chair Buss gave the commissioners an option to hear this again next month or wait till March 2022 to have another election.

The Commissioner agreed to have the election of both the Chair and Vice Chair in March 2022.

9) Recruitment of Historic Preservation Officer update

Mr. Abrahamson stated that it is bittersweet that Mr. Southard is leaving the City. At this point there are six candidates that were invited for first round of interview on October 22, 2021. The interview panel had representatives from the Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community, the historic preservation commission, and the Tempe History Museum, as well as staff from Community Development. Three candidates were moved forward and interviewed for the second round on November 4, 2021 and November 8, 2021. Staff is reviewing the reference of the three candidates and ranking them on the interview performance and references and will be decided on the offer. All three candidates for consideration are from out of state. Because of transition time the new Historic Preservation Officer will be in place by January 2022 at the latest.

**Commission Discussion**

Chair Buss asked if there is not a replacement in early December will there still be a meeting.

Mr. Abrahamson stated that yes there will be a December meeting and that the City will point an Interim in Mr. Southard place.

10) Chair / Staff Updates

Mr. Abrahamson stated that John Southard is leaving Wednesday November 17, 2021. Where John Southard is a historian who specializes in Arizona History with an emphasis on Phoenix Metropolitan area. As a trained public historian Mr. Southard believes the practice of history to be of great value in understanding society. Viewing history as a field that can and should be viewed for all. He works to present his research in an accessible and engaging matter. Mr. Southard has been very proactive on the Historic Preservation Commission with 17 years as the Historic Preservation Officer. Mr. Southard has worked with and strengthened the relationship with the Four Southern Tribes. Mr. Abrahamson presented Mr. Southard with a certificate of appropriateness.

Ms. Seyler stated that she is only been in this role for 10 months and she would like to say thank you to John for being patient with her. As she is learning more about the role and always educating her on historic preservation and archaeology. And his willingness to teach everyone.

The Commissioners all gave their sincere well wishes for his next endeavor.

Mr. Southard informed the commissioners that Reggie McKay of Adobe technology has asked that a statement be read into the record on the Eisendrath House the statement is as follows:

*Results of deteriorating causes the building which is a single wide adobe structure single wall adobe bricks ten inches wide by 18 inches long and ten inches thick. The Adobe is placed ten inches long starting at the building base concrete stem leaving a ten-inch-wide wall. The Adobe has a cement plaster coating with a rough texture finish. The cement plaster has diagonal cracks throughout the exterior finish due to differential settlement. There are vertical tension cracks due to thermal extension and contraction. Horizontal compression cracks at the bottom of the building. The area inspected of the East corridor building had plaster delaminating from an adobe wall and showed evidence of rodent intrusion digging through the wall surface. Several other areas of the building are showing evidence of rodent intrusion the area that was inspected had been worked on in the past by others using unapproved means and method of repair. Leading to the suffering of the building from the new fix to the original wall. This appears throughout all exterior adobe walls. Total plaster area of the exterior has been patched, filled, and/or replastered throughout. It appears no scarifying of the original bond agents were used when applying new plaster on the original. There is coating at the base of several walls due to erosion caused by moisture build up and poor drainage. The planters against the adobe wall caused cracks and bubbles throughout the exterior wall. Failure of the repair evidence is throughout. To protect and save this building from deterioration each section of the wall should have the plaster removed the adobe properly repaired and plaster reapplied. The whole building does not need to be done at once. Work should be done fixing the most critical areas around the building till all walls are*

*completed. Work could be spaced over a five-year period. With a project maintenance cost going forward. All work should be completed by an experience knowledgeable team who can match adobe soils to the original and apply plaster using the same mix application and finish as close to the original as possible the team should consist of a preservation architect with structural engineer and material knowledge. Tempe historic preservation staff could evaluate line plaster instead of a cementitious plaster a yearly budget should be approved over a five-year period with all maintenance work required. All architects, builders want to believe that a building will last forever but that cannot be. Material and techniques have a measurable life span and must be maintained on a regular basis.*

11) Current Events / Announcements / Future Agenda Items

No items to discuss.

Hearing adjourned at 8:19pm

-----  
Prepared by: Brittainy Nelson, Administrative Assistant  
Reviewed by:

Steve Abrahamson, Principal Planner

SA:bn