



# TOWN OF JEROME

POST OFFICE BOX 335, JEROME, ARIZONA 86331  
(928) 634-7943 FAX (928) 634-0715

Founded 1876  
Incorporated 1899

## Minutes General Plan Steering Committee Wednesday, August 26, 2015 6:00 p.m. Jerome Town Hall, 600 Clark Street

### ITEM 1: Call to Order/Roll Call

Doug Freund called the meeting to order at 6:13 p.m.

Roll call was taken by Albert Sengstock, Zoning Administrator. Members present were Chair Doug Freund, Jane Moore, Margie Hardie, Mimi Currier, Suzy Mound, Denise Guth and Natalie Barlow.

Staff present were Al Sengstock, Zoning Administrator and Jennifer Julian, Minute Taker.

Members of the public present were Frank Vander Horst, Council member; Ellen Vojnic, business owner; and Shane Hughes, resident.

### ITEM 2: Approve meeting minutes of July 22, 2015

Ms. Moore moved to approve the minutes of July 22, 2015 with one change. The motion was seconded by Ms. Mound. The motion passed unanimously.

### ITEM 3: Public Comment

Ms. Ellen Vojnic, a local business owner, was in attendance. She understands from Chip Davis [Yavapai County District 3 Supervisor] that Yavapai County has not been asked to partner with the Town of Jerome recently. He is running for election [to the state legislature], so the Town should keep in contact with him as well as approach his replacement for future planning. The Town pays county taxes so it should work with the county on financing projects.

Ms. Moore wondered if the access to the lower level of Town Hall could be a project to work with the county on. Mr. Freund said that project is in the budget and the Mayor is in contact with Mr. Davis. Mr. Freund also said that perhaps the revised General Plan could be shared with Mr. Davis when it is finalized.

Apropos of Ms. Vojnic's comment, Ms. Guth believes that the Town is not utilizing all its resources. For example, the Committee discussed the "long-range dream" of a proposed shuttle system at the last meeting. She understood that the Town had not contacted the county to collaborate on funding a shuttle system. It is an example of not contacting entities who have an interest in the Town. Furthermore, Ms. Guth believes a shuttle should not be reserved as a long-range dream but considered a more urgent issue for the following reasons: 1) fewer people driving around; 2) clears streets more quickly; 3) exudes hospitality; 4) reduces traffic; 5) reduces fatigue of some visitors resulting in fewer emergencies and longer stays.

Ms. Currier said, "During budget meetings, the Chamber of Commerce, who certainly should have an interest in a shuttle system as much as anyone in this town, shot it down."

Mr. Freund said that this is a discussion to have with Town Council.

Ms. Guth said that the Town hasn't contacted the county even though they have money and want to help. The Town

should explore funding from all possible agencies rather than raising taxes to maintain the quality of life residents have now and ameliorate some of the problems.

There was general discussion regarding a Town shuttle. Mr. Freund appreciated the comments and assured the committee that the shuttle is still on the table. He recommended that individuals who feel strongly about a shuttle contact the mayor and make a public petition during a Town Council meeting.

There was no additional public comment.

Mr. Freund asked to move Item 6 on the agenda forward. He distributed an outline of the Economic Development section from 1981 general plan. This section has changed dramatically and will need to be created from scratch. He asked that the committee members review the existing economic section and put together an outline for the new section for the next meeting. The committee agreed.

**ITEM 4: Review and approve changes from last session.**

On page 36, Mr. Freund felt that Items 1 and 2 say the same thing. He prefers the original Items. Ms. Moore agreed. Ms. Currier agreed but pointed out that transportation system should be changed to circulation system in Item 1. Ms. Barlow disagrees that Items 1 and 2 say the same thing. She prefers the new Item 2 which was already settled on by the committee. Ms. Moore suggested keeping the original Item 1 and the new Item 2. The committee agreed to strike the new Item 1 but keep the new Item 2.

On page 37, Ms. Barlow said that the old and new Item 6 do not match each other at all. After discussion, it was explained that some items have been eliminated and rewritten, so the content of each number may not match. Ms. Barlow was satisfied.

The committee discussed the confusion of having comparisons of the old and new plan on the same document (black original text and red new text). Ms. Guth favored having both versions together to aid in evaluation. Ms. Hardie does as well. Mr. Freund felt like it was time to begin considering the plan without the old version on the same document. Mr. Sengstock proposed reviewing the section without the old version at the next meeting.

On Page 38, Mr. Freund pointed out a change that had been missed: Jerome relied heavily.

Also on page 38, in the red paragraph, Ms. Hardie suggested changing the second sentence to the smelter from a smelter. The committee agreed. She also felt that the phrase "history-minded tourists" was too limiting. However, after some discussion, it was agreed not to change the phrase.

Ms. Hardie then suggested a new sentence for the paragraph: "The Verde Canyon Railroad is a popular destination with an average of 90,000 people per year taking the trip through the unique landscape of the Verde Canyon."

Ms. Moore and the rest of the committee seemed to approve of the sentence. Ms. Hardie was asked to write the sentence down and provide it to Mr. Sengstock.

Ms. Moore wondered about the phrase "connecting Jerome to this historical railroad attraction via shuttle services." She hopes it does not imply that visitors will park in Jerome and take a shuttle to the train. Ms. Hardie suggested "connecting visitors to the railroad to Jerome." There was general discussion about shuttle services and private tours. Ms. Hardie suggested "connecting Jerome and the Verde Canyon railroad be accomplished via shuttle services or other types of traffic-reducing transportation." There was no consensus.

Mr. Freund reminded the committee that the goals are to reduce traffic and connect to local attractions. Mr. Sengstock said that he is envisioning a future where people may be able to move by affordable regional mass transit between each community.

Ms. Barlow wondered if the phrase “as well as investigating the possible use of abandoned railroad right-of-ways” is repeated previously in the document. Mr. Freund did not recall but this instance refers specifically to the railroad’s history and possible future.

The committee seemed to feel that the paragraph was acceptable after including the minor changes mentioned above. Ms. Hardie will email her revised sentence to Mr. Sengstock for inclusion

On page 39, Ms. Currier wondered if the first sentence in red referred to air taxi services. Mr. Freund explained that it refers to airport shuttles to Sky Harbor Airport, not to air taxi services. Ms. Moore suggested removing the word “Although” and Mr. Freund suggested making the paragraph into two sentences. Ms. Hardie asked to change the word “handle” to “support.” The new paragraph reads *It is unlikely that the Cottonwood Airport will ever be able to support significant tourist or commuter traffic. There are now numerous daily airport shuttle trips scheduled between the Verde Valley and Sky Harbor Airport in Phoenix.*

Ms. Hardie asked about the use of “citizen” versus “resident.” Ms. Currier felt that “citizen” is more appropriate and implies that the individual has obligations. Mr. Sengstock also prefers “citizen” and wants to be consistent. Ms. Guth wondered what the difference is between “resident” and “citizen.” Ms. Currier said that “resident” could be used to describe someone who stays one night. A citizen is involved and has responsibilities.

Ms. Moore read the dictionary definitions of “citizen” and “resident.” A citizen is an inhabitant of a particular town or city. A resident is a person who lives somewhere permanently or long-term.

Mr. Freund thought the document could continue to use both terms. Either may be appropriate depending on the context.

Ms. Hardie also pointed out that the document uses both “tourist” and “visitor.” She thinks they are two different things. Mr. Freund felt the terms were interchangeable. It was agreed that “tourist” would be important in the Economic section.

Also on page 39, Ms. Hardie suggested adding “a main artery” before Interstate 17 in the last sentence of paragraph 1 in red. Ms. Mound felt that the sentence works as written. Mr. Freund pointed out that Interstate 17 is already referred to as a primary highway. The point was abandoned.

On page 40, Ms. Guth said that the Town’s original cobblestone paving is important but it is not mentioned in the new paragraph in red. She thought it should be included and Ms. Moore and Ms. Mound agreed. Ms. Guth felt that the new paragraph is campaigning for paving, while the committee has not agreed that is the way to go. She believes that the document needs to be specific about such important elements to aid people in the future. The committee agreed. Mr. Sengstock agreed that preservation is important to include in the background and he will rework the paragraph.

On page 41, in the topography paragraph, Mr. Freund suggested changing “keep its historic streetscape” to “*preserve its historic streetscape*” and the committee agreed.

On page 42, in the last line of the first red paragraph, Mr. Freund suggested changing “as an effort to make such

improvements" to "in an effort to make such improvements."

On page 42, Mr. Sengstock read the new paragraph based on the recent drainage survey. He is planning to include an exhibit to illustrate the problem flow areas. Mr. Freund agreed that some of the images from the drainage survey were informative. He felt that more of the drainage survey could be included in the plan.

There was a general discussion about storm drains and responsibility.

On page 43, in Item 1 in red, Mr. Freund said that the "are maintained" in yellow could be deleted.

With input from the committee, Mr. Sengstock read a revised paragraph: The Town's Public Works Department shall develop a specific and prioritized maintenance program, which assures that Town roads, road support structures, and sidewalks do not deteriorate further and where possible are improved. The program will identify specific locations which require major work.

On page 44, in the new paragraph, Mr. Freund suggested including an explanation of why the lower parking lot was lost. The phrase will read: "...as well as the loss of the lower parking lot due to subsidence."

On page 45, Ms. Guth objected to the new Item 2. When do we stop adding parking? Is there a balance? Mr. Freund pointed out that the issue has been under discussion and that the document definitely needs a philosophical statement regarding parking. There was general discussion about the philosophy of "find more parking" and the impact on residents.

Ms. Moore asked for clarification of the new Item 2. She suggested removing the word "Town" to make it more general. Ms. Barlow said "and/or land" needs to be deleted as well. The new Item 2 reads: Identify possible additional property which could be leased or purchased for additional parking.

**ITEM 5: Continue review of Parking Element Including Changes**

The committee ended discussion on page 45, Pedestrian Walkways.

**ITEM 6: Future Agenda Items**

Addressed previously.

**ITEM 7: ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Freund made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Mound seconded. The motion carried unanimously and the meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Jennifer Julian on September 23, 2015.

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: Oct. 28, 2015  
Chair

Attest: J Moore \_\_\_\_\_ Date: 10-28-15  
Vice Chair