



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, July 22, 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, and Natalie Barlow. Suzy Mound and Denise Guth had an excused absence. Staff present: Al Sengstock, Zoning Administrator and Jennifer Julian, Minute Taker.

ITEM 2: Approve meeting minutes of June 24, 2015

Ms. Currier moved to approve the minutes of June 24, 2015 with changes as provided by Mr. Freund. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hardie. The motion passed unanimously.

ITEM 3: Public Comment

There was no public comment.

ITEM 4: Review and approve changes from last session.

Mr. Freund passed out a list of changes to both the minutes and the plan from last session.

On page 36 of the plan, Mr. Freund pointed out a comma that was missed from last session. The sentence should read: Although a primary mode of transportation to and from Jerome is vehicular, pedestrian paths and corridors are the primary mode of circulation within the Town.

Ms. Currier read the red Item 1 from page 37. She would like to add "parking" so that the Item reads: Enforce fire lane, parking, double parking, and roadway obstruction codes and ordinances. The committee agreed after discussion.

Ms. Moore suggested deleting "where feasible" from Item 3, because deliveries would be only exception to this. Mr. Sengstock suggested beginning the Item with "prohibit" instead of "direct." The committee disagreed with this and after discussion it was agreed to strike "where feasible" so that the new items reads: Direct industrial and commercial traffic along routes which do not pass through residential neighborhoods.

Ms. Barlow felt that the original Item 3 is fine how it is, along with pertinent information in the new Item 3.

Per Mr. Freund's suggestion, the committee agreed to remove the word "lot" from Item 5. It now reads: Encourage greater pedestrian activity by developing new parking opportunities...

Ms. Currier observed that Item 4 is impossible but a good goal.

In Item 6, Mr. Freund suggested adding “if necessary” so that the Item reads: “Review and if necessary arrange for the protection...” The committee thought that addition was too finicky. The item was not changed.

On page 38, Item 7, Ms. Barlow suggested the word “changed” instead of “expanded.” Mr. Freund suggested “altered.” The committee discussed the change of use and that if a business expands, it is supposed to get additional parking. The relevant code was consulted and Mr. Sengstock said that it is a question of enforcement. After discussion, the item as written was accepted.

On page 38, in the Railroad section, Mr. Freund pointed out a missing hyphen from history-minded tourists.

Ms. Currier said that the phrase “hiking and biking” is still in this paragraph. Ms. Moore suggested changing from “hiking and biking” to “non-motorized transport.” Ms. Barlow wondered why this is considered part of town. After general discussion, Mr. Sengstock suggested changing this to “non-motorized alternatives.”

Ms. Hardie wondered if the historical railroad attraction needs to be included. Isn't it too detailed? Mr. Freund thought it was important to include this. Ms. Currier wondered if it would be relevant 35 years from now when the plan is redone again. Ms. Barlow preferred not changing the sentence from “hiking and biking” to “non-motorized alternatives,” but agreed to accept it. The committee agreed and the phrase now reads: ...as well as investigating the possible use of abandoned railroad right-of-ways to be used for non-motorized alternatives should be investigated.

On page 38, on the bottom red paragraph, Mr. Freund suggested removing the word “to” so that the phrase reads: ...there are now numerous daily airport shuttle trips scheduled between the Verde Valley and Sky Harbor Airport in Phoenix.

On page 39 in the first red paragraph, Ms. Currier questioned the line “Jerome is currently listed as the third most visited tourist destination in Arizona.” Why is this necessary? Ms. Barlow agreed and asked where this statistic came from.

Ms. Currier asked about the last line on page 38 regarding shuttles and additional visitors to Jerome. Mr. Freund said shuttles are coming. Ms. Moore said that shuttles may reduce vehicle traffic to Jerome. Ms. Currier said she doesn't see how.

Ms. Hardie asked about the area's multi-modal transportation plan and the proposed Verde Valley national monument. Mr. Sengstock said that the Town is not a stakeholder in that, but he is attending the meeting. He has talked to the CAT system about connecting a Jerome shuttle to CAT at the Number 1 convenience store. He likes the possibility of a shuttle as a long-range plan. There was discussion among the committee regarding shuttles that already come to Jerome. There was no consensus so Mr. Sengstock will rewrite the paragraph for next time.

On page 39, Ms. Currier read the second red paragraph. She disagrees with the whole town being paved. Ms. Hardie said that no one wants to pave the Gulch. Mr. Freund said that this paragraph is referring to poorly paved areas. Ms. Currier would like to leave those areas as they are. Ms. Hardie said this is referring to parking on the side of the road. Ms. Currier would rather see firehose parking striping rather than pavement. Natalie wants the last sentence to read “is a primary objective” rather than “must be a primary objective”. The committee did not comment.

On page 40, Ms. Currier pointed out a missing “e” in “Jerome's.” Mr. Freund pointed out a transposed period in Item 2 on the same page.

On page 41, Mr. Freund suggested changing the second sentence of the Topography paragraph to “Many of the Town's existing streets are affected by retaining walls which are often in need of repair.” Doug has suggestion for

the new topography section. Ms. Currier suggested it read “some of which are in need of repair.” The committee agreed on the new sentence: “Many of the Town’s existing streets are affected by retaining walls, some of which are in need of repair.”

Mr. Freund also recommended removing “both” from the next sentence. It should read: The challenge is to develop funding mechanisms which will allow the Town to keep its historic streetscape, while keeping streets safe.

Ms. Hardie wondered if it was necessary to refer to the “funding mechanisms.”

Ms. Currier wondered why the explanation of “cut and fill” was omitted from the new paragraph. It needs the old verbiage as well as the illustrations.

Ms. Moore wondered if the last two sentences of the original paragraph could be kept, along with “see illustration.” Mr. Sengstock said that he understood the intent of the committee and he will rewrite it to make it clear.

Ms. Barlow asked that the word “traffic” be included in the new paragraph at the bottom per Ms. Guth’s previous remark. The line should read “... it will complete an inventory of the location and conditional of all traffic signs...”

There was general discussion about last paragraph regarding drainage. The committee is waiting for the recent drainage survey before addressing this.

Ms. Hardie asked about the last sentence of the new paragraph at the bottom of page 41. Why not say Town revenue streams rather than grants? Mr. Sengstock said that it is normal business practice for any town to seek grants. Ms. Moore suggested: Jerome will continue to pursue all funding sources as an effort to make such improvements. The committee agreed.

On page 42, in the new paragraph, Mr. Freund changed “we will continue this process” to Jerome will continue this process.

It was pointed out that the first sentence of that paragraph had been struck in the previous meeting. Ms. Moore, following a suggestion in the previous meeting, proposed: Jerome will continue its ongoing maintenance program, while working with ADOT to create a better directional and safety sign program, as well as a more effective street striping program.

Ms. Hardie wondered why the plan is inconsistent when referring to people in the town as both residents and citizens. She prefers residents. Mr. Sengstock will check to see what is standard.

The committee discussed the new Item 2 (mislabeled 5) on page 42. The Item should read Investigate and determine possible improvements to the turning radius of Jerome’s most problematic streets.

Ms. Currier thought that Item 1 should begin with “Public Works shall develop a specific and prioritized program...” Ms. Moore suggested that it say “The Town shall develop...” While the committee liked that suggestion, Ms. Currier felt that it would be too easy to pass the buck. Following general discussion regarding public works and delegation, Mr. Sengstock suggested: The Town’s Public Works Department shall develop a specific and prioritized maintenance program... which was accepted.

The committee agreed to strike Item 4 from the bottom of page 42 as it was completed.

On page 43, in the Parking section, Ms. Hardie read the first sentence of the original paragraph. She felt it was

important to include that on-street parking intrudes into the roadway. Ms. Moore agreed. The committee discussed further if it is "often" a problem for people to park a great distance from their homes. This is a problem on some streets, but the committee agreed to delete "often". "Citizens" should also be changed to "residents." The new paragraph reads: Jerome pre-dates the automobile, subsequently its roads are narrow, and in many cases there is barely room for on-street parking without intruding into the roadway. As a result, especially during peak tourist seasons, parking opportunities are limited. This can mean that Jerome's residents have to park a significant distance from their homes.

Mr. Sengstock pointed out two minor changes to the second new paragraph near the bottom of page 43 (removing an extra comma and adding the word "a"). There was general discussion about parking challenges in the Town, especially since the lower parking lot is no longer available. Ms. Currier felt that the last sentence should read "parking options and improvements may be considered" rather than "must be." Mr. Freund said that the committee absolutely needs to include a philosophical statement in the plan's introduction about visitors and historic towns.

Mr. Freund passed out a revised "Pedestrian Walkways" section for discussion at a later date.

On page 44, in the new Items under Commercial Parking, Mr. Freund suggested adding a new Item 5: "Initiate a public relations effort to encourage employees to park outside the commercial area."

The committee discussed the proposed shuttle system. It was agreed to leave it in as a long-range dream.

Ms. Barlow felt that Item 1 should read "may be paved" rather than "should be paved." Mr. Freund said that maybe paving is not the best option. Ms. Moore suggested "improved." Mr. Sengstock said that he supports defined parking to help people know where and how to park. Mr. Freund suggested "should be clearly delineated" rather than "should be clearly striped."

The committee agreed to remove the reference to the Lower Lot in the next sentence in Item 1.

The committee discussed Item 2 and paving vs. not paving. Mr. Sengstock suggested "resurfaced." Ms. Moore suggested "improved." The committee will continue discussion of the Parking section at the next meeting.

ITEM 5: Continue review of Parking Element Including Changes

The committee ended discussion on page 44, Parking Recommendations.

ITEM 6: Future Agenda Items

There were no future agenda items.

ITEM 7: ADJOURNMENT

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

Respectfully submitted by Jennifer Julian on August 26, 2015.

Approved: _____

Chair

Date: _____

8/26/2015

Attest: _____

Vice Chair

Date: _____

8-26-15