

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
(HPAC)  
OF  
ARIZONA STATE PARKS  
Lath House, Heritage Square  
115 N. Sixth Street  
Phoenix, AZ  
June 24, 2004**

**A. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Chair Linoff called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Vivia Strang, Advisory Committee Coordinator, called roll and advised that there was a quorum present for the meeting.

**Committee Members Present:**

Vic Linoff, Chair  
Bill Coomer (arrived at 9:10 a.m.)  
Matt Jennings  
Jill McCormick  
Tom Rushin

**Committee Members Absent:**

Theresa Nesser  
Winston Thorne

**Arizona State Parks Staff:**

William Collins, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer/ Historian  
Sue Hilderbrand, Acting Chief of Grants  
Stephanie Sandrock, Grants Coordinator  
Vivia Strang, Advisory Committee Coordinator

**Guest:**

John Beshears, Executive Director Arizona Heritage Alliance

**B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS AND STAFF**

Members and staff introduced themselves.

## C. ACTION ITEMS

### 1. Approval of Minutes from May 17, 2004 meeting.

Mr. Rushin moved and Ms. McCormick seconded that the May 17, 2004 HPAC minutes be accepted as presented.

Motion passed 4-0.

## D. DISCUSSION OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION HERITAGE FUND GRANT PROGRAM

### 1. Draft Rating Criteria

Chair Linoff requested that a record of the HPAC meeting dates and time spent updating the Heritage Fund Grant manual be included in the presentation to the Arizona State Parks Board.

Ms. Sandrock reviewed changes made since the last HPAC meeting. SHPO consultation was eliminated as a requirement and included as part of the workshop attendance. It was decided that these elements would be mandatory. SHPO will be more involved in the workshops and will do the consultations at the workshops. Workshop attendance will be mandatory for at least one year due to the significant changes being made in the grant application. A description of project-specific planning documents pertinent to the type of grant project was added to the rating criteria. Further clarification on matching funds was provided and awarding of points was broken down into smaller categories.

Chair Linoff wants to further clarify some of the wording in the rating criteria. Under **End Use** the last sentence says, "provide available documentation to explain the intended use", he does not understand what documentation should be provided. Ms. Hilderbrand said the ideal would be using any kind of documentation and perhaps it should say "for example". If it is going to be a business, include a business plan. There should be some sort of planning document that says what the intended use will be.

Ms. Hilderbrand said this brings up the question of if somebody provides a narrative and says there are grand plans for a project but no documentation, is that okay. What kind of documentation would HPAC like to have provided.

Chair Linoff said some things are conceptual but in a thoughtful narrative the applicant should show an organized thought process of how a conclusion was reached. He is not sure that there will be a physical document to submit showing the intended end use.

## HPAC Minutes

June 24, 2004

Page 3 of 6

What HPAC is looking for is that the project will have a good use after all the money has been expended and maybe that comes through an organized thought process narrative.

Mr. Rushin said this appears to be a request for documentation. If the applicant has the documentation it will receive points.

Chair Linoff said some applications are not for future use projects but to stabilize an existing building or improve an existing structure that already has a good use. Then what happens. Ms. Sandrock said the applicant could provide that specific information and submit documentation like a strategic plan to show the end use.

Chair Linoff said he would like to put in some clarification on what does it mean to provide documentation. Help people understand how to complete an application.

Ms. Hilderbrand said if there is no end use for the project beyond what is already being done how are the points awarded.

Mr. Coomer said the purpose is to make sure that the project does not sit as an empty building.

Chair Linoff said it seems like most of the applications are for existing buildings and doing repairs. How are the majority of the applications handled that already have a good use.

Mr. Collins suggested awarding the application the five points if there is already a good use. Chair Linoff said okay.

Chair Linoff said under "Matching Funds" the sentence that says "only applicants providing cash for the required 40% match are eligible to receive extra points". He would like to have the sentence reworded so it is clearer to the applicant. The last

section says "10 points will be awarded for providing 59-60% + cash match", he thinks it should read 59% +.

Mr. Jennings asked what the final outcome on the National Register Nomination (NRN) requirement was.

Mr. Collins said he did not think a final decision had been made. He suggested that if a property has already been listed on the NRN it would receive points, if an applicant is applying for NRN as part of the grant application it would receive points. If the property is only eligible and a NRN is not part of the project, then it does not receive any points. The Register's value is validation of the property being worthy of preservation. It has gone through a public review process and has been approved.

Chair Linoff said as the competition goes up, as evident by more grant applications, this is a fair way of providing some separation. Mr. Collins said this applies to "Public Benefit" because some of the value to the public is the NRN listing. Points could be taken from the Community Impact total of 30 points and used for the NRN.

## HPAC Minutes

June 24, 2004

Page 4 of 6

Ms. Hilderbrand said it is not enough that an applicant just says the project includes a National Register Nomination or says an application has been made. There should be some kind of documentation provided.

Chair Linoff said the reality is the NRN application will not be completed before the grant is awarded. Ms. Sandrock said then the nomination process becomes part of the scope award and the application should at least go before the Historic Site Review Committee (HSRC) before the grant closes. At least that shows a review has been done regardless if the NRN Keeper has accepted the nomination or not.

Chair Linoff said some explanation should be provided to the applicant on why the National Register Nomination is important. This makes it clearer to the applicant on why some things are being asked for.

Mr. Coomer said the early involvement of SHPO will make a lot of things much clearer.

Mr. Collins asked HPAC how many points should be awarded for the NRN. He thinks that an applicant applying for a grant should be motivated to apply for NRN if the project is not listed yet.

Mr. Jennings felt that 3 points would be a good motivator.

Chair Linoff said the NRN could take longer to accomplish than doing the work being applied for through the grant process. He thought 3 points would be good. HPAC agreed that 3 points would be good.

Ms. Hilderbrand said awarding 3 points would leave 27 points for Public Benefit. Three points will be awarded for already having a NRN listing, 3 points will be awarded for having the NRN listing process included in the scope of work, and zero points given for not doing anything.

Chair Linoff said the project either has to be listed, in the process of being listed, or included in the scope of work.

Mr. Collins said applicants could be encouraged during the SHPO consultation to begin the NRN application process immediately.

Ms. Hilderbrand suggested that HPAC take a vote and formally approve the grant rating criteria. She recommended that HPAC attend the Parks Board meeting in July and present either a recommendation or present the information and request input from the Board and then come back and take a vote.

Mr. Jennings would like to have Board input before taking a final vote.

Chair Linoff would like to present the information to the Board telling where HPAC is at on the rating criteria.

## **HPAC Minutes**

**June 24, 2004**

**Page 5 of 6**

Mr. Rushin would like to have the Board's input and then have HPAC come back to consider any Board recommendations.

Chair Linoff would like to send a draft out to former grant applicants and get their input and comments.

Ms. Hilderbrand said the Heritage Preservation grant manual should go to print around the end of November.

Chair Linoff and Mr. Coomer asked Mr. Collins if it would be possible for HPAC to solicit input from the Historic Preservation Conference attendees. Chair Linoff and Mr. Coomer said HPAC members would provide the manpower for the table. People could be informed about, and invited to the August 9, 2004 HPAC meeting.

### **E. PUBLIC COMMENT**

John Beshears, Executive Director Arizona Heritage Alliance, introduced himself and encouraged HPAC members to contact him with any concerns or questions. He asked for model project locations to use when giving presentations about the Heritage Fund. Mr. Beshears also offered to speak about the Historic Preservation grant program when he attends the Historic Preservation Conference.

### **F. SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS, MATTERS OF BOARD PROCEDURE, REQUESTS AND ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS**

- Grant Rating Criteria
- Grant Policies
- Historic Preservation Grant Manual

### **G. TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING**

10:00 a.m.  
August 9, 2004  
Town of Cave Creek Council Chambers  
Cave Creek, Arizona

### **H. ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Rushin moved and Mr. Coomer seconded that the meeting be adjourned.

Motion passed 5-0.

Chair Linoff adjourned the meeting at 10:09 a.m.

**HPAC Minutes**

**June 24, 2004**

**Page 6 of 6**