

2022

Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission
Plans Review Subcommittee

LEGAL ACTION REPORT/Minutes

Thursday, March 10, 2022

Pursuant to safe practices during the COVID-19 pandemic, all in-person meetings are cancelled until further notice. This meeting was held virtually to allow for healthy practices and social distancing. The meeting was accessible at provided link to allow for participating virtually and/or calling in.

1. Call to Order / Roll Call

Meeting called to order at 1:05 P.M., and per roll call, a quorum was established.

Commissioners Present: Terry Majewski (Chair), Carol Griffith, Savannah McDonald, and Rikki Riojas

Commissioners Absent/Excused: Joel Ireland and Jan Mulder

Applicants/Public Present: Ian Sansom (DTM), John Burr, Martha McClements, and the following from Pima County Office of Sustainability and Conservation: Linda Mayro, Ian Milliken, Scott O'Mark, and Courtney Rose.

Staff Present: Michael Taku, Jodie Brown, and Dan Bursuck PDSD

2. Approval of the Legal Action Report (LAR)/Minutes for the Meeting of 2-24-22

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Riojas to approve the Legal Action Report/Minutes for the meeting of 2-24-22, as submitted.

Commissioner Griffith seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously by a roll call vote of 4-0. (Commissioners Ireland and Mulder absent)

3. Planning Projects – Informational Updates

[Note: 3b was heard before 3a.]

3a. Infill Incentive District (IID) Update

Staff Dan Bursuck (Principal Planner, Planning and Development Services Department [PDSD]) provided a summary of the project updates and discussed the rationale for proposed changes. He noted that Mayor and Council initiated an update to UDC 5.12, Downtown Infill Incentive District, on February 8, 2022, in

order to revise and review this section of code in advance of the sunset date on January 31, 2023, and then presented an overview of the scope and timeline for the code update. The IID is an optional zoning overlay for downtown, designed to lead to more dense urban development, things that are more pedestrian and bike friendly. In 2015, the provision was added to protect historic buildings. Staff Bursuck mentioned some past IID projects that have utilized the benefits of opting in. Some of these involved historic buildings, including Marist College. The IID is one of the tools that can implement the goals of eTOD [see below]. Revisions to the IID and eTOD planning are going along simultaneously, as there is a lot of overlap – doing things in tandem. A mix of housing types is needed. Post pandemic there may be less need for office space downtown. The City will be doing outreach, some in conjunction with eTOD. He wanted to be sure that PRS was informed at the outset. PDSD will be back with updates.

Chair Majewski asked if there were plans to delete any of the historic protections currently in the IID, and Staff Bursuck said he doubted that would happen. It would be good for PRS to continue discussion about this. Commissioner Griffith asked if any funding will be available down the road for rehabilitation or enhancement for existing historic communities. She addressed the need to consider people of all income ranges in studies for the update. Commissioner McDonald thanked Staff Bursuck for addressing many issues of concern to her and noted that she had worked on the Marist project.

No action was taken.

3b. Equitable Transit Oriented Development (eTOD) Update

Staff Brown deferred the introduction and discussion to City of Tucson Department of Transportation and Mobility (TDTM) staff.

Project Manager Ian Sansom (TDTM) presented an update on the planning for equitable Transit Oriented Development (eTOD) along a 14.5-mile north-south High-Capacity Transit corridor, connecting downtown Tucson to the Tucson airport on the south and the Tucson Mall on the north. In 2019, the City was awarded a 3-year Federal Transit Administration grant to plan for eTOD. Staff Sansom is the project manager for the grant. Planning for eTOD is a cross between transportation and land-use planning. They are currently in the first year of the grant and are starting outreach. Today he wants to bring awareness of the project, as it has the potential to impact historic neighborhoods, especially around downtown. He explained transit-oriented development, which is mixed-use and has multiple types of housing. eTOD incorporates affordability and accessibility. North Oracle Road is being considered as the corridor for development, with Stone as an option. Open houses on eTOD will be held on 3/18 and 3/19. They will be conducting outreach through the Spring. They will have a website and will do focus groups, community dialogues, and pop-up events. Chair Majewski asked him to share his presentation with Staff Brown, so it could be distributed to commissioners, particularly the Transportation Subcommittee. She also asked if someone from the Transportation Subcommittee could be included in a focus group and suggested that they present to the new City commission on equitable housing.

Commissioner Riojas brought up that during extended periods of construction it makes it harder for people with low transport accessibility to commute. She also favored the Stone corridor as opposed to the Oracle corridor. Discussion ensued about the pros and cons of each route. She also brought up bicycle lanes and connector routes to tie Oracle and Stone together, and Mr. Sansom said these would be added. Chair Griffith noted that she was disappointed with the Broadway widening, as it made it even less pedestrian friendly. She hopes that the trolley could be connected to the project we're discussing today. Why not expand the infrastructure that has already been built? Commissioner McDonald asked about the extent to which historic properties play into the analysis being conducted. Mr. Sansom noted that they are using a Denver-based firm and some local experts. Cultural-asset mapping is also desired. Chair Majewski reminded him we would like to receive a copy of the presentation. She also noted re the impending commission split. At some point in the future, separate outreach for this project will be needed for the City and the County. For the former, he would contact Staff Brown, and for the latter, he would contact Staff Mayro.

No action was taken.

4. Historic Preservation Zone Review Cases

UDC Section 5.8/TSM 9-02.0.0/Historic District Design Guidelines/Revised Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines

There were no cases for review.

5. Task Force on Inclusivity Recommendations

5a. Discussion on incorporation of the Task Force on Inclusivity report recommendations.

Commissioner Riojas, Commissioner Griffith, and Chair Majewski shared the latest outline of a best practices for naming document that had been prepared with PRS members as guidance for City and County departments and entities. Further edits were made "live" during the meeting, and these edits are documented below. Staff from the Pima County Department of Sustainability and Conservation were present for today's meeting. Linda Mayro was originally involved in meetings of the Task Force on Inclusivity and provided County-related information for their work.

Best Practices for Naming of City- and County-Owned Buildings Physical Assets, Structures, Objects, Roads, Parks, Landscapes, and Properties [discussed ending the title after "Physical Assets" and incorporating what this would cover in the introductory paragraph; PRS members agreed with this]

Place names can convey important information related to the significance and history of a property or place. The naming and renaming of City- and County-owned buildings, structures, objects, roads, landscapes, and properties should reflect the rich history, culture, and ethnic diversity of Tucson and Pima County. The Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission (TPCHC) created the Task Force on Inclusivity Regarding the Naming of City- and County-Owned Buildings and Properties to investigate current practices and make recommendations.

Based on the findings of this Task Force, the following are “Best Practices” recommended by the TPCHC. [PRS will take to full commission for approval]

1. Consider the meaning or significance of the proposed name
 - a. Appropriateness to (acceptance by) the surrounding area and the local (or impacted/referenced) community
2. If renaming, determine/evaluate why the new name is more relevant than the previous one. Renaming should be done if the original name is offensive to the community or other cultural group(s). [Waiting to receive the list mentioned by Commissioner Steere at the TPCHC meeting of 3-9-22, which has been prepared by the Department of the Interior, so that list can possibly be referenced.]
3. Conduct historical research to support proposed name
 - a. Information must be authenticated/cited.
 - b. If proposed name is that of a living person, research into their background is required, and the significance of their contribution must be established.
 - c. Is the name one already being used by residents in the area?
 - d. Are there any archaeological ties?
 - e. Was or is the property/landscape used by Native Americans?
 - f. Who has the property previously belonged to?
4. Determine/evaluate impact on the community
 - a. If approved, will there be a need for address changes?
 - i. List of affected properties/businesses
 - b. Does it bring representation of an underrepresented population whose contribution has been inadequately recognized?
 - c. Cost involved (any sign changes)
5. Obtain letters of support from surrounding community – e.g., neighbors in a neighborhood, nearby businesses if a commercial building
6. Hold public opinion meetings
 - a. Letter(s)/notice(s) given to the community regarding the meetings and the proposed change
 - b. Meeting minutes & community comments
 - c. Multiple meetings, at differing times, must be held in the vicinity of the proposed renamed building, structure, object, landscape, etc.
 - d. If affecting address changes, then resources on how to do so must be provided
7. Solicit full commission presentation [need to flesh out when this would be in play? Only when it's a designated or potentially eligible historic resource in an HPZ or in terms of the National Register of Historic Places?]
 - a. Letter of support generated if a majority of commission members support the name
 - b. Recommendation of other possible names by the commission
 - c. Distribute letter to ? Who sends the commission the naming request in the first place? At what point in the process? What has to change to make this happen? The City administrative directive would have to be modified. What about in the County? [Linda Mayro to provide more information on County naming policies.]
8. Considerations for Commemorative naming for living or deceased persons [need to determine if this is the appropriate place in the outline]

- a. The person has a direct and long-term or early association with the property being named.
- b. The person has made a significant contribution to the area, community, state where the property is located.
- c. The person played a significant role in the protection or long-term preservation of the property, community, or area for public benefit.
- d. The person has made a significant contribution to the restoration, rehabilitation, or maintenance of original elements of the property that convey its historical or cultural importance.

The document has purposefully excluded properties that are named after large donors due to existing legislation. It is still recommended that the document be used alongside the county's guiding principles to evaluate if a donor is of clean background and community supported. When naming a property after a living subject, special attention should be paid to historical distance and perspective in order to ensure applicability. At any time, the naming authorities of Pima County and the City of Tucson have the right to revoke a name should the name fail to follow county naming guidelines, prove inaccurate, or be named after an individual who is no longer reputable.

Also excluded in this document is the naming of streets, subdivisions, and other properties or geographic features that fall under the jurisdiction of the Arizona State Board on Geographic and Historic Names or the United States Board on Geographic Names. [discussed need to add links to appropriate websites]

In conclusion, the Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission supports naming and renaming if it is more representative of the history, culture, and ethnic diversity present within the City of Tucson and Pima County. The use of the "Best Practices" document provides both guidance and resources for ensuring more inclusive naming.

Possible resources for information concerning the history of the property and the community

- State Historic Preservation Office/City Historic Preservation Office-Context studies, National and State Registers of Historic Properties
- Tribal Historic Preservation Offices
- City and County Historic Preservation Offices
- Parking & Transportation
- Universities/special collections, Arizona State Museum
- Arizona Historical Society and local historical societies
- Federal land managing agencies such as National Park Service, US Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management
- National Register of Historic Places
- State land managing agencies such as Arizona State Land Department, Arizona State Parks

- State Library & Archives, including the Board on Geographic and Historic Names
- “Arizona Place Names” by Will C. Barnes
- Historical Maps - Sanborn maps, USGS maps
- *Historical Archaeology Research Guide* – This guide provides information on how to conduct historical research as well as a comprehensive source of records and where they are available. <https://www.arizonastateparks.com/SHPO>

End note [will format appropriately and add date in the blank space when finalizing the draft]: Links are current as of _____ and provided for ease of resource access to the general public. It is recommended they are checked and updated every 6–12 months to ensure consistency in access.

Notes regarding the revisions to the document presented to PRS on 3-10-22.

1. Consensus is to leave best practices document in outline format. [This version includes more proactive wording.]
2. Donations – the best practice document will not go into depth on donations but will include a statement about using best practices for naming/renaming where donations are involved, urge that best practices be followed when evaluating naming requests. [See the first and third paragraphs that were added following Item 8.]
3. Discussed adding a statement that the governing body (i.e., the City or County) should reserve the right to change a name at any time should the name end up being disreputable or not follow their guiding principles. [A statement was added in the first paragraph following Item 8. Did not decide on whether or not there should be a waiting period to provide for historical perspective when proposing a naming/renaming for a recently deceased person.]
4. Confirmed that the best practices should be in a policy document rather than in code. [This was reiterated at the 3-10 PRS meeting.]
5. Need language on the jurisdiction of the Arizona State Board on Geographic and Historic Names, particularly in how it intersects with the naming of roads. This board will be asked to review the document. State Board has jurisdiction over the naming of geographic features and federal, state, and county roads, but not city roads or buildings and structures. [A statement to this effect was added in the second paragraph following Item 8.]
6. Include a section on what is not covered by the best practices document. In addition to what the State Board is responsible for, include process that architects go through for naming of subdivisions/streets in subdivisions (ask Linda Mayro for more information). [See second paragraph following Item 8.]
7. Chair Majewski suggested that when PRS has a draft ready for next steps that it goes to TPCHC Subcommittees for review and feedback before going to the full commission. Commissioners Riojas and Griffith will draft a proposed review schedule. [This schedule was discussed.]

8. Will include resource links and reference other best practice documents. Make note on need to periodically check links, etc. [This was added at the end of the bulleting list of resources.]
9. Tribal feedback on the naming policy will be sought through Commissioners Sadongei and Steere during review of the draft document.
10. Need to address process and City and County historical commissions' involvement. [This requires further discussion.] Review City of Tucson Administrative Directive and make suggestions for amending it, referring to best practice document, etc. Also need ideas from Pima County following their review. Linda Mayro and her staff want more time to review and consider all of the communities within the County.
11. Proposed review schedule: mentioned at 3/9 full commission meeting [done], PRS finalize draft at 3/10 meeting, send finalized draft to commission subcommittees, Commissioners Steere and Sadongei, other commissioners; PRS incorporates feedback and creates final draft at 3/24 PRS meeting and brings back to full commission at 4/13 full commission meeting for in-depth review, discussion, and approval. [This schedule was discussed further at the meeting, and will now be moved forward. Commissions not likely to be separated until after May.]

No action was taken.

6. Current Issues for Information/Discussion

6a. Minor Reviews

Staff Taku noted that recent minor reviews included one in the West University HPZ at 316 E. Speedway for solar panel installation, and Commissioner Riojas assisted with this review along with a representative from the HZAB. Installation was recommended because the panels are on the side of the roof facing the alley. No panels were approved on the roof of an unapproved addition, and this addition will be coming through PRS. Upcoming minor reviews include two in the West University HPZ (one for a fence and wall at 927 N. 2nd Avenue, and the other at 628 N. 10th Avenue for rain gutters; Commissioner Riojas will assist), and two in the Armory Park HPZ (one for shingle replacement at 801 S. 3rd Avenue, and the other at 502 S. 4th Avenue for a fence, doors, shingle replacement, and rainwater catchment).

6b. Appeals

Staff Taku noted that there are no current appeals.

6c. Zoning Violations

Staff Taku noted that there are ongoing and pending cases being worked on for compliance and/or in the review process, and that staff is working with their zoning violation code enforcement liaison.

6d. Review Process Issues

No review process issues were raised.

7. **Summary of Public Comments (Information Only)**

No comments were received by the deadline.

8. **Future Agenda Items for Upcoming Meetings**

Staff mentioned that there will likely be several projects from HPZs ready for review. Will continue to include discussion of the Best Practices for Naming Document.

The next scheduled meeting is March 24, 2022. PRS meetings to be conducted virtually until further notice.

9. **Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 2:47 P.M.