



TOWN OF JEROME

POST OFFICE BOX 335, JEROME, ARIZONA 86331
(928) 634-7943 www.jerome.az.gov

MINUTES

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE JEROME TOWN COUNCIL
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, JEROME TOWN HALL, 600 CLARK STREET, JEROME, AZ
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 2022 AT 6:00 P.M.

ITEM #1: 6:00 (0:01)	Call to Order / Roll Call <i>Mayor Jack Dillenberg called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.</i> <i>Present at the meeting were Mayor Dillenberg, Vice Mayor Alex Barber, Councilmembers Sage Harvey, Jane Moore, and Sonia Sheffield.</i> <i>Staff present included Town Manager Brett Klein, Planning and Zoning Administrator Will Blodgett, and Deputy Town Clerk Kristen Muenz.</i>
ITEM #2: 6:00 (0:34)	Discussion and Possible Action on Hotel Jerome Potential Designs and Uses Including Affordable Housing <i>Mayor Jack Dillenberg said that Steve Knowlton was in attendance and asked if there were any concerns or questions.</i> <i>Vice Mayor Barber said thank you to Mr. Knowlton, the plan is amazing and planning for the parking lot is our next step.</i> <i>Dr. Dillenberg invited Zoning Administrator Will Blodgett to speak.</i> <i>Mr. Blodgett said that he attended a Co-op directors meeting and gave them a run down on the intentions for the building. At the meeting, he asked them if they had questions or concerns. He said he is considering residential access for the upper floors while maintaining integrity of the Co-op and making sure the art is still secure. Mr. Blodgett said they discussed doing some needed work on the front windows and skylights. He invited them to consider a redesign of their floor, as this would be a good time; there may be a more efficient use of their space. Mr. Blodgett said the Co-op is hesitant to lose the front window area because they display art in it. He is planning to back for the next meeting to see what ideas they produced. They also had concerns about construction activities having an impact on their operations, which is something we should consider, how to work with and around the Co-op.</i> <i>Dr. Dillenberg replied that the questions he keeps hearing are about access and security.</i> <i>Steve Knowlton said he spoke with Will Blodgett about the design and, originally, it was a hotel. If we pushed the Co-op back momentarily and turn the front back into a lobby or sitting area, they could sit down there. They could still display art there, but the displays would have to be locked up, with a cashier available to help them access it. You could make it look like a hotel and give people access to the building, but the Co-op could still use the space.</i> <i>Dr. Dillenberg asked Mr. Blodgett if he could discuss that with the Co-op.</i> <i>Mr. Blodgett answered, yes, their concerns are losing that front window area but with the right display set up, the items can be secured and displayed. He said that he thought a RFDI access card or fob could allow secure access after-hours, and work for the elevator as well.</i> <i>Dr. Dillenberg thanked Mr. Blodgett and Mr. Knowlton.</i> <i>Ms. Moore asked how soon they could start.</i> <i>Mr. Blodgett explained that he is waiting for the results of the Arc survey because that will be significant source of funding.</i> <i>Ms. Moore wondered if it might be possible, based on square footage, for the gallery could utilize part of the salsa shop because they might not need much space. She was concerned about taking away the gallery space.</i> <i>Mr. Blodgett said they have office space in the back that is not efficiently utilized. With a redesign of the back areas, we could give them more space than they would potentially be losing. When I looked at the display stands, using a little smart design it could fit in the area. We don't want to inconvenience them, so I would love to expand their space, even a new POS counter inside to preserve the original lobby counter.</i> <i>Ms. Moore said she does want to work closely with them. She asked about access to the upper floors while the construction is happening, with lumber going in and out.</i> <i>Dr. Dillenberg replied that there will be some imposition and we need to be as considerate as we can.</i> <i>Mr. Blodgett explained that, with smart planning for the work, for instance we could get fire access and the elevator in place first, we could provide access and it might benefit the project as a whole.</i> <i>Ms. Moore said that she was also thinking about the elevator as a first step.</i> <i>Jerome Resident Nancy Robinson suggested, for manipulating materials, scaffolding on the outside with shoots and an outside elevator, perhaps on the side of the building with stairs. She explained that freight elevators have different capacities, so she feels we will want an outside elevator.</i> <i>Dr. Dillenberg asked Mr. Blodgett to continue collaborating with the Co-op and update Council after the next meeting.</i> <i>Steve Knowlton responded to Ms. Moore's question about timing. He said they should consider it is a huge project and you need a coordinator for it, someone to act as an advisor who has experience working with old buildings.</i>

	<p><i>Jane Moore said we will no doubt looking for grant money and she wondered if that could be part of the application, a Coordinator.</i></p> <p><i>Ms. Robinson suggested we be very careful with grant money on restorations.</i></p> <p><i>Mr. Knowlton agreed that grant money comes with many strings attached and can cause a project to cost much more than it would have without the grant.</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Dillenberg comment that it might still be an option, but we don't know yet.</i></p> <p><i>Ms. Moore said that selling the cemetery property might be the best option to fund the project.</i></p> <p><i>Mr. Blodgett responded that he should have an update on Arch survey at next Council meeting.</i></p> <p><i>Tim Stratton, Town's bond counsel, said one avenue to pursue is looking into USDA rural development funding as they have programs for historic preservation.</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Dillenberg asked Mr. Stratton to share that information with Mr. Klein so we can reach out to them.</i></p> <p><i>Ms. Barber said that we had talked about USDA funding previously because they helped with replacing the windows, but they did not have funding available again.</i></p> <p><i>Mr. Stratton said he believes they have a 2-year cycle for funding.</i></p> <p><i>Ms. Barber suggested we try to reach out again.</i></p> <p><i>Engineer Mike Krebs said that if you get one before the end of the year, the current loan rate is 1.25%</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Dillenberg asked Mr. Blodgett and Mr. Klein to see if they could submit a request before the end of the year. He thanked Mr. Knowlton and Ms. Robinson for their help.</i></p>
<p>ITEM #3: 6:18 (18:13)</p>	<p>Discussion and Consideration of Options for the Waste Water Treatment Plant Upgrade Including but not limited to Sludge Removal, Access, Timeline, and Rate Structure</p> <p><i>Mr. Klein explained the item was put on the agenda because there were some issues outstanding that needed clarification. Mike Krebs was present from Pace Engineering to make a presentation. He invited members of public in attendance to get closer to the front to be able to view the projector screen.</i></p> <p><i>Mr. Krebs thanked the Mayor and Council and introduced his associate, Taylor from Pace engineering. He said they wanted to do a review to answer some of the questions Council had. Mr. Krebs said he wanted to point out that everything, including the rates and calculations, is information included in the PDR, which is the Preliminary Engineering Report, which is required by USDA to get funding. We want to talk about water data usage because it is important to have that, how we calculate wastewater flows, and a review of equivalent dwelling units. It's utilized as part of the USDA process; when they look at a community and a grant loan, it is how much the loan can handle. The EDU is critical in that calculation. He said he would walk them through how the calculations were done.</i></p> <p><i>Mr. Krebs said they used information from the year 2019 and a combination of 2020 and 2021 to calculate drinking water usage. On average, you are using 35.6 million gallons of water per year. Commercial use is 32% and residential is 68%, but you will see how that flips on the wastewater side.</i></p> <p><i>Ms. Moore that the 2021 amounts were probably lower because of Covid.</i></p> <p><i>Mr. Krebs said his calculations were an average for the entire year. When it comes to wastewater flows, we have one flow. Henry MacVittie confirmed the amount is measured flowing from the treatment plant.</i></p> <p><i>Mr. Krebs continued to explain how he had made his calculations, following the requirements of the USDA.</i></p> <p><i>Ms. Moore, viewing the cost calculations, asked where is the hauling of the sludge?</i></p> <p><i>Mr. Krebs said it could be included with the miscellaneous costs. He added that his numbers are based on full capacity, and your current flows are half of that.</i></p> <p><i>The number we used was \$320,000. In your updated budget, you added \$10 or \$12 thousand to this. We added more to the short-lived assets cost and estimated the life and costs at over \$3,000 set aside per year. He pointed out that this is just a guideline and, if the USDA audits, they will look for this. Based on the letter of conditions, your debt payment will be \$57,852 per year at 1.25% with an additional reserve of 10%. Rounded up with Operation & Maintenance costs, total annual cost is estimated at \$386,000.</i></p> <p><i>Ms. Moore asked if that equaled an additional \$100,000 total annual cost and Mr. Krebs replied, yes.</i></p> <p><i>Mr. Krebs commented that the rate, divided between 560 EDU's, is a rate of \$57.58 per month.</i></p> <p><i>Mr. MacVittie said, so you're billing \$57.58 per EDU per month in theory, and Mr. Krebs said, yes, in theory.</i></p> <p><i>Ms. Barber asked, what is the implication for how much we must raise the sewer rates? With 246 connections and a loan of \$1.8 million, I came up with over \$7,000. We don't want to charge people that, but obviously connection costs must go up. For the layperson, the bottom line is how much is my bill going up?</i></p> <p><i>(42:47) Mr. Krebs explained that they should divide the annual total by the total connections, and then divide that monthly.</i></p> <p><i>Ms. Harvey said, you are talking about \$131 per bill?</i></p> <p><i>Mr. Krebs reminded Council that 70% of the sewer flows were coming from Commercial, and a lot of communities have different rates for commercial users.</i></p> <p><i>Ms. Moore suggested using the dedicated parking fees for infrastructure, as people parking may not be shopping but might be walking around town using restrooms.</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Dillenberg agreed the funds could be used for infrastructure. He asked Ms. Moore, is \$100 a month too much?</i></p> <p><i>Ms. Harvey replied, absolutely, to which Dr. Dillenberg asked, what would be fair per month?</i></p> <p><i>Mr. Krebs suggested setting the residential rate at \$57.58 and then updating commercial rates to cover the remainder. Or, to use other revenue to cut the cost down first and then recalculate the numbers.</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Dillenberg said he agrees with Ms. Harvey that we must lower the costs for residents.</i></p> <p><i>There was continued discussion about how to calculate the costs and set the rates equitably.</i></p> <p><i>Mr. Klein reminded Council that, while the estimates were as good as they could be with the current information, the numbers are going to change. We have not confirmed the total number of sewer connections, not to mention the costs. He said we would recalculate the numbers with the help of a Financial Advisor.</i></p>

(56:58) Mr. Stratton said the FA will be able to provide financial modeling and recommended doing that sooner than later. He also commented that WIFFA has forgivable loan programs that could be a potential source of funding, which is something the FA could help explore.

Dr. Dillenberg said he was not certain what an FA would cost, but we should investigate it.

There was discussion of the cost of a FA along with the benefits, and the amount of the annual budget that had been earmarked for infrastructure improvements for the fiscal year.

Mr. Krebs said he had provided an updated schedule for all the items that we've been working towards. The design stage is January to October of 2023, the bid period will be September 2023 to January of 2024, and construction until August of 2025.

Dr. Dillenberg asked, in August of 2025, we'll be done?

Mr. Krebs replied, hopefully sooner. We'll also coordinate with ADEQ and get updated with them.

Mr. Klein asked Mr. Stratton if an FA would suggest incremental increases, and Mr. Stratton agreed they might.

Ms. Moore said we are moving along with the grant loan at this point, it's a done deal.

Dr. Dillenberg said we want to make sure we're moving forward and keeping well informed.

(1:05:25) For Pace Engineering, Taylor addressed the Council on the topic solid waste. He had received questions regarding access to the site and potential truck traffic. He pointed out the area on a map drawing and said it will take a lot of work to get the road in there. The drawing showed wide turn arounds and not more than 10% grade; by having those, you can get dump trucks and construction equipment to the site.

Dr. Dillenberg commented that is key.

Taylor described the current state of Cemetery Road, and improvements that need to be made.

Ms. Moore asked if there was going to be paving in the area.

Mr. Krebs replied that is something they will need to figure out ahead of time.

Taylor said he has spoken to two companies that are willing to work with the town, Taylor & Sons and SRE. He said SRE is different because they want to bring up a tractor-trailer, but they also have dump trucks.

Ms. Moore asked if they know what road we're talking about?

Taylor responded that they said they would evaluate the site.

Ms. Moore expressed concern that anyone would be able to haul on the road and Mr. Krebs said he would agree with her that coming off 89-A is a drop-off.

Taylor stated that both companies were willing to do a site survey.

Dr. Dillenberg said, if we could get road graded, they may be more willing to work with us.

Ms. Moore said she and Mr. MacVittie had discussed potentially placing a dumpster on the first big turn of the road. It is wide enough to put a dumpster there and perhaps a contract service would be more willing to haul from there.

Taylor agreed that knowing how much solid waste removal would be needed was key to finding a contract service willing to work with the town. He pointed to his graph on the projector and proceeded to explain further the calculated current flows and max capacities. He also summarized how the new facility would function and some necessary requirements.

There was more discussion as to how best to get the waste removed, and who would do the removal.

Ms. Harvey suggested that both hauling companies come for a site review because, unless we find someone willing to do the work, that could be deal breaker on the project.

Mr. Krebs suggested that, if you have a single-axel dump truck, you can haul it yourself. He mentioned another community that does it, and they have larger flows than Jerome.

Ms. Harvey said that if we can't get a hauling company, we would have to purchase a second dump truck.

Ms. Moore asked about the potential for composting the solid waste.

Taylor said it could be possible and he and Mr. Krebs explained that Sierra Vista was able to create compost utilizing locally available green waste and an expensive, specialized facility. Mr. Krebs suggested speaking to neighboring communities.

Dr. Dillenberg commented that it sounded complex.

Ms. Harvey asked, because a mechanical de-waterer was what was in the plan if drying beds would be an additional cost.

Taylor responded that they would be and could be added if the money is available.

Ms. Harvey asked, under contract, do we have to have the mechanical de-waterer and 5 hauling trips per year?

Taylor said, no, that was negotiable.

Ms. Harvey and Dr. Dillenberg repeated that it was important to know if the hauling companies were interested.

Taylor said that SRE Environmental are very interested, but they are more expensive and work out of Phoenix.

Ms. Harvey commented that she would rather work with Taylor & Sons because they are local, and family owned.

There was some more discussion about the road and the possibility of driving a large truck to the site. Council also briefly discussed the effects the updated treatment plant would have on Henry MacVittie's workload.

Mr. MacVittie said they could discuss that when it was time to renew his contract.

Resident Nancy Robinson asked who will pay for the road.

Mr. Krebs answered that it was included in the plans. He explained that improvements to Cemetery Road are also in the scope of work because if you can't get truck off 89-A, this project is worthless, and USDA will understand that.

Ms. Harvey pointed out that Miss Sheffield was being very quiet, perhaps because she had not seen the area. She suggested a field trip to make her more familiar with the site.

Dr. Dillenberg said it is not an easy project, but it is critically important.

Mr. Klein said the take away points are setting up a site visit, finding a hauling company and a Financial Advisor, and an equitable solution for residential rates. Also, he would investigate more potential grants.

Ms. Moore suggested they also educate the public on what should or should not go down the sewer; grease traps and garbage disposals: anything that contributes to the grease problem.

Mr. Krebs recommended that a pretreatment ordinance that requires grease traps be used might be worthwhile.

Ms. Moore replied that they had discussed pretreatment in the past, and it is important for the Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Council thanked Taylor from Pace Engineering for his presentation and for answering their questions.

ITEM #4:
7:39 (1:39:50)

Discussion and Possible Action Regarding a Town Response to the Yavapai County Comprehensive Plan Update Comment Period

**(1:39:50) at 7:39 p.m., Council took a short break. The meeting reconvened at 7:48 p.m.*

(1:40:20) Dr. Dillenberg introduced the item.

Ms. Moore said that one concern had been growth area and keeping an open space between us and Clarkdale. She said she had looked but didn't see where the growth corridors were on Clarkdale's plan.

Ms. Barber said that she had looked into their general plan, and it includes every road out of Clarkdale as a growth corridor. She said she spoke to former Clarkdale Mayor and Doug Gossic about it, but they said they dropped the ball on it. When she looks at the 89-A growth corridor, the new APS substation should have been put on the other side because it had industrial uses. It was a mistake, and she does not want mistakes to continue to happen. Ms. Barber said that Clarkdale used to be an adorable, little community and it has sprawled. The subdivision development has no yards. Clarkdale was promised many things, and it went bad. She said she is passionate about this as someone who grew up here. There are many areas, like Cottonwood to grow. Ms. Barber said she felt that trying to maintain the historic character of individual communities is something the voters want. She read a quote from the petition letter by Stephan Block.

Ms. Moore said that what Mr. Block was asking of the county was for individual community plans, which they cannot adopt, could be kept as addendums in the Verde Valley Regional Land Use Plan. They won't be adopted as part of the plan, but we say that Jerome would like to keep the open space.

Ms. Barber recommended a discussion at an intergovernmental meeting to get growth corridors out of Clarkdale's general plan. She said it does not behoove us to have it as a growth corridor. She also felt concern that the list of Yavapai County elected officials / staff is comprised of almost entirely new people. Ms. Barber said she is not anti-growth, but she wants to see it managed responsibly with conserving resources. She said that either we take care of Verde River or will not have it anymore.

Dr. Dillenberg said we should do something. He told Ms. Barber that he appreciates her passion and asked how they should respond.

Council then paged through the plan and discussed projected growth for areas in and around Jerome. Ms. Barber mentioned her concerns that the recent census may not have had correct information and asked how they should form a rebuttal.

Ms. Moore said she highlighted some items she felt are in alignment with our thinking, such as preserving resources, creating buffers around new development, and encouraging locating high intensity areas along highway corridors. She said that highway 89-A coming up from Clarkdale does not support heavy traffic.

Ms. Barber said she also agreed with the section about creating buffers around historic areas to maintain the character.

Ms. Moore said the plan does talk about it, but Ms. Barber said that nothing is done about it.

There was some discussion about high-density growth areas and how it could impact Jerome if the growth was approved.

Ms. Barber said that adding large communities becomes a water issue too.

Ms. Moore agreed that not approving higher density growth would help with the water. She said we need to keep our comments on the topics that affect us, and November 15 is the deadline to respond.

Speaking on transparency, Ms. Harvey said that though the plan is from the county, we didn't hear about it until someone sent Ms. Moore an email.

Ms. Barber asked, did anyone reach out to us? She wanted to bring up the active management areas are not good enough. She suggested mentioning that we should become wiser with our water, and that we cannot have a growth area because our highway does not support it. Ms. Barber also said she felt sad that Jerome was not invited to the table to discuss this.

Ms. Moore said she would be willing to put together her own comments, but she would like everyone else to contribute and then have someone put it all together.

Ms. Harvey asked if she could put something together before the next meeting for Mr. Klein to review.

Dr. Dillenberg said he liked the idea that they get it done at the next meeting and all agree to let them know this is not good.

Ms. Moore commented on some sections of the plan that discussed major developments, encouraging healthy communities, and food production.

Dr. Dillenberg said that our comments should say "some good, some bad," but it is not all bad.

Ms. Moore said there are a lot of good things if they stick to it, such as discouraging high-density growth areas.

Ms. Barber said she would like to bring up the hydroelectric conditions on page 88. She read a section at the bottom of 8.4.4 which said, to date, only a few have been built, but 22 sites have been identified as potential pump storage facilities. We do need these things, but not in the desert, we don't have enough water for this to work. This is scary.

Ms. Moore said that is more of an individual comment. She said to Ms. Barber, because she had talked about Off-road vehicle noise, that they could say they like the section in the county plan about limits on vehicle noise.

Ms. Barber also wanted to say that she felt there are enough golf courses, and they should only use reclaimed water.

Ms. Moore said that in the water element, the plan said planners should incorporate a public meeting. She asked Mr. Klein how best to proceed with gathering Council's comments for the reply.

Mr. Klein responded it would be best if comments came to him, and he will synthesize them. We want to keep it succinct for it to be more impactful.

Dr. Dillenberg said that we should highlight the parts we really like.

Ms. Barber mentioned that there is also something in the plan about dark sky, creating a guide for developers and residents to become the first dark sky community. We have been told that they no longer make our streetlights, so now would be a good time to talk about becoming a dark sky community.

Dr. Dillenberg said let's keep it focused on one page, with things we like and what we don't, so we can get it done on the 8th.


Ms. Moore read a list of some of her main concerns and said that if anyone has any others, to submit them to Mr. Klein.

Dr. Dillenberg suggested to Ms. Barber that when she becomes the next Mayor, she meets with other local mayors. He said Ms. Barber has a great historic perspective and understands that Jerome is an important component.

	<p>Ms. Barber thanked the member of the public that sent the County Plan to us, Steve Block, and Ms. Moore thanked Ginger from the Art and Wine Walk also.</p> <p>Ms. Harvey repeated her disappointment that the county did not reach out to Jerome.</p> <p>Ms. Barber asked about intergovernmental meetings, and Dr. Dillenberg said they were holding them bi-weekly over the phone. Ms. Barber said she would like to comment about Donna Michaels, she does not feel she has had enough time yet and it is sad to just hand the reins over to someone and say it's in your court as training is important and makes things easier. She said it is amazing that we are willing to work together even if we don't see eye to eye.</p> <p>Ms. Moore said she would also like to mention the transportation element because we support public transport.</p> <p>The was some further discussion about the state of the roads, and electric vehicles effecting tax revenue.</p>																																										
ITEM #5: 8:13 (2:13:32)	<p>To and From the Council –Council May Provide Direction Regarding Items to be Placed on a Future Agenda</p> <p>At first, Ms. Barber said they did not need to do “to and from” at this meeting, but Ms. Moore wanted to bring to the attention that the agenda was missing the disability paragraph and is in a different format.</p> <p>Mr. Klein explained that he had made some changes to the agenda with the advice of the town attorney and the disability statement was inadvertently left off but will always be on there.</p> <p>Ms. Harvey said they have had the format that way for 4 years, and Ms. Barber said it has been on there for the 8 years she served on council.</p> <p>Ms. Harvey repeated that she finds the format to be very helpful.</p> <p>Mr. Klein said it was just a recommendation and does not mean the way they prefer can't be done, so he will arrange the agendas the way the Councilmembers prefer it although there may be some slight modifications when the new agenda management system is implemented.</p>																																										
ITEM #6:	<p>Adjournment</p> <p>Motion to adjourn at 8:24 p.m.</p> <table><tr><th>COUNCILMEMBER</th><th>MOTION</th><th>SECOND</th><th>AYE</th><th>NAY</th><th>ABSENT</th><th>ABSTAIN</th></tr><tr><td>BARBER</td><td></td><td>X</td><td>X</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>DILLENBERG</td><td></td><td></td><td>X</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>HARVEY</td><td>X</td><td></td><td>X</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>MOORE</td><td></td><td></td><td>X</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>SHEFFIELD</td><td></td><td></td><td>X</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	COUNCILMEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN	BARBER		X	X				DILLENBERG			X				HARVEY	X		X				MOORE			X				SHEFFIELD			X			
COUNCILMEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN																																					
BARBER		X	X																																								
DILLENBERG			X																																								
HARVEY	X		X																																								
MOORE			X																																								
SHEFFIELD			X																																								

APPROVE:

ATTEST:


 Alex Barber, Mayor


 Brett Klein, Town Manager/Clerk

Date: 11/8/2022