

Minutes of the Fort Lowell Restoration Advisory Committee Meeting
5230 E. Fort Lowell Road, Tucson, Arizona 85712
May 13, 2009 5:00 p.m.

1. **Call to Order**

Meeting called to order at 5:03 p.m. Those in attendance were:

Larry Hecker, Committee Chair
Elaine Hill, Committee Member
Frank McClure, Committee Member
Peggy Sackheim, Committee Member
Patsy Waterfall, Committee Member
Lisa Cuestas, City of Tucson
Jim Conroy, City of Tucson
Midge Irwin, City of Tucson
Jonathan Mabry, City of Tucson
Damian Fellows, City of Tucson
Norma Stevens, City of Tucson
Simon Herbert, Pima County
Loy Neff, Pima County
Linda Mayro, Pima County
Corky Poster, Poster Frost Assoc.
Drew Gorski, Poster Frost Assoc.
Rebecca Field, SAGE
Bruce Hilpert (sub-consultant to PFA)
Bob Jones, Neighborhood Resident
John Meaney, Neighborhood Resident
Bill Anderson, OFLNA Council
Frank and Kate Flasch, Neighborhood Residents
Janet Marcus, Neighborhood Resident
Stefanie Thrush, Wood/Patel (sub-consultant to PFA)
Philip S. Abromowitz, La Sonrisa HOA
Bob Harman, La Sonrisa HOA
Paul E. Clinco, Concerned Citizen
Ken Scoville, Concerned Citizen

2. **Review of meeting minutes (ACTION)**

- March 11 meeting: Motion made by Frank McClure and seconded by Peggy Sackheim to approve the March 11 meeting minutes and attach as well as post on the website the written comments that were submitted by members of the public. Motion passed unanimously.
- Patsy Waterfall moved to approve the April 8th meeting minutes; motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

3. **Work Plan: Project Status Reports**

a. **COT, Project Status Updates**

i. **Environmental cleanup update**

Lisa Cuestas, Environmental Services, announced that the City of Tucson was awarded an EPA \$200,000 Brownsfield Clean-up Grant through regular competition. When selected through regular competition, normal grant funds are awarded in October, 2009. However, once a project officer is assigned to the grant, the award costs will be requested, basically asking EPA to approve spending the funds earlier than October, 2009. If funds are received in the summer, the cleanup can begin. The first step involves working with the consultant to develop the best clean-up strategy for the site. Taken into consideration will be the site history, what's involved, what's around it, and the historic issues of the site. Once submitted there are different layers of approval needed, one being the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality voluntary remediation clean-up approval. The ultimate goal for the clean up project to be completed is summer of 2010. Jim Conroy added that the City's Environmental Services Department will match an additional \$40,000, bringing the total to \$240,000. Expenditures above that amount will be covered by Environmental Services.

ii. COT Historic Zone Commission Advisory Committee – opinion on Draft Concept Master Plan

Elaine Hill agreed to read the parts in the Fort Lowell Historic Zone Advisory Board's (FLHZAB) report as the specific topics in the agenda are addressed. Copies will be emailed to the members.

iii. Other COT updates – No additional updates.

b. Poster Frost Associates (PFA), Master Plan Status Updates

i. Background Information Report – discussion and comment

Drew Gorski announced that he had received comments from Peggy Sackheim and Elaine Hill on the background report so there is one more round of comments to address. This report will be posted on the county's website.

ii. Building Treatments: OQ1 (ghosting), OQ2 (protective structure), OQ3 (restoration) – Discussion deferred to allow time for other agenda items

iii. Native American consultation: Status update (Apache Bronze)

Gorski distributed a short summary of comments by John Welch, "Tribal Consultation . . . Summary Report" dated May 13, 2009. The fourth paragraph addressed the proposed Apache bronze statue, questioning the choice of a warrior instead of a family. Gorski announced that he would be among a group meeting with representatives of the Four Southern Arizona Tribes. A more detailed report containing a summary of all of his communication with the tribes will be prepared for the final report for this project.

iv. Other PFA project updates – There were none.

c. County, Project Status Updates

i. SHPO consultation: status update

Simon Herbert, Cultural Resources, announced that a meeting is scheduled with Jim Garrison, State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) on Wednesday, May 20, at 10:00 a.m. David Yubeta has been asked to attend, partly because of his adobe expertise.

This gives SHPO an opportunity to respond to the draft master plan, looking at the Fort Lowell Park as well as the Adkins parcel.

ii. Emergency Repairs and Stabilization: status update

A copy of a report that was sent to SHPO was distributed to the members, outlining the latest round of emergency repairs. These were basically pictures with descriptions beneath of what work took place.

iii. Discussion: Future role of the Advisory Committee (after the Master Plan?)

Loy Neff asked the committee to be thinking how they envision their role as this project moves forward. Once the master plan is completed the implementation of the restoration plan will follow, and, depending on the bond fund scheduling, moving forward with the implementation of the major portion of the master plan for the entire park. Questions to consider:

- End this committee's responsibilities at the conclusion of the master plan, or
- Continue involvement, and, if so, in what capacity? How would the committee wish to work as a group (or not) as the project proceeds beyond the master plan?

Larry Hecker raised the question of how much money will be available to move forward on the master plan. Linda Mayro, Cultural Resources, has followed the progress of the bond committee and reported the following:

- The 2004 bond is reserved to apply to the Adkins parcel (restoration plan and improvements). It would require a bond amendment to apply it to improvements outside the Adkins parcel.
- It has been recommended to delay a future bond election to November 2010. The assumption is that the bond advisory committee would reconvene in September to begin reviewing the old projects that have been presented and set new priorities as circumstances have changed.
- Roughly \$1.2 million will remain to implement the Fort Lowell restoration Plan after completion of the Master Plan.

Hecker, who chairs the bond advisory committee, added that projects had been prioritized in different categories and additional funding was identified for Fort Lowell and placed on the top tier of the advisory committee list.

Other County updates – there were none.

4. New Business

a. Master Plan elements: (ACTION)

i. Revisit Tabled item from April 9 meeting – Adkins-era buildings and structures: Interpretive treatment (ACTION)

Concerning the matter of removing or leaving the Adkins-era buildings, Larry Hecker, after reviewing the action items from April's meeting, concurred with the actions that were taken by the committee at the April 8th meeting. Patsy Waterfall read comments made by David Yubeta who was not in attendance at this meeting. Yubeta agrees that the steel shed be removed but incorporate the residence and keep it within the footprint of the historic landscape.

Elaine Hill noted that the April 8th meeting minutes need to reflect the word, “deferred” in the motion for removal of the Adkins buildings. Loy Neff read from the “April 8th draft” minutes: “Vote was initially deferred until the arrival of Larry Hecker; however, in Hecker’s absence the committee **tabled this action** until the May meeting so that committee members can have a chance to review.” The April 8th meeting minutes will be corrected to add, “vote on the removal of the Adkins steel building and residence was deferred.” Larry Hecker asked for a vote on the original tabled motion. Motion failed. (ACTION)

Peggy Sackheim made a motion to remove the steel works building, including the pad/slab without ghosting of the building. Seconded by Patsy Waterfall. Estimated costs to preserve the building are included in the PFA report. Motion passed unanimously. (ACTION)

Adkins Property: House, Water Tower, and Windmill. Frank McClure moved that the building be removed. Larry Hecker seconded and discussion followed. Hill referenced the recommendations made by the Fort Lowell Historic Zone Advisory Board (FLHZAB) to preserve and incorporate these three structures into a functional aspect of the park. Corky Poster stated that it would cost \$46,000 to stabilize the Adkins residence, \$150,000 plus to restore and \$7500 or less to demolish it. Frank McClure reminded the committee that the goal is to interpret the Fort and only those living in the area of the park see the significance of the structures. Call for the vote. Patsy Waterfall and Elaine Hill voted nay; Peggy Sackheim abstained; motion failed. (ACTION)

ii. Land acquisition/disposition: Clinco easement and La Sonrisa property south of OQs

Two proposals were received:

- The Clinco easement
- La Sonrisa HOA Land

Presentations were made by Paul Clinco and Philip Abromowitz and handouts distributed. No recommendation was made as this item was not listed as an action item on the agenda.

iii. Commissary use(s) & possible rezoning

Currently the property is zoned R-2 which limits the commercial activities that have been discussed, i.e. a gift shop/restaurant. A rezoning may be required in order to pursue uses that are not allowed in the R-2 zone. Bruce Hilpert added that visitors would like to have access to that building and this would provide an opportunity to address the preservation issues of the neighborhood. Conroy added that based on the recommendation by PFA for the best use of this facility, the City’s legal, rezoning, or city manager’s departments would be approached as to the best function of that structure. The zoning should not dictate that decision. Jonathan Mabry added as long as they are used as private residences there is not a tangible public benefit to their preservation or restoration.

Poster Frost reiterated that PFA has worked extremely hard throughout this process to develop a consensus plan that the vast number of people involved would embrace. He explained that an R-2 zone allows educational and cultural facilities only if owned by the government. Hill read the following from the Fort Lowell Historic Zone Advisory Board (FLHZAB):

“The Board does not want to see the use of these buildings as a commercial venture except, perhaps with use by non-profit groups or in small spaces. The public should have access to the facility at some level. . . The Board recommends that the complex remain residential until a program to change its use is developed and has been accepted by the Board. . .”

No formal action was taken.

i. Museum: Possible location(s) and phasing

Corky Poster Frost listed the following options for the museum:

1. Stay as a functional museum
2. Develop an orientation ramada to serve as a footprint along the far western boundary
3. Construct a new museum southwest of the pond.

Depending on the availability of future bond monies, recommending the reconstruction of the 1963 museum currently on the site.

Finally, consideration exists for doing an interpretive element with OQ3, allowing visitors to enter and experience what it was like in the 1880s when these quarters were occupied, adding different elements over time. Corky Poster asked, “What is the correct approach?”

The Fort Lowell Historic Zone Advisory Board (FLHZAB) advises that unless there are reasons to move the current museum, it should be left in place and continue to be used as such until a new building is built. They agree that a location near the pond on the concept plan appears to be an ideal place and once built retain the old museum for public use. Jonathan Mabry and Jim Conroy brought up the high costs and frequency of building maintenance for the current structure which will most likely continue as it was poorly constructed. Peggy Sackheim asked that a future vote be taken when the new museum is built, revisiting the issue of what to do with the current structure.

Bruce Hilpert added that this new museum has the potential to be a world class institution and encouraged this to be a high funding priority item. Exhibits are capital costs and need to be included in the next bond election.

b. Restoration Plan

Drew Gorski, Poster Frost, distributed a Fencing Options – Phase 1 handout addressing both the short term treatment of the Adkins parcel and possibly beyond Phase 1 to the built-up master plan.

- Option A is basically keeping the fencing how it is now, fencing the entire site.

- Option B is treating the three officer's quarters separately as secured areas and adding fencing between Cottonwood Lane.
- Option C is individual building security, creating a lower shed roof on OQ2. This would be less intrusive on the visible landscape but more obscure on the building level.

Frost brought up the question of available funding in 2010 for installing and maintaining security measures.

c. Draft business plan

Gorski referred to the business plan distributed a month ago. The next update would include the rezoning of the commissary and related costs.

d. Draft capital costs

Gorski reported that the rough draft had been emailed to members on Monday, May 11th. Costs for the individual resources for the commissary have not yet been given. Costs for infrastructure are being worked on with TEP and attempts made to get fees waived. Poster added that Phase 1 includes the real monies and Phase 2 is just under \$11 million for everything except for the new museum. However, Gorski said that \$13 million is more realistic. The Total Phase III with Escalation for the new museum is estimated to cost \$3.1 million without exhibits. The markups are explained in the Compusult Statement of Probable Costs.

5. Call to the public

- Ken Scoville agreed that the greatest appeal is the military history of the Fort but cautioned against forgetting the social history and why Tucson is the place it is today.
- John Meaney agreed that the Fort should be the predominant theme of the master plan, building a world class museum showing frontier military history, and seriously considering the comments made by John Welch read earlier in the meeting.

6. Items for next meeting — scheduled for June 10.

7. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 7:12 p.m.