

Minutes of the Fort Lowell Restoration Advisory Committee Meeting
5230 E. Fort Lowell Road, Tucson, Arizona 85712
June 24, 2009, 4:00 P.M.

1. Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 4:05 p.m. Those in attendance were:

Larry Hecker, Committee Chair
Elaine Hill, Committee Member
Frank McClure, Committee Member
Anne Woosley, Committee Member
David Yubeta, Committee Member
Lisa Cuestas, City of Tucson
Jim Conroy, City of Tucson
Midge Irwin, City of Tucson
Jonathan Mabry, City of Tucson
Peg Weber, City of Tucson
Courtney Rose, Pima County
Simon Herbert, Pima County
Loy Neff, Pima County
Corky Poster, Poster Frost Assoc.
Drew Gorski, Poster Frost Assoc.
Rebecca Field, SAGE (PFA Sub-consultant)
Bill Anderson, OFLNA
Janet Marcus, OFLNA
Barry Spicer, Neighborhood Resident
Donna Chernick, OFLNA
Ned Mackey, OFLNA
R.G. Cooke, Neighborhood Resident (STBA)
Audrey Sander, OFLNA
Tamiyo Morishita, Neighborhood Resident

2. Review of Meeting minutes: May 13 meeting (Action)

May 13 meeting: Elaine Hill relayed request by John Meaney that his remarks recorded in the minutes be removed (Page 6 of the meeting minutes). Larry Hecker said that they are part of the record and that they cannot be removed but can be corrected if incorrect.

Action: Motion made by David Yubeta and seconded by Frank McClure to approve the May 13 meeting minutes, with corrections offered by Meany. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Work Plan: Project Status Reports

a. COT Project Status Updates.

i. Environmental clean up: Work plan will be sent to EPA in mid-July. COT will find out if EPA will do pre-award costs; otherwise will start expending grant funds when awarded in October, 2009. 1st phase is a feasibility study (to identify the best cleanup option). In this case, the clean up will start in the winter of 2009.

ii. Committee Recommendations: Clinco Easement and La Sonrisa property (Action)

Larry Hecker led a discussion on the Clinco Easement and La Sonrisa property: Corky Poster discussed both issues: Potential land acquisition on the south side of the Adkins parcels (proposed by La Sonrisa) and the Clinco request to acquire the driveway easement to their property, which crosses City land on the west side of the Commissary.

The Clinco Easement allows access to their home through an easement across City property. The Clincos wish to acquire the easement. They felt the Bolsius shed, which is within the easement, should be included in the acquisition because it belongs historically with the Bolsius house, which is now the Clinco family home. It was noted that an Advisory Committee member also would like to acquire the property at issue. Corky Poster advised the Committee to take no action on this issue because it doesn't add significance to the Master Plan.

The La Sonrisa proposal was considered by COT previously and declined. The La Sonrisa proposal at the previous meeting included the offer to sell at the "original" appraised value, based on the 2006 acquisition of the Adkins parcels. Poster Frost Associates considers the acquisition worthy of consideration because it would provide a buffer for security and fencing on the south side of the adobe Officers' Quarters. The La Sonrisa property cannot be developed and is part of that neighborhood's open space, so its value is low. However, the acquisition is not in the Master Plan.

Discussion: Anne Woosley asked if it is within the Committee's responsibility to make a recommendation regarding the acquisitions. Larry Hecker responded that the land acquisitions are not needed for the Master Plan, then the issue is not relevant and the Committee does not have to take action. Anne Woosley expressed discomfort about making a recommendation on the Clinco Easement, but she is more comfortable about making a recommendation about the La Sonrisa property. Corky noted that County Bond funds are not eligible for purchase of the La Sonrisa property and Loy Neff confirmed this. Jim Conroy stated that an acquisition would not be part of the Master Plan project. Elaine Hill commented on other claims to use the property. Hecker repeated that the Committee has the ability to take an action, but is not required to act. Elaine Hill suggested that the La Sonrisa property should be pursued because it may benefit the Master Plan, but she acknowledged that no money should be directed at an acquisition now.

Action: Larry Hecker asked for motions on recommendations regarding the Clinco Easement and La Sonrisa property. Elaine Hill moved that if funds were available for the acquisition of the La Sonrisa property she would recommend that it be pursued—but no activity is recommended at this moment. Anne Woosley seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously. No action was taken on the Clinco Easement.

iii. No other COT updates

b. County Project Status Updates.

i. SHPO Consultation: Simon Herbert reported on SHPO consultation meeting. Jim Garrison and Bob Frankeberger, of SHPO, visited the Ft Lowell Park for a consultation meeting on the Master Plan held at the museum building. Corky Poster and Drew Gorski were present, as was Bruce Hilpert, sub-consultant to PFA; Jim Conroy, Midge Irwin, and Jonathan Mabry of COT; and Simon Herbert and Loy Neff of Pima County. SHPO approved the concept of the Master Plan layout, the four use zones of the park, but had some thoughts and suggestions about interpretation and different proposed treatments at different buildings in the park. For example, SHPO stated that the current museum, a 1960s reconstructed Officers Quarters aligned 30 feet off the original officers quarters alignment, represents early efforts in historic preservation and should be presented as part of the interpretive story. PFA agrees. Herbert is preparing a consultation letter that will go to SHPO shortly. The consultation will focus on concepts of the Master Plan, with later consultations about specific aspects of the implementation. Herbert pointed out that

we are undergoing voluntary consultation on the initial concept plan, because there is no undertaking, yet. Later when there is an undertaking, plans will undergo formal SHPO consultation.

ii. Report on Fort Lowell Presentation at Arizona Historic Preservation

Conference: (taken out of order) Simon Herbert spoke on Arizona Historic Preservation Conference: Corky Poster described the history and process of preservation in the park and what the property was like at the time COT took ownership in 2006 and changes that have taken place up until today. Corky Poster: is pleased with the openness of the process and how the public is involved. Spent a lot of time discussing the Adkins parcel. Also walked through the controversial aspects. Just 3 or 4 issues could be considered somewhat controversial while entire Master Plan is agreed upon by the public and historic preservation specialists. This process pinpointed that no matter how clear the process is or the fact that there are standards; there are some fuzzy areas in interpretation. Overall, the presentation was well -received.

iii. Report on Committee responses concerning the future role of the Committee during implementation of the Master plan and Restoration Plan: (Taken out of order)

Loy Neff reviewed email correspondence with Committee and confirmed Committee and staff responses unanimous regarding the question of a summer recess for 2 months. Reported that Committee all agreed to continue in oversight role during implementation of Master Plan and restoration Plan. Regarding her participation, Anne Woosley clarified that Loy's use of "if" in email correspondence about this topic should have been "because" AHS runs the park museum. David Yubeta asked if the continuing Committee would have authority, or teeth, if everyone wants to stay involved. What weight would their recommendations have? Neff responded that their opinions will definitely have great weight, but agreed to check to see if the IGA allows official capacity in oversight role and if not he will explore other options for official status for the Committee. Neff will pursue this issue during the summer break and took responsibility for disseminating information to the Committee. Regarding the summer recess, Neff said there is the ability to schedule a summer meeting if the need arises. Larry Hecker commented that his understanding of the IGA is that the Committee's term extends until the recommendation to the COT Mayor and Council and County Board of Supervisors and they take action. Therefore, the Committee would continue in this role. Larry suggested that there could be a formal body to take over after that. Corky Poster responded to a question about the Canoa Ranch Master Plan Advisory Committee, who continued involvement during the implementation of that Master Plan. Neff and Simon Herbert will follow through to learn how this was done.

c. Poster Frost Associates Master Plan Status Updates (Agenda items taken out of order):

i. Background information Report. Corky Poster reported to the Committee on current project status. The Background Information Report is completed and posted on the website.

ii. Presentation to the Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission: June 10: The Master Plan was presented by Corky Poster and Drew Gorski to the TPCHC on June 10 and approved by the commission. The TPCHC made only a few comments about accessibility issues and details on interpretation to be discussed at a later stage.

iii. Report on Presentation to Four Southern Tribes on May 19. Presentation made at the San Miguel Community Center, south of Sells, on the TON reservation, by Linda Mayro, Simon Herbert, Loy Neff, Drew Gorski, and Bruce Hilpert. Drew gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Master Plan, which was received very well, but without comment from the Tribes. Also reported that John Welch is continuing to work with tribal members on the over all project and will continue consultation, with a report of results submitted after consultation is concluded. Anne Woosley asked whether the report

to include the Apache Tribes as well as the Four Southern Tribes, and Corky Poster answered yes.

iv. No other project updates.

4. New Business.

a. Master Plan Elements: (Action)

ii. Executive Summary; and iii. Final Concept Plan (taken out of order and combined for presentation)

Corky Poster presented The Master Plan “Executive Summary” of Historic Ft. Lowell Park: Master Plan and Restoration Plan. See hand-out and graphic exhibit. Discussion of the four use zones:

Zone 1 – Fort Lowell Historic Zone: This zone will focus on historic interpretation of the Fort Lowell historic period by capturing the footprint of the original Fort Parade Grounds on both sides of today’s Craycroft Road, which artificially separates the Parade Ground into east and west portions. Corky reminded the Committee that plans for Craycroft Road will provide for unification of the historic Parade Ground, as well as provide for safety enhancement of the road and safe pedestrian crossing, using a HAWK crossing installed along the Cottonwood Lane alignment.

The historic footprints and volumes of the military buildings around the Parade Ground will be represented by using various treatments, ranging from rehabilitation for re-use to structural “ghosting” of original buildings to capture form and volume, both in functional ways (to create picnic and day-use ramadas) and non-functional ways. Officers’ Quarters 1 and 2 on the Adkins parcels will have protective roofs that recreate exactly the historic height and form of the original buildings. Officers Quarters #3 will be rehabilitated using various treatments to its original 1880 fort form and will be open to park visitors.

Cottonwood Lane, the alley of cottonwood trees aligned on the south and west sides of the Parade Ground, will be established with trees gradually returned to the original alignment through attrition and replacement. The current alignment of cottonwoods is off-set to the north 30 feet to match the incorrect alignment of the reconstructed Officers Quarters now used as the park museum.

The Commissary Building will be retained in partial residential use, but with public access. Residential use will be reduced gradually, as leases expire, to conform to the current zoning, which allows for two residences. Today, there are five residences on the property, making current use nonconforming to existing zoning (but these are legal exemptions allowed by the City). Public access to the Commissary is part of the Master Plan. The Historic Zone will feature public access with walk-through spaces.

Corky Poster recommended that the Adkins House not be removed, but receive only enough stabilization to preserve it and prevent further deterioration. The goal is to keep it in place for now and make a final decision at a later stage of the implementation. David Yubeta questioned whether enough effort would be expended to preserve the building and asked what types of preservation would be implemented. Corky proposed sufficient preservation to “mothball” the building, but no adaptive reuse is planned. He agreed with David that a building being used is preserved better than an empty building and reassured the Committee that the goal is to prevent further deterioration, but without spending a lot of money on it now. Corky also recommended removal of the Adkins steel manufacturing shed because it will be expensive and difficult to bring it up to contemporary structural standards and no adaptive reuse is planned for this structure (the Committee recommended removal of the Adkins shed in a previous meeting).

Corky commented that the Final Concept Plan incorporates all stakeholder and public opinions (Public, Committee, City, County, ASM, SHPO, etc.)

Zone 2 – Organized Sports Fields Zone: Organized sports, like soccer and baseball/softball, will be repositioned in the southern part of the park, with four championship quality soccer fields and five baseball/softball fields sharing space in this zone.

A Plaza amenity at the southwest corner of the park was proposed as a “Gateway” entrance feature, perhaps with the Chief Trumpeter statue moved to be the centerpiece of the gateway.

Reorganized parking is also proposed, with the existing parking lot along Craycroft Road removed, new parking areas added in the center of the park, and increased parking on the south side, along East Glenn Street.

Zone 3 – Swimming, Tennis, and Active Recreation Zone. This zone will be in the north-central part of the park, featuring new exercise areas, but keeping and improving existing swimming pool and tennis facilities. New “ziggurat-style” bleachers are proposed for viewing both swimming and tennis events.

Corky proposed a new location for a future museum, which would be constructed as a final phase of the project. The museum would be a 6,000 sq. ft. facility centrally located in the park, near the parking areas.

Zone 4 – Pantano Wash Natural Area and Native American Interpretation. This zone will be dedicated to preservation and interpretation of the natural environment, focusing on the Pantano Wash and associated riparian area. It also will preserve the historic Pecan tree grove in this area. Corky proposed a possible partnership with the Audubon Society in the eastern part of the park, which will include facilities and areas for bird watchers and other environmental education through signage, trails, classes, etc.

The Native American Interpretation area will expand and improve the existing Hohokam lifeways exhibit.

Corky reported that through the Public review process and Advisory Committee guidance, consensus has been reached on much of the proposed Final Concept Plan. However, a few issues remain to be resolved, which can be done as the plan is implemented through several phases over time.

Discussion: Elaine Hill asked questions on whether proposed grassy areas would reflect native environment. Corky responded that grass is proposed for the Historic Zone to provide unity with existing grassy field on east side of Craycroft Road, but this issue is still open.

Jim Conroy, City of Tucson, responded to question about the park maintenance facility, which currently serves several parks in the area. The City can relocate stockpiles of fill and other materials to another park, freeing up space for park development, resulting in a smaller maintenance footprint at this park.

Rebecca Field, Sage: Responded to questions about the native environment. The plan is to restore the native landscape around the Pantano Wash, and focus on restoring that kind

of environment and vegetation community. Corky Poster recommended removal of several non-native eucalyptus trees in parade ground area.

Anne Woosley asked how Sage will define “native plants” and when does the term “native” start chronologically? Rebecca responded that they will start by reestablishing plants native to that specific wash (Pantano watershed) area. It might be difficult to find certain species, but this would be the goal. Anne Woosley asked if this definition would preclude the use of introduced plants brought in during the fort period, for instance, by wives of officers and enlisted soldiers. In other words, are we limiting ourselves to one perception of “native?” Corky Poster responded that the intent is to provide a mix of cultural landscapes and natural landscapes, which would allow a more flexible definition of “native.” Anne stated that she would like to clarify that cultural plants could be included and commended the Master Plan as a very serious effort to retain some of that recent history. She also expressed her belief that the preservation of the fort buildings is very important.

Elaine Hill asked about the pecan trees after noting that the graphic Final Concept Plan shows trees missing, and new trees. Rebecca responded that some trees would be removed to allow for parking and other uses, but more trees would be added than removed to recreate the original grove.

Loy Neff commented that although absent from this meeting, in earlier email communications Committee members Patsy Waterfall and Peg Sackheim expressed support for the Final Concept Plan and Executive Summary. He asked if their comments could be included in the meeting record. Larry Hecker approved and these comments are incorporated as part of the official record. Comments included below in “Call to the Public:”

Larry Hecker asked about the action under the executive summary. Does it include the Restoration Plan phasing and costs? Corky answered no, and said the Restoration Plan is a separate work task that is not well developed at this time, so it would be premature to make recommendations concerning it now. Simon Herbert suggested a schedule shift to allow the Concept Plan and Restoration Plan to be completed together for presentation and recommendation together to City Mayor and Council and County Board of Supervisors. PFA will present the draft Restoration Plan for Committee review in the September meeting. On the other hand, a decision on the Final Concept Plan can be made now. This will require a slight change in schedule, with the Plans going to COT and BOS in Oct and Nov rather than September. This strategy will not delay the design and construction phases as currently planned. Larry acknowledged that the costs for Phase 1 will be supported by the existing Bond funding, but he asked what other funds are available from elsewhere to support portions of the Master Plan, such as the HAWK crossing of Craycroft, which he notes has strong local support. He asked about RTA funding, or other funds. Corky Poster answered there is a possibility of COT funding. The HAWK crossing is currently planned in Phase 2, which will depend on a future County Bond initiative. Larry said that he'd like to put the HAWK crossing in Phase 1 if funding can be identified. Corky also mentioned that the new museum appears to be the last phase, and may be the last construction implemented.

Action: Larry Hecker asked for a motion on Agenda Items 4.ii. and 4.iii. Executive Summary and Final Concept Plan for the Fort Lowell Master Plan. Anne Woosley moved that the Committee approve and recommend the Final Concept Plan and Executive Summary as proposed. Motion seconded by Frank McClure and Elaine Hill. Motion passed unanimously. Congratulations were offered to Poster Frost Associates.

i. Draft Business Plan and draft Capital Costs (taken out of order). Corky Poster summarized the Draft Business Plan and Capital costs, citing the reports distributed to the Committee. He noted that the only funding currently available is for Phase 1, the Restoration Plan, which is County Bond funding that must be expended on preservation and restoration of the historic buildings on the Adkins parcels. Phase 2 is currently unfunded, but will focus on the rest of the Master Plan elements, with the exception of the proposed new Museum. Future county Bond funding is anticipated for Phase 2. Phase 3 will be construction of the new museum. Funding is not identified at this time for Phase 3. Corky stated that a business plan was in preparation by a sub-consultant firm and will be ready for review in about a month.

b. Draft Recommendation Letter. Loy handed out a draft recommendation letter for Committee review and comment. The letter was offered as an example, or template, of how such a letter might look. He suggested that the Chair, Larry Hecker, could sign, but he is open to all suggestions on how to do this. Larry agreed to sign the letter as Chair, but also wanted all Committee members to sign to recognize their efforts and contributions to the process. Loy agreed that can be done and stated the recommendation letter would be submitted to the City Mayor and Council and County Board of Supervisors after the next phase of the planning process is complete, the Restoration Plan, so that both can be reviewed and approved at the same time.

c. Restoration Plan (Adkins parcels only) – Discussion. Loy brought up the Restoration Plan in relation to the previously discussed idea of the Committee's oversight role and quarterly meetings for the future by asking if PFA could have a Draft Restoration Plan ready for Committee review by the September meeting. Simon Herbert asked Corky if the summer recess was enough time to accomplish this goal. Corky agreed this could be done. Loy mentioned that in this case, the Committee should consider the possibility of continuing monthly meetings from September through the end of the year to be sure of completing and approving the Restoration Plan. If this means moving the approval and implementation schedule out a bit, then it would be worth it to complete the process correctly. The Committee could go to the quarterly meeting schedule after the approval of both Master Plan and Restoration Plan.

5. Call to the Public (the public was asked to limit comments to five minutes).

-Barry Spicer: Questions on proposals for the Master Plan. Where will the Master Plan include information about specific visitors, settlers, and residents in the area before, during, and after the Fort period? Will the sanatorium period be interpreted? Corky Poster answered that interpretation of all stories, and historic periods will be presented at several venues and in various ways: in the park orientation center, museum, in exhibit signs at different locations at historic buildings, such as the Officers Quarters on the Adkins parcels, and along trails, etc. The sanatorium period will be interpreted. For instance, the Officers Quarters on the Adkins parcels were used as a tuberculosis sanatorium. The Adkins family came to the area because a daughter was ill, and after she passed away, they acquired the property and remained to run the sanatorium. Later family businesses included trucking and steel tank manufacturing. Specific plans for exhibits will come later in the implementation phases of the project. Barry Spicer mentioned several family names of early residents obtained from a former resident, including names of people who were born in abandoned fort buildings. Loy responded that such sources of information are very important and he would like to follow up with Mr. Spicer. Loy also mentioned that the project has sponsored cultural resources and historic reports on the Adkins parcels and the over all park. The former report is already available on the project website and the latter is undergoing final review and soon will be posted on the website. Barry Spicer asked about historic work on plant species, especially the large mesquite trees in the area. Loy answered that the report on the over all park has a section on early botanists who recorded new plant species in the fort area, but he was not

sure how specific the discussions are. Corky Poster also responded that the mesquites in the park would be preserved and that there is a plant inventory completed for the park. Barry Spicer commented on the plans to restore the natural environment in the eastern part of the park and noted at least three biological communities were present. He asked if these plant communities will be enhanced. Rebecca answered that the plan included preservation, enhancement, and interpretation of these plant communities.

-Bill Anderson: Made a statement representing the Old Fort Lowell Neighborhood Association (OFLNA) that a letter in protest of the Master Plan from an ad hoc OFLNA committee does not represent the official opinion of OFLNA and OFLNA does not recognize this ad hoc committee. He finished by stating that OFLNA stands by its official response to the Master Plan.

-Ned Mackey, neighborhood resident: Asked about the riparian areas. How many cottonwoods will be planted given the water table changes today and how will planted trees be supported? Rebecca acknowledged that this is a concern, but there is reclaimed water access to provide water for trees and other vegetation at the park. Corky answered that water is very specifically focused here and recognizes the need for conservation. Larry Hecker confirmed that non-potable water is available at the park.

Email comments from absent Committee members: Patsy Waterfall and Peg Sackheim

(Excerpts from email messages with comments on the Fort Lowell Final Concept Master Plan)

From: Patricia H. Waterfall

Sent: Monday, June 22, 2009 10:24 AM

To: Loy Neff

Subject: Re: FLRAC Agenda and Information Package for June 24 Meeting, 4:00PM

From Patsy: Comments on agenda action items.

2. Minutes. Yes.

3.a.ii. I do not think City should sell [Clinco] easement. We don't know what will happen in the future. The La Sonrisa property seems worthless to that neighborhood, maybe they would donate it to the city. If not, agree to buy, but at a very low price.

4.a.1.,2.,3. Approve.

4.b. Approve

Sorry to miss the meeting. Patsy

From: Peggy Sackheim

Sent: Saturday, June 20, 2009 9:37 PM

To: Loy Neff

Subject: RE: FLRAC Agenda and Information Package for June 24 Meeting, 4:00PM

Loy, I am sorry that I will not be able to attend this important meeting.

On item 3. a. ii. Committee recommendations: Clinco easement and La Sonrisa property (Action). I am opposed to the City selling any part of the Commissary property. We don't know what's going to happen there and at some point in time there will be other people owning the Clinco house. And if the City is considering selling any part, my lot borders the Commissary property and I would be interested in purchasing it. But as I just stated, I am opposed to the City selling it, even to me. La Sonrisa property, I am opposed to the City spending any money to purchase this triangle. It really has no value. We are in a budget crisis and any money we have or that might

be available should be used for the preservation of the historic properties, to build the ramada building on the footprint of the Adjutants Office, etc.

4. New business. I approve all the "Actions" on these items.

Peg

PS. I am also in favor at this point in time of keeping and stabilizing the Adkins home. Peg

6. Items and schedule for next meeting, proposed for Wednesday, September 9 (Action)

Loy Neff reviewed the proposed schedule and plan for approval of the Restoration Plan, followed by the summer recess and then reconvening in September. Loy affirmed that the schedule would be monthly meetings after September until the Restoration Plan is approved, then the meeting schedule would be quarterly. He stated that there would be provision made for interim project updates (by email) and that an "emergency" summer meeting could be convened, if needed.

Action: After discussion, Larry Hecker set the next Committee meeting for September 23, 2009.

7. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.