

Minutes of the Fort Lowell Restoration Advisory Committee Meeting

5230 E. Fort Lowell Road, Tucson, Arizona 85712

September 30, 2009, 5:00 P.M.

1. Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 5:00 p.m. Those in attendance were:

Larry Hecker (Committee Chair)

Elaine Hill (Committee Member)

Peggy Sackheim (Committee Member)

Anne Woosley (Committee Member)

David Yubeta (Committee Member)

Lynne Birkinbine (City of Tucson)

Jim Conroy (City of Tucson)

Jonathan Mabry (City of Tucson)

Lisa Cuestas (City of Tucson)

Midge Irwin (City of Tucson)

Linda Mayro (Pima County)

Simon Herbert (Pima County)

Loy Neff (Pima County)

Courtney Rose (Pima County)

Drew Gorski (Poster Frost Assoc.)

Corky Poster (Poster Frost Assoc.)

Janet Marcus (OFLNA)

Bill Anderson (OFLNA)

R.G. Cooke (STBA)

Demion Clinco (Tucson Historic Preservation Foundation)

Tamiyo Morishita (Resident)

2. Review of Meeting minutes: June 24 meeting (Action)

Anne Woosley requested a spelling correction in the minutes.

Action: Motion was made by David Yubeta and seconded by Anne Woosley to approve the June 24 meeting minutes. Motion passed unanimously.

3. New Business.

a. Restoration/Preservation Plan (Action)

i. PFA presentation of Restoration/Preservation Plan elements

ii. Corky Poster and Drew Gorski led discussion of the Preservation Plan.

The recommendations from the approved Master Plan are carried over in this document. The plans show intent of future construction and preservation treatments on the Adkins parcel and the illustration of approaches and not actual “construction plans.”

Larry Hecker asked about public right-of-way improvements along Craycroft Road. Corky Poster mentioned that it would be unlikely to use Bond \$ to work on public sidewalks. The HAWK crossing cost is shown in the Preservation Plan but it is not funded by this project. Larry suggested that RTA has the funding for such a project. He asked if the Board may receive a formal recommendation of funding source. Corky Poster agreed and said that it is in discussion.

Larry Hecker asked how the Officers Quarters #1 will be secured. Drew said the Officers Quarters would be fenced separately (with gates open during the day, but closed at night) and another barrier could be introduced close to the buildings-such as an ocotillo fence-and mentioned that the public would not be able to get to the adobe structures on their own since tours would be docent-led.

Elaine Hill asked about porches and when they had been added (1880s). Corky Poster mentioned that there is still some debate on the issue. He pointed out that the design elements and parts of the structures must show a type of uniformity in structure.

Jonathan Mabry asked why a protective roof was not planned for Officer Quarters #1. Drew Gorski mentioned the cost. Loy Neff mentioned that the walls would be capped as part of the long-term maintenance program. Jonathan Mabry asked about a roof-covering in the future. David Yubeta suggested that perforated roofs work best in these cases (diffuses rain, etc.). Discussion amongst Anne Woosley, Jonathan Mabry, Drew Gorski, and Corky Poster about what would the best strategies be for protecting the existing adobe walls. Drew Gorski discussed that at this point in the Plan, emphasis is on uniformity of structures while also trying to balance protection with roof-of the adobe walls with visual representation, and meeting building codes. Loy Neff asked about how long capping will keep the adobe walls maintained and David Yubeta said that with regular maintenance program, it's a good strategy and works as long as maintained. This also addressed Anne Woosley's question about whether the roof structure would outlast the adobe wall remains. Discussion also included phasing-out the outside, diagonal steel bracing on Officer Quarters #2, having a sidewalk for Officer Quarters #3, and how the water tower will be stabilized.

- iii. Discussion and approval. Larry asked if the appropriate action is to approve the "Restoration" or "Preservation" Plan. A "Restoration" Plan is in the contract, although the Plan is actually a "Preservation" Plan. Decided that "Preservation" Plan is appropriate for this project.

Action: Motion made by Anne Woosley and seconded by Peggy Sackheim to accept the Preservation Plan for the Adkins Parcel at Fort Lowell Park dated September 2009. Motion passed unanimously.

- iv. Schedule to submit to Mayor and Council and Board of Supervisors

- v. Approval schedule

Simon Herbert: both Advisory Committee recommendation letters need to be approved and signed by the committee. Then in the acceptance phase, needs to move timely through COT, the County, and other organizations. On agenda

for Oct 27 for Mayor and Council/COT PFA will present @ 2:00 p.m. Will go to Co. BOS Nov 3rd. Should be accepted by all parties before contract ends for PFA and then project will move into design phase.

Larry Hecker: Asked if the solicitation for design could go out 2 weeks prior to approval? Simon Herbert: Yes, just a tentative date. Because NTP could be issued after approval.

Corky Poster said that they need to print 26 copies of the Master Plan and Preservation Plan to present to City by Friday, Oct 2.

Jonathan Mabry mentioned that the Chief Trumpeter statue location should be shown in the Plan because its absence might elicit public comment. Corky Poster agreed to show the statue in the Plan submitted for approval.

- b. Recommendation letters (**Action**)
 - i. Signatures on Master Plan Recommendation Letter (Committee approved in June 24 meeting): Loy Neff created a letter for all committee members to sign. Larry Hecker reviewed and signed. Then passed letter around for committee to sign.
 - ii. Signatures on Restoration Plan Recommendation Letter: Loy Neff presented letter for signatures. Larry Hecker reviewed and signed and passed letter around for committee to sign.

- c. Environmental cleanup project: Discussion pointed out that environmental cleanup included not only environmental mitigation but also archaeological mitigation and demolition of several existing structures. The cleanup, including demolition, requires appropriate review and approval by agencies and organizations.

Lynn Birkinbine: Plan for cleanup will also go to SHPO because of archaeological work (the clean up grant is comprised of federal monies from the EPA, which requires consultation to meet Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act). COT will conduct consultation. Grant will pay for SHPO consultation plus document going to all regulatory agencies. Met with Desert Archaeology Inc., 2 weeks ago to get a cost estimate to monitor and possibly data recovery while removing contaminated soil. Will use backhoe

with operator trained in archaeological excavation to conduct the soil removal and the required archaeological mitigation.

Jonathan Mabry discussed the compliance process of project with a Federal nexus (EPA).

Lynne Birkinbine discussed some of the issues that will need to be addressed in a project that will require archaeologists to be trained to work in an environmentally contaminated site and how the environmental scientists will also need to do assist with archaeological excavations. A desired approach would employ preservation of exposed features in place, with minimal disturbance whenever possible, rather than fully excavating features during clean-up process. Demolition would need to be done before the clean-up process starts. Many issues to work through that include environmental contamination and mandates but would like to start clean-up in Spring 2010. Jonathan Mabry is managing the consultation process with the EPA and SHPO for this project.

4. Work Plan: Project Status Reports

a. COT Project Status Updates.

i. Other COT updates: Jim Conroy said that updates have already been covered.

b. County Project Status Updates.

i. SHPO Consultation update: Simon Herbert said the Master Plan consultation is still underway. SHPO has responded to the first submittal and Simon has replied and is awaiting SHPO concurrence or additional comments. Simon will also send Preservation Plan to SHPO now that the Committee has approved it.

Loy Neff brought up the subject of how the Committee could continue to work in an official capacity as the project moves into implementation and what ways are available to allow this (the project IGA cites completion of the Master Plan and Restoration Plan as the Committee mandate). He identified two possible ways for the committee to continue in an official capacity. 1. the IGA could be amended (a lengthy and complicated process), or 2. letters could be requested from the City Manager and County Administrator extending official status to the continued work of the Committee in their advisory capacity. This would allow the Committee to continue meeting in an oversight role and in an official capacity,

rather than as an *ad hoc* committee. Neff stated that regardless of whether the committee role is sanctioned “official” or not, it would continue to function in the same capacity and City and County staff would continue to work closely with the committee and respect its recommendations.

Larry Hecker preferred the option of discussing with City Manager and County Administrator about the Committee continuing in official capacity. Linda Mayro and Jim Conroy offered to approach County Administrator and City Manager about this option.

c. Poster Frost Associates Status Updates: already covered.

5. Call to the public: Larry Hecker inquired if anyone from the public wished to address the committee and if there were any questions. No one from the public chose to address the committee.
6. **Action:** Items and schedule for next meeting, proposed for Wed, Oct 14. Motion made by Elaine Hill to approve the next meeting time for Oct 14 and was seconded by Peggy Sackheim. Motion passed unanimously.
7. Adjourn: 6:39 pm