

PRESCOTT PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
July 11, 2008  
Prescott, Arizona

MINUTES OF THE **PRESCOTT PRESERVATION COMMISSION** held on **July 11, 2008** in the **CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS** located at **201 S. CORTEZ ST.**, Prescott, Arizona.

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Stroh called the meeting to order at 8:00 AM.

**II. ATTENDANCE**

<b><i>Members Present</i></b> Doug Stroh, Chairman Russ Buchanan Don Rantz Elisabeth Ruffner Mike Todd Marv Wright	<b><i>Others Present</i></b> Nancy Burgess, Historic Preservation Specialist Mike Bacon, Community Planner Steve Gaber, Community Planner Jim Ciaffoni, City Utilities Engineer Kelly Sammeli, Recording Secretary
<b><i>Members Absent</i></b> Frank DeGrazia, Vice Chairman	<b><i>Council Members Present</i></b> Lora Lopas

**III. REGULAR AGENDA**

1. **Consider approval** of the minutes of the 5-9-08 meeting.

Ms. Ruffner, **MOTION: to approve the minutes** of the May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2008 meeting.  
Mr. Todd, 2<sup>nd</sup>. **VOTE: 6-0.**

2. **HP08-014, 207(C) W. Gurley Street.** Historic District #1, Courthouse Plaza Preservation District. APN: 109-02-009. Request for approval to install a ceramic tile sign. Owner is Hotel St. Michael/Applicant is Jamie Ferrari for Aroma Works. Community Planner is Mike Bacon.

Mr. Bacon reviewed the staff report and indicated:

- the proposed sign is located within the Courthouse Plaza Preservation District #1 at the sub-level area of the St. Michael's Hotel;
- signage is already in place due to misunderstanding with client thinking that they only needed approval from the Hotel St. Michael to install the sign;
- the sign consists of two green tile borders on the top and bottom with white colored tiles in the center which have black sign lettering;
- dimensions of the sign is about 58" in length and 18" in width and totaling 7 sq feet, where a total of 40 sq feet is allowed under code; and,
- staff believes the sign meets the historic design guidelines and is historically appropriately.

Mr. Wright, **MOTION: to approve HP08-014 sign located at 207(C) W. Gurley Street.** Mr. Stroh, 2<sup>nd</sup>. **VOTE: 6-0.**

3. **HP08-017, 347 S. Mount Vernon Avenue.** Historic District # 13, Southeast Prescott Preservation District. APN: 110-03-043. Request is for a building permit to remodel the kitchen, a conversion of a utility room into a bathroom, update existing knob & tube wiring with grounded electrical circuits, replace and relocate the furnace and duct work from cellar to attic location, replace gas water heater with electric water heater, replace all lath and plaster ceilings with ceiling board, repair and refinish all plaster walls, replace windows, relocate rear door, and to remove the rear porch and entry steps. Owner is Ronald J. Lavit and Rachel G. Oesterle. Community Planner is Mike Bacon.

Mr. Bacon reviewed the staff report and indicated:

- this request is a remodel proposal to include;
- remodeling for the kitchen;
- convert the utility room/laundry room into a bathroom;
- replace existing windows with wood overclad metal and finish in a white color, all will be single/double casement with one exception-which will be double-hug (by the bedroom) to match the original window;
- replace the electric wiring;
- elevations, cut sheets, and floor plans were displayed; and,
- staff believes request is within historic district guidelines and supports approval.

Commissioners queried:

- if this request was in addition to the previous request for outdoor work that was granted in March of 2007;

Mr. Peter Madine, 604 Coronado Avenue stated that he was representing the owners of the property and that the request made in March of 2007 was made by the previous owners and would not be completed.

Commissioners further queried;

- the windows are a combination of both single/double hung and casement windows; [Mr. Madine: yes, the windows are being replaced with like style].

Mr. Wright, **MOTION: to approve** HP08-017, 347 S. Mount Vernon Avenue as submitted.  
Ms. Ruffner, 2<sup>nd</sup>. **VOTE: 6-0**

4. **HP08-015, 170 E. Sheldon Street.** Historic District # 8, Santa Fe Depot Preservation District. APN: 113-18-007. Request for building permit to remodel existing Fazolis restaurant to Panda Express restaurant. Awnings, lights, color palette and architectural elements will be added to the exterior. This request also includes a new sign package. Owner is Fazolis/Nellis; LLC/Applicant is Panda Express. Community Planner is Mike Bacon.

This item was continued to the next meeting date, August 8, 2008 at 8:00 AM, due to incomplete information.

5. **HP08-016, 500 Verde Lane.** Historic District # 12, Fort Necessity Preservation District. APN: 108-03- 048B. Indian Hill Reservoir replacement project. Request is to demolish existing water tanks, ancillary equipment, and antennas. To install a fence to protect the Archeological site. Excavate the site to prepare for the installation of a new 1.33 million gallon tank. Tank is 85-feet in diameter and slightly higher than the original tanks height. Install a new 60-foot high tower mono-pole containing City of Prescott Emergency Services

in the north quadrant of the site. Space at the location is also identified for 4 cellular towers that will be approximately 32-feet high. Owner/Applicant is the City of Prescott. Historic Preservation Specialist, Nancy Burgess.

Prior to the start of the staff presentation Ms. Burgess introduced Jim Ciaffoni, City Utilities Engineer; Greg Barry, representative for PBS&J Design Consultants hired by the City of Prescott; and Lynn Nile, archeologist with Envoi Systems Management, Inc., who provided the Archeological report for this project. Ms. Burgess then reviewed the staff report and indicated:

- the property is owned by the City of Prescott, it is commonly known as Indian Hill, and the archeological name is Fort Necessity;
- this request comes before the Preservation Commission because it is located within a City of Prescott Historic Preservation overlay district;
- a preservation overlay district requirements call for any project that requires City of Prescott permits, or any other permits, go before the Preservation Commission for review;
- this project will require permits from the FCC for the cell tower installation;
- the Commission should be concerned with two things: the protection and insurance that all rules and regulations are followed regarding the archeology site that is located on the property, and the aesthetics of the project;
- the site has been surveyed for archeological remains six times, dating 1912, 1926, 1978, 1995, 2000, and 2007;
- early survey work done in 1912 and 1926 did not include any photography or drawings of the site, and it is unclear as to what the site looked like;
- similar sites within the Prescott basin are known as “hilltop forts” or “refuge sites”;
- there have been some artifacts found on the site, however, no human remains have ever been reported;
- the latest archeology report obtained by Envoi Systems Management, Inc., of Flagstaff looked exclusively at the site where the City will be working and has identified “no build” or “no disturbance” areas outside of the area that the City will be working and it will be fenced off and protected during the work;
- in addition, there is another area to the west that will be flagged for protection during the construction site work;
- the FCC compliance officer with the State Historic Preservation Office has looked at the site with staff and has submitted a letter outlining recommendations for the site;
- the City must have the archeological consultant prepare a treatment plan for any disturbance to the site and not disturb any artifacts on the site;
- the old trenching from the water tank down the hill will be excavated and utilized for the instillation of new water pipes along with new drainage relief to help direct the run-off water into the catch basins below;
- SHPO has determined that no new investigations should be done underneath the existing tank;
- all archeological work will be done months prior to the start of the new tank, which is slated to start no sooner than July, 2009;
- the pipeline and pumphouse project will be done first;
- the Commission will be looking at how to mitigate the new 1.33 million gallon water tank from the historic homes of the Old Hassayampa view shed;
- visibility screening should be placed, as much as possible, from the intersection of Deodora and Old Hassayampa Lane;
- green chain-link fencing will replace existing fencing, and new fencing will be added to move the fence line out;
- an additional structural retaining wall constructed out of split face block, varying in height from 2.5 feet to 7 feet will also be placed around the new water tank, with

- Commission to choose the color;
- there is some archeological material located within the area that the cell towers are to be installed, however, this will be reviewed prior to the start of that portion of the project;
  - the site includes several small buildings that house cell equipment, generators and transformers;
  - in addition, there will be four small pad areas created to hold three 32' cell monopoles to relocate the leases already in place and existing on the current water tank;
  - one location will hold the COP monopole that will be 60' in height, and it will hold all the public safety communications equipment for the surrounding area;
  - the pole needs to be 60' tall in order to get the necessary separation for the different types of equipment located on it;
  - each cell monopole will hold three or four vendors as part of the collocation program;
  - the monopoles will be painted in color to match the water tank, cutting down on the monopoles visibility;
  - the Prescott Historic Preservation Plan addresses this site in regards to the Prehistoric Preservation Master Plan adopted by the City Council in 1998;
  - summary guidelines include preservation and protection of prehistoric resources of the district, maintenance and enhancement of the native vegetation of the district, Development of an overall plan for the Fort Necessity Historic District, no allowances for significant new construction within the district, encouragement of low impact structures associated with passive use parks such as benches, signage, shelters, restrooms, etc., encouragement of small, unobtrusive structures constructed of durable, low-maintenance, and encouragement of the use of native materials in any improvements not from the archaeological site;
  - the property is not registered in the National Register of Historic Places, however, it is the opinion of the Arizona SHPO that it is eligible for the listing in the National Register under criterion "D", potential to yield information important in prehistory; and,
  - the State Historic preservation Office does not have any issue with the installation of the new water tank or the monopoles for the communication towers. SHPO's main concern is the protection of the archaeological site during construction.

Commissioners queried:

- is the new tank slightly higher than the old tank [Ms. Burgess: 8 feet];
- that the communication equipment is located on the tank and it will be relocated; and,
- what is the purpose of the new tank.

Mr. Ciaffoni, City Utilities Engineer, stated that:

- the purpose of the new tank is to provide increased volume to allow the fire flow to last longer;
- the eight additional feet of tank will account for about three pounds per square inch;
- the pressure of the water it will not increase but will allow water to flow longer; and,
- the new tank will cover Zone 39.

Mr. Barry, representative for PBS&J, indicated that:

- the new tank will add capacity and volume;
- the tank will increase the duration of water available to fight a fire in the area;
- the tank is connected to pressure zone 39, which feeds a large southern portion of the City;
- the tank also will feed several other pressure zones that are below in elevation;
- overall, approximately 15,000 people are served from this location; and,
- the service will be enhanced.

Commissioner Wright asked for clarification on the heights of the monopoles for the cell towers. He stated that there was a difference in the packet indicating a 25' height and the presentation today indicating the mono poles would be 32' in height.

Ms. Burgess stated that the request did change due to additional information that was not available at the time the staff report was prepared. She then indicated that the monopoles would be 32', the same height as the water tank.

Commissioners queried again:

- what the overall new tank height was vs. the existing tank height;
- if the request included landscaping or vegetation plans; and,
- the design and color of the masonry wall.

Ms. Burgess indicated that:

- the overall height of the new tank would be 32', the existing tank is currently 24' high;
- the new tank would be 4' below grade on a pad, making the visibility 28';
- the overall difference between the two tanks would be 8' total;
- that landscaping has not been determined at this time, however, it is a requirement;
- landscaping will be in place upon completion of the project;
- the Commission can make a recommendation for the landscaping design;
- the final landscaping design will come before the Commission for approval;
- the masonry wall would need to be structurally designed; and,
- the color and texture should match the native rock in the area as much as possible.

Commissioners further queried:

- how does the tank fill up [Mr. Barry: the tank will be filled from the Pioneer Pump Station that will be reconstructed as part of this project. The tank fills in the off-peak hours, and it takes anywhere from 4 to 8 hours to fill];
- the archaeological aspect of the site has been completely compromised from the existing tank [Ms. Burgess: Yes, there are artifacts there, but nothing is in the build zone];
- how tall are the outbuildings coming into the site [Ms. Burgess: the buildings will be 12' x 24' and 8' tall, and located inside the fence];
- if the old buildings will be staying there [Mr. Barry: the existing buildings will be relocated and possibly reused];
- how tall the fence will be [Mr. Barry: 8'];
- if a decision on the wall color needs to be made today [Chairman Stroh: yes, the City is looking for a decision or recommendation on colors today];
- if the colors need to be specific or if they could be generalized, such as a "dirt color" [Ms. Burgess: the colors should be specific. There is some flexibility but the materials need to be ordered];
- if the Commission is approving the project subject to the colors and materials [Ms. Burgess: the Preservation Commission is approving its parts of the project which is the archaeology issues and the aesthetics, for example, the colors, screening and the monitoring of the site];
- if the Commission will only give input with regards to the colors and materials, and the City Council will approve the final construction contract; and, if the final approval of this project goes before the City Council [Ms. Burgess: City Council will be approving the construction contract].

The meeting was then opened to the public.

Ms. Cathy Rusing, 1904 Yampa Place, stated that:

- she is a 20-year resident and it's a great place to raise a family;
- the Engineering Department should show the computer rendering slides of the tank site that were shown at the neighborhood meeting (slides were shown of the new tank vs. the existing tank at this time); and,
- the cell towers were not reflected in the slide [Mr. Barry, representative for PBS&J pointed the towers out in the slide presentation].

Commissioner Rantz then asked staff if this was the view from the intersection of Deodora Lane and Old Hassayampa Lane.

Ms. Burgess stated that this was a closer view than the view from Deodora and Old Hassayampa Lane and it was from the other direction (east).

Ms. Rusing continued:

- that Indian Hill is a very prominent landmark visible throughout the city of Prescott, as well as the surrounding areas, second only to Thumb Butte;
- to use the site for a water tank and commercial cell carriers for cell towers was a crime;
- that she is a member of the Save the Hill Coalition and that there is huge support to save the hill as it is;
- the whole reason that the City wanted to put the 1.33 million gallon tank on the hill was due to the fact that they need more water storage because most of the new water is already allocated for future growth;
- the City is looking at 50 to 100 years from now and they need the monster tanks, located on all the hills to stretch the water allocations;
- when there is less water, then bigger tanks are built;
- she has seen lots of water tanks on hills but she has never seen any in the middle of a city, surrounded by historic homes or multi-million dollar homes;
- that she has reviewed all the cell tower leases, commercial leases, and that she believes that they have nothing to do with public safety;
- the Police/Fire monopole was necessary for public safety and should be allowed, but all the other towers are nothing but junk;
- that she has spoken to a representative for Verizon and that she was informed that Verizon has purchased the Qwest lease;
- the leases that the City holds could be relocated to other places;
- she did not understand why the City holds allegiance to the multinational billion dollar cell carriers and not the citizens, taxpayers, and voters of Prescott;
- if allowed, the cell towers would decrease the property values;
- she hoped it is the goal of the Preservation Commission to save the hill and not decimate the views and the property values;
- that one of the items that the Commission reviewed was a small tile sign and she didn't understand how the Commission could allow what she called the "elephant in the living room" when the Commission reviews the smallest of details within Preservation areas;
- she had spoken with the former mayor of the City, Rowle Simmons, who explained to her that the City has partnered with the cell tower carriers to build cluster towers on three hills throughout the city;
- she believed that if the monopole was placed this year that within a couple of years down the road the City could put up an 85' tripod lattice-type tower;
- if you look at the proportions of the tank vs. the towers, the tank appears to be displaced by all the facilities for the cell towers;
- if the cell towers were eliminated then the tank could be relocated off of the edge of the hill, then sunk deeper into the hill, and it would not be so dangerous;

- as the existing tank is now designed, the huge mass is sitting on the edge of the hill with a retaining wall;
- she believed that SHPO was involved because she had personally contacted them to let them know what was going on;
- upon making contact [with SHPO] she was informed that there was a federal law, Section 106, that protects historic districts from the encroachment of the cell towers;
- the federal law exempts the public safety tower, and the commercial carriers must abide by the law that states they cannot place towers within a half of a mile of a historic view shed;
- these cell towers are located right in the Old Hassayampa Preservation District residents backyards;
- when this was brought up at the community meeting, she was told that it is not the City's job to inform the carriers what the federal laws were;
- if the City is collecting lease money, why wouldn't they [the City] have to tell the carriers of the federal regulations;
- they [cell carriers?] also have to apply to the state for permits which has not been done;
- that there is a groundswell of community support to save the hill;
- there has been a lot of footwork completed and they [the community ?] would like to be part of the solution of investigating the water needs;
- in addition, in half of the area that this tank is to serve there are no fire hydrants to fight fires with;
- the City has been dealing with fallout from the Lowe's project, and she believes that people are fed up; and,
- she thanked the Commission for listening to this important issue for the community.

Commissioner Ruffner then requested that staff recite the federal, state, and City ordinance with regard to cell towers for the public.

Ms. Burgess responded that:

- the State Historic Preservation Office has known about this project for more than two years;
- after meeting with Tim Burkeen, Project Manager, City of Prescott, 2+ years ago regarding this proposal, she immediately had a discussion with Carol Griffith, SHPO Deputy, regarding the City's proposal;
- she currently is working with Connie Thompson-Gibson, the FCC compliance representative at SHPO;
- Ms. Thompson-Gibson is involved with the project because there is FCC licensing required, and she will be monitoring the City's project as a requirement of the law;
- the City is fully aware of the requirements and will apply for licensing when the time is appropriate in the process of the project; and,
- that any questions regarding the FCC licensing requirement and cell towers would be addressed by Steve Gaber, Community Planner.

Mr. Gaber, Community Planner, City of Prescott, stated that:

- he has been involved with cell site related items for the last ten years on behalf of the City;
- the City does have an ordinance that falls under the *Land Development Code* that describes the two different processes that the City engages in for cell sites;
- one process is special use permits for private sites, and the other process is for leasing public-owned property such as the City's Indian Hill where there is significant infrastructure already in place;
- the City directs cell companies to co-locate, or cluster, at these locations;

- this decision came about many years ago with the onset of the cell tower explosion and wireless communication services;
- there are 13 leases in all, scattered around the community;
- three leases are located at Indian Hill which include AT&T, Verizon, and Sprint;
- the idea was to take advantage of the tower that was already at the site of Indian Hill as well as mounting the towers on the tanks;
- private property owners may be contracted by these commercial carriers anywhere in the city; and,
- this prompted the decision a decade ago to have clustering of the sites for the public as well as for private sites.

Commissioners queried:

- if cell leases were not located at Indian Hill, is there an alternative City site [Mr. Gaber: No. That site had been determined a decade ago with the thought that it would be better to have the clustering rather than having the sites dispersed throughout the City];
- how tall is the existing tower at Indian Hill [Mr. Gaber: 75'];
- the new public safety mono tower is proposed at 60', the four private lease monopoles are proposed at 32'; and,
- if the private leases for the cell towers went away, would the City consider moving the tank further back on the site [Mr. Barry: the City has contractual obligations for the site] and [Mr. Gaber: the City has three carrier leases that are for five-year periods with four automatic renewals. The City is in the second period of the renewal process].

Commissioners further queried;

- if private monopoles were not allowed, could the tank be relocated from the edge of the hill;
- if it has been determined that the tank must sit at the site regardless of the monopoles being located there;
- how many gallons of water are held now vs. the amount to be held;
- if the new tank were reduced in a height by eight feet, how many gallons could the tank hold; and,
- do the lessee's have control over the tower heights.

Mr. Barry, representative for PBS&J, reported that:

- the City had looked at three or four other sites within this area where the water tank might be placed but they were rejected due to the elevations being below the 5700 feet required to service the area;
- that there are only a few spots that meet the requirements, and going off site would mean a large, long distance pipeline to get the water to the area;
- that several of the buildings on the site currently house equipment for the water tank as well as cellular equipment;
- if buildings were removed, the tank could possibly be moved back;
- the current tank holds 400,000 gallons of water and the new tank would hold 1.33 million gallons of water; and,
- if the tank height was reduced by 8 feet then the tank would hold about a million gallons of water.

Mr. Gaber responded to the question of the lessee having control and reported that the City owns the land and would control any new lease agreements with a public hearing process as it did in the past.

Commissioner Todd stated that he was not a disinterested party with respect to the aesthetics of the tank; however, he is on the fire suppression sub-committee for the area and knows the critical nature of the fire danger in the area. He further stated that the southwest quadrant is particularly at risk. While he does not have an opinion of the cell towers, he stated that while getting the color, landscaping and materials are important, he finds it irresponsible not to support the project because of the impact to so many residents in the event of a fire.

Ms. Rusing stated that she thought it would be a good idea to have input from the City Attorney, Gary Kidd, regarding the cell tower leases. She stated that during her review she had noted that the leases were written ten years ago by Mr. Moffitt and they are for the site located on the tanks. She further stated that just because the leases are already there it doesn't mean that they can't be renegotiated or rewritten to meet the new site.

At that time, Mr. Gaber was asked by Chairman Stroh if he would like to respond.

Mr. Gaber stated that he only had further information to share, and he then reported that the existing leases provide opportunity for adjustments of how things are located at the site. He stated that within each five-year renewal period the City can inform the cell carriers that changes are to be made on the site. The carriers are informed of the changes and the options given, and then the carriers have a year to accept or reject the new option for the lease.

Commissioners further queried:

- if the Commission could lock in the maximum height of 35' for the cell towers;
- any major changes to the cell tower would go before the public; and,
- the outcome would only be for the term of the lease, any permanent changes would have to be through an adoption of the ordinance.

Chairman Stroh then asked Ms. Rusing how she liked the presentation.

Ms. Rusing responded that two wrongs don't make a right. She stated that sixty years ago this was not done right. And in that beautiful neighborhood, the tank is an industrial-sized tank, the cell clusters are an industrial project and they [?] would just like things left as they are. Continuing, she stated that her group intended to go to the Open Space Committee to see if they could get this location saved as open space like Granite Mountain.

Chairman Stroh stated that he looks at this as an opportunity to make things much better. He continued by saying the Commission should look at ways to mitigate the effects of the project and make it better. Pointing out that the profiles are similar, and by camouflaging and landscaping the tank, the project could be better. He stressed that it was not the Commission's duty to decide if the City needs the tank or not, the duty is the proposal before Commission, and the proposal needs to be addressed from a view-shed point of view.

Commissioners queried:

- how the 1.33 million gallon tank determined;
- is this the tallest tank that needs to be replaced;
- the City has determined that there is no other viable site for the tank;
- if this tank has any impact on fighting a fire within the Timberidge area or areas to the south of Copper Basin Road;
- it is a top priority to build larger tanks in fire danger areas that interface with the Prescott National Forest; and,
- it would be wise to go back to the Carollo Report and review it.

Mr. Barry stated that:

- the 1.33-million-gallon size tank was determined several years ago from the Carollo Report;
- the report stated that the City should place a 2-million-gallon tank on Indian Hill to replace the aging one and to add more water storage as needed by the City;
- the report also recommended other sites within the City where increased storage was needed based on current engineering principles and current fire flow demands;
- in addition the 1.33-million-gallon size tank came from the available size of the available land space on top of the hill; and,
- the aesthetic concerns are not to make the tank too high and limit it to 32'.

Mr. Bill Richards, 425 Fairway View Drive, stated that:

- he lives about 400' below the tank site;
- there are a number of reasonable alternatives where the issue of water storage and pressure can be dealt with;
- with a number of smaller tanks adjacent to existing tanks, it would provide an equal amount of storage and pressure to that area;
- by putting a large storage tank anywhere is cost effective but not [cost effective] on a hill;
- the City of Mesa storage tanks are not elevated storage tanks and are at ground level where they have large pumps to fill the mains for the pressure;
- the neighborhood is not willing to accept the City's conclusion and their reasons regarding the site;
- he reviewed the Carollo study, and it is about two inches thick, and it takes time to review something that big;
- the Carollo Report should be placed into the library as a reference document;
- information such as where the tanks are located in the southwestern quadrant and the tables may be something that can be reviewed with staff;
- the whole issue needs to be re-evaluated with more information available to the public; and,
- the tank should be reduced down to one million gallons.

Mr. Ciaffoni stated that:

- the City has looked at other locations but the sites are not at the right elevations, or if the elevation was right, the houses would have to be torn down to accommodate the tank;
- Timber Ridge Road is in a higher elevation and will not be served by Zone 39, and the tanks that take care of that location will need to be replaced also;
- the copy of the Carollo Report is available at City Hall for review. Due to the fact that the City has concerns regarding the safety of the information and because the report provides the water-system layout and the system's vulnerability points, the report is not distributed;
- the Public Works Department does not have a clear-cut policy on copying the documents, it is based on a judgment call;
- the report concluded that 20-million gallons are in storage right now but the city will need to more than double that to 40 million gallons at the time of the predicted 2050 growth rate;
- this is not the case for this tank; and,
- the tank is to correct an existing deficiency as it relates to today's standards for fire flow, which is 1500 gallons per minutes for a continuous period of two hours which is based on population served and the land uses.

Ms. Debra Kaukol, 432 Shalimar Drive, Prescott stated that:

- she was firefighter that flew air tankers in the 1970s and 1980s in the area;
- after reviewing the zoning map in the overhead projector, she pointed out Indian Hill and that it is a highly-congested historic residential area;
- that all locations from the Old Hassayama, Country Club Sears & Roebuck Houses and historic Park Avenue will be affected;
- if you look at the tank in relation to the size of the hill, it is half the size of the hill;
- when expanding the tank out to the south side 12', it will be astounding at how much leveling will have to be done;
- the retaining wall has to be placed on the site because the tank is too big for the hill;
- what is going to happen when it rain—there will be landslides to homes at the base of the hill;
- construction work will cause land deterioration, scarring of the hill, and rain runoff;
- aesthetically, the new tank is too big for the hill--6½ times larger than what is there now;
- there is a wall plaque given to the City from Laura Bush for continuing commitments of preserving and using the cultural and natural resources for the benefit of the public;
- there is noise at the current tank at night when it fills up and you cannot go outside without noticing it;
- forest fires start in the forest and then come into town;
- the tank should be placed on the outskirts of town; and,
- with today's technology we could put a 10-million-gallon water tank under the parking garage and nobody would know it was there.

Ms. Kaukol then read a poem by Ted Edmundson, titled "Indian Hill."

Chairman Stroh indicated a ten minute break in the proceedings at 9:50 AM.

The meeting resumed at 10:00 AM with additional public comments.

Mr. Frederick Lindquist, 1091 Old Hassayampa Lane, stated that:

- he is a former PHS teacher/coach, had attended the University of Arizona, the University of Illinois and achieved a Master's Degree from Arizona State University, with a major in Cultural Anthropology and a minor in Archeology;
- he had a brief background of archeology study with the University of Arizona at the Ringo site, which is approximately the same age date as Indian Hill;
- he was alarmed to have read in the paper that there were no burials, artifacts, or pottery found on the site of Indian Hill, so he surveyed the site and discovered a handful of pottery pieces and other artifacts that he left in place;
- both the Archeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 and the National Parks Service have indicators of what is required of an archeology survey, and it will be interesting to see if the project is approved;
- a tsunami effect could be created if the tank bursts; and,
- he is a member of the community and feels that this is really "an elephant in the dining room" for the site;

Mr. Lindquist asked for a show of hands from the Commissioners who had walked up the hill and viewed the site. (three Commissioners raised their hands: Elisabeth Ruffner, Don Rantz and Doug Stroh).

Commissioner Ruffner stated for the record that at the time the tank was constructed, the event occurred outside of the law, and that we know the 1906 antiquities law existed at that time. However, this is a problem of the past that we have no ability to address today. Nobody condemned the City of Prescott and what we must deal with is the condition of the site as it is today after the damage was done. Ms. Ruffner is confident that all measures are being taken to protect Indian Hill.

Mr. Ed Brogan, 1104 Country Club Drive, stated that:

- he lives on the west side of the tank roughly 100 yards below the tank;
- he is a retired attorney from the City of Phoenix and is well aware of how a city operates and he is here as an individual;
- we are dealing with facts here, and there is no question that there are artifacts at the location everyone, and has agreed to that;
- to take in heavy equipment with operators would not be the most careful thing to do;
- the City makes a big point of saying that they will keep within the area, but if you go in with big equipment and move dirt around, how will they keep from running over the stuff--it can't be done;
- the area is zoned residential and the City is conducting a business there, leasing out antennas, how does that make people in the area feel;
- God made that mountain and man cannot improve on it, all you have to do is look at Route 69 to see the spectacles they have made out of our mountains;
- it makes you want to cry, someplace you have to stop, and he thinks this is the point to stop;
- the current road spirals around, this plan call for the lines to go directly up the hill;
- the scars that are incurred when you dig the lines do not recover quickly;
- the decrease in property value has not been approached yet and should be looked at;
- a 10% to 30% decrease of the property value [may occur] and many of the homes are Valued at over \$700,000.00 dollars;
- there are 94 families that are going to be affected by this project;
- this is a reconstruction, not a repair or improvement project;
- originally this tank was scheduled to be a 2-million-gallon tank and it was scaled down to what it is today, however, that leaves 77 thousand gallons in limbo; and,
- this is the wrong place for a tank.

Commissioner Stroh asked if Mr. Lindquist would just prefer to have it left as it is.

Mr. Lindquist stated that since they are remodeling/rebuilding the pump house, they could put in large enough lines, where the pumps could supply water to those tanks.

Mr. William Jenkins, 1105 Old Hassayampa Lane, stated that:

- the slides from the neighborhood meeting the night before had far more impact to be able to view the new tank vs. the old tank;
- if the only choices left were to mitigate the color choices and landscaping, why were the other four sites studied;
- spending \$250,000 to study unsuitable sites seems like a waste of money and an insincere attempt to seriously consider alternatives to trashing Indian Hill;
- there is no way to mitigate the damage of a 1.33-million-gallon tank;
- you can't hide that thing, you could paint it whatever color you want and it will be seen;
- size and scale is the issue, not the color;
- the view shed will be dramatically impacted no matter how this project is done;

- the increase in demand is generated by new growth, and any new tanks should be located within the neighborhoods that they are designed to serve and not impact an existing neighborhood that has more than adequately addressed its water needs;
- the City has stated that this is the first of many new tanks to come, if that is the case then that means we need the unpleasing hillside/hilltop tanks to be located on twenty more areas like Indian Hill; and,
- if that is the case maybe we should rethink the whole process, the tank is only 50 years old and could last for an additional 50 more years.

Ms. Rebecca Brooks, 1105 Old Hassayampa Lane, stated that:

- the Preservation Commission is the caretaker of the present and future aesthetic concerns for the portrait of Prescott and for its view sheds;
- they purchased a 1939 built house several years ago because they chose not to add to the footprint of the community;
- they chose to revive an older house, to live in a historic neighborhood and to answer to the restrictions and requirements that protect neighborhoods and they are listed on the National Register of historic homes;
- there is an expectation and there are requirements that we on that Register will follow--we respect and abide to the criteria set in place by this historic committee;
- this can be a detail as small as adding a tiny window to an already existing historical home that might not have had that window;
- her expectation, and the expectation of the people that are here today, is that our City will also answer to these same standards;
- as caretakers of our City, its coffers, its resources, our elected representatives have an obligation to listen to the townspeople of Prescott;
- her concerns are the aesthetics because that is why we are all here today;
- it appears that this project is pinned to only one hope-- that since it is an improvement of an already existing water supply that it is exempt from the criteria and protection laws that are now in place;
- she believes that the protectionary laws were tossed aside;
- there is the expectation that the current caretakers and representatives will honor the hard work of those before them;
- the City needs to be responsible in our approach to this project and embrace all the criteria that exists;
- if this project, and everyone will agree, were it not a pre-existing water tank, it wouldn't be here for approval approval or allowed;
- it is time for the plans of the City to be neighborhood specific, and our neighborhood met its water needs 50 years ago to the best of its abilities;
- today she is sure that we can do a better job with the advances, technologies, and respect to protect the natural resources and its aesthetic concerns;
- it is important, when the Council approves new neighborhoods, that the responsibility to service, support and supply for their needs is based on self-sufficiency and not impacting already working, balanced and effective, established communities;
- the idea that progress and population growth should be the burden of the already existing working neighborhoods is to put everyone at risk;
- it was established at the meeting last night that the existing tanks would sufficiently provide for the current needs of Zone 39 which do not have a build out opportunity;
- it was also established from Tim Burkeen, Project Manager, that there are at least 50 more years of service from the existing tanks;
- the Commission does not think that this is just an Indian Hill issue, it is not;
- this is about responsible, mindful, aesthetic planning;
- it was stated last night that this was the first of many water projects and improvements that are already lined up, and she thinks that it is all the more reason

- to stop, slow down and thoughtfully consider how to address the water needs and how can we best answer them;
- if this is the first of many tanks to come, then it's all the more reason to set the bar high and take the time and do it justice;
- at last night's meeting, a fellow towns person asked, if your plan goes through what provision will you make to capture the runoff from this storage tank, will you be able to retain it, retreat it and use this water? And, Tim Burkeen's response was it would not be cost effective. I think this comment best reflects the demoralizing quality of this improvement project;
- on a personal note, she is an artist, her husband is a builder, and many of the plans he does are about function vs. form, design vs. aesthetics, and how it's going to work. Every time that they have collaborated on something, it is better when both things are attended to and given their due attention;
- something much better can be created than what is being proposed and it's upsetting to think that the planners are already happy to give you fencing color samples;
- she doesn't think it's time to think about how we can disguise a project that is a big Pandora's box;
- there should be more meetings on this issue and no decisions made today;
- better communication about the project would be advised; and,
- she just lives down from this site, and it was only two months' ago that she found out about this project was even in the workings.

Commissioner Ruffner stated that:

- in the interest of Historic Preservation information, she would like to make it clear that the City-owned property on the top of Indian Hill is not included in any Historic Preservation District [*note per Ms. Burgess: this is not correct*];
- there are no requirements for design or any other kind of control there [*note per Ms. Burgess: this is not correct*];
- it is her understanding that the whole project includes replacing ageing pipes and systems from one place to another;
- the reason for the Carollo Study was not to accommodate growth but to protect the people who already live there; and,
- the rainfall has been addressed as far as runoff is concerned.

Mr. Ciaffoni stated that:

- the Carollo report showed that this tank was just to correct an existing deficiency and that the City is not proposing the tank to facilitate new growth;
- all the rainwater that falls on the top of the tank or the shoulder will be captured in an underground drainage system to control the flow rate and direct it away from the site into the existing sewer system;
- there could be some opportunity to capture some of the water in an underground tank which might water the screening vegetation; and,
- the tanks on the hill at this time have 50 years of life remaining in them--they are just too small to provide the volume that we need to meet today's standards.

Ms. Brooks responded that:

- the project manager stated that the existing tanks provided for the area and area 39, and now we are looking at the building that is occurring on Copper Basin Road;
- new neighborhoods should be required to take care of themselves, and this project is affecting a very old, established neighborhood;
- the hill doesn't answer to historic criteria but it does answer to a view shed and this is a prominent place, this is not a basin;

- you can hardly walk the area and look back and not see Indian Hill. It is like Thumb Butte, the “calling card” of Prescott; and,
- the project manager also stated that these tanks are to take care of the existing area and that they do have a good serviceable life if they are maintained.

Mr. Richardson stated that:

- he was the one to ask the question at the meeting of what was the expected lifespan of the tanks;
- if the City just kept things *status quo*, what would the life of the tanks be--the staff said that they know of tanks that were 100-years old;
- there is a chance that the tanks could be used for a potential of fifty more years if they are taken care of;
- he asked if they [the tanks] were leaking, if they were rusting, if they met the demands to which the staff responded by saying: no, they did not leak and they were not rusting;
- they may not be meeting today’s demands, perhaps not if the goal is to have more water flow to fight fires, but yet the Carollo Study called for a 2-million-gallon tank so how does a 1.33-million-gallon-tank serve the need;
- do we need to burden another place with a 700,000-gallon-size water tank to make up the deficiency that they already admitted that they have even if they do this project—let’s just put the whole thing in another location that is not so intrusive and impacting to a view shed of a Historic District.

The public portion of the meeting was closed at this time, and the Commissioners queried:

- if this hilltop didn’t change the current tanks, and it stayed *status quo*, what were the consequences or what would be the alternative for the City’s next step in trying to maintain the City’s water service to that area;
- if the City has ever considered ground level tanks with pumps;

Mr. Ciaffoni responded that:

- putting larger tanks in higher elevation areas could indirectly provide the water needed, but we need to be realistic in that the City does not have a lot of options on placement of tanks, most places are already occupied;
- there are problems with trying to find a lower elevation site that would allow a burial of something that big, along with constraints of ground water and rock to excavate a hole that big;
- there are not many options when a pump is sucking water out and pressuring the line to make it flow uphill;
- if the power goes out, you lose the pressure in the lines on the discharge side of the lower elevations;
- pipelines don’t hold that much water and many pumps are needed in case one line fails;
- to switch the system will incur extra costs for backup emergency power;
- how many emergency generators are needed on line;
- we never will get to the reliability of the tank on the hill; and,
- everything needs to be upsized by a factor of 50% more, and that translates to increased costs.

**Chairman Stroh: I’m going to make a motion to table this.** I think we need more information. I think that we are used to buildings, houses, and things like that; but, I think there are a lot of questions that we need to research for another thirty days. Maybe the City can look at some options; and, I don’t feel that I am informed enough on what procedures that we [Commission] can take.

**Commissioner Wright, 2<sup>nd</sup>.** The point that has been made in my mind, that we need to be thinking about, is if we were doubling the water capacity over the next couple of decades, we're going to be running into this on every hilltop; and, I need to think about that and get some more information.

Commissioner Ruffner asked about the implications and costs on delaying this project one month; we have to talk about more than just one neighborhood.

Jim Ciaffoni indicated this contract for the construction of the tank is not scheduled until the spring of next year; however, there is a related project, the design of the pump station on Pioneer and Hassayampa, and the design of the pipeline is interrelated to the size of the tank, and that project is due to go out in the next couple of months. So, if we were going to make changes to the tank then there will be changes in the pump station design. So there is urgency.

Commissioner Rantz: So, this is not creating an undo burden on the taxpayers of Prescott to postpone this for one month?

Chairman Stroh: Okay, so we have a motion and a second. All those in favor of delaying the project for 30 days, signify by raising your hands and saying aye. **Vote: 3-3.** Stroh, Buchanan, and Wright for the motion; Ruffner, Rantz and Todd against. DeGrazia, absent. **Motion fails to carry.**

Commissioner Ruffner, **MOTION: move that the Prescott Preservation Commission approve HP08-016**, 500 Verde Lane, Indian Hill Reservoir replacement project, remove existing two water tanks, install new water tank, color to be determined; install new retaining walls, materials and color to be determined; install new storm drain; construct new equipment buildings, color to be determined; install new vinyl coated fence, color to be determined; monitoring of new fence post holes, installation of one public safety tower, 60' specify monopole tower instead of tower, color to be determined; future installation of four 25' cell towers with private leases, Commission to specify monopoles instead of towers, specific feet are still in question. That is the end of the motion but I need to ask staff if that needs to be left open or determined, the 60' and the 25' foot tower.

Nancy Burgess: should be 60' and 32', the same height as the tank.

Chairman Stroh: do we have a second?

Commissioner Rantz, **2<sup>nd</sup>.**

Chairman Stroh: additional comments by the Commissioners? My view is this is going to set precedence for a long, long time; and, as the City grows, all these hilltops will be coming back time and time again. I think it is irresponsible to not wait the thirty days to do more research and understand how the process works.

Commissioner Ruffner: I'd like to make another comment. All the other sites do not hold any prehistoric sites and many of them will not come before the Commission but as historic view shed.

Nancy Burgess: None of the other tanks will come before the Preservation Commission as far as I know because they do not fall within a Preservation Overlay District; however, they could come to the Commission for courtesy review if the Community Development Director

so directs.

Mr. Stroh: We have a motion and a 2<sup>nd</sup>. All those in favor, raise your hand and signify by saying aye. **Vote: 3-3.** (Ruffner, Rantz and Todd for the motion; Stroh, Buchanan, and Wright against the motion; DeGrazia absent. **Motion fails to carry.**

Ms. Burgess: Commission has to make some kind of a decision. Because we have six commissioners here it looks like things are going to be tied, but we can't just leave it hanging open. We have to make some kind of decision, to have some next step. May I suggest a possibility of a special meeting in less than thirty days (the next regularly scheduled meeting is the second Friday in August), just for this item if you are concerned about the time frame of delay. Staff would have to know exactly what kind of information you desire for that meeting. New information only, when everyone is available, that would take us out of the deadlock.

Commissioner Ruffner: Are you suggesting that we would do this with seven members present?

Ms. Burgess: We could gather questions from the Commissioners; we need a special meeting with only new information and all seven commissioners here.

Commissioner Ruffner: New information and the slide, as it is a point of contention.

Commissioner Wright: I would be interested if there is any support for the tank, and a work up on a million gallon tank that would clean up the hill.

Mr. Ciaffoni: If the tank is smaller than the 1.33-million-gallon tank, we will have to redesign the pump house.

Ms. Ruffner: I am happy to give this more time, all the time that it takes, but I would like to recall to the Commission and the public that we're talking about a major, huge City expense when we plan on moving, changing or adding to the water supplies and building new water lines in an antiquated area when the lines went in during the 1930s. We must really consider the overall expense for the whole citizenry of Prescott and how we are going to pay for it. I do warn you to be careful.

Mr. Stroh, **MOTION: to have a special meeting within a couple of weeks, date to be determined, where all seven commissioners could be in attendance, with requests for additional information submitted to the City to come in the next few days.**

Ms. Ruffner, 2<sup>nd</sup>. **VOTE 5-1.** (dissenting vote: Todd).

Mr. Ciaffoni asked if the Commission could give some direction as to acceptable colors so when we do come back we can show some renderings of two or three shades that cover the range that you could communicate to us now.

Chairman Stroh called for a short, two minute break.

Meeting reconvened at 11:02

- 6. HP08-013, 300 N. Montezuma Street.** Adjacent to the proposed North Prescott Townsite (National Register Historic District pending). APN: 113-13-038F. Request for a courtesy review of the proposed 23,390 square foot masonry, two story building that will house a

twenty-four hour, seven day per week, four-bay Fire Station for the City of Prescott. Owner is City of Prescott. Historic Preservation Specialist, Nancy Burgess.

Nancy Burgess introduced Ron Miller, Project Manger for the new Fire Station project for the City of Prescott and Larry Enyart, LEA-Architecture firm. Ms. Burgess continued review of the staff report and stated that:

- this will be a courtesy review for the proposed fire station and administration Building which is to be located at 300 N. Montezuma which is located at the Intersection of N. Montezuma Street and E. Sheldon Street;
- immediately behind it to the west is the historic Santa Fe, Prescott and Phoenix Railroad Bridge, which has been determined to be eligible for the National Historic Register;
- it is not listed in the Register at this time and there are no initial plans to do a nomination;
- the site is a landmark location for downtown Prescott and it is immediately adjacent to the proposed North Prescott Townsite National Register Historic District and is across the street from the Santa Fe Depot Historic District (HPD#8);
- the project is currently at 25% of the design stage and the floor plan and building elevations will be presented;
- the property will be accessed primarily off the alley, and plans call for a right-in and right-out only on Montezuma Street; and,
- design materials will include jumbo brick, split faced CMU banding, aluminum window frames, standing seam metal roof, steel railings, and exposed beams.

Ron Miller, City of Prescott, Facilities Construction Project Manager, stated that Deputy Fire Chief for the City of Prescott, Bruce Martinez, was also available for any questions and then he reintroduced Larry Enyart, FAIA, from LEA-Architects to do the presentation.

Mr. Enyart, stated that:

- the firm has been in business for three decades and has had the privilege of designing over 125 Fire Stations;
- they had just finished the Central Yavapai Fire District training center;
- that this project is at the 25% design mark;
- the plan is to incorporate the historic Santa Fe, Prescott, and Phoenix Railroad Bridge;
- the building will be two stories high and will incorporate public parking for the park area;
- on the bottom floor, there will be four apparatus bays and a lobby, with the second floor housing the administration;
- the second floor will incorporate offices, meeting and break rooms;
- the lower level will be raised above grade 4' as the site location is located within a 500-year flood zone;
- the light fixtures will be in the building, parking lot, and the bridge;
- the arch "theme" will be incorporated into the design of the building;
- the majority of the building is made out of jumbo brick, using with a split faced brick as the banding;
- details will include ADA entrances, dimly lit columns, two towers, one at each end of the building that are 48'8" above grade and barrel vaults throughout the building;
- the building height will be low and respectful of the area; and,
- if determined by the Council, the building could be built as a green building;

Commissioners queried:

- that this is a courtesy review with regard to the design;
- criteria is that infill lots should match the existing buildings, there are no curved roof structures within Prescott, and the towers should be of a pyramid shape;
- if it is possible to only have one tower instead of two;
- there should be more room at the front of the site to allow parking of the fire engine to be located within the site and not on Montezuma Street;
- the exterior stairs should be covered due to the changes in weather for this area;
- on the upper level where the offices are, the patio area should be accessible to all staff and not just a private patio for the Chief;
- what is the purpose of the lobby space on the lower floor;
- will the city of Prescott allow the design to be that of Platinum LEED;
- if there is public restroom on the north side of the building;
- the design does not fit in with the design of downtown Prescott;
- the spirit of downtown Prescott is not captured as part of the design;
- the design needs to reflect that of an infill building within in an historic district;
- that arches and barrel vaults are not used in the downtown area, the forms look foreign;
- sustainability has to do with orientation of the building, right now 99% of the glass faces east and west;
- there is no protection from the elements, and being in the higher country, there should be some protection from the sun and the snow over the entrances and the bay doors;
- it would be nice to see some sort of solar incorporated in to the design;
- the plan should recommend that the City look into a central unit for heating and cooling instead of rooftop units to mitigate visibility;
- with the site plan as it is designed now, the railroad trestle disappears, and unless it is redesigned, it will not be visible from Sheldon Street anymore;
- more of a relationship of design between the trestle and the building needs to be done;
- there is not any structure in downtown Prescott built with split faced block, and it would be nice to see the local flagstone or a waterproof masonry used in the design rather than block;
- it is possible that the parking is inadequate for the number of staff that is slated for the building, and the public parking on the weekend would probably be okay;
- most of the windows in the downtown area are a single-hung or double-hung type window, and this design is showing slider-type windows; and,
- consideration should include going to three stories as this would minimize the footprint.

Mr. Enyart stated that he would like to address the Commissioners concerns with the following:

- the patio located on the second floor does serve the senior leadership but it also serves as an announcement for the building as it reflects back to the curved form;
- the public area is designed for the purpose of groups coming through the building, it is a location needed for the public to gather, many people go there to get their blood pressure checked, etc;
- the fire administration staff that mans the station has to exist with some degree of privacy and yet have public areas, and the reception area is an area to limit access to senior staff;
- the building is a long rectangular building and is designed to reflect the long, skinny site with the vertical calculation in the towers being necessary by code for the egress;
- the wrap-around stairways will allow the area to also be utilized as an area for rappelling training purposes, and it will allow easy access to the roof area;

- the unsureness of the City's decision on the "green building" as it is just in the design stages, however, the Mayor has expressed great interest in LEED buildings;
- the parking area is designed as a turn around site with an opening for the entrance to the park that citizens can utilize;
- the jumbo brick is manufactured in Phoenix and the materials with regards to LEED must be obtained within a 500-mile radius;
- the arched-shaped brick structures are being respectful of the building that is located directly across the street known as the Summit bank building;
- historic buildings of the 1920s period have large arched openings and lots of little arches, and it should be noted this type of design is expensive;
- the fire station design has some of these designs as well as the various parapets that are located throughout Prescott;
- the design of the roof is not to be one of gilded, shiny, gold plated roof, it is to be subdued but use the materials, forms, and textures of those that are already located here;
- one half of the building is apparatus based and will not be air conditioned;
- to design the building at three stories would put added time on for emergency service calls as staff would have to exit three flights of stairs;
- the canopy could be extended out on the east side to adjust for the protection factors;
- the first design the firm submitted did represent the design elements that were recommended: the triangular designs, exposed beams and truss work, canopies over the windows, but the project was redesigned due to costs and maintenance; and,
- having the structure facing Montezuma Street will again save on response time.

Mr. Miller stated that it would be helpful to the design team and the users of the building to assist the architect in meeting more of the design intent; and, as the project moves forward, the comments of this design review are made available for the design teams' review and possible use.

Ms. Burgess stated that when the minutes are done, the comments are summarized and that they would be available for the review of the written record.

Mr. Miller stated that they were before the Historic Preservation Commission based on a request from the Mayor for the courtesy review, and the review recommendations will be taken seriously.

Chairman Stroh stated that to bring the project back before the Commission would be a very positive thing and that, hopefully, the Commission would support the finished design 100%.

Mr. Enyart stated that he hoped that he had answered the question that the Commission had and provided some logic as to how the design had come about. In closing he also stated:

- in summary he understood that barrel vaults are one of the big design components that is not liked;
- that the Commission preferred a masonry structure instead of the split faced brick and the jumbo block [Commissioner Rantz: No, that was only a recommendation. The design of the building is for you to do. We are giving you some ideas on what other infill buildings have done in downtown Prescott. Split face buildings have never been done, but it is a good way to differentiate old from new. Again, it is not something that is part of the vernacular downtown Prescott. When we recommended other building design components we recommended flagstone or granite as it is more traditional of the downtown area];

- that a couple of the last buildings that the firm has done actually used an Arizona sandstone which is really a beautiful material;
- one of the challenges that is present is the budget, and we have to be mindful of the capital improvement costs;
- we have spoken to a roofing company and the roof is a trade off--if we do a pitched roof, then we have to worry about cap flashing and tops. A curved roof is a single sheet and we don't have to worry about the ridge; and,
- there is potential to place the pitched roofs instead of the barrel vaults.

Chairman Stroh stated that the Commission does not disagree and to keep in mind that flagstone is mined only 10- to 15-miles outside of the Prescott area. He further stated that by going to the 4" high masonry vs. the 4" high jumbo block could save thousands of dollars.

Commissioner Rantz stated that perhaps gable roofs would be less expensive than barrel vaults.

Mr. Larry Enyart responded in summary:

- we will explore the material opportunities, i.e., incorporation of stone;
- we will check the window configurations;
- we will investigate integration of diagonals to pick up on the spirit of the bridge, perhaps with the windows;
- we would like to keep the towers for the triple duty of training, circulation, and maintenance and communication access, but if the barrel vaults were removed off the towers maybe nothing would be needed and it would help the height too.

Commissioner Rantz stated the only thing that wasn't addressed was the fire truck located in the street.

Mr. Enyart stated that:

- the setback space will not be used as the area for daily use of apparatus trucks, but it could be utilized to park a historic vehicle on the Fourth of July or a special occasion.
- the firm really wants to make this a sustainable showcase and actually show the solar collectors;
- the south-facing opportunity of the pitched roof could actually be utilized for photometrics all along the south roof; and,
- we will return with something similar yet different with the barrel vaults going away.

Chairman Stroh asked Mr. Enyart if the fire station that was in the paper dated July 10, 2008 was his.

Mr. Enyart responded that it was, and that it is a Gold Certified LEED design, located in Scottsdale, AZ.

Commissioner Wright asked if there was anyway that the site could tie in with the park a little more.

Mr. Miller responded that the City has been working with the Parks Department and they will eventually be improving that portion of the park. With the addition the Fire Station and the new parking, the design will allow better integration of that side of the park. Improvements to the park along with the new fire station in the area will be much better due to the 24-hour manning of the station.

No action taken.

**IV. SUMMARY OF CURRENT OR RECENT EVENTS**

None.

**V. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:16 PM.

---

Frank DeGrazia, Chairman pro tempore