

Nov. 5, 2008 Presidio Trust Meeting



Tigerfish[®]
Transcribing·Editing

203 Columbus Avenue · San Francisco 94133
toll-free 877-TIGERFISH

www.tigerfish.com

Nov. 5, 2008 Presidio Trust Meeting

[Abrupt Beginning of Recorded Material]

Michael Boland: -- Tia, turn [unintelligible] before we get started and all that. [unintelligible]. All right, and everyone's given their name to our transcriber. We're, uh, we're transcribing all of this session so that we can share the results.

So today, we wanted to, uh, walk through these materials that we've been working on developing with the National Park Service and with [unintelligible] office. The matrix that you all -- I see you have copies. I've also handed out a hard copy as well as a few other pieces of background material that I thought might be helpful for our discussion today.

So just a bit about how we develop these materials. We, when I say we, a handful of Trust staff came together for a two-and-a-half day charette with a number of folks from National Park Service, [Randy Gallis] from the Washington office of the Park Service, Roger [Rebbits] who heads the design planning section of the Denver service center, Larry Waller who is a retired landscape architect with the National Park Service. And then, we were supported by a number of cultural resources staff in [unintelligible] one of them, [unintelligible] also participated. On our staff was [Borges], myself, [Jenna McCoy], [Louis Griffith], who has left the Trust, but he's involved [unintelligible]. And that's everybody.

Male Voice: Rob.

Michael Boland: Oh, and [Rob Thompson], sorry. Rob's not here [unintelligible].

So we came together for a two-and-a-half day work session, and we had a charge. We gave ourselves a charge. And the charge that was imposed, a simple one, was to, which in practice was not so simple, to take the Secretary of the Interior's standards or [unintelligible] and to apply those to look at each of the proposals for new construction at each of the sites that are proposed in the SEIS, to look at, identify what a conforming structure, a structure that conforms with the secretary's standards, what it would look like at each of those locations. And so that was really the setup for the meeting.

We spent two and a half days, as I said. We spent the first part of our day touring the Presidio, the whole Presidio, to give some of our outside guests some Presidio contacts. And then, we spent a good part of the remainder of the first day touring the Main Post, trying to understand what is then proposed today, trying to understand some of the projects that have already been approved, that are being considered, or that are underway.

And then, we also, in the course of that, began by sort of due diligence. And one of the pieces of diligence we did, which two pieces of [unintelligible] top sheet, the first was familiarizing ourselves, if you see the map, predicted features, archeological

features [unintelligible], familiarizing ourselves with what lies beneath, what lies under the ground at the Presidio, understanding the various archeological sensitivity zones that are protected. This map comes from, by the way, from the 1993 National Historic Landmark District update. And so that's the kind of genesis of this particular document.

And also, identifying the character-defining features of the Main Post district. And so you see this column [unintelligible] over here. We as a group identified a number of the character-defining features [unintelligible]. The secretary's standards is very much designed around the idea of preserving what is character-defining about a historic property. And so we began our undertaking by identifying what those character-defining features were. So we used that the basis of our subsequent analysis.

Then, lastly, we looked at the Secretary of the Interior's standards, and I've handed out a one page that actually includes the actual language of the standards. You'll see in the matrix we actually paraphrased them. And as a group, we identified the standards that struck us as being the most relevant to the particular undertaking, to the particular positions -- not all of these standards are applied in each circumstance -- and identified several standards that seemed the most relevant. We'll talk about that in a minute, and a lively discussion about that.

And then together, these three pieces of input, combined with our tour around the post, were really the sort of due diligence, if you will, that we used to generate the matrix that we'll talk about, okay? Anything else, Craig, that you want to add to that?

Craig Kenkel: No, sounds good.

Michael Boland: Okay.

Amy Meyer: Uh, I have a question first about the archeological features. I haven't seen this particular map before. And when I look at them, at the various states, are all of them considered equally valuable for, you know, how are they viewed?

Michael Boland: Eric, you want to answer that question?

Eric Blind: Sure. When --

Michael Boland: You all know Eric by the way? Eric?

Eric Blind: In the Park Services work in 1993, they explicitly said that they did not value or rank the different features or create any sort of gradation between them. And there were all equally valuable.

Michael Boland: And this is a map that's in the [unintelligible]. So this is --

Amy Meyer: Oh, [unintelligible] back to it there.

Michael Boland: Yeah, this map is in the [unintelligible], so it should --

Amy Meyer: It takes on extra significance when you frame it all in this manner.

Michael Boland: That's fine. I'm sorry. And so it, because it's sort of baseline [unintelligible] important kind of thing [unintelligible] analysis. So if I could ask everyone to go to the next page, or to the packet, if you will. And the packet includes, I've given everyone -- you've all received an easier-to-read, larger version of the matrix, which I -- ? Yeah, we, the first one, for some reason, we couldn't enlarge it. So [unintelligible]. And then, I've also included a series of --this is sort of a yearly copy, or we had a copier malfunction -- series of sketches that actually describe the ideas that we'll be talking about here. So if anyone's interested in understanding the actual layout --

Amy Meyer: Are those different from -- ?

Michael Boland: No, they're the same. They're the same. I just wanted to make sure everyone has it.

Craig Kenkel: I don't have those, that [unintelligible]. I didn't have it.

Michael Boland: There you go.

Craig Kenkel: Thank you.

Michael Boland: And lastly, the other thing I'll mention is that we developed, we created a study model and used a series of these small items so that we could actually understand some of these ideas in space as well. And again, this is another one of, another of our analysis tools that we used in these discussions about the application of the Secretary of Interior's standards.

Okay, so we began, we began our day with, actually, with an analysis of the currently proposed [unintelligible]. And if I can direct your attention to the matrix, let's just walk through it briefly just to explain what the various columns are. Column one, these were the five of the secretary's standards that we thought were the most relevant. The consensus of the group was that these five standards, one, two, three, eight, and nine, were the most relevant ones. And so they're listed down the side.

Then, as a group we asked ourselves, "Well, what are the key strategies that we might employ to ensure that a building is conforming with those standards?" And again, that was informed by all of the due diligence that we did, the list of character-defining features and such. And so column two you see here, this second colored column, strategies for conformance with the secretary's standards. We tried to identify, you know, what are the key moves that we could make.

So, for example, if standard one is minimizing change to the state of materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships, one of the key

things that we could do to ensure the project is conforming is avoid removal of the historic structures. And so that then was the strategy. And so we went through, and we identified what those key strategies are. Because that then becomes a bridge between the standards and these physical ideas about what a conforming building would look like.

And so, you know, we came up with a number of -- so, for example, maybe we should run through them quickly. In terms of standard one, the key move was avoiding the removal of historic structures, which, as we all know, the current [camp] proposal proposes the removal of both a historic building and also a historic feature [unintelligible].

Under Secretary of the Interior standard two, which focuses on retaining a historic character of a property and avoiding the removal of features, spaces, and spatial relationships, we identified a whole series of -- and I think of these as sort of, they're sort of meta-level ideas about the way buildings relate to each other and create ensembles [unintelligible] Main Post. And so we came up with a series of strategies.

For example, one of the things that's character defining about the Main Post is that buildings, with actually just one and two exceptions, 97 and also the old jail, maintain an orthogonal orientation to each other and to the street [unintelligible] in the post.

Amy Meyer: Which one are you calling? Down by the post office?

Michael Boland: Yeah, post office, you know, it's slightly, you know, slightly skewed. But other than that, I mean, I think the map tells the story that down in the Main Post, all of the other buildings have, you know, [unintelligible] as an orthogonal orientation.

Amy Meyer: It's a bridge.

Michael Boland: That generally, buildings have a north-south orientation, or building ensembles have a north-south orientation. Because they were pointing to two [unintelligible], and also because they grew out of the original footprint of the [unintelligible].

That we would want to avoid, we would want to maintain the historic roadways. So we wouldn't want to have a building that intrudes in a historic roadway and blocks the openness of that historic roadway. That we would maintain sort of open spaces. We wouldn't want to build a site, build a building at a site that was historically an open space. That we would want to maintain significant views, both within the Main Post and from the Main Post out.

That we would want to maintain an open south end of the parade. We had a lot of discussion about the fact that this site is the site that, though it was developed, was a site that had sort of secondary buildings and a smaller scale. So quite a bit of discussion about that.

And there was a feeling that additional connection between this area up here and down here at a meta-level was important.

That the building [unintelligible] scale relevant to the other buildings in its vicinity. And that the building ensembles really have seriality or repetition of forms. And it's very easy to see here that there is, there are many building ensembles where there's duplication in terms of building mass, fenestration, and whatnot.

In terms of secretary standard three, which is really focused on creating, avoiding the creation of a false sense of historical development. Again, the idea here was that we create something, I mean it's pretty simple, that we create a new construction that is differentiated from the old, but compatible. And I think by compatible, what we really did -- we had a lively discussion about this. And I think we realized that there is probably a slightly clearer way to say this, that we don't want a building we create, whatever it is, new construction, to create a false sense of historical value. It comes right of the secretary's standard. And that's what we mean by compatible.

Rebecca Evans: Can I ask a question?

Michael Boland: Yeah, sure.

Rebecca Evans: The material that I've got from Fed Ex does not match what I've seen this morning in terms of the, what's up at the top. What I got this morning is not that --

Brian Ramos: There's two separate sheets, two pages.

Tia Lombardi: There's nothing here.

Karen Cook: [unintelligible]

Rebecca Evans: Unless you got it on yours, but it's not on the one I have. I'll use my other one. But the large one, the large-format one is not here.

Karen Cook: Well, we have, we have two sets of papers that mailed out. One -- and I have trouble distinguishing between them -- but one, they both start off by going down --

Male Voice: They just didn't have enough room to fit on the --

Michael Boland: Yeah, there are two pages. Do you not have two pages?

Amy Meyer: No.

Tia Lombardi: Maybe this is not the --

Michael Boland: Oh okay.

Amy Meyer: Neither do I. [unintelligible]

Neal Desai: It should be the one that's dated 10/28.

Michael Boland: It looks like she, you're just missing a page.

Amy Meyer: Yeah, 10/27, 10 --

[Everybody talking at once]

Male Voice: I'm going to go run some copies.

Michael Boland: So you'll make a copy?

Male Voice: Yeah.

Michael Boland: I'm sorry. You have this section, though, what we're reading right now? The colored -- ?

Rebecca Evans: Yeah, she had -- the colored one, I don't have that.

Michael Boland: Okay, well, we'll get you a copy of that one.

Rebecca Evans: That's fine.

Michael Boland: But let's continue to walk down the columns here just to talk a bit about these strategies, because they're important. In eight, protect

archeological resources in place. Obviously, we would, you know, protect archeological resources consistent with research guidelines. This is the point that it really speaks to something that Eric said, and this is something particularly [unintelligible]. But his sense was that though these different sites in the Park Service documentation were all treated as equivalently important, the fact is that the old Presidio site is more important. Because it is more distinct, and it's not a site that is duplicated by other sites.

So, for example, his sense was that there are other sites, there were Civil War sites where the army demolished buildings. And there are archeological remains that date from the Civil War. That there are other examples in and around the post, but there was only one on the Presidio site. So in his mind, there actually is a difference. And the old Presidio site is more significant, because it's the only large-scale Spanish [unintelligible].

Amy Meyer: Thank you. That's where I was going.

Michael Boland: Yeah, yeah. So that's how, again, from our perspective, from the group's perspective, there is a difference. And that that's what this is an attempt to refer to.

And then, under standard nine, which has to do with new additions and character of new construction in a historic district, we identified a series of strategies that we thought were important for any new construction to conform. That we have a compatible scale and

proportion, or compatible proportions. That it be of compatible materials, have compatible texture, compatible color. That it be of a compatible building height. That it have compatible features. And we identified in our discussion what those features might be, porches, roofline, punch windows, etc.

Amy Meyer: What a punch window?

Michael Boland: A punch window is what you see on many Main Post buildings where it's a building -- the window is surrounded by wall, essentially, as opposed to a long string, like, sheets of glass.

Amy Meyer: Oh, like modern buildings?

Michael Boland: Yeah. A compatible building should have compatible roof type, though we had a lively discussion about the fact that there are a number of flat-roofed buildings in the Main Post. So a flat roof isn't necessarily out of the running, but it depends on how the building has a flat roof, and the scale of the building [unintelligible] like that. We'll come back to that.

And then have compatible mass. This has to do quite a bit with articulation. If you look at most of the buildings, I think the models tell the story. Many of the buildings are fairly well-articulated. And that tends to break down the apparent mass of the structure. So those were the series of strategies that we came up with for conforming with the secretary's standard.

Then, we actually began our process by applying that --- does everybody else have that -- or everybody else has a column that says campus proposal? All right, so we applied that to CAMP that's proposed and ran through each of these categories and, again, asked ourselves whether or not the building that's proposed conformed, employed these strategies that we had identified for conformance.

So, for example, does CAMP avoid removal of historic structures? And if it demolishes buildings [unintelligible]. Does it maintain an orthogonal orientation? No, because a significant piece of the building, this upper portion of the building is actually skewed and doesn't relate to that orthogonal grid. The sense of the group was that, you know, a building can have fairly small portions of it that don't relate to the orthogonal grid, but that a significant portion of the rest should.

Does it maintain a north-south orientation? Well, in fact, it does maintain a north-south orientation. Does it maintain roadways? It does. It avoids protruding into any historic roadways. Does it maintain historic open spaces? No, that it, because of its scale and because of its mass, it doesn't maintain the historic openness of the site. And we had, again, a kind of fairly lively discussion about what openness means, you know? There were buildings there, but the fact is they were subordinate. And so from the scale perspective, this building doesn't maintain that open south end.

Maintain significant views? No. Because of its height, it blocks views from buildings 15 and also the view from building 100 out to the front. Does it maintain the south, an open south end of the parade? No, it does not. Is it a compatible scale? No, and you'll see here, we'll come back to this before we go through in a minute and talk about this 20,000 square footprint. But the essential thinking was that the scale of this building, the footprint of the building is so large that it is out of scale with the surrounding buildings, building 97 and the theater and also the building behind it.

Does it have seriality? No, it doesn't. Because of its scale, one might hope that the building might be broken down into a series of smaller buildings so that it read, you know, like a series of smaller buildings that had seriality, and no, it doesn't. It's one fairly large mass.

Does it avoid creating a false sense of historical development? And it does not [unintelligible]. But essentially, it doesn't conform because it creates a focal point where a focal point never existed. And it creates a strong southern edge at the top of the main [unintelligible], just again because of the scale of the building and its location. Now, there were buildings in the application that were smaller. They were shorter.

Protect archeological resources? No. The excavation for this building would intrude into contributing archeology site F1 and F20. And you can see that those are labeled here on this map. F1 is

the old Presidio site, and F20 is the filling that the company [unintelligible] construction of the main parade. [unintelligible].

Amy Meyer: Yeah.

Michael Boland: So then, down under standard nine, is it of a compatible scale and proportion? No, it exceeds the scale and doesn't have proportions characteristic of the buildings within the immediate context. So we talked quite a bit about sort of which buildings are fair game and which don't sort of relate. And the strong feeling was that it should relate to the buildings that are in the immediate context. It should relate to [unintelligible].

So in terms of all of these factors that are down here under nine, it should relate to the buildings along Montgomery Street, the buildings that remain on Grand Street, the buildings up in this elevation, you know? That pulling a building from a more remote portion of the Main Post really is not relevant.

Amy Meyer: How do [unintelligible] 38, 39? Why don't we say those? I know the Montgomery Street barracks. I know the, you know, what do we call them?

Michael Boland: Buildings 38 and 39.

[Laughter]

Michael Boland: Generically.

Amy Meyer: Generically? Sorry. I just, I think they might have a group name.

Karen Cook: Well, they were the former headquarters.

Michael Boland: They were the former headquarters, yeah. We call them the former headquarters.

Amy Meyer: Okay, all right.

Michael Boland: Yeah, 38 and 39 [unintelligible].

Amy Meyer: All right.

Michael Boland: But, and again, I think we can run through this quite quickly. Is it compatible materials, color, and texture? Though the idea of the building being masonry is a compatible idea, the way in which the masonry is used is thought to be incompatible. I don't know if you all caught it. The masonry is very patterned in a very geometric way. It's looks sort of like a Native American basket. And the feeling was that, you know, the diagonal, this sort of pattern diagonal was not thought to be compatible. Nobody saw it as --

Amy Meyer: How about its glass? I would think it was, since you defined punch windows --

Michael Boland: Yeah, we didn't even, you know, we didn't even get to glass, yeah. Really, the usage of the glass is incompatible. And that really comes into play. I mean, the thing about these features, about these categories and some of these strategies, is [unintelligible]. So, you know, for example, we really talk about that in terms of the lack of articulation and lack of punch windows down under compatible features.

Amy Meyer: Oh, okay.

Michael Boland: So you know, we covered it as well, I guess is really the answer.

We had a very interesting discussion about compatible building type. And the sense of the group was that, in fact, the building as currently designed is of a compatible prototype for surrounding buildings. But again, there are other problems with that height. It may be compatible, but it creates a false sense of historical development. It blocks views and other things like that.

Does it have compatible features? No. Here again, it lacks porches, modulation of the surfaces, and punched openings that exist on the surrounding buildings. Is it of a compatible roof type? And this is a very interesting discussion we had -- and it's something that I'll come back to when we talk about the south [unintelligible] side -- that the feeling of the group was that a building in this location of this scale has less flexibility in terms of roof form and type. And

that because of its prominence, because of its scale, that a flat roof was not appropriate.

That the predominance of buildings in the vicinity of this site have pitched roofs. They have red roofs. They don't have a flat roof. And that if the building was smaller, a flat roof might be appropriate. But because of its scale and location, the feeling was that it was not appropriate. And the scale and location I think we've talked quite a bit about with a lot of these things. And you'll see we'll come back to that and talk about features and some other things.

Compatible massing? No, the mass is out of proportion and lacks modulation and articulation, you know? A building, a large building could have more compatible mass if it was broken down in the way that, you know, 38 and 39 are broken down, and the way that 35 is broken down. These are, you know, these are large buildings. And their mass is broken down by the way the mass is treated.

So that was how we began the process. We looked at CAMP. We did an analysis of the building as proposed and did this analysis. So then we looked at -- and we thought that was a good way to test the methodology to see whether or not we were on the right track.

So then, we asked ourselves, went through each of the sites that are proposed in the SEIS for the camp, with one exception. We didn't get to Fort Scot, and we'll talk about that in a minute. And then, we also looked at infill construction associated with the theater and

infill construction that's proposed for the lodge. So we looked at all of those projects.

And we tried to apply the same methodology, going through the standards, and defining an envelope. And we used, in real time, we used these little foam models and were constantly carting them up and monkeying with them to try and see if what we were proposing, what we were coming up with actually made sense and was conforming. Neal, you have a question?

Neal Desai: Yeah, before we move forward. What was Gluckman's level of involvement in this? And how does he feel about his design on this and other options? Where does it end?

Michael Boland: Yeah, Gluckman wasn't involved in this. This was a joint effort of the Trust and the Park Service.

Neal Desai: Okay.

Michael Boland: So this was us, you know, stepping back and apply, secretary's standards.

Amy Meyer: Well, I'm going one step further back than that, which is how receptive has Don Fisher been to what's going on here?

Michael Boland: Uh --

- Neal Desai: And Gluckman, too. I want to know, yeah, does he know about this?
- Tia Lombardi: We, we do -- we're going to do a workshop with him next week just like this one.
- Michael Boland: I mean, they, we've sent them this material as well, just like we sent everyone. So, but we're going to meet with him next week and find out. Yeah?
- Rebecca Evans: When charettes occur normally, do they normally occur at this point in time of the process? Or do they generally [unintelligible]?
- Michael Boland: You know, there's no rule about that. I mean, you know, we -- I-I see this as a way, at this point in the process, we're getting public comment on these ideas. And it was an opportunity for us to inform our decision, I think. And so that was, you know, that was why this happened at this particular moment in the process.
- Neal Desai: So I, just before we move on, and this is sort of a frame for -- if you can address this, or if someone can -- how do all of these other alternatives besides [Ken] conform to the, to the legislations, specifically new construction related to replacement of existing structures and similar size [unintelligible]? How is that considered into anything non [unintelligible]?

Michael Boland: It was not considered. That particular question, again, we simply looked at those three little sections of the Secretary of Interior's standards. That was the project.

Neal Desai: And when is that going to be applied? Because, I mean, we can spin our wheels for a long time.

Karen Cook: That's not the topic of this meeting.

Neal Desai: But the foundation is --

Karen Cook: No, let me just finish.

Neal Desai: Sure.

Karen Cook: We know that you have a point of view on this. We don't share that point of view. What we were engaged in here was the discussion of the Secretary of the Interior's standards. And that's what we [unintelligible]. So that's, you know, that's pretty much what we are here to discuss, and not discuss this new issue.

Neal Desai: Now, do you folks have any comment on that, the Park Service?

Karen Cook: The Park Service is not charged with interpretation of the Trust. They do have special expertise for the administration of laws that have to do with historic preservation and laws [unintelligible] Trust

Act and [unintelligible] conversation about what would be conforming.

Neal Desai: Right. I just wondered if they had an opinion on this. I mean, we have an opinion. These other two people here representing organizations have an opinion on it. And we believe that this is the foundation of any sort of consideration. I mean, that you go legislation, then you go with the plans that are based on the legislation, and proposals that are based on the plans.

Karen Cook: Right.

Neal Desai: And so my understanding is that the Park Service also feels that this one down, one up issue that we have, is also relevant. I mean, they feel that if these, the secretary's standards, they're also going to be, they could be illegal from the building construction guidelines.

Karen Cook: Yeah, that's not an issue as far as this goes.

Neal Desai: Why not?

Brian Ramos: Yeah, let me, let me try here a little bit. I mean, the -- I hear everything that you're saying. And the Trust is going through multiple processes right now. And we're here today for one of those. And they're going through the [NEEFA] process. They're going through the, relative to their Main Post update again. And they're going through the 106 process.

And the 106 process is fairly narrow in its scope in that it doesn't address those kinds of concerns that you have. And it addresses, you know, determining the effects of your undertaking on historic property. So it does it within the context of regulations. We're trying to give you a roadmap of how to do that, the things like the Secretary of Interior's standards that we're talking about.

Neal Desai: Yeah, I'm familiar with the distinctions. I'm just saying that if the foundation is legislation here, then it, all the proposals should be complying to that. And then, from there you can, then you can look at okay, well, let's take a look at the secretary's standards. Let's go through the NEEFA process. I mean, those things all form the foundation.

Brian Ramos: No, I hear what you're saying. But we're not the group to -- we're not the group to -- this is not the convening of folks to interpret the Trust Act.

Neal Desai: Right.

Brian Ramos: This is folks to talk about the Section 106 process. So I'm just saying that you should find another vehicle for communicating your concerns about that than this meeting.

Neal Desai: Well, I -- the quick question that you answered right off the top was, was that considered. And the answer was no. And so that's

fine. I just, what I wanted to know was if the Park Service had anything to do, because this is getting on record, and I know [unintelligible] group and Amy also, feel free to chime in.

Brian Ramos: Yeah, and so, you know, the exercise here -- and so, you know, let's see where this goes. I mean, listen to this presentation and hear where it goes. And then, you know, you have the opportunity to continue to make your comments about your concerns that are kind of independent of that 106 process. Because I can tell you that the Advisory Council and State Historic Preservation officer and the National Park Service are not empowered to enforce legislation relative to the concerns that you're raising.

Neal Desai: Well, we're not enforcing. It's a question of acknowledging. They can acknowledge it. And, I mean, these are respected bodies that, if they have an opinion, it would be nice if there was some record as being acknowledged. We don't need to talk about it more.

Amy Meyer: No, and it's -- because, obviously, we would like, there's been an enormous amount of human effort that has gone into doing this project since August of 2007. Lots and lots of people have been involved. And one of the concerns has been underneath, that the legislation hasn't been followed. But it's not part of the topic here.

I have a different one. And this has to do with a program that normally, this first applied to CAMP, but has gradually spread as we've gotten involved in the field more, and [unintelligible] not

considered. But at least those of us who were here, that is the three of us who were called to this particular meeting, recognize this [account], that the program that's proposed for the relatively small area of the Main Post is so intense, that is, the theater with an enlargement, the Heritage Center somewhere in here, and the Visitors Center, the lodge, and CAMP, that all of these together make a problematic intensity that makes it wait a minute, what are we doing. Are we urbanizing an area?

Michael smiled, because I brought in old documents I, you know, including statements about how we went in the [unintelligible] 2002 from a relatively relaxed point of view about development in this area to a very intense and quite urbanized kind of development. I'm going to say [unintelligible]. And so as we, I mean, you're following through.

I recognize what you're doing. I recognize this is about third tier. And in other words, the first tier to me is the legislature. And the second tier is what's the program of the legislation. You fit it into buildings. You follow the legislation. And finally, you get to the secretary's standards, or, at least, that's the next level down.

And it's certainly important, more than anything up to this point, just what you did just now, worked us through what CAMP has proposed and said, "Well, as compared with the draft FOE you said, this doesn't conform in so many ways. And this is what it needs." And by putting up this model, you've helped us a great deal. I mean,

and you brought this to a point where people will be able to see this. But it still doesn't answer some of these underlying things.

In art, and my background's in art originally, and we used to use the phrase "form follows function." I mean, that was a standard phrase. And the function here has always never been -- we know he's got a big collection of huge pieces. But the form of , we start looking at small buildings, can his function follow small forms? We don't know that. And this was not investigated, you know, early on. And this scale, I mean, that's why everybody has been pushing, [unintelligible] Fisher objects to it, to the commissary side. Because it has the room, and it has the room to be much more nonconforming. But if anything, it's an extremely sensitive area.

But what's happening in this area, and just want to put it in as an underlying remark, is that an awful lot is trying to be stuffed into one area. And although it has some reasons, like transit, it has other reasons for changing in a very profound and fundamental way according to those seven characteristics of integrity that I pulled out of the graph FOE. That it has a potential to profoundly change what this place and this area feels like.

Tia Lombardi: Can I ask a quick qualification? I want to make sure I understand. When you say putting a lot in one area, are you talking specifically about the area at the southern end of the Main Post?

Amy Meyer: Yeah.

Tia Lombardi: Not the whole Main Post?

Amy Meyer: No. In other words, by taking down the original thing, I mean, this is aside from Neal's, and certainly mine, one down and one up, that -- and Becky's, I know, that aside from that, what it's become is a concentration. Which, if you were planning Point Reyes Station after an earthquake, would be quite appropriate. I mean, you'd have your commercial center, your civic center. And you'd have your housing and, you know, your greenbelt, you know, around it.

But this is not Point Reyes Station. This is an extremely, I mean, incredibly complex thing, which you can try to break down in various ways. And yes, Tia, it's the concentration at the south end, especially if you take in what is not, is not even on the list, the proposal that -- let me give you an example, a simple one. The Heritage Center might be located, co-existing according to the meeting that we had with you and people from the Presidio, with the Visitors Center. It made a lot of sense to put the Heritage and Visitors Center together.

But aha, we need the theater [unintelligible]. And instead of adding to the theater building, might we get maybe even a third theater, but co-exist those theaters, you know, the additional screening rooms. And it's never been considered in the SEIS, which it has to be, that inside that warren of rooms in the back of the officers' club where we talked a lot about having the Heritage and the Visitors Center, if

we analyze that, we might get the ability to show films in the Visitors Center and have, you know, a much, a less-expensive solution that would create greater public value.

This is not an SEIS meeting. I recognize that. But it's this kind of consideration this thing has, for numbers of reasons, we --

Rebecca Evans: It's grown like [topsy].

Amy Meyer: What?

Rebecca Evans: Some of the things have grown like topsy. The theater is a good example of that.

Amy Meyer: It has left us with the image -- it sometimes comes to mind -- this has left me with the image of trying to play football on a baseball field.

Michael Boland: Well, let me make a suggestion. Because I can tell you I would love nothing more than to engage in the conversation you're putting on the table right now.

Amy Meyer: I wasn't, it's not --

Michael Boland: About, you know, appropriate urban development and park development and sustainable development and design. I've been getting ready for the conversation and would love to talk about it.

Because I'd love to challenge some of the things you've said.
However, I'd like to get through the agenda that we have set.

Amy Meyer: I understand.

Michael Boland: And if we have time at the end, then let's come back to that topic,
because I'm always happy to talk about that particular issue.

So, uh, then we turned our attention to the other sites, as I
mentioned. And -- hey, Don. How you doing? Do you have your --
did you bring your stuff?

Donald Green: I have a [photo] memory.

Michael Boland: You memorized it by now?

Donald Green: Right.

Michael Boland: All right, okay. [Laughs] So let's talk about a conforming building
at the bowling alley site, which is the first thing we asked ourselves.
What are the qualities that a conforming building at the bowling
alley site would have? A conforming building at the bowling alley
site -- I'll put it back in. It's not quite the right location, but there
you go -- would avoid the demolition of intruding structures, so it
would not require the demolition of building number
[unintelligible].

A conforming building at the bowling alley site would maintain a diagonal orientation to the street grid. This is our little dummy building here. It would maintain a north-south orientation. Would not intrude into the surrounding street corridor. Would be pushed to the southern end of the site to maintain a more open character and confront building 100 to maintain, preserve views from building 100 without --

Amy Meyer: Apparently, that was done originally when the bowling alley was built.

Michael Boland: It was. I mean, the history of the site is there was the dentist's office right there. There was a dentist's office here. It was a one-story building. It was actually about that wide. It was a sort of long, wide building. A dentist's office and a parking lot behind it. And then, they built the parking lot where the dentist's office was [unintelligible] parking lot. So that's the glorious history of this site [unintelligible] about it.

Maintain significant views, again, the building is pulled back this way. It would tend to maintain views from here over to the main parade and to the Bay and continues from here. There are no views in this building because it has no windows. Maintain open south end of the parade, yes. The feeling of the group was that the building is located at the southern end of the site as shown here. And if the building was no higher than the bowling alley, the top of

the bowling alley that you see here on this model, that that would maintain that open character.

And just to clarify, the top of this coincides with the top of the peak of the roof of the bowling alley, so just to give everyone a sense of context. Which the top of the peak of the roof of the bowling alley is the same elevation as the top of the theater. It's just that's such a big crown. But the feeling was that a building of that height would maintain that visual connection. And the kind of -- we had a long conversation about this idea of creating a focal point or creating a building that felt more subordinate to the Montgomery Street barracks. And the feeling was that this was, the scalability was accomplished.

The idea of seriality or repetition of forms, building with the scale wouldn't need to be broken up into a series of larger, repeating forms because it's perfectly to scale for the surrounding buildings. We think that the sense in terms of standard three, the sense, again, of the group was that there were, there have been since the -- I'm not sure when the dentist office was built, maybe the '20s and '30s -- there has been architecture at this southern end, but it's never been a focal point. So a building of this scale, again, would not create a false sense of historical development if it was scaled in a similar way.

If it was located in this spot, which is essentially the bowling alley, it would avoid the boundaries, the known boundaries of the

predicted archeological features from the NHLV update. And then, under nine -- and, again, we, you know, didn't really do much more than just create a little mass -- but the sense was that, again, because of its location, even a smaller building would want to, would -- the scale is right, but it would still want to have proportion that's compatible with surrounding buildings.

We had an interesting discussion about how do all the materials, color, and texture, and there was a feeling, especially on the part of [unintelligible], that if this building was darker, it would tend to recede against the green backdrop and therefore reduce its prominence versus a white building. So that is mentioned there. The height is of a compatible height with the bowling alley, which it would replace, and with the historic theater.

There was a sense that it would be compatible, but only if the building had features, a roofline, porches, and windows that are compatible with the surrounding buildings, again, because of its location. Even though it's a small building, it would still want to be, have a compatible character and have compatible features.

Again, roofline, roof types, this issue of scale and location came into play. And the feeling of the group was that though it is small, that due to its location, that still we'd want to have a compatible with the type to be conforming. So most of the buildings in the vicinity have either a completely peaked roof or, like the bowling

alley, a flat roof that had some sort of acknowledgment of a sloped roof.

And lastly, that although the building in terms of massing, although the building is in proportion, a building of this scale is in proportion with the historic context, that the massing would still want to be articulated like the surrounding buildings so that it would be feel conforming. And the sense of the group was that if the building had all of these qualities, that if somebody -- and I'm going to quote this part -- "that if somebody stood on the parade ground and they scanned kind of the horizon, that your eye wouldn't stop on that building." It would sort of be like one of the buildings. It would be part of the family, and that that was the goal. So the sense was that a building that would, you know, conform with what we laid out would do that.

Tia Lombardi: Michael, what is the actual square footage footprint that CAMP has proposed?

Amy Meyer: Fifty-six thousand.

Michael Boland: Fifty-six thousand.

Amy Meyer: Why didn't we get the [unintelligible]?

Michael Boland: That's square footage. This is --

Tia Lombardi: We're trying to ask what the footprint is, though.

Michael Boland: The footprint is going to be 56,000.

Tia Lombardi: Okay.

Michael Boland: Yeah, that's the size of the footprint of the main floor, which is the largest one, the lower floor. And the upper floor is smaller.

All right, so then, we turned our attention to the site south of Maraga. And this -- let's reassemble the bowling alley site here.

Amy Meyer: But nobody had the ability, I mean, to ask Don whether any of his art would fit in this.

Michael Boland: In that thing we just -- ? No, no, again, we were looking at this purely in terms of conformance with the secretary's standards.

Amy Meyer: Okay.

Neal Desai: Did this take into account any, like, outdoor sculpture? I don't know where that stands from the original proposal.

Michael Boland: Yeah, it does not. I mean, even though it talked about that. I mean, I think that is something we talked about in the abstract as a group and, you know, talked about some of the challenges of that. But again, we were more focused on the buildings.

Neal Desai: But it is something that you folks are going to perpetuate and factor in based on the program?

Michael Boland: Yeah, yeah. I mean, at this point, we don't have any real information about it. So, here's the -- we turned our attention to 2A. And, again, we thought -- because it's like 2A is so much less [unintelligible], we thought it was important to come up with a couple of different strategies for massing building on this site and just a few assumptions about that.

We thought it would be important for us to take the biggest envelope that we might anticipate here, which assumes -- and you all know that the current proposal for CAMP includes construction here and also includes building a walkway. It's unclear whether if CAMP moved up here it would still include building 1 or [unintelligible]. And so we considered 140,000 square foot, what it would take, how we would organize 140,000 feet on this site rather than the 100,000 feet plus the 44,000 square feet, which is [unintelligible].

Amy Meyer: Oh, that's where the high, so the -- ?

Michael Boland: That's where 140 comes from.

Amy Meyer: Oh, okay, so 140 is -- but it includes the historically, or it is new construction, depending upon which alternative -- ?

Michael Boland: That's right. And so for 2A, we set for ourselves the challenge of -- think about 140,000 square feet on this site. How would you want that? So we created three different strategies for that. And I'll walk through each of them quickly.

Whit Hall: But before you go --

Michael Boland: Oh, yeah?

Whit Hall: This, for clarification, does that depressed elevation there indicate that the base level is the level of the Maraga, or eight feet up which is the current baseline?

Michael Boland: No, it simply makes it easier for me to put rectangular pieces of stuff on the map.

Female Voice: He did it with his little [knife].

Michael Boland: Yeah. This, I'm not this good, you know, to make something that really reflects the great shape. So that, it makes it easier. But no, it doesn't, it assumes -- I mean, we actually talked quite a bit about the opportunity to sink a portion of the square footage down into the site because of the grade change that goes on there. And so you'll see that the blocks that I'm going to put up there make some assumption that some portion of the building's actually underground.

And again, we'll be, you know, just to give you a sense of the way this works, we worked, you know, down around the model, looking up at the views, and, you know, really working with these ideas, working with these massive models. Because we tried to make them accurate so we actually had a sense of the visual impact of the various [unintelligible].

So we tested against the secretary's standards three different idea. Idea one, was a notion of locating the building over on the side like that. The bulk of the building would be to the side. And there'd be a fairly small transverse [unintelligible] low, you know, lower, one story away, a two-story central place. And that's what's shown in this sketch, concept A. The mass of the building is slid over to the side to maintain [unintelligible] side, small transverse space. Most of the side is left over.

Amy Meyer: And the side is flipped over? I mean, the view from the parade ground is really rather less [unintelligible].

Michael Boland: Yeah, so that was one concept. So that's scheme A. And just as a point of information, although all of these drawings, you see the library is missing, we developed concepts that would avoid the library. So that's --

Rebecca Evans: The library is still there.

Michael Boland: Yeah, the library could be there because the archeology zone extends under the library. So these were designed to allow us to retain the library. So this is concept A, okay?

Rebecca Evans: And what's the footprint of that, I mean in terms of square footage?

Michael Boland: Again, well, the whole building is 140,000 square feet.

Rebecca Evans: Okay, thank you.

Michael Boland: Each, for each of these three schemes, yeah, 140,000, which is the maximum [unintelligible].

Okay, then concept B we took a slightly different tack, which is take the mass of the building and center it on the parade group. So it would sit up at the top. So the first is move the mass to the side. The second is have the mass of the building in the middle. And then the third concept that we put on the table was we nicknamed it, "It Takes a Village." And the idea was that the mass of the building would be broken up into a series of blocks.

Tia Lombardi: [unintelligible]

Amy Meyer: Mm-hmm.

Michael Boland: That, you know, might engage the library as part of the facility, for example. But the idea is that a portion of it would sit here on this

side, on the bowling alley side and be connect, either connected underground or not connected to what's across this street. And that these buildings could all be connected underground, because taking advantage of that bridge, actually, [unintelligible].

So we analyzed those three different ideas, and with an eye to understanding how each of those different concepts -- those, I mean, you know, there clearly are other ways we could organize the maps, but those seemed like the three pretty very fundamental different strategies for how you might organize mass on the site. And so we analyzed each of those ideas against the secretary's standards.

And maybe for the purposes of time, instead of running through each, because there are a lot of the same answers in each, I'll just simply point out some of the differences. I would say that generally, what it would come down to -- you see there, yes, it obviously avoids the removal, all of these ideas, we avoid the removal of historic buildings. If you scroll down to the next section --

Amy Meyer: Are we under two?

Michael Boland: Under two, maintain historic open spaces. Now, the feeling of the group was that although this area was historically open -- because during the period of significance, this portion of the site was actually open -- there were ball fields on it -- that this is a site that is

less historically significant, that there are other open spaces sort of within this square.

And so the idea of moving the square footage up here was seen as a lower impact than having all of the square footage concentrated down in the kind of [unintelligible]. And also that the grade change tends to mitigate for some of the impact of having all of that square footage left here.

Maintain significant views, it's of compatible scale. We had a very interesting discussion about scale vis-à-vis these three ideas. The first feeling was that in terms of A, the idea of moving the building over here, the sense was that by sliding the building over and really almost engaging the slope of the hill, and getting it out of the view shed by pulling it over here, that scale was really less of an issue in that location. They could have a very large building in that location. But because it was really almost -- it would be very difficult to see from most locations, pulled away from [unintelligible] which is a major roadway corridor, it's pulled out of the view shed, that scale was less of an issue.

The alternative B, the idea of moving this building to the center, there was a lot of concern expressed that moving that massive building on an axis with the parade ground would actually be out of scale because of its visual impact.

Amy Meyer: Even if you made it dark it would be?

Michael Boland: Yeah, it'd just be very large, you know? There's no way a 140,000 square foot building [unintelligible]. And in terms of this It Takes a Village concept, the notion was that, obviously, the smaller buildings, the breaking the mass up into a collection of buildings or campus negates the scale. And so [unintelligible] is one that is probably the most refined with the secretary's standards. Again, we designed all of these ideas within standard eight to avoid [unintelligible] anticipated archeological sites.

Why don't we run through a couple other things? And there are a lot of possibilities. And, again, that's because we were -- you know? A lot of these things really depend, or they're about helping us understand, you know, what are the things that would get us out of the possibly and into the yes, which was the goal here was to get to yes.

Whit Hall: A real quick clarification?

Michael Boland: Yeah, sure.

Whit Hall: That taller building is 50 feet?

Michael Boland: Which one?

Whit Hall: That one that you -- in the back. Do we still have a 50-foot structure?

Michael Boland: Is these -- this height?

Whit Hall: Yes.

Michael Boland: Is it actually? Yes, this is 50 feet.

Whit Hall: Okay, can you, off the top of your head, tell us how tall the peak of the daycare center would be?

Michael Boland: The peak of the daycare center? Does anyone help, can help me out on this? Chandler's not here, so I can't.

Male Voice: It's on the model.

Michael Boland: Oh, here we go. Here it is, daycare center.

Whit Hall: You guys are ready for anything.

Michael Boland: Yeah, daycare center, daycare center is shown about half as high. So this is higher. But again, we, you know, I think our sense was that we would take advantage of the slope and could sink some of the building into the ground so that you could make an underground portion.

I don't know if any of you have seen the Nelson-Atkins Museum?
It's in Nebraska. It's a very modern building. It's actually an addition

to a historic building. And the addition is like a landscape, because the building's underground. And it pops up in a series of smaller buildings that are above a lawn. And so that was very much the idea, that this would be a series of smaller buildings.

Okay, one more, so section nine. Is this of a compatible scale? We already talked a little bit about scale and the relationship to this location and its visibility. Materials, color, and texture, there was a strong sense that this site offered greater flexibility, but that the fact that this would be a fairly large building, and it would still be visible from the Main Post, so the materials you wanted to be compatible. Or the building wanted to be designed with dark colors so that it would tend to recede.

In terms of its height, there was actually a sense that building on Maraga should be no higher than 45 feet, which is elevation 145.

Donald Green: Can you explain what elevation 145 is?

Michael Boland: Yeah, elevation 145, elevation 145 is the top of the -- I'll try to get this right -- visual 145 is the top, is the top of this looking across. So the idea was that we would be higher than that [unintelligible].

Donald Green: What's it literally mean is a better question?

Michael Boland: Oh, it's just, you know, what we're trying to do is we've gotten a lot of, a lot of people have said that building heights, because the ground slopes, is a confusing issue. So what we're doing is turning instead to an elevation. Because an elevation is absolute. So that's 145 feet about sea level, you know, as opposed to 88 feet about sea level.

Donald Green: So it's the height of the current barracks above sea level?

Michael Boland: The top, that's right.

Craig Kenkel: The height of the building and its site above sea level.

Michael Boland: Yeah, that's right.

Donald Green: So it wouldn't be correct to put back the big thing you took out and put the highest one of those spot and fill it in on top of that?

Michael Boland: No, that's right, because that would be too high. That would be too high. What I'm saying is this mass is sunk into the ground, would be sunk into the ground. So a portion of this that would actually be above ground, there would be less of it. There's just no way, you know, I'm not manual dexterity in terms of modeling [unintelligible].

But what we're trying to do is, because that becomes an absolute. So then we can say, you know, that the elevation of the top of the

theater is elevation 145. The elevation of the top of the O Club is elevation 160, and they're absolute kind of data. It's an absolute data that we can [unintelligible] that I think will help everybody understand the relationship of the buildings better than, you know, building's no more than 50 feet high. Because that's relevant everywhere. I'm trying to respond to that concern that's been expressed by folks.

Compatible features, again, in this whole entire bottom section, that I would say that generally there was a feeling that this site offers more flexibility in terms of scalability, in terms of the kinds of features that the building has, but that that is mitigated by the fact that it is so large, and that particularly the building that's in the center where this building here would be still very much visible from the Main Post.

And so, you know, the essential bottom line of all of this is that the goal is to create something that still incorporates compatible features and still feels like it has some relationship to the Main Post. But that there is more flexibility on this [unintelligible]. We're trying to acknowledge that balance, if you will.

Amy Meyer: And in this campus [unintelligible], the library will then stay, but the [hertz] would go?

Michael Boland: Yeah, that was the thought, that the library could stay, the hertz could go, you know, and that you infill both these buildings which

are not contributing, and use that as an opportunity to add to the construction. Because you can see it's based on the --

Amy Meyer: When you say -- which are the non-contributing [unintelligible]?

Michael Boland: Oh, the hertz and the daycare center.

Amy Meyer: Daycare center, okay.

Donald Green: Does the daycare stay or go?

Michael Boland: It would go under this one, yeah.

Amy Meyer: It would be sent somewhere else?

Michael Boland: Yeah, it would move somewhere else. So, and, again, the idea of, you know, and this is really also informed very much by scheme A we talked about. Because the strong feeling of the group was that to the extent that we're sliding a mass of buildings to the west, it reduces their visual impact. So, you know, that's how we ended up with a scheme like this.

Craig Kenkel: The other thing about the campus concept, and I heard somebody else said earlier about pieces of construction that might be outside on landscape, is that the campus concept would allow you to locate buildings and maybe create an outdoor space that's not so visible to, from the Main Post as well where outdoor sculpture can be

displayed. And so we'll have somewhat depressed outdoor gardens for that as well. [unintelligible]

Amy Meyer: So then it doesn't move, in going back to integrity of the site, this would kind of -- and integrity of feeling and integrity of association -- that up on this side and somewhat depressed, the effect would not be anywhere near what the effect would be lower down?

Craig Kenkel: Correct.

Michael Boland: [unintelligible]

Amy Meyer: Well --

Michael Boland: Well, I mean --

Amy Meyer: One of the nice things about the concerts [unintelligible] is if you went over the hill, could walk down and [unintelligible] Doyle Drive is that you could have a sculpture garden down there. And you'd be able to see it from above, you know? There are lots of things that are possible out there. But this is the first time I've heard this question answered as to how, because of the campus relationship or a [unintelligible] relationship, perhaps this would not so much affect the integrity of the site.

Michael Boland: All right, so we'll move to the next page. Commissary on the next page. I think it's the last column. Informing structure commissary,

so we didn't extend the model down to the commissary. So we went down, and we visited the commissary. We talked about the commissary quite a bit. And so let's quickly run through the commissary site.

The commissary, the use of the commissary would avoid the removal of historic structures. The use would maintain the orthogonal relationship to Main Street, the buildings down on Crissy Field. Which, again, what we did is we used the relevant strategies for conformance that apply to the commissary. And so, for example, orthogonal orientation happens to apply, as opposed to a north-south orientation. In fact, the buildings at Crissy Field tend to have more of an east-west orientation historically, the ones that were south of Mason Street.

So, you can see that it's no, that a north-south orientation doesn't apply for this situation. It would maintain historic auto roadways. It would maintain sort of open spaces. I don't know if everyone knows it, but there's been a lot of history of buildings located down in that portion of Crissy Field. So that is an area that hasn't been filled in quite some time.

Amy Meyer: Oh, the whole engineering complex was in there.

Michael Boland: Yeah, there were multiple sets of buildings in that one place. So locating the museum there would maintain a circle. Maintains historic views to the Bay and towards the main coast? Yes, it does.

And it was noted that there's an opportunity for it to be designed to relate to the use that are available on the site.

[unintelligible] obviously doesn't apply. Compatible scale with Crissy Field. The commissary is already there. And we noted here that this location provides greater flexibility in terms of compatibility. We had a long discussion about the architectural character of Crissy Field and the main, kind of main guises of Crissy Field, and posed that scenario that had both the headquarters function and also a kind of back of house and a utilitarian character. There are actually more building types and more kinds of architectural --

Amy Meyer: There are barrack houses and everything.

Michael Boland: Right, that you can relate to, and so that was really an acknowledgment of that. Seriality, repetition of forms, you know, we moved back and forth between talking about using an existing building and talking about putting a new building on the site.

And so there was some acknowledgment that if the building was modified more dramatically, you know, rather than simply reusing the building, it was arguably one way [unintelligible] reuse the commissary [unintelligible] museum and modify it fairly significantly, that there might be an opportunity to modify the mass by articulation on the outside, in such a way that it would feel like an ensemble building [unintelligible].

Amy Meyer: I would add a little more emphasis to that, which is that actually if Don were to go for that site, and really go for it in his lifetime, because he is aging -- I mean, we all are, but, you know, this is something that he's wanted to see something in his lifetime -- that actually starting him at the commissary site while the building is just more fully designed and put in place, he could actually start the museum [around].

Michael Boland: You know the secretary's standards don't speak to that.

Amy Meyer: I'm sorry.

Michael Boland: [Laughs]

Amy Meyer: I'm sorry.

Michael Boland: Good idea.

Amy Meyer: Thanks.

Michael Boland: This is all getting captured, and so it's fine.

Craig Kenkel: I think, Amy, we'll put you on a service-wide team to add standards to the list. That's a good one.

Michael Boland: Okay, yes, clearly, whether it's the reuse of the existing building or a modification of it, it would be differentiated, and it would not create a false sense of historic value, since this was always the site for construction.

Now, we had a lot of discussion about P1. I don't know if you all -- P1 is actually on the map. It's a site that's behind the commissary. It's P1, also known as SFR6, which is a very sensitive Native American site. So we had a lively discussion about the fact that whatever is done to the building, it couldn't grow in that direction. And there were some issues around ground penetration and excavation and that kind of thing we have to be mindful of. I don't know, Eric, do you want to add anything else about that?

Tia Lombardi: Does the commissary have a basement?

Eric Blind: Not that I know of, but I think [unintelligible] excavation [unintelligible].

Michael Boland: P1 is a sensitive, is the archeology site.

Amy Meyer: But this area is [unintelligible] park?

Michael Boland: Oh, yeah, yeah. And that's out of [unintelligible]. And he's pointing out that the parking lot, the current parking lot between the commissary and the [kiosk] is not attributed to P1. I don't know if there's anything intruding. It looks like P2 -- what is P2?

Amy Meyer: P2 is [unintelligible].

Eric Blind: Yeah, it's an area all around the bluffs that the Park Service has predicted couldn't contain prehistoric archeological sites. Our new ideas are that most of the sites would probably be down in the marshy areas themselves and not on [unintelligible].

Michael Boland: Right.

Amy Meyer: I thought that, in looking at this, I'm having discussions briefly with [Steve Howell] that this parking lot side would be, you know, the side next to the building, and people actually [unintelligible] able to step on the archeological sites involved.

Eric Blind: It goes through the parking in between the commissary and [unintelligible]?

Amy Meyer: Yeah, if that was the site of the new building, that would be [unintelligible] archeological sites.

Michael Boland: Yeah, I'm editing, because there's always the Crissy, know, the lingering difficulty of, on prehistoric sites like the edge of the marsh, like [unintelligible].

Male Voice: [unintelligible]

Michael Boland: Yeah, because that was all marsh [unintelligible].

Tia Lombardi: I was just curious, because people are still talking about potential expansion in the marshes in the future. Would the commissary site [unintelligible]?

Michael Boland: The commissary site, the commissary site would not necessarily. I mean, clearly, if the building wasn't there, it might allow us to create a different kind of upland. But the archeological issues in that. And once you get into the commissary building itself, you get very close to that sensitive archeology site. So I think it would be very hard for us to excavate it. Wouldn't you say the building -- that's why we've always imagined that building would stay no matter what happens east of the building.

All right, let's run through nine.

Amy Meyer: Okay, so you aren't doing down, up in that area?

Michael Boland: We were, we were assuming that either the existing building would be modified, or something new would be built essentially on the existing site.

Amy Meyer: On that site? That's fine.

Michael Boland: Yeah, that was our assumption.

Karen Cook: [unintelligible]

Michael Boland: Yeah, it's PTMP.

Karen Cook: It's PTMP sort of potentially.

Donald Green: Can you remind everybody on this map where the you call the commissary is [unintelligible] basically, and where the PX is and where the parking lot it?

Michael Boland: Yeah, 610 is the commissary, building 610.

Donald Green: Yeah.

Michael Boland: Six-oh-six and 605 are the PFs; 603 is the Crissy Field Center.

Donald Green: Okay, and the new building would, my understanding -- ?

Michael Boland: On footprint 610.

Donald Green: The idea is to not be in the parking lot, what you said would be the parking lot?

Michael Boland: No, no, Amy was asking me about the parking lot. And we assumed it would be we'd reuse the commissary, or we would rebuild something on the site of the commissary.

Amy Meyer: Well, how would that affect -- ?

Neal Desai: Use the existing building space or tear it down, something like that?

Michael Boland: Well, I mean --

Amy Meyer: How would that affect [unintelligible] if you tore down a building?

Michael Boland: Well, we'd have to do it very sensitively. We are largely -- I mean, to be frank, I think that what we would probably do is, you know, largely reuse, or keep portions of the building, you know, the foundations, and put it -- you do something shorter than complete start-over. Because, you know, there's a lot of that building that's actually usable.

Amy Meyer: Oh, yeah, it's new.

Michael Boland: [unintelligible] structural system and such. But, you know, you could eliminate the sod and do all that sort of stuff, maintain the basic core of the building in development [unintelligible]. So, you know, that, we assume that. I mean, obviously, every side has, you know, there's an opportunity. If we had to do a lot of excavation, there could be issues with P1.

Okay, then nine, it would have new features. Again, we think that the building is already there, and it's according to scale given the varied scaled buildings that used to exist. The building could have

an industrial aesthetic, because that area was a warehouse district [unintelligible]. We thought it was important that the building height would need to be restricted so that it's lower than the height of the [unintelligible], so that it didn't interrupt that visual connection between Main Post and Crissy Field.

We maintain -- we think that it's [unintelligible] if we go from [unintelligible] maintain compatible features, it would be Crissy for context, and acknowledging that there's greater flexibility because of the more varied history of building types in the area. Flat roof is quite -- I only remember flat roof buildings there. And, you know, the mass is compatible. There are plenty of very large, simple buildings at Crissy Field.

Tia Lombardi: Michael, how close does Doyle Drive come to that building?

Michael Boland: Harry, do you remember the, how wide Doyle Drive gets in that location? Doyle Drive doesn't take it out, but it is --

Tia Lombardi: [unintelligible] so it's about [unintelligible].

Michael Boland: Yeah, I do too. I don't remember how much closer it comes to the commissary, but it's -- do you guys remember?

Whit Hall: At one point, they were talking about actually having to take out 10 or 20 feet of the back end, not through Doyle itself, but through the construction [unintelligible].

Michael Boland: A detour, yeah.

Whit Hall: But where that stands now, I don't know.

Tia Lombardi: Okay, I'll look at it.

Whit Hall: But the building essentially was going to be able to stay.

Tia Lombardi: Okay, thank you.

Michael Boland: And they did that primarily to avoid impacting archeological resources, actually. If they miss the building, they'll miss the archeology. And so that's why [unintelligible].

So that was our assessment of the commissary. And as I mentioned, we didn't get to the Fort Scott side. We just, quite frankly, ran out of time in the scheme and thought it was more important that we look at the lodge, that we look at [unintelligible].

Amy Meyer: Fort Scott's [unintelligible]?

Michael Boland: I think the Fort Scott is a pretty open site in some ways, you know? So shall we turn our attention to the lodge and the theater?

So what we did, we kept this pretty simple. We looked at the existing proposals, and we asked ourselves what, if there is a

conforming version of this, what will it cover. So we didn't come up with multiple alternatives of what a conforming, for example, conforming theater addition would be. We simply looked at the theater addition and said, "What is a conforming version of the theater addition?" I'm not sure I said that very well.

But let me, why don't we start with the theater? So standard one, minimize the change through distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships. Our feeling was that the big, the key thing that the current proposal does is build [unintelligible]. This is subdividing the original theater into two theaters. And that instead, the proposal retained the existing theater and instead built two smaller, you know, 100-seat and 200-seat theaters, you know, adjacent to it, that that would be better. And that would be conforming to the secretary's standards. So that was the first thing.

In terms of standard two, we thought it was important that the new addition be orthogonal. All the other buildings were orthogonal. The would be orthogonal. That the mass have a north-south orientation. That it not intrude into historic roadways. We talked a lot about a couple things. We talked a lot -- and let me back up.

We talked about this open space. And the feeling of the group was very much the same way that this is the second -- it's always been historically a secondary open space. This has always been a secondary open space. And so there really aren't any signif -- and this is a building that has no windows on its side. So it's not like

there are any significant views that one is maintaining, or any significant views. I mean, you know, it's a collection of roads here. There really aren't any significant moves, nor is this really a significant open space. It's a more secondary open space.

As opposed to putting, for example, if the proposal was to build an addition on this side, that the character of this street front is just so important that that would be seen as having a significant impact on views and on open space. Locating it on this side, it's seen as not having a significant impact.

Whit Hall: You [unintelligible] it's a major entryway into the Presidio, into the historic heart of the Presidio.

Michael Boland: Well, it's actually --

Whit Hall: I remember when Robert Redford in Sundance wanted to build movie theaters there. The reason that we objected, and actually, he graciously withdrew his proposal, was the fact that it is a major entry point as you drive past the cemetery. You're moving into the historic site there. So it is a sensitive site, and I don't think it can be dismissed quite as easily.

Michael Boland: You know, I think we just had a different feeling about it. The sense of the group was that Sheridan Street coming in right here is absolutely as you described it. And this exp -- this is a major

entrance. But this was, was a more secondary entrance in experience.

Whit Hall: Wait, that's 49-Mile Drive up there, though.

Amy Meyer: Well, actually, Whit is bringing up something that came up. This was a big Advisory Commission issue at the time, what's to use and [unintelligible] before you can build. And this is why I brought up earlier, and I want to reiterate it, just you have to consider the alternatives. SEIS has to. And we're in a historic building between the film center and the theater. Can we have screening rooms? This is what they seem to be asking for is screening rooms, especially [unintelligible] south, like [unintelligible].

Neal Desai: But I think -- is that what you were hitting on initially, that you looked at for the lodge and just what's proposed there? But you may, will you guys be going back to look at what alternate location setup similar to A, B, and C for CAMP?

Michael Boland: I mean, the project we set for ourselves in this effort -- let me just clarify what we -- was to look at what a conforming addition, if there is a conforming addition, what a conforming addition to the theater might look like. We didn't set about asking ourselves where else we might build new additions to house screening rooms.

And we also did not set about asking ourselves where else we might have screening rooms in existing historic buildings, because that's

something -- there are many other options. We simply looked at this proposal and asked ourselves, "Is there a conforming version of it?" So that was the project.

Amy Meyer: This particular?

Michael Boland: Right, right, that was the undertaking that [unintelligible]. So, and again, we just talked about focus-based and talked about the use. It doesn't have an impact on the south end, public south end of the parade. We talked a lot about scale and the massing of the building, the scale of the building, and the way any addition might relate to a historic building. And there was a strong feeling that it clearly should be subordinate, that it should be smaller, it should be shorter, it should be smaller scale in its footprint.

And then, ideally, it would be held away, the [unintelligible], because the theater obviously has a [unintelligible], you know, lobby space even more transparent, that the mass would be pulled away from the building. And that the interstitial space, which could be the lobby [unintelligible] design it in such a way to make it as light as possible. So that the original building, when you continued to read this building, that there would be some kind of interstitial lobby space. It could be very translucent. It could be [unintelligible] through.

And then, there could be a smaller, shorter addition, that we talked about the possibility of sinking it in the ground and some other, that

could sit over here, it could be more solid. So you could still read the original building, and the addition would clearly read as separate in this respect. Craig, anything else you want to add about that? That was the discussion.

Craig Kenkel: It's reversible.

Michael Boland: And that really speaks -- it's reversible, you know? Wayne talked about other projects where this sort of trend has happened. And, you know, this is really the way that you approach this [unintelligible]. And that really speaks to, actually, a number of these things, that, you know, we want it to be compatible in scale. We want it to be smaller, relate to the existing theater. We want it to be differentiated.

And we were particularly interested in the west wall of the historic theater read, you know, this solid wall read, and that it not be obscured by any construction, so that, again, the lobby would be very transparent. We'd want to see this in the building. Maybe, Eric, you could speak to the archeological issue here?

Eric Blind: Yeah, on that first map you see there, there was a site predicted in the location of the theater that was non-commissioned officers' quarters in the late 1800s. But it came down during the [filling] of the main parade ground. And now, we're trying to figure out these massive landform transformations that have happened. The Army had an incredible ability to [move].

And one of the ones that they were doing was when you think of most of the fill that you see in this map in blue that didn't make grade [unintelligible] is actually coming from a very tall hill that was on this western side of the theater and then going up towards Infantry Terrace. And there's up to 40 feet of earth missing. So the non-commissioned officers' quarters would be about 20 feet above today's grade, so the possibility of archeology is gone. Maybe it exists somewhere else, but with no integrity. So F16 is more or less off the map at this point.

Michael Boland: And then, in terms of standard nine, there was a sense that if the building was, that an addition -- there is a possibility of creating a compatible scaled addition having the qualities that I described previously in terms of height, in terms of footprint. That it would clearly want to use compatible materials and relate to the historic material, color, and texture of the existing building. In this case, because we're adding on to an existing building, we have a palette to work with that we would want the addition to relate to.

It would be of a compatible building height, and the height of the addition would not exceed the ridge movie theater. The movie theater doesn't really have a ridge, so that might seem like a perplexing idea. But in fact, what we actually said is that ideally, the height of the addition would not exceed [unintelligible] the edge, the top of the wall, that you actually not see the eave at all.

We thought it was important -- you know, the theater is a funny building. It has almost no fenestrations. And it's a pretty blank [unintelligible] that has a little bit of articulation, mostly due to the fact that it's 4-inch-thick concrete. And so there's some kind of wonderful variation in the texture of it. There also were some [unintelligible] plasters that break up the façade.

Amy Meyer: Well, the south side is the one that people know.

Michael Boland: Yeah, well, the, you know, the front door, if you will. But the other three sides are fairly quiet. Nonetheless, there was a feeling that any addition would want to acknowledge the character of those other façades on the sides where there's some [unintelligible] plasters and the kind of texture within those walls.

And again, the feeling that we would want it to have a roof type that was compatible with the historic theater so that it was consistent. And in terms of the massing, I've mentioned this already, that the massing would treat these two new smaller halls as a subordinate solid with a light interstitial lobby that would separate that mass from the hall so that it would really [unintelligible]. Anything else you want to add about that, Craig, about the discussion we had?

So that was the sense of the theater, of what a conforming theater structure might look like. Again, I think that the big moves there were, you know, keeping and retaining the integrity of the existing hall, building a pair of smaller 100-seat, 200-seat theaters, and

keeping that new addition a solid, like a solid [unintelligible] smaller, and the subordinate would be solid, with the lobby being a very translucent, transparent interstitial space.

Amy Meyer: What is the term reversible? [unintelligible]

Michael Boland: Craig, talk about reversibility?

Craig Kenkel: So, the original building is treated in such a way that any connection to it is light and as minimal as possible so that it's what Michael is saying, that translucent hallway is a great light architectural hyphen between the old and the new. So at some point in the future, if there was a reason to remove the addition, the historic building has had minimal impact to it.

Amy Meyer: Oh, that's how the term reversible is used?

Craig Kenkel: Mm-hmm.

Amy Meyer: Okay, fine.

Michael Boland: And so that was the basis for the concept as we developed it. I think it is, you know, considerably [unintelligible] what we've seen today in terms of proposals.

Donald Green: Would the entrance stay where it is now on the south side? I think the proposal has it on the north side, right?

Michael Boland: Yeah, no, we definitely are -- we all felt very strongly that the lobby would need to maintain its primacy as the lobby, and that it could connect, you know? If you look at the doors on the side of the building, there's a way to connect out or connect to this other kind of interstitial space, you know?

Because there are things, you know, accessible restaurants and things that we can't put in afterwards very easily, but that you could build, you know, without really destroying the historical fabric. But you could put those things in the adjacent lobby. So you would want to connect those spaces. But there is an architectural solution.

Okay, we're in the home stretch here. Let's talk about the lodge. I'll reassemble the Presidio.

Amy Meyer: When you do that, you missed cumulative effect.

Donald Green: Yeah, that's right. [unintelligible]

[Laughter]

Michael Boland: Okay, the secretary's standards, and we'll talk about that a little bit more.

Amy Meyer: Well, okay, I mean, that's all right.

Michael Boland: [unintelligible] Yeah, that's right. Okay, so let's talk about the lodge.

Craig Kenkel: I think while Michael's putting that together, yesterday's discussion, there was a lot of additional information that was provided about massing and scale, and the group had a hard time looking at a rectangle foam and then understanding that that could be further sculpted down, gabled roofs and pitched roofs and so forth, and further articulated. And that, you know, a lot of these strategies in and of themselves are just individual solutions, but it's a posit of them that we call design that would result in a much more defined, probably more conforming result.

Male Voice: You're talking about two, A, B, and C? You talking about the lodge?

Craig Kenkel: We're talking about [unintelligible].

Neal Desai: When you get to that level of design, is it you guys, or is that design people outside the proposal?

Craig Kenkel: Design people outside, but they should be using the Secretary of the Interior's standards as, you know, design guidelines as well as compliance.

Michael Boland: All right, good, here we go. Okay, I think I got the right pieces assembled here. So this is, again, we're not nearly as skilled as the model makers are, but imagine that these are that size. You can see

these are a little smaller and more refined. Imagine what it would be [with this one piece]. It's a little hard to do. I'm not nearly as skilled as -- but, you know, again, this illustrates, I think, some of the key points that we're going to make about some of the key issues we've talked about. And, again, I'll try to walk through this briefly [unintelligible].

But in terms of the lodge, we, again, asked ourselves if we were going to do infill construction on this site, what are the things that we would need to do to the current proposal to make it conforming with the Secretary of Interior's standards. And let me run through those quickly. That the lodge would avoid the removal of historic structures, which it does as proposed. That the structures would have an orthogonal orientation to the Main Post grid. It does. That the structure would maintain a north-south orientation which is characteristic of the buildings that formerly existed on this site.

Amy Meyer: That's very interesting, because the [unintelligible] on evolution of the Main Post, and you're saying this is the division? This would have been the main parade, and this would be the old parade ground?

Michael Boland: Yes, that's Grand Street right there.

Amy Meyer: Okay.

Michael Boland: And that's 86 and 87. And the footprint of the lodge is where these buildings already are.

Amy Meyer: Okay.

Michael Boland: That's the [unintelligible]. It fits between Anza Street and Grand Street.

Amy Meyer: Right.

Michael Boland: Which is where these buildings are.

Amy Meyer: Except I understood that the secretary's integrity standards, you know, the integrity had to do with real time, the present time. And these are long gone.

Michael Boland: Oh, it does, it does, no, absolutely, yeah. No, I mean, we're not, we wouldn't rebuild those buildings. That would be contrary to the secretary's standards, absolutely. New construction. The structure would maintain historic roadways by avoiding the footprint of Anza Street and Grand Street, which were the two major streets in that location, which it does. The current proposal does, and this proposal does as well.

Maintaining historic open spaces. We had a very long conversation about this question of whether or not it does, or would it maintain historic open spaces. And the feeling of the group was that so long

as the footprint of the building maintains the open roadways, that this is a site where there was historically a separation between the old parade and the main parade during the period of [unintelligible]. And so long as it occupied that block, that it would maintain the historic open spaces.

One of the key things in the next -- maintain significant views. Although structure maintains significant exterior views to that, which it does, it, you know, keeps the main grid open. And by dropping down at the southern end as shown in the conforming version, it would also maintain a view from the O Club to the Bay.

It interferes with internal east-west views. And that is something that we had a lot of conversation about, about sort of these east-west views. Now, again, historically, on the ground, there were no east-west views. It's really the east-west views from the [unintelligible] buildings from one side to the other side.

Amy Meyer: Well, that's like saying the National Mall in Washington, that some of the old railroad structures and things that used to be there might be brought back across the National Mall. I mean, this to me is a major offense to the eye, you know?

Michael Boland: Well, Amy, it's a little different than that. During the period of significance, there were buildings there. And they were built by the Army. And were they here today, they would be contributing, and they would be character-defining.

Amy Meyer: Yeah, but they aren't here today. They haven't been here today in any recent time. My understanding of where the secretary's standards [unintelligible] includes real time defined, you know?

Michael Boland: It does. But it also asks us to preserve any places where we can restore the historic character not only buildings, but the landscape as well.

Amy Meyer: And the traffic that goes through this? [unintelligible] the traffic that goes to the hotel [unintelligible]?

Michael Boland: We're not talking about traffic right now. But [unintelligible] waiting for the traffic question. And actually, again, I think that is another conversation I'm looking forward to having as well about the kind of historic character of this place and [unintelligible].

Neal Desai: The scale and the massing, how does it relate to those buildings in the past?

Michael Boland: Yeah, these buildings are taller than those buildings. I mean, I don't know if everybody knows this, but those barracks [unintelligible] there, they were like the top part of buildings 86 -- in fact, they were the top part of 86 and 87. Eighty-six and 87 were initially one story, and they were raised [unintelligible]. So the buildings were like the top floor with the peaked roof [unintelligible]. And there

was a series of them [unintelligible] and Grand Street [unintelligible], except for the topmost one.

Rebecca Evans: So you're proposing basically, let's put the theater aside to major, or considering two major developments on the post. Does the secretary's standards address any way the cumulative impacts of changes?

Craig Kenkel: I'll answer your question. The standards -- [clears throat] excuse me. The standards are used to help influence design of buildings and landscapes cumulative impact that's sort of [unintelligible] considered under the Section 106 process. So under Section 106, projects are reviewed under the [unintelligible] toward their impact on the integrity, the overall integrity of a historic property. So under Section 106 in theory, if a federal agency is keeping track of cumulative undertakings over time, we might reach a saturation point for a historic property where you can just say, "We can't make any more changes here."

But you're not -- I don't think we're there at all with the Presidio. There are a lot of significant projects being proposed. But my sense is right now that if these projects are developed in such a way that they conform with the standards for rehabbing buildings or adding new buildings to a cultural and historic landscape, the integrity can still be maintained.

Neal Desai: Right, keeping in mind that the goal isn't to get to that maximum threshold.

Craig Kenkel: Right.

Neal Desai: And you do anything possible to reduce it.

Whit Hall: That includes the discussion of cultural landscape in the secretary's standards?

Craig Kenkel: Yeah, [unintelligible] treatment and historical and cultural landscapes. So basically, these 10 standards pretty much provide a foundation for a number of suites of standards that deal with restoration, reconstruction, rehab of building, rehab of landscapes, restoration of landscape. So they're very, very transferable and integratable for a comprehensive project that involves landscapes and [unintelligible].

Donald Green: Craig, did you say that it would not destroy the integrity [unintelligible] in your view? That was your view as opposed to interpretation?

Craig Kenkel: I'm saying that if these projects move forward, and there's an earnest effort to design them so that they conform with the standards, then there should be no adverse effect on NHLP.

Donald Green: That's something, I guess, under the 106 the people will either write about or comment on?

Craig Kenkel: Correct.

Donald Green: It's not an arbitrary -- your statement is not necessarily the final word that it doesn't destroy the integrity?

Brian Ramos: Yeah, in the 106 process, it would be the lead federal agency that makes a finding. And then, they seek the concurrence of the state historic preservation officer, the Advisory Council, and the Park Service in this case, with their finding.

Craig Kenkel: Yeah, so, you know, what could happen over 100 years of Presidio Trust management of the Presidio is that a number of projects could happen that all eventually are determined to conform to the standards and have [unintelligible]. And at some point, though, someone may come forward, either the Trust or a proposer, with a new project. And at that point, it might be the [unintelligible] with the Trust or some lead federal agency says the Presidio is fully developed. It cannot tolerate another addition to it, because if you add one more thing to it based on cumulative impact, it might be an adverse effect and impact the integrity.

Brian Ramos: And back to your original question is the finding of effect document looks at these proposed elements individually, but collectively as well as a cumulative effect. So the Section 106, as Craig said, not

the secretary's standards, but the Section 106 process itself requires you to look at that cumulative aspect of integrity as well.

Neal Desai: Well, while we're waiting for Michael, I have a few more questions. So how would you, if you had to rate these, the [CAMP proposals], because there's multiple proposals [unintelligible], if you had to rate these in terms of highest level of conformance and lowest, where do you put them? Because that's something you probably want to present to the proponents.

Craig Kenkel: Based on the workshop here and --

Female Voice: [unintelligible]

[Laughter]

Craig Kenkel: Yeah, obviously, CAMP itself as it's currently proposed does not conform with the standards. That's easy. I think looking at the other ones and understanding, again, that we're dealing with an abstract, we're not dealing with a developed design for each site, that I think any of them could work.

But the sense was that It Takes a Village would provide us with the greatest degree of breaking down what might be a large facility into smaller and more discrete pieces that allow you to fit the overall form and function within the cultural landscape [unintelligible] Maraga, and also allow the buildings to be a bit more conforming to

scale and massing, and provide a variety of materials and so forth as part of it. And, again, that interplay of indoor and outdoor spaces with the It Takes a Village concept, I think, really would work well.

Amy Meyer: But number three, the alternative to the CAMP as proposed, have you rated those?

Craig Kenkel: No, and, again, because we're doing an abstract process, you know?

Donald Green: But you didn't say that the two, that it doesn't belong where it's proposed now, either. And with 2A, B, and C, you said that B worked [unintelligible] longer in the middle had too many nonconforming. So you're left, really, with 2A and C are the two, one against the side, and one is It Takes a Village, are the ones that meet the secretary's standards?

Michael Boland: Yeah, that CAMP as proposed is nonconforming and that there are some real challenges with B as well because of its location.

Craig Kenkel: It's on axis with the [unintelligible].

Michael Boland: All right, I want to be respectful of everyone's time. Let's see if I can finish up the lodge here, and then we'll have a few minutes to chat.

Craig Kenkel: I guess more comment about It Takes a Village is that you end up having two conforming evaluations for that, because It Takes a

Village could have a structure on the bowling alley site plus what happens around it. So there's two evaluations that support that one.

Michael Boland: All right, shall we go? Under two, in terms of scale and seriality, there was a small incentive that buildings need -- and again, I apologize if my handiwork here is not generally as sophisticated as the model makers. But the idea is that a conforming building would not exceed the scale of the adjacent Grand Street barracks. So that the building mass as it's currently proposed is broken up into four pieces. And that those pieces, it would be, you know, these peaks should be like those peaks down there. They should be the same scale.

Amy Meyer: And they look like [unintelligible].

Michael Boland: And they do. I confess I was just unable to make one smaller to make it work. Bt you can see here that our intention is that it would not exceed the height of the historic building [unintelligible] barracks. And secondarily, the building would need to read as [unintelligible] to either B or to read it as, or clearly separated repeating forms. So either they're connected on the upper floor with a transparent glaze looking [unintelligible] or that they simply be [unintelligible] walk outside [unintelligible].

In terms of secretary's standard three, the new construction would be differentiated from the old. We talked quite a bit about site F6. Eric, anything you want to talk about this one?

Eric Blind: Yeah.

Michael Boland: There was a point you had made earlier about the difference between the sites.

Eric Blind: So when we were at F9?

Michael Boland: Yeah.

Eric Blind: That is literally the archeological remains that have been left from the Civil War-era barracks, of which 86 and 87 remain. We expect [unintelligible] in there at this building are going to be gone because of the base of the [unintelligible] building and the construction that took place here. And what [unintelligible] space just south of us here in 34, we did limited testing. And they found that there were [unintelligible] down there related to the building and the use of that area that conform to the, you know, the predictions that the Park Service made in '93. So construction of that location would have an adverse effect on those.

Amy Meyer: I'm sorry, this is F9?

Michael Boland: Yes, F9.

Eric Blind: Yes, on F9.

Michael Boland: And F9 is the foundations of the barracks that were there before [unintelligible].

Eric Blind: These would be Civil War-era, up until about 1890 is the time period we considered, the archeological period. We generally don't do archeological things from the 1930s, even though there are buildings from the 1930s that contribute. Archeology goes until about 1890.

Michael Boland: So then, in terms of the features of the building itself, just quickly a couple of them. There was a sense that the building should really read like a collection of buildings, an ensemble of buildings that used to be here, which was an ensemble of buildings, that it should read a series of four distinct buildings running this way. And that the back and front should also read as distinct buildings so that you would accentuate the connection between them.

That you would pull the corners back, so that these would really lead as a series of buildings that are scaled like these so it would be more appropriately scaled and modulated. And the width would be modulated so it wouldn't exceed this width. And this should be distinct from this in the same way that this is distinct from this. That we would pull the corners back to actually accentuate that difference.

That the structure should use compatible materials, traditional white walls and the red roof, again, something you can relate right to. And

the scale shouldn't exceed the building height of the adjacent buildings. That they should have a porch-like element on the eastern façade that mimics, but doesn't duplicate directly the porch there. It should have small-scale architectural details and punch windows like the other buildings.

That the east portion of the lodge have a gable roof running on a direct south direction. The gable reflects adjacent buildings. And that the building should have massing and architectural features that are compatible with the Grand Street barracks and/or the Montgomery Street barracks. But that it should relate to its surrounding context is important in terms of its massing and the articulation of the massing. So anything you want to add about that, Craig?

Rebecca Evans: I have a question.

Michael Boland: Yeah.

Rebecca Evans: I don't know, this may not be a [unintelligible] question, but do you, or are you considering the functions that will occur in the open spaces on either side of the lodge and how that might impact the design? As an example, I went to the Aloha Festival, and there were probably tens of thousands of people, all being very noisy. I can't imagine staying in a room in that lodge and being comfortable with that kind of event going on. And I wonder whether that will impact

the use of that parade ground over time or other functions here to consider?

Michael Boland: Yeah, good question actually. We will continue to have special events on both the open spaces, you know, wit Shakespeare in the Park on the parade ground and things like the Aloha Festival on the main parade. And, you know, our feeling is that that's part of the reason people come and stay here. They come here to engage in the park and its programs. And so, you know, clearly, somebody who's wanting to come here and have a wilderness experience, you know, or a very quiet experience probably wouldn't stay in the Presidio Lodge. They would presumably [unintelligible].

Tia Lombardi: Well, I wasn't thinking about a wilderness experience. I was thinking about the normal hotel functions. You stay at any hotel, and whether it's the noise of the AC or the noise of the cars that approach or delivery trucks, there's some expectation of [unintelligible] of, you know, quiet and solitude, especially in a national park.

Amy Meyer: And also, the person who can afford to pay for rooms in this situation, being frequently an older person, would like to take a nap in the middle of the afternoon, you know?

Michael Boland: Well, I, again, I mean, you know, (a) that is a very easy problem to solve architecturally, you know? Modern architecture is well-insulated. It's double-glazed windows. I mean, you know, so there's

no reason to assume that this is going to be noisy inside the building and that you couldn't have an Aloha Festival adjacent to it, and that somebody couldn't take a nap in the adjacent building. I guess the other thing I'd say is that, you know, our programs happen during the day. And --

Amy Meyer: Shakespeare happened at night. And you don't know what's going to happen. And you're saying that now, but you don't know what's going to happen or be wanted in the future. In other words, what I see this as is a big crimp in what's going to be possible on the two parades over time.

Donald Green: A big what did you say?

Michael Boland: Crimp.

Amy Meyer: Crimp in the abilities to carry on the kinds of programs and have the flexibility. But I think of all -- actually, these things, the original CAMP design and what I've seen -- and I appreciate what you did, that your model is quite right -- but everything I've seen in terms of this lodge marching across, aside from all other issues that have been brought up, it just seems very bulky and very much not in keeping with what was wanted there.

There are so many other [pies] you do want to divide between the old and main parade, I think that there are other things that could be done with smaller buildings that could be highly compatible with

the site and accomplish the purposes with a mixture of landscaping and small buildings. I just think it's a very poor choice for this site.

Donald Green: I'm just going to comment on this part right here. I hadn't thought about it. This is the old parade?

Michael Boland: Yes.

Donald Green: And when you stand here, you have these large buildings, two stories. You don't really see the red brick ones hardly. And if these were originally one-story, a few of them are now over the many years, the idea of a two-story building there just strikes me as a huge blockage.

Amy Meyer: It's wall. It's a wall.

Donald Green: Yeah. It's how is that compatible? Why is that compatible with 106?

Michael Boland: Well, why is being able to see those red-brick buildings important, aside from being something that you like? I mean, again, this is about historic preservation. But, you know, being able to look every way in every direction doesn't mean it's significant, you know? I think we have to be careful. We're talking about historic preservation here. We're not talking about what we like.

Amy Meyer: Michael, there are a couple of two-story buildings here.

Michael Boland: Yeah, there are several two-story buildings.

Amy Meyer: And maybe 86 and 87. But most of these are one-story buildings.
And I would pass this around. It's on page eight, just so --

Donald Green: I was thinking. I read through the historic scenes.

Amy Meyer: The bottom picture on page eight. And you can see I feel really strongly this is one of the worst ideas that has come up in the [unintelligible]. Because I think it's possible to do it elsewhere and do it successfully and not do it. And I also, I mean, it's for use. It's for traffic. And it's for, above all, cumulative effect. And I think this is just somehow disappear, whether it's, you know, finding a fact document, or it's in the, you know, rolling, we just discussed the secretary's standards here. We're losing something. And it has to do with so many things going on in one place.

Michael Boland: So the idea of having the building slightly larger than this building, slightly taller than this building, built where the canon is --

Amy Meyer: And a row of these going uphill?

Michael Boland: No, but one more building, essentially a little taller than this building [unintelligible] on that block.

Amy Meyer: This building, from the day we came to the Presidio Trust, I mean, from 1996-7 on, we came here, the first thing was the reason -- I mean, I know this --

Michael Boland: No, I understand.

Amy Meyer: We want to take down this building because it's the biggest blot in the Presidio, one of the biggest blots. It's been useful. We've used it up, and we never let any tenant come into this building. But the idea that we would replicate something of this kind --

Michael Boland: Well, I would replicate this. But you're talking about it from a spatial perspective?

Amy Meyer: From a spatial perspective, adding another one of these only does more damage.

Karen Cook: But, you know, PTMP contemplated that.

Michael Boland: Yeah, that's what PTMP calls for.

Amy Meyer: Okay, and as you remember, PTMP was such a relief from what had come with PTIP, that we didn't look at details, and said we would look, as we are doing right now, at the things that we would carry out. And any of these things we have to have review as we went through them. And that's what we're doing, right?

- Whit Hall: Yeah, the PTMP really emphasized converting existing buildings for lodging. And it was small-scale lodging. And it's all [definitional]. But it will get more review.
- Karen Cook: PTMP talked about these very values about recreating the division between the historic, the two parades.
- Whit Hall: But that's always been controversial.
- Karen Cook: And having another building site that was [unintelligible].
- Amy Meyer: Yeah, but the idea that you could do that on a scale that more close -- where am I in the document at this point? Craig, would you keep bringing that document down?
- Craig Kenkel: And one down here, too.
- Donald Green: That's only one period if you look at the whole 100 years.
- Amy Meyer: Yeah, but it's just the idea that --
- Michael Boland: But it's a period that goes from the Civil War to the 1950s. I mean, it's not a short period, just to be clear. These buildings were here for quite a while, almost 100 years.
- Amy Meyer: Okay, but they were also one-story. This is the only program I have to work on.

Michael Boland: A mix of one- or two-story buildings?

Amy Meyer: Yeah, but the idea that you can do something here and accomplish it, here it's a little frustrating [unintelligible]. And you may say that's not a question of secretary's standards. But I have said this since the day --

Michael Boland: No, that discussion's over. [Laughs]

Amy Meyer: Yeah, well, it may be, or it may not be depending on the economy. And --

Michael Boland: No, no, I mean, this discussion of the secretary's standards.

Neal Desai: I want to channel this into a question, I guess. And that is what are the next steps, if any, proposed for looking at alternate location designs that would also meet or conform? Similar to what you guys did for two days, but spend some more time, get back together? I mean, you spoke --

Michael Boland: Well, we are looking -- are you talking about in terms of lodging?

Neal Desai: Lodging and --

Michael Boland: Well, we're already looking at a number of different alternatives for how to accommodate lodging. This is the only one that involves new construction.

Amy Meyer: I also realize, I had been told by people involved in the process for a long time, that putting lodging exclusively in historic buildings, it's costing three to four times per room as it is to build new. So I understand the urge to build --

Michael Boland: No, no. Well, there's some real issues around affordability. I mean, that's the point price is \$500 a night.

Amy Meyer: Yeah, and --

Michael Boland: Between [unintelligible].

Amy Meyer: Right. But -- and I also understand that these people have said we were willing to take on [Persian] Hall.

Michael Boland: That is part of the current proposal, Persian Hall.

Amy Meyer: Yeah, that would take a -- well, that's commendable. But the idea is whether new buildings in this site are not going to be both [unintelligible] strength and cumulative effect are going to all be too much for this area.

Michael Boland: But to go back to your question, I guess that's we're looking at. We're looking at the reuse of existing buildings. And we're looking at infill construction in this location.

Neal Desai: And that's the only site for infill construction that you guys are going to be looking at?

Michael Boland: Yeah, I mean, if you have some ideas about other infill construction sites, I'd like to hear them. But those are the ones that came up in the spoken process, you know? That we look at a number of rehab projects, and this was the only infill construction site that we analyzed.

Amy Meyer: You were going to talk about Fort Scott and why we [unintelligible] museum. I thought it was just, you know, relatively speaking off-the-charts for a number of reasons. But have you looked at Fort Scott, for example, that area that you have marked for CAMP, for your lodge proposal?

Michael Boland: No, we have not. I mean, we have looked at reusing some other buildings, you know, like Scott Hall [unintelligible] one of the projects that we're, you know, [unintelligible]. Because it's a building that can adapt itself.

Amy Meyer: And would it do it at that three, four times the rate of Persian Hall?

Tia Lombardi: No.

Michael Boland: Well, it's comparable to Persian Hall. I mean, it's a [unintelligible], actually a little more expensive because it's a --

Tia Lombardi: It's probably more expensive because it's got a lot more tiles.

Michael Boland: As opposed to an unreinforced red-brick building.

Amy Meyer: Okay, so it's, again, I'm speaking new construction. You have sites placed down here and buildings up there?

Michael Boland: No, no, I have not looked at new construction up there.

Amy Meyer: By breaking into the SEIS, NHPA, and, you know, the SEIS NEEFA process, the NHPA process, and the legislation process, all these things coming in pieces, we're having a very hard time -- the public's having a hard time dealing with this process. And I appreciate very much the effort that you've gone to, to show it to us. And so what's going to happen on November 13?

Karen Cook: We postponed.

Michael Boland: Yeah, we postponed.

Amy Meyer: No, I mean, what are you --

Michael Boland: [unintelligible]

Amy Meyer: No, I have [unintelligible]

Tia Lombardi: We haven't made an official announcement. We're still finalizing dates and locations, etc. But we are going to push it.

Donald Green: Because one of the issues, Amy, would be to at least repeat here that the concept one was brought before that the, I guess it's the meeting, but it's also the date for the comments due on the SEIS as it is now. And yet, now we've got a very detailed alternative to A, B, and C that we didn't have before. And therefore --

Karen Cook: No, no, you don't.

Donald Green: Two A, B, and C is a lot more -- all we had before was Fisher's museum south of Maraga. Now, you've come up with 2A, B, and C, which is a family of buildings, or one long one over there. It's not the Fisher museum. Anyway, my point was that the proposal was that the comments due on the SEIS should wait until the Section 106 scheduled meeting in December where this stuff will be amended and discussed in a public venue, that you should delay the response date of the SEIS until we have much more information on these kind of things that will be discussed in the 106 process. So I don't know if people here --

Neal Desai: I completely, I mean, we've been saying that for about, you know, it goes back to linking up the processes and giving the public as well

as all of us here more opportunity to see what exactly we're talking about. And it looks like progress has been made, obviously, to, like, getting to some place that's getting worked out from at least the 106 perspective, or from the secretary's standards perspective. So yeah, I would ask for that.

Amy Meyer: In other words, what might the -- since we're not going to meet on November 13 -- what might the subject of a meeting sometime in the future, whenever that might be, what might be the topic? This was a regular board meeting, a public board meeting.

Neal Desai: I think there was going to be a presentation about, that was the detail. Is this a part of that? Is this to educate the public rather than get comments because I've just learned about it?

Amy Meyer: And you can in the SEIS process four days later when the people might see the new material, you know, whatever November 13 becomes. I mean, we are -- the public --

Karen Cook: That meeting was intended to be a meeting for people to make comments on the SEIS.

Amy Meyer: The old SEIS? The SEIS was --

Michael Boland: There's only one SEIS.

Karen Cook: There's only one SEIS. There's no old.

Amy Meyer: The SEIS without the ratification shown here.

Karen Cook: Well, let's be really clear. These things that we're talking about, these concepts are all within the parameters of the alternatives in our layout of the SEIS. We analyzed a project at the 2A site. We analyzed the project at the bowling alley site. We analyzed the commissary building.

So everything that we are talking about today is within those parameters. How they get placed on any given site, what we are talking about in this discussion, from a design standpoint of the impacts of those alternatives as laid out in the SEIS are completely consistent with what we're talking about.

Amy Meyer: Well, first of all, the Fort Scott [has a site plan]. So there are, in other words, when people act --

Karen Cook: We're still analyzing the Fort Scott --

Amy Meyer: Okay, but basically advocates see, I mean, the group of us that you asked to come in here today, and the other series, part of the series of meetings, are all people who have been advocating, worrying about parts of this program. And when they have a public meeting, you want to make sure that what everybody is talking about is on the same page. In other words, I know more coming into this

meeting now and having received the material you sent than I knew 10 days ago.

Karen Cook: That's why we're having this.

Amy Meyer: Okay. But let's say that you've got people from other organizations, the general public, that huge number of people that showed up on July 14, how are they going to be informed about what you have just told us and any --

Neal Desai: Or will they be?

Amy Meyer: Right. Well, again, I said how.

Karen Cook: Again, just to clarify, what we are talking about today is under the Section 106 process, that you are all consulting parties. And that's why we're having this meeting to work with the consulting parties so that just some, you know, have the ability to explain these fully. And you can see that it's, you know, it takes a while to get through it all and as well to have the questions.

But you're right, the general public, I mean, to the extent that the [unintelligible] not identified as a preferred alternative to the extent that the preferred alternative comes out of these various proponents, and we fashion a preferred alternative that is some way different from the proposed action that we've gotten. That has to be explained to the public. That will be explained in the FDIS. But the question

of these things that we're talking about today is really directed towards the consulting parties.

Amy Meyer: Yeah, okay, I appreciate that. But you say this will be explained in the FDIS. If you put out the FDIS, what's the comment period within [unintelligible]?

Neal Desai: [unintelligible]

Karen Cook: Again, we've never not taken into account comments that we've gotten on a final [unintelligible].

Amy Meyer: Karen --

Karen Cook: Let me back up. Let me finish. Again, the FDIS, the preferred alternative that would come out of this process, to the extent that it would change, all of the impacts that, I mean, all the impacts that we have been discussing at the draft FDIS level, everybody's talking about, or will be talking about, are incorporated. They are encompassed. We're not going to come up with something that is different.

Neal Desai: Can I jump in?

Karen Cook: Please.

Neal Desai: That may be fine. I'm saying what could be a better process, right? Let's shoot for the best here. I'm thinking you get these ideas, proposals. Whatever to the extent possible you can say to the public, "This works for this site and because of X, Y, and Z reasons they're conforming to the 106 process. The consulting parties have given their input," all these things, and then allow the public to look at the draft SEIS and say, "Okay, well, yeah, they're looking at this."

And in reality, you know, knowing that there's negotiations going on, this is what they're actually thinking about specifically. That gives someone a little bit more idea to say, "Hey, I like this," or, you know, and talk a little bit in more substance rather than I-don't-like-this/I-like-this blanket statements, which is what you folks heard in the first hearing. And that's not helpful.

And so what I'm saying is that I think the more, the way you construct your process in a better way is to allow this stuff to move forward, get a little bit more [unintelligible] about what you folks are doing. And then, have another series of workshops, something that discusses, I mean, historic preservation issues. You can focus on --

Karen Cook: Yeah, that's what I'm hearing is that you essentially want the general public, people who are not members of --

Whit Hall: The 106 process.

Karen Cook: The 106 process to be able to have this preview.

Donald Green: So you have an amended SEIS who says we've now expanded.

Neal Desai: Yeah, be a little bit more specific in the amended SEIS
[unintelligible].

Karen Cook: Well, that's where we disagree. That's where we disagree.

Amy Meyer: Well, Karen, let me give you one example.

Karen Cook: Because this is the section -- the SEIS process is analyzing the
environmental impact. The impacts that are analyzed in the SEIS
are the same --

Neal Desai: Isn't 140,000, I mean, isn't that larger than the proposed -- ?

Karen Cook: No, no.

Neal Desai: That's what's in the proposal?

Donald Green: So it's a larger amount of new construction. The new construction
was 100,000. Now, it's up to 140,000.

Karen Cook: The new construction on site 2A is 140,000.

Michael Boland: On site 2A it's 140,000. That's what in the SEIS.

Whit Hall: Let me just [run] along on both Amy and Neal's comment here, you know, is to rationalize the process. Because God knows we have a members meeting tomorrow night, probably 100- 120 people there. And, you know, what are we going to tell them? And we're going to tell them the meeting's been possibly delayed on the 14th or 13th. And the question is why?

Amy Meyer: And can he say that?

Karen Cook: Yeah.

Whit Hall: But it seems to me before we moved, as you think of how to restructure this, and I hope you will, is there's some thresholds -- before the public gets all jerked around -- it seems to me there are two thresholds that have to be [unintelligible]. One is you have to have a very private talk with Mr. Fisher and find out where he is. Why jerk around all the public if this thing is a nonstarter?

And the second one is, I don't know if the public will ever be involved to see the 213 report, but I assume that had some input to this. Maybe it didn't. But the 213 report is out there. And the whole 106 process has to terminate with the memorandum of an understanding or a failure, either one of which will affect the process as it goes forward.

So let's get Mr. Fisher's reaction out of the way and get the 106 process out of the way before we continue going in with this. Because that way you've got the 106 feeding into your SEIS process prior to the public submitting its comments and the last public hearing. That, the public could understand.

Brian Ramos: So, I was going to add just a couple of things, just [unintelligible], that the NEEFA document analyzes the impacts of a project. And what we're talking about here in terms of different ways of doing this, utilizing the secretary's standards, not the project, the applicants, there weren't applicants that came forward and said, "We have this thing called It Takes a Village. What are the impacts of that?" It's a different way of looking at it and starting at two different ends.

So, the NEEFA document analyzes alternatives that are partly conceptual and identifies impacts relative to concepts. Because they're at various levels of being cooked, I guess you could say. Or there's more detail known about certain aspects of this than other aspects. So it's identifying kind a program level concept and what those impacts would be and correctly calling out that those are having impacts to the NHL.

Then, the 106 process at the same time is doing that by saying, "Here's what's been put forward. This is a project, an undertaking under the 106 process." And these are what those impacts would be. And the finding of effect documents attempts to document those as

well as it can, utilizing the secretary's standards for rehabilitation as a guidance to kind of show how you would assess those impacts.

But this workshop that was done is saying okay, if we start at this the other way and say how would it look if it were to be conforming, you're right. At some point of this, folks need to go back to the proponents for these undertakings and say, "How does this sit with you, you know?" And that's the next exercise.

But think about this process as continuing efforts to minimize impacts, or potential impacts, on what has been identified as the project. And it's an ongoing discussion of what would it look it. How could it be done? And the 106 process that identifies specific procedures that you follow moving forward, that would continue to have National Parks Service involvement in terms of [unintelligible] and Advisory Council, in terms of review of the undertaking as design details become more developed.

Neal Desai:

I completely agree with what you're saying. I'm just saying, I'm not saying that's not the right process. I guess what I'm saying is that there's probably a better way to inform the public that may not follow all the -- I mean, what you're saying may follow the [unintelligible] way of doing things, okay? I'm saying from a practical standpoint of getting the public back on the same page as where some of us are [unintelligible] let's go ahead there [unintelligible] discussion page, you know? This will just make everything a little bit better. And so --

Amy Meyer: Let me toss a very practical one that we all --

Rebecca Evans: And I have one, too, when you're done.

Amy Meyer: Thirteen people got up and said the childcare center last year, that whatever document comes before people, whatever they are asked to comment on, there were board members who came down afterwards and said, "I wish I had said something, that they're not going to lose the childcare center." But some of this needs to be known ahead of time to the general public so you don't have a seething bunch of people [unintelligible] the mayor and generally, you know, I mean, people were just seething that night.

Karen Cook: We enjoy that.

Amy Meyer: Who enjoyed it?

Karen Cook: I'm joking.

Tia Lombardi: I think that we agree that -- now, these are ideas. I think that, I think, Whit, you said this, and we don't know. We don't know whether there is going to be a positive and real response to these ideas from [unintelligible]. We don't know. We are moving the board meeting, largely to accommodate the Section 106 meeting early in December. I think the date's the first week or the second.

Karen Cook: It's the first week of December, and we're trying to confirm the date.

Rebecca Evans: Will you delay the comments for the SEIS as well?

Tia Lombardi: Yes, we won't close the comment period until we've had that board meeting. So all that official announcement hurrah, we have things like dates and times and places in doubt. And so there is, you know, between now and then, I don't know, you know? So it takes a lot of patience. But I do think that you're absolutely right, that at some point, assuming that this isn't just an intellectual exercise, that there are some project changes, there will be public discussion of that. But we're not there.

Neal Desai: Great, so when we get to that point, I mean, let's keep things extended and not close them out until we get them. Let's, for example --

Tia Lombardi: But let's keep in mind that the kinds of things we're talking about today do not change the impacts being analyzed under the FDIS. Those are two separate things. The other thing is if this whole process doesn't conclude, we will not have the [unintelligible] decision until the NHPA and the NEEFA kind of meet again.

So the other thing, too, and historically we've gone through this at the Presidio, there's an SEIS, and it will analyze impacts and will identify a preferred alternative. That doesn't mean that there aren't

some changes between them and the record of decision. Think of the public health hospital.

Amy Meyer: Well, actually, Tia, thank you for mentioning that. Because what you're touching on in that sentence is we need to look at a process that will work for this. It might not be the same as the public health service hospital, but something that will make the public feel included rather than [feeling left out].

Karen Cook: I mean, that's a good comment that Neal made that, you know, essentially there are consulting parties for the general public. And you want the general public at some level to have not an in-depth a presentation as this has been, but an overall sense that we have looked at this and come up with some things that could work under a variety of scenarios.

Rebecca Evans: Well, I want to [tier] off in something. And I'm sure some of you heard some of this buzz as well. But there are people in city departments who are looking for other sites in San Francisco other than the Presidio for Mr. Fisher's museum.

Karen Cook: Oh, believe me, he's gotten many offers as a result of all of this.

Rebecca Evans: And, I mean, people are earnestly working in this direction to basically protect the Main Post for that monstrosity of a building. But at some point, you're going to have to talk to Mr. Fisher about these potential alternatives.

Amy Meyer: That's next week, isn't it?

Karen Cook: Yeah, we have a meeting.

Whit Hall: Tia?

Karen Cook: He, again, you know, we have given him all these materials to all of the project proponents.

Whit Hall: Before we break up, do we continue to encourage our members to complete their written comment on the SEIS and get it in by November 17, even though there may be some substantial new information coming on? I grant you, you could fit all this within the scope of the SEIS, but they'd certainly have much better informed comments and probably not quite as hostile in some cases.

Tia Lombardi: We will be extending the comment period to accommodate the board meeting. Now, we just don't have those dates right now.

Donald Green: Let me add one thing. I was very happy. We're having another meeting tonight also about that. I'm happy to hear that you're going to, that the board meeting has been postponed, that the SEIS response will be after that board meeting, and that that will take into account the December meeting of the PHA.

Whit Hall: Section 106.

Donald Green: I just wanted to go back to one thing. The Trust has now spent about \$2.5 million on this process starting with the Fisher's proposal. If it's announced tomorrow sometime that the Fisher proposal, as proposed on the bowling alley, won't go, that's basically what we've agreed, I think, on the various need, it just won't fit, okay? And therefore, we're looking at something else. And if you present this to Fisher, that group that's meeting next week, and you say, I don't know how long it takes to present it, but that won't go.

Now, Mr. Fisher, he's already had this stuff. He's read the same charts we have, comes to the same conclusion without going into the meeting. And if he says, "I'm going to entertain the consideration," either with the commissary or 2A, that puts us in a whole different position than if he were to say, "Thank you very much. I'm not interested in the commissary for six reasons. And I really don't like the idea of It Holds a Village or a long narrow one. I want my building." Then, we terminate the whole thing.

He basically withdraws his proposal on the grounds that it's not acceptable. And I don't know how many more meetings you'd need, SEISes and all the rest of it. But I really think we do need [unintelligible]. And I think the time to do it, certainly, is following next week's meeting. [unintelligible] be there.

But I really think it's up to Don, who's an old family member, to simply stand up and say, "Thanks, you know, I appreciate it. And I will look seriously at these. Or I really don't want it. I want my building." And if the building is key, which I have a sense it is, because the art goes with the building, then none of these fit. And I would just love to see some resolution of that issue instead of what you said, the theoretical, intellectual concept of meetings and [unintelligible]. We do appreciate this. There's no question about that. This is a tremendous effort, a tremendous benefit.

Neal Desai: There's so much out of our control right here. There's so much out of your control if we're waiting on a response.

Tia Lombardi: You should know that when -- we don't know what Don will say.

Karen Cook: We'd love him to stand up and say that, too.

Amy Meyer: What did you say, Karen?

Karen Cook: I said we'd love to have him stand up and say this.

Tia Lombardi: Exactly. But we don't know. But that also doesn't mean that we can conclude the EIS process. That's as we have started it. That doesn't mean we wouldn't continue to analyze 100,000 square feet or 140,000 square feet for some kind of cultural use. So we'll complete the EIS process.

Brian Ramos: I just wanted to clarify one thing that you said, and I'm sure for everyone this is clear, but the workshop that looked at this was not making a statement about this can't be built here. It's making a statement that it's not conforming. Because the CAMP is not that group's decision. It's the board's decision.

Amy Meyer: There's two other aspects of this that stand out. If, for some reason, Don said, "This doesn't go with me," it opens up a whole new site for the lodge area that wouldn't be so difficult. And the other thing is that none of this [unintelligible], and I just want to speak again to the cumulative impacts, is that nothing today has taken into account the Heritage Center and the Visitors Centers and the uses that that -- I mean, to me, they're very interlocking.

Tia Lombardi: Well, because the Heritage Center is being analyzed as reuse of either buildings 50, 2, or 1 and 2.

Amy Meyer: That's all fine. But what it is, is how many people are being drawn into an area [unintelligible].

Karen Cook: And that's a separate issue.

Amy Meyer: And that's in the EIS.

Karen Cook: Yeah, that is in the EIS, but that's not part of this discussion about the --

Amy Meyer: But the EIS wasn't that fully developed back then. It got some, but not all.

Tia Lombardi: The ESI fully analyzes the Heritage Center in various locations.

Neal Desai: Because of [unintelligible] update and all the alternatives the SEIS are having at the same time, typically you would find the planning document being updated first and then alternatives based on that. But what happens if the public rejects the [unintelligible] update? All this stuff is not possible.

Tia Lombardi: You mean the Main Post update which is circulated?

Neal Desai: Yeah.

Tia Lombardi: That is a draft document. And that document will change when we identify the preferred alternative, which we haven't done.

Karen Cook: Remember, the Main Post update is a reflection of alternative two under the SEIS, which is the proposed actions.

Amy Meyer: And CAMP, as the [unintelligible].

Karen Cook: Yeah, it was essentially trying to put in descriptive terms what the overall program, or what the overall picture would be like if alternative 2, which is identified as the preferred action [unintelligible], if in between now and whenever we get to the end

of this, what comes out of it is different because it's not the bowling alley site or whatever. That also will change.

Donald Green: The [unintelligible] changes with the SEIS.

Neal Desai: So you're saying the comments directed at the [unintelligible] update, general guidelines update, that's done in direct comment? We're actually supposed to be commenting on the SEIS, which would then inform how you folks update the [unintelligible]?

Donald Green: It's an update --

Brian Ramos: PTMP, you're not using the right word, I don't think.

Donald Green: I'm sorry. The update is a revision of the PTMP, that's true.

Tia Lombardi: For the Main Post.

Karen Cook: For the Main Post.

Neal Desai: So are you saying we can't comment on that directly to say we support these guidelines?

Karen Cook: No. No, you can comment on it. You can comment on it. You can comment on both of those documents.

Donald Green: Right, except it's a waste of time because the update is no longer relevant, because that building in the update can't be done. It won't be done.

Tia Lombardi: Well, wait a minute, the update is on a lot more than one building. And we'll look at one building. It's about uses. It's about how people experience the place. It's about the history, etc., etc., the many, many, many [unintelligible].

Neal Desai: But it is focused on --

Donald Green: But there is a problem with the design guidelines.

Tia Lombardi: Absolutely not. I disagree with you. CAMP may be a large architectural feature. The Main Post update is not about CAMP. It is about the Main Post.

Donald Green: But it was the only alternative that was reviewed, though.

Tia Lombardi: It is the proposed action, but it includes within it multiple activities.

Whit Hall: We have difficulty with that because of the nature -- it includes the design guidelines.

Tia Lombardi: That's right.

Whit Hall: And that's really a critical, critical part of all this. And the design guidelines clearly were written for option two, for alternative two. I mean, it talks about art, a roof that you can put art on, for Pete's sake.

Tia Lombardi: Right, it's for the proposed [unintelligible].

Whit Hall: So that's what I'm saying. And so mentioning it and everything in there is not appropriate, really, for any structure.

Tia Lombardi: Well, it's, as we talked about today, these are all draft documents. These things will evolve as we make our way through this process.

Neal Desai: We're giving comment on this. We're giving comments on this document. Let's say I look at it, and I say, "You know what? This sort of update for the Main Post, that sort of square footage was actually considered only six years ago, and it was rejected. There's no need for an update." And let's say all the public says that, right? Okay, they give their comments [unintelligible] we don't need to have it. We don't need the Main Post [unintelligible] update.

Then, we have the SEIS process that goes on. And let's say folks say, "Oh, yeah, well, while we don't want it updated, we'd like something that's -- we like this specific location." So you have conflicting -- what I'm saying is you have conflicting views going in. I mean --

Tia Lombardi: No, I don't think so.

Neal Desai: If Main Post update is rejected, those guide, those principles doesn't allow for any of the alternatives, or at least a proposed action. That's a tiny document that's a foundation of what you can do and what you can't do. And so CAMP as proposed would not be allowed under that because that's rejected.

Tia Lombardi: So if CAMP changes, the Main Post update will change to reflect the changes that will be --

Neal Desai: What if [unintelligible]? What if no one wants it changed?

Donald Green: The Trust decision [unintelligible].

Neal Desai: Right, but you --

Tia Lombardi: Don't they have to change?

Amy Meyer: If no one wants the update to change, or the [unintelligible] to change?

Neal Desai: No one wants the update to change.

Tia Lombardi: So not everyone likes the update that we've put out this last quarter?

Male Voice: No, he means the people.

Donald Green: Nobody likes the update.

Neal Desai: People want 2002. They don't want --

Tia Lombardi: And that is alternative one, right?

Karen Cook: They really are not in conflict. I mean, think of it as taking a part of what was in the SEIS, alternative two, because that is the alternative that reflects actual proposals that we have, and so we want to focus people's attention. Think of it as sticking that and putting it under a magnifying glass to give more of a description of what the overall feel of the programs, you know, the whole environment would be like if they were to occur so that people could really understand that in a more complete way. That's essentially what we did by putting that Main Post update together was to focus people on what we have as actual proposals.

If everybody writes and says, "We don't like that," we still have these other alternatives that are viable, that are possible for us to change how, you know, how that Main Post update might, ultimately, evolve. So --

Amy Meyer: But the important thing is a very public process on it. Because if something like [unintelligible] successfully worked, it's [unintelligible] at the public health service hospital, something that

gets the public positively involved. Because that came out. So I'd say most people were 90-95 percent happy. And that --

Donald Green: That was way after the final SEISes public health service, all that took place after that. And I think what we want to avoid, if I could differ a little bit, I don't think they should come out with their final SEIS and surprise us with this stuff. I think you had said earlier let's get the public informed on this kind of stuff.

Amy Meyer: Yeah, oh, yeah.

Donald Green: Not after the final SEIS.

Amy Meyer: I didn't follow the details of the public health service hospital, but I -- you're right. We're actually dragging this out having this very long process. It would be better -- how do we get the public well informed now?

Jennifer Correia: [unintelligible] early. I mean, we're having a hard enough time with [unintelligible].

Amy Meyer: Oh, I don't mean [unintelligible].

Neal Desai: What are you doing with our comments here? I mean, what's the --

Karen Cook: We've got a transcription.

Neal Desai: But how does it feed into, I mean, does it feed into any negotiations?

Karen Cook: It feeds into the 106 process.

Tia Lombardi: It feeds into the 106 process.

Amy Meyer: Right.

Brian Ramos: I would hope that you all see that your role in this is already making people think about things in a particular way.

Neal Desai: It's coming at a distance of time much after when we first started advocating for [unintelligible]. I think we're on the same path now where we're seeing this moving towards and where things can work and where things can't work. And, I mean, it sounds like we're getting towards that same page. The issue is we don't want it to drag out for another 10 months to get to the next step.

Amy Meyer: We've been on this for 14 months.

[Everybody talking at once]

Neal Desai: You know, the action is just taking off right now on this scale, okay? I mean, this, we were seeing a while ago that this -- I mean, you look at these different alternatives first, you know, the schematics and what --

Tia Lombardi: You have to have alternatives to look at.

Brian Ramos: Yeah, and that's what I was saying before is that, you know, see, what we're looking at, what we're looking at is a result of people kind of saying, "How could you?" This is not actions that applicants came in and said, "This is what we want to do."

And so the environmental process looks at what's real and what people, you know, and the applicants came in and said, "Here's my proposal. Here's a project." And then the environmental process looks at the impacts of that. And then, the public comments on those and informs an agency's thinking and decision-making about that. And that's what we're going through right now.

I understand the frustration of how long that takes. And many people probably feel like we should have been at this point before. But this is a way of saying well, okay, we're kind of going back to the drawing board and saying is there a different way for us to look at meeting these objectives and satisfying the public? Is there a sweet spot here?

Karen Cook: I would submit for your consideration that, I mean, it may not be pretty, and it may not be smooth, you know? It's herky-jerky. If we could foresee how long some of this stuff was going to take, you know, we wouldn't have to keep postponing board meetings. But I think it is emblematic of the fact that the process is working. So,

you know, your comments are being taken into account, and they are affecting how it's being considered. So I think that's where the focus should be.

Tia Lombardi: Yeah, and I'd like to --

Karen Cook: I mean, yes, it could inform how we do this in the future. But at the same time.

Rebecca Evans: That's why I asked the charette question. Because projects I'm familiar with that had charettes, that happened earlier in the process.

Tia Lombardi: But these were on the CAMP project, which was the trigger came as a proposal. And, you know, I'd like to also remind everyone that this is not the first time that we've been through a difficult process. But the process has affected the projects in every instance. So there should be a fair amount of trust and good faith in the fact that the process has changed every project.

Amy Meyer: People, most people don't recognize it because they're not part of the 106 process. The distance, for example, on the CAMP issues have come since the last time they heard about it. They last heard about it, for all intents and purposes, on July 14. A year before that, there was a large public affairs, public, really, publicity process of saying, "This is where CAMP will go."

Tia Lombardi: Well, that's not exactly true.

Amy Meyer: Well, you've got all that stuff that Sam Singer put out, all the stuff that Don put out, everything.

Neal Desai: But also, the tours that you folks led specifically for this site.

Amy Meyer: The tours, oh, yeah.

Donald Green: We said earlier that because it is a national historic landmark - I think Craig had mentioned this at the last meeting -- in that proposal, it's very unusual for a proposal to come in and start the whole process from the outside, as opposed to people saying on the inside, "Maybe we should have something." In this case, if they had asked the question before they said yes to Don and published it, if they said let's give it the 106 review, in two months, the amount of time it took to do this, you could have come back and said no. And we would have saved all this time and all this effort. I mentioned this all before. I'm sorry, it's looking backwards. But it is a little different because it's a national historic landmark and you have the 106 process. And somehow --

Neal Desai: There are already established [unintelligible].

Donald Green: Just because a proposal comes in does not mean you therefore go out for RFPs, you stop looking at the proposal and say will it fit. And I'm really sorry that the staff of the Trust did not do that at that time.

Amy Meyer: I don't think the staff of the Trust had any idea. Because I was at the August [unintelligible] press conference. And at that point, you know, speaking as former board member, I mean, wow. And we could have something very, you know, some kind of fine cultural institution here. No one ever knew or thought, until those drawings were made that -- and the model, Gluckman's model came out. And I will tell you flatly that I was shown that model four days before it became public.

Donald Green: By the way, was that December probably, January? It was a long time.

Amy Meyer: It was about late November. The hearing, I think, was in December.

Donald Green: That's what startled the world.

Amy Meyer: Yes. And I was shown that model. And I said as strongly as I could to Don and to Gluckman, "Don't ever show that model." And I tried. And, you know, just that's -- and that's part of what's happened here. I don't want to point my fingers at the Trust staff in that instance. I think it's really important to know that when people said, "There's some terribly wrong with what you're presenting, and your architect doesn't get it," in fact, to his face, and I'm not normally -- they both know me well -- I'm not normally this blunt.

But Wallace Harrison, who designed the U.N building in New York, designed an auditorium on my campus at Oberlin College my last year that I was there. And when I went back for my 50th reunion, that horrible building was still there. [Laughs] It was a huge, white marble thing on a 19th century square. And then, here was this, you know -- and I said, to him bluntly, "This is like what we had on our campus." The [unintelligible] had let it go gray and dingy in hopes that kind of maybe [unintelligible] it, and covered it with, you know, stuff.

But the idea that this building was not appropriate, I couldn't have given him -- I know much more about NHL [unintelligible] than I did a year ago.

Donald Green: Right, but now we're years since then. When you first saw the building, somebody should have said about the monstrosity, "Wow, let's take a look." And it might have been stopped then within a month instead of years.

Amy Meyer: Well, you have a very persistent governor with the very, you know, very grand idea --

Donald Green: And a big offer.

Amy Meyer: And a big offer, and that was tough. That was really tough.

Donald Green: Yeah, I know.

Rebecca Evans: He's got Mary Murphy, a former trustee, who [unintelligible].

Brian Ramos: Well, we certainly appreciate [unintelligible].

Karen Cook: Thank you all for coming.

Amy Meyer: Thank you.

[Meeting Convened]

[End of Recorded Material]