

Presidio Trust 11.12.08 - 11.30 a.m



Tigerfish[®]
Transcribing·Editing

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

www.tigerfish.com

Presidio Trust 11.12.08 - 11.30 a.m

[Beginning of Recorded Material]

Michael Boland: Well, why don't we get started, and at least I can -- we can begin. Just a note before we begin. We're actually transcribing this meeting, along with all the other meetings. So we will all be recording, just so everyone knows. That's so everyone can --

Welcome. Has everybody gotten a copy of a couple of things? You've gotten a packet that -- like this 11 x 17 a map of [unintelligible] -- if not, let me know -- and an 8 1/2 x 11 1/2. It has the secretary standards on it. Those are the two things that we will be talking about today.

Well, thank you for coming today. I -- today what we wanted to do was to brief everybody on some work that we've been engaged in over the last couple of -- last month and a half to two months, working in collaboration with the Park Service with the state historic preservation officer and with the [unintelligible] for preservation. And this work has been focused on looking at the proposed additions and reconstruction that are proposed as part of the new Trust SEIS and trying to understand -- and trying to apply the secretary of interior standards for rehabilitation, new construction in a historic district to these ideas to all of the sites that are being considered in the Main Post SEIS and trying to define an envelope around what conforming structures might look like in each of those locations. So that's what we really want to talk about today.

So we've turned our attention to the three major projects that are proposed as part of the SEIS, the contemporary art museum, the proposed lodge, and also the proposed addition to the theater. So we'll walk through each of those today. I believe everyone got copies of this matrix in advance, so you might have had a chance to review it. If not, I apologize.

I thought it would be helpful if I just talked a bit about kind of methodology and how we began this effort. We began this process with a 2 1/2-day [unintelligible] with a number of staff from the Park Service and also Presidio Trust. They included the director of planning and design at the Denver Service Center in Washington, Rodger Evans, Randy Biallas, who's an historic architect that works in the Washington office of the Park Service, and Larry [Walling], who's a retired landscape architect with the Park Service, again, not from Denver. So three folks from across the country. A couple of the folks who are here participated, provided resource for us. Craig Kenkel and Elaine Jackson-Retondo participated, and they kind of bookended our efforts, and a number of Trust staff as well, Rick [Borgis], who many of you know, Chandler McCoy -- he's not here today -- planner and designer on staff, myself, Rob Thompson, who also is not here. He's on paternity leave.

And we came together, and we took this 2 1/2-day workshop. We developed this model as a tool that we used in the workshop and used a lot of this sort of stuff and fiddled around with, you know,

looking at these areas, proposals, and asking ourselves about the applicability of the secretary standards, how they might apply and how they might shape these proposals, and how those differ from the proposals as we understand them to be -- as we received them initially.

Tia Lombardi: Michael, let me interrupt.

Michael Boland: Yeah. Sure.

Tia Lombardi: This might be a good time for everybody to introduce themselves --

Michael Boland: Yeah. Sure. I'm sorry.

Tia Lombardi: --and --

Michael Boland: I jumped right in --

Tia Lombardi: But I wanted to first introduce Brian Ramos, who I think some of you know, but some of you may not know.

Brian, you should just tell us who you are and how you're helping us out.

Brian Ramos: I -- thanks. I'm -- I work for ICF Jones & Stokes. I'm an environmental consultant. My background -- I have a Ph.D. in archaeology. And I've been hired by Presidio to help them

[unintelligible] process and work as facilitator. I was the facilitator for the large public meeting that you were all at as well.

So I'm going to take that opportunity to just kind of -- since I'm in the spotlight, to just kind of talk a little bit about the expectations for the meeting today. What Michael mentioned is the fact that this was -- what you're seeing today is the result of a workshop where experts in historic preservation and in architecture and architecture history got together to look at this project and say, you know, if it were to be done in a way that was, you know, starting from the secretary of interior standards, working from those, what would it look like. And so what you're going to hear today is some of the different ways that it would look in -- being in conformance with those standards.

But -- and we've had a series of these meetings so far. We've had, I think, four or three so far. And what's different about today's meeting -- and that I hope everyone's respectful of -- is that today's meeting has project applicants here. And so they're going to hear some of this for the first time. And so folks that are here as observers, I'm just asking that you respect the fact that this meeting is for them to hear this information. If there's time at the end for questions for the Presidio, then they'll entertain those questions.

But I don't -- we can't put people on the spot here. This is for folks to hear some information, take -- and take it away and digest it. So just be mindful of that, that, you know, truly, the dynamic of today's

meeting is different than the other ones, because there are both applicants and members of the public here today. So this is really for them to hear the result of fine work that a number of specialists did.

Tia Lombardi: Thank you.

So I'll start the introductions. I'm Tia Lombardi. I'm the director of public affairs, Presidio Trust.

Terry Reagan: I'm Terry Reagan. I'm coordinator with the CAMP project.

Jay Turnbull: I'm Jay Turnbull, CAMP.

Sam Nunes: Sam Nunes, CAMP.

Mary Murphy: Mary Murphy, CAMP.

Allison Kidd: Allison Kidd, CAMP.

Melanie Blum: Melanie Blum, the Presidio Theater.

Eric Blind: Eric Blind, archaeologist for Presidio.

Jean DiMaria: Jean DiMaria with Larkspur hotels and restaurants.

Jim Hanson: I'm Jim Hanson with Larkspur and the lodge project.

Anne Poon: Anne Poon from [Hornberger Worstell Architects].

Mark Hornberger: Mark Hornberger, Hornberger Worstell Architects for the lodge.

Andrea Andersen: Andrea Andersen. I'm the environmental attorney for the Trust.

Michael Boland: Michael Boland, [Presidio Trust].

Craig Kenkel: Craig Kenkel, chief of cultural resources, Golden Gate.

Elaine Jackson-Retondo: Elaine Jackson-Retondo, [unintelligible]
manager.

Female Voice: Presidio Historical Association.

Joshua Steinberger: Joshua Steinberger, a planner at Presidio Trust.

Judith Hulka: Judith Hulka, neighborhood associations for Presidio planning.

[Laurie Brook]: Laurie Brook, president of Town Hall Association.

[Inior Kemp]: I'm Inior Kemp with the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

[Jennifer Gree]: Jennifer Gree. I'm with Presidio Trust and Historic [unintelligible].

Michael Boland: All right. Thank you. So we've -- why don't we talk a bit about how we accomplished this matrix, developed it, and then let's walk through some of the results of it. First a bit about methodology. We, as I said, spent 2 1/2 days --

Craig, we just did introductions. Will you introduce yourself?

Craig Middleton: Craig Middleton with Presidio Trust.

Michael Boland: As I mentioned, we spent -- a group of us spent 2 1/2 days working on this. And we began our process by touring the Presidio. We spent the morning touring the entire Presidio to get the kind of broader context for the Main Post. Then we spent the afternoon actually out in the landscape studying the proposals that we'd received in the contexts of the Main Post landscape -- and also doing a couple of other things. We were trying to familiarize our out-of-town participants in this process with the character of the Main Post, of its history, trying to help them understand the complex layering of history in the Main Post.

And we also were working with them to identify a list of character-defining features to the Main Post district. And the first sheet that you've all received is a product of our due diligence. And you see there are two things on it. The first is this map that shows predicted archaeological features that the NHLD -- one of the things that we did is we walked around and looked in the Main Post district -- was we familiarized ourselves and -- refamiliarized ourselves and

familiarized our participants with these areas, which are contributing features of the Presidio's natural historic landmark district, these archaeological sites, these predicted archaeological features. And we also developed this list of character-defining features. And the character-defining features are really the -- kind of the basis upon which this whole edifice of this analysis is built. So they're important. And I'll come back to them as we run through the matrix a little later on.

Then we looked at the secretary of the interior standards. And I passed that out to everyone on one page, 8 1/2 by 11 sheet, that lists the secretary of the interior standards. And everyone has that. I actually don't, so if somebody will hold it up and say, "This." There. You can see it now. Thank now -- and ran through this list.

And we asked ourselves, as a group, which of these standards are the most applicable to the particular question at hand, which is looking at the secretary standards and applying them to these, you know, building-addition and new-construction sites. Because not all of them are necessarily completely relevant to the particular -- this current undertaking. And in some cases, there's some redundancy.

And so we tried to simplify them down. We identified five of them that we thought were particularly relevant. And I thought -- and they become, then, the matrix -- the very first column that you see on the side here says secretary standard. And the standards that we identified that became the basis for this analysis that seemed the

most appropriate for us to consider as we considered these is standard one, a property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

Standard two, the historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

Standard three, each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties will not be undertaken.

Standard eight, archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

And number nine, new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, or spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportion and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

So these five secretary standards, again, became the most -- in our minds, were the most relevant and became the ones that we focused our attention on as we did this analysis. And bearing in mind those standards, in considering for a minute the character-defining features that we identified as we wandered about and the other due diligence that we did, we came up with a series of strategies that would -- we believed would enable a project -- that would enable a project to attain conformance with these standards.

And if you look at the matrix, that's the second column, strategies. And for each of the secretary standards, we identified a series of these strategies. And they're listed down here. And they flow right out of the standard itself, or they flow right out of the character-defining features that we identified in our analysis as we moved around. So that was -- these are sort of linking all the pieces together. That was how we developed this methodologically.

And then what we did is we applied this, these strategies, to each of the proposed sites, to the various projects. And when I say proposed sites, they're the ideas that we're exploring or that we're considering as part of the SEIS. We only look at either new infill construction or additions. We didn't look at the existing historic properties in this and ask ourselves about how we would apply those to this. So you'll notice building 42 isn't on here, Montgomery Street Barracks aren't on here, building 101 is not on here, you know, these other historic properties that are part of the proposals that you've developed. So we did not analyze those as part of this effort.

So is that enough background? Is there any questions about how we -- at least the kind of basic premise as to what we're doing?

Then I thought what might be helpful is if we actually quickly ran through some of these ideas, our assessment of them, and then we can have the -- you know, this is an open forum, so if you have any questions, please ask.

But why don't we start with CAMP? So the first sheet that you have -- and I'll -- looks at a series of different sites that were proposed for the CAMP project. It also looked as CAMP is -- looked at CAMP as proposed, which is column 4 here. We actually began our effort by looking at CAMP as proposed and analyzed it against all of these various strategies that we'd identified. Then we looked at each of the other sites, and we asked ourselves what would a conforming building look like at each of those.

So for example, why don't we start with column 3? Thank you so much. Column 3, a conforming building at the bowling-alley site. Here you go. And again, I -- just a point of clarification. We're -- these are very simple maps and models. We're not assuming the building really looks like this. So let's look at how this works at the CAMP -- at the bowling-alley site and how we thought about a conforming building at the bowling-alley site.

So under secretary standard one, the most important strategy that we came up with to conform with that has to do with avoiding the removal of historic structures. And so ideally, a building -- a conforming building on that site would allow for building 97 to remain in place -- which is what's shown in this model -- and also ostensibly could allow for the tennis court to be retained.

Secretary standard two. In terms of retaining the historic character of the property, avoiding the removal of features, spaces, and spatial relationships, we identified a series of different strategies based on the character-defining features. So for example, we found that an orthogonal orientation is pretty much true of almost all the buildings in the Main Post. Building 97 is one notable example. The former jail at the foot of the Main Post is another example. But generally, most of the buildings in Main Post are orthogonal. So therefore, an orthogonal orientation is important. And so yes, if the building had it, we would want to build a conforming building here to have an orthogonal orientation.

We would want it to have a north-south orientation. You can see from the model, many of the buildings have a north-south orientation. We wouldn't want it to intrude into any historic roadways. We would want it to maintain historic open spaces. And we had quite a lively discussion about open spaces and what an open space is, where the parade ground was historically and where the parade ground was, as many of you noticed. We had quite a bit

of conversation about the parade ground -- and a lot of -- many misconceptions about where the parade ground was historically.

But generally, just to review, this is a site that historically has had a number of different uses, number of different iterations there. It was an open space. It's had a series of smaller buildings on it as well during the period of significance.

And so the -- when we're talking about an open space, there are really three factors. And they're really -- we tried to tease them apart in the next three of these strategies. One is to maintain the open character of the site or maintain any historic open spaces. One is to maintain significant views, and not just views from this site looking out, but also views within the larger site, looking across and looking down to the Bay, et cetera. And the last having to do with maintaining the open south end of the parade -- and by open, we don't mean that it is building-free. We mean that it has an open character that historically -- the buildings that were located in this area were shorter than the buildings that were located along the edges. And so the idea is that whatever you put there would maintain this open character and not be so large that it terminated the view of the parade ground in a way that's not consistent with the historic character of that site.

So again, a conforming building would be -- would not block views from building 50 down to the Bay, nor from building 100 out. It would be pulled back so that it would maintain some of the historic

openness of the site and wouldn't cover the entire site so that the site generally was open, had a more open feeling, and that the -- if the building was located at the southern end and is higher than the bowling alley -- here it says approximately 30 feet. I have an elevation, if that's more helpful -- that that would maintain, again, this sort of open character of the site that was [unintelligible].

Is it of a compatible scale? Scale is something else that we had quite a bit of conversation about. And we assumed -- we decided, as a group, that a building that had an approximately 20,000-square-foot footprint -- it would be somewhere in the -- it would be more appropriately scaled with the surrounding buildings.

Moving on to the back page, seriality of repetition of forms. If you notice, any of the building ensembles here have a repetition of -- there's seriality repetition of forms. A building of this size could be a freestanding building, and it wouldn't need to -- it's a single building, and so seriality of repetition of forms doesn't come into play. It comes into play later when we talk about the characteristics of the building itself.

Secretary standard three. The most important strategy -- we talked quite a bit about this -- has to do with avoiding creating a false sense of historical development by creating -- not -- and not creating something that is incompatible, but creating something that is clearly differentiated from the old. And so the important thing we talked about, again, was this idea that there never was a terminus, if

you will, a strong visual terminus at the head of the main parade -- and so that a building that is of a smaller scale or would have a shorter stature would not terminate the main parade in a way that creates a false sense of history, creates a false focal point, if you will, in the parade ground. And so that's what we're trying to get at in this smaller building of this scale.

In terms of protecting archaeological resources, a site -- this site, as you can tell from the matrix, front page -- there are actually two archaeological sites that intrude onto this bowling-alley site, F1 and F20. And so by locating the building at the southern end and at the western side, it allows you to avoid those predicted archaeology sites and allows you to fit the building in this footprint that's located out there. This is about a 37,000-square-foot rectangle right here. It is outside the known sensitive archaeology [unintelligible].

And then lastly, in terms of secretary standard nine, we looked at -- there were a number of key moves that we determined were important to make sure that a building would conform with that, creating a building that is of compatible scale and has compatible proportions. A building of this size is of compatible scale. It could be designed in such a way that it would actually have a proportion - - proportions.

There were two thoughts that we put on the table about building in this location and materiality, this idea that it should have compatible materials, color, and texture. One is that it should be of a

compatible material, which is very easy to do. But the other is that one could also try to make this building dark so that it would tend to visually recede, especially given that the backdrop -- this backdrop up here is heavily wooded and fairly dark. And so if you were on the north side looking up, if the building was darker, then it would tend to recede visually and be less prominent in your visual plane. So there were two ideas, two possibilities in terms of conforming with that particular strategy.

Compatible building height. We already talked about that. The feeling was that a building that was consistent with the height of the bowling alley or the eave of the movie theater would be of a consistent building height with the surrounding buildings.

In terms of compatible features, again, this little blob doesn't really talk much about compatible features, but the notion is that the building would have, you know, features that are recognizably related to the surrounding -- buildings surrounding the main parade, things like porches and windows, some sort of acknowledgement of a roofline or eave -- that those are the features that, if you look at the buildings around -- this building would want to have some of those features as well. So again, being -- as the standard says, being clearly contemporary -- intervention and [unintelligible].

Compatible roof types. Now, we had an interesting conversation about the interaction of scale and location in discussing both this site as well as this site. And we'll get to site [2A]. This is site -- in

SEIS, this is site 2A. We talked a lot about the interaction of scale and design. And the note -- and this reflects an idea that will come up over and over again in this analysis, namely that the smaller a building gets, the more flexibility that one has in terms of features that it has, that it's easier for it to be compatible -- you know, so that a very large building will want to be more compatible, particularly in this location, and that a smaller building -- there's more flexibility.

Though the building still wants to be compatible in terms of the sum of the features that it has --that one has more flexibility. And so this was an attempt to offer that, to sort of reflect that reality, that although the building's relatively small-scale [unintelligible] some flexibility in terms of wood form. Due to its location, it must still be compatible with surrounding buildings to be conformant.

And then lastly, we talked a bit about massing. And though the building is of an appropriate scale -- it was a comparable scale to the surrounding buildings -- that because of its location, that the mass still wants to be articulated, still broken down in some way, so that it feels more compatible with the architecture that surrounds it. So that was our analysis of what a -- conforming building at the bowling-alley site.

So any questions about that? I can through a number of these, and then we can come back and have a more -- a meta-level conversation, if that's helpful.

Then we turned our attention to the 2A site. And because we thought that -- the 2A site offers quite a bit of flexibility in terms of its [unintelligible]. You know, it's [unintelligible]. And there are a number of different ways that one could organize a museum at the 2A site. And so we actually came up with -- we identified three possible building strategies that one might employ, kind of massing strategies, if you will, for ways you might organize the square footage on the site.

An important note is that, as in the SEIS, we assumed at the 2A site that we were looking at a 140,000 square feet rather than the 100,000 square feet that had been proposed originally for the bowling-alley site. That's because it's unclear in the -- whether building 101, which is part of the current proposal for the CAMP project, would actually continue to be part of that project if the museum was located up there at 2A. And so we went with 140,000-square-foot assumption. And so these models reflect that idea, 140,000 square feet.

So we came up with three concepts. And we've actually included images of those concepts in your packages, so it's a little bit clearer. These sort of ghostly -- I apologize. We had technical difficulties with our color copier, so we're not -- we're hoping it won't look quite this eerie when it's done. But we came up with a series of sketch diagrams to articulate -- so this is the idea of the conforming building at the bowling-alley site. You see this red mass here.

And we identified three different massing concepts. So [unintelligible] concept A. And concept A moves the mass of the building over to the edge, the side, if you will, and would include a lower wing that would come across. So it moves the bulk of the building over to the west side, where it can engage this wooded slope out of the view of the top of the parade, add some architecture, you know, lower, translucent architecture that comes across [unintelligible]. But this is concept A.

Then we looked at massing concept B, which is shown on the next page, which takes that square footage, and it moves the mass into the middle of the site. Again, these are sort of, you know, dummy solutions, dummy strategies that we wanted to explore. The idea is that we would center the mass of the building actually on the opening at the top of the -- which seems like another strategy. You could put the building to the side. You could put the mass of the building to the middle.

And then lastly, we developed a strategy that we nicknamed it takes a village. And the idea of it takes a village was that we would break up the mass of the building into a series of smaller structures that could be connected underground -- you know, might or might not incorporate a library. But the idea being that you take that 140,000 square feet of mass, and you break it up, and you array it on the site. And we did this because we thought it was important for us to understand the benefits or challenges in each of those

[unintelligible] massing strategies. And so that was how we undertook the analysis.

And you can see that each of these ideas are contrasted with. And what I'll try to do is run through them fairly quickly, because the truth is that there are certain things that the 2A site offers up that are true of all the alternatives, you know, irregardless of the massing strategy. And then there's some different -- there's some nuances depending on which of the massing strategies that we undertook.

So if I could direct you to these last three columns here on the matrix. Sorry. There are a lot of papers, I know. But -- and I'll point out that we developed each of these massing concepts in such a way that they avoid the removal of 97, and they also avoid the removal of the library. So in terms of standard one, they could be done in a way that they would avoid the removal of those [unintelligible] structures.

Terry Regan: Michael, do all of these concepts -- do they -- is there an underlying assumption that the main parade ground will be done, or would that be parking lot?

Michael Boland: There's an assumption that would be green. Yeah. That would be green. Yeah. In all of these alternatives, the parade ground is green.

Then in terms of standard two, the historic character of the property, you know, a number of these things obviously it would be quite

easy to do. It would be quite easy for these buildings to maintain an orthogonal orientation, to have a north-south orientation. It would avoid historic roadways if I organized it in this way.

We talked a lot about historic open spaces. And the fact is that the 2A site was -- had a very open character for most of the period -- all of the period of significance. There were just a handful of historic structures that were located over here in this edge during the period of significance. There were actually ball fields located out here. And then these existing structures were built at the very end of the period of significance or early in the postwar period, and the site took on a different character.

Nonetheless, the feeling was that by moving the mass of the building, employing these different strategies and moving the mass to the side, breaking the building up -- that one could maintain the historic open character of this site, because it's -- though it's more square footage, it's a considerably larger site, and you could arrange the square footage in such a way that it could still maintain that open character.

And also, we talked quite a bit about the relative significance of the various footprints, the various locations. And there was a strong feeling that this site, because it's out of the main quad, because it's somewhat obscured from view because of the topography, was a less significant site than the site down at the bowling-alley site. Would it maintain significant views? Yes, it would easily maintain

significant views by pulling the mass of the building up here. Again, by breaking it apart, it would maintain that open south end of the parade ground.

And we talked a lot about scale, and it was interesting. We -- again, each of these three strategies -- we had a slightly different response. The first is that, clearly, breaking the mass of the building up into a series of smaller buildings does mitigate for scale and allows us to develop a solution that is in scale with the other architecture of the Main Post.

There was -- similarly, sliding the mass of the building over to the edge was felt to be a very interesting and probably successful strategy for reducing the apparent scale of the building, because you're moving it out of the main view, and you're allowing it to engage this larger feature here, which is the slope.

The one that raised the most concern was the idea of moving all of the mass of the building on axis and putting it in the center -- that there's no really way you could take a 140,000-square-foot building located on axis in a central location in one large mass and mitigate for its scale because of its visibility and prominence, et cetera, so --

And in terms of seriality, there was a feeling that this -- 140,000 square feet is a large enough building that it actually could -- would almost be like an ensemble of buildings, and that it was important that we think about it in that way, and that it could be designed to

read, again, as a series of buildings, sort of breaking up that mass, and that that would be an appropriate response and a way for the building to be more conforming with the secretary standards.

To avoid creating a false sense of historical development -- [unintelligible] accomplish that, again, so long, I think, as we weren't creating a strong terminus. And there was some concern -- though we ended up saying yes here, there was some discussion about, again, the idea of locating the mass in the center and creating that strong terminus or visual terminus, you know, location, that it never looks like.

As I mentioned, we designed these so that they could avoid the known or predicated archaeological sites. And then in terms of the last one, in terms of new construction, the question of compatibility, we looked at each of these. And again, because these are just simple bubble diagrams, you know, they're -- you see a lot of possibly or could be, things like that. But again, I think it gives us a kind of roadmap on how a building in this location would want -- we'd want to think about it for it to be compatible, to be conforming.

In terms of scale and proportion, we already talked a bit about that. In terms of materials, there was a strong feeling that being outside the lower quad and being located up a hill gave us a lot more flexibility -- it's described here as this sort of natural site -- gave us a lot more flexibility in terms of color and materials but mitigated to some extent by how visible the building was from what was below.

So again, the central building -- I think the sense of the group was that we would want that building to be designed much more compatibly than either of the other two [unintelligible].

Compatible building height. We worked with models and identified that we would want the buildings to be no more than 45 feet above grade, that that seemed to be about the right height in terms of view corridors and maintaining that kind of visual connection through the site and would keep the buildings -- the mass in scale with the surrounding buildings.

Talked a lot about compatible features and what some of those might be. Talked a lot about transparency because of the scale of the building in the context of this one proposal I mentioned that showed the mass of the building here -- and have some sort of transverse piece coming across. The question of whether or not -- how you design a building to be transparent -- really transparent. And, you know, ideally, it would really read like the landscape was flowing through the building, that sense of openness was maintained.

In terms of roof type, a strong feeling that in this location, there's a greater degree of flexibility in terms of roof type. Talked a bit about green roofs and the potential of a green roof to make the building feel like an extension of the hillside so that this mass, particularly if it was located here -- the green -- the roof was green -- it could feel

like, certainly from above, the building was an extension of that slope.

And we talked a bit about massing and how you might break the building up. One notion that this could actually -- can be a series of buildings rather than one building -- read like a series of buildings, though it could functionally be one building, to allow the trees to come down, allow the mass of the building to be broken up. But again, a real sense that there -- it's very difficult to take a large building, a 140,000-square-foot building located in that location, and to break up the mass in a way that it could be conforming.

And lastly, in terms of the CAMP project, we did look at the commissary site. And that's on the next page, very last column [unintelligible]. And I apologize. The commissary wasn't on here. But we actually took everyone down to the commissary site. We looked at the commissary site and walked around it and went through this analysis onsite rather than doing it using the model.

And just quickly, the commissary site -- reuse of the commissary as a museum -- you know, construction of a building at that site would avoid the removal of historic structures. It would be compatible -- could be compatible to -- with the orthogonal relationship of the building at Mason Street. There were -- there's a whole history of buildings on that location.

The commissary is the last of a series of buildings that existed there. And they all have an orthogonal orientation to Mason Street, as does the commissary today. North-south orientation [unintelligible]. In fact, most of the buildings has east-west orientation rather than a north-south orientation. And of course we would maintain historic roadways, maintains historic open spaces. I mentioned this is a site that's had many buildings on it over time. Maintains historic views today and toward the Main Post.

We talked a lot about making sure the building wasn't too tall so that it blocked that visual connection between Main Post and Crissy Field in that location. There's a feeling that that visual communication has historically existed, which was really important. And if the building grew too tall, that that would be an impact.

In terms of compatibility, in terms of compatible scale, there are a number of large buildings down in Crissy Field, and so there was a feeling that this building -- a building of this scale would be compatible with [unintelligible].

Seriality, again, doesn't really apply, though there was some discussion about the idea that, ideally, a building there -- you -- we built a building on that site -- that you may want to break up the apparent mass, because it is a large building, to feel like it's a smaller building -- making it seem like a series of buildings rather than one large building.

It would be very easy to put new construction there and avoid creating a false sense of historical development, again, because there have been a series of buildings there over time, so it wasn't ever -- it wasn't an open space subsequent to the filling of the tidal marsh for [PPIE] in 1915.

Protect archaeological resources. This one is an interesting one. There's a sensitive archaeology site immediately to the west of the commissary site, so there was quite a discussion about that site and the sensitivity of that site to ground disturbance and how any building in that location -- that would be a significant constraint on how we could modify that building, because we're a little bit fuzzy on the actual footprint of that particular archaeological site and how far it extends under the building. So we talked quite a bit about that and the kind of potential limitations that might place. You know, could we build a basement? You know, you could modify the buildings in some way or rebuild something, but ground-disturbance potential -- it could be a significant challenge there. But, you know, one could build a building that could largely avoid P1, which is the name of that site, if we be mindful of the fact that P1 --

In terms of standard nine, scale, yes, we think it would be compatibly scaled. Compatible materials, color, and texture. There was a feeling that -- you know, Crissy Field has a pretty varied series of building types located on it. There are industrial buildings. There are, you know, more intimately-scaled administrative

buildings, large buildings, small buildings -- but that there's an opportunity for an industrialist -- that if there -- that isn't true, say, for example, in the Main Post. So that's an acknowledgement that there's a sort of other additional vocabulary that one could mine in that area beyond other kinds of characters that those buildings have, you know, more similar to the Main Post character.

Building height again. Our -- the sense was that, so long as the building was lower than the height of the adjacent bluff -- that it would be compatible, primarily about -- relating to the surrounding architecture and also maintaining the view that I mentioned earlier.

Compatible features. We talked a bit about what those features might be. And again, because of the varied building types that have existed -- do exist and have existed at Crissy, there was a sense that there's a little more flexibility in terms of how you might achieve a building that has compatible features in this location. And similarly with roof types -- again, some variety of roof types, and so there's a sense that there was greater flexibility in that location.

We did not get to Fort Scott and look at the Fort Scott side, due -- we just simply ran out of time. And we wanted to make sure we had time to devote to looking at the theater proposal and the lodge proposal as well, so we turned our attention to those two sites and never finished Fort Scott. So you'll notice that Fort Scott is missing.

So before we turn our attention to the lodge and theater, are there any questions or thoughts or --

Terry Regan: I had a --

Michael Boland: Yeah?

Terry Regan: Were these concepts -- were those screened at all for parking that's underground for [unintelligible]?

Michael Boland: It assumes that there would be parking -- some parking underground.

Eric Blind: Michael, if I could, I just want to --

Michael Boland: Yeah, Eric.

Eric Blind: -- sort of a little bit of detail on the predicted nature of some of these archaeological features. So the lines that we see on that map from 1993 aren't exactly the [unintelligible], and that archaeology's not exactly contained within those lines, because they are different lines. So what we've tried to do is add a little bit of nuance to those predicted features by doing some modeling. Would it help us understand some of the landform transformations in the area -- basically, what the army did in that area.

So on this map, when you see areas in red, the army has eliminated the possibility for archaeology. Areas in blue, the army has [unintelligible] buried archaeology at considerable depths. So what we're trying to do now is use this map. And we've created some profiles to kind of give you an idea of the landform of the area so that you can figure out where archaeology's possible, where it's virtually impossible because the army's eliminated the layer we'd be looking for, and where it's deeply buried. And in addition to that 1993 map, which we found to be remarkably accurate, that kind of information can really help design areas where you could forget archaeology. It wouldn't be a problem.

Allison Kidd: Do you think we could get a -- where are those available, the materials that you just --

Eric Blind: I've got a couple extra copies over here, and I'd be happy --and I can make more copies, email them around.

Allison Kidd: That would be great.

Eric Blind: Because for areas --

Mark Hornberger: And do you have those for the A9 site as well?

Eric Blind: The --

Mark Hornberger A9 site.

Eric Blind: Oh, yes. The ones we did -- tried to incorporate those CAMP 2, 2A, and the lodge site, out of this building here, so the southern site.

Michael Boland: All right. Shall we talk about the lodge? If I could ask everyone to turn to conforming lodge, conforming movie theater page. So what we did in each of these cases is we looked at the proposals that we'd received, and we asked ourselves how we might modify those proposals in order to make them conforming -- completely conforming with the secretary of the interior standards. And so that was the project we set for ourselves.

And I -- you know, I didn't say early on that -- I should say -- I should acknowledge that this undertaking was done -- they all presented a building program. So I understand that -- you know, that you all have the challenge of making these buildings work, and having to consider a building program. This was an effort that was focused on the secretary standards. And so, again, it was an abstraction, somewhat of an abstraction. And so I'm sure in what I'm saying today they'll be any number of things that I suggest that will be -- you know, will run afoul of the building program. And, you know, that's always the challenge in working through these questions.

So with that said, let's talk about the lodge. So we did look at the site proposed for the Presidio Lodge, and we came up with a

number of things. And let me just do a little construction project here.

[Audio Gap]

Michael Boland: All right. Let's talk about the lodge. So we've -- we took the basic [unintelligible] as designed, this idea of the lodge being broken into four building masses, four interconnected building masses located on the [Anza Esquinet] side, and apply the standards and asked ourselves how the [unintelligible] may or may not be different than what we received.

So in terms of standard one, the proposal as currently received does avoid the removal of historic structures. It necessitates the removal of building 34, the building that it's sitting on, which is not -- the building -- it does maintain an orthogonal orientation. It maintains a north-south orientation. It does maintain the openness and historic roadways. It's contained within the historic alignment of the Anza Street and the alignment of Graham Street. Anza Street, just to make sure everyone knows, is the -- what now feels like an alley running along the edge of the main parade. It was actually a street, originally, in the middle of an ensemble of buildings that ran up this entire side of the Main Post [unintelligible] the eastern edge of the main parade.

It maintains historic open spaces. Yes, architecture in this location would maintain historic open spaces and would define the historic

separation between the old parade and the main parade, with an important note that this design, as you see -- you see that we accentuated the gaps between -- and the idea is that it is important that -- those building ensembles were always transparent in terms of people who wanted to walk through them and move from east to west, pedestrians who wanted to move through them -- and that -- the idea that -- and this is an idea that's seen as important. And so we wanted to emphasize that, so long as it maintains this east-west movement between the old parade -- communication between the old parade and the new parade -- because this wasn't just one building located on the site. It was an ensemble of smaller buildings that had gaps between them, and so people were able to walk back and forth.

Maintains significant views. We [unintelligible] a discussion about significant views. And you'll see that the southernmost of these four bays is actually lower. And so in this scheme, in this concept that we developed, these are three-story and this is two-story bay, the southern end, that allows for views from this portion of the post down to the bay. And because these three don't interfere with that -- but this fourth one -- southern end of this fourth one does interfere with some pretty important internal views, primarily from the [oak club].

And so the feeling of the group was that this building, as designed, was not -- it does maintain significant exterior views, but acknowledges that it does necessarily -- because these buildings are

taller than the buildings that used to be there -- does necessarily block views within the Main Post turning this way. We had a quite a bit of lively discussion about how significant those are. I think the feeling are that these long views that are really the reason the Main Post was founded where it is, which is its relationship to the bay -- that these long views to the bay are really very important. And so they were given -- thought to have a higher level of significance than some of the other views that are true of this place.

Open south end of the parade. It has no impact on the south end of the parade. Is it a compatible scale? The feeling of the group was that, so long as the structures do not exceed the height of the adjacent historic Graham Street Barracks -- that they would be compatibly scaled. Now, bear in mind, height is one of those topics that has -- is very complicated, and primarily because the site slopes. And the buildings, therefore, on each façade are a different height. And so we had quite a bit of conversation about heights. And so what we mean by this is the northern end of the Graham Street Barracks -- each of those barracks -- the barracks step up. There is a maximum height -- and that that height is the height that would be the maximum limit in terms of the height of each of these pieces.

Does it have seriality or repetition of forms? Yes, meaning the current proposal -- the building as proposed in our compliant version is designed to be a series of clearly-separated repeating forms that are connected with transparent [glaze-looking] pieces or

not connected at all. Again, I think that what's important in terms of the secretary standards is that these really read as separate building forms and that the difference between them, the [unintelligible] between them, the transparency of what's -- the connecting tissue there -- all of those are various factors that add up to the idea of the [unintelligible] read as a series of separate building masses and were thought to be important.

Avoid creating a false sense of historic development. This is clearly different than what was there historically, that -- in some of those ways, it's different. And it's gotten a little bit dinged, you know, in terms of internal views. But it clearly would be different from what was there historically, and so it would not be mistaken as a reconstruction.

This is a site -- in terms of standard eight, this is a site that inherently has an impact on F9. And maybe, Eric, you could talk about F9.

Eric Blind:

Sure. Unlike the other sites [unintelligible] 2A, there's really not much transformation that's happened in those areas. There's not a lot of cut. There's not a lot of fill. The limited testing we did out there showed that there were archaeological features near the surface [unintelligible] three to four feet. And there are potentially the remains -- what we found are the remains of the Civil War-era barracks that these -- this lodge is kind of meant to recreate -- that edge that was there. So construction in this area would necessary

eliminate those features, whether it's -- because they're so shallow, whether it includes underground parking or not.

Mark Hornberger: And what were those? When you say features, these are remnants of foundation, or demolition remnants that were just thrown on to the site? What are they?

Eric Blind: Some of them are architectural features, the -- kind of the post [unintelligible] -- they created those buildings, kind of establishing the layout. Some of them are trash features where the RVs come, aggregating its trash in between the buildings before there was kind of unified trash pickup throughout the post. And, you know, [unintelligible] kind of the major features that we found, architectural and trash.

Michael Boland: And I think the important point we were trying to make in this matrix is the notion that we're trying to draw a distinction between this site and the El Presidio site, which is a site that's located up in this area. I can't remember. F1? Is it F1?

Eric Blind: Yeah.

Michael Boland: F1. Trying to make some distinction, because this is not the only Civil War-era archaeological site that we have, as opposed to the El Presidio Site, which is deep, primary Spanish site. We have other sites, Spanish archaeological sites. But the El Presidio Site is quite significant, as opposed to this site, which is significant, but there are

other sites where we can -- other Civil War Sites that we do not want to disturb, so we're trying to cull that out in this matrix.

In terms of standard nine, we talked a bit about it. And there are a number of features that are true in this building as proposed that also we thought were important and tried to bring to bear on this particular conforming-lodge concept -- that in terms of compatible scale and proportion, there's a sense that if the building width and length is modulated to relate to existing buildings, 86 and 87, that we could conform.

And let me talk about that in two ways. We already talked about height. There's this length question. But there also is the width. And there was a strong sense that these -- you know, historically there were multiple rows of buildings. There were actually two rows of buildings between Graham and Anza. And so to the extent that these can read like parallel rows of buildings and they can be broken up and these edges can be pulled in or varied in some way, so that when you're looking up here, it begins to break apart and read as a pair of adjacent separate buildings -- tends to break the mass. It's going to make the building ensemble be more compatible with adjacent buildings 86 and 87. I understand there's some practical considerations that I'm not going to talk about [unintelligible]. Again, I -- certainly, in terms of modulating the ends and things like that, that's possible.

In terms of compatible materials, color, and texture, the current scheme uses white and the red combo, and [unintelligible] very compatible [unintelligible].

Thank you for coming.

Compatible building height. We already talked about building height in the Graham Street Barracks. Compatible features. We talked quite a bit about the porch. The current proposal has a porch-like elm and -- along the east elevation along Graham Street that relates to the porches that used to be there on the buildings historically, as well as the porches on buildings 86 and 87. And there is a sense that that was an important feature, but it was also important that the building have compatible windows and compatible small-scale architectural detail. So they [don't] feel like it relates pretty directly to the Graham Street Barracks and the -- that ensemble of Civil War architecture that existed there without being imitative.

There was strong support for the idea that the eastern portion of the lodge should have a gabled roof running in the north-south direction, much like buildings 86 and 87. You can see we've carried that forward. There was some discussion about the back portion of the building and the flat roof and concern that, depending on how that's done, it may not be compatible. But the -- to the extent that that can feel like a porch almost like the porch that's on the front

side, that it may be possible to make that -- it's sort of a porch on steroids, if you will, you know. It's on the front side.

And last but not least, in terms of massing, there was a sense that it's quite possible for this building to be compatible from a massing perspective, so long as it has massing and architectural features that are typical of the Graham Street Barracks. Those are fairly unarticulated buildings. They're rectangles with porches and gabled roofs and punched windows. And there was a sense that so long as it had some of the character with gable and, you know, the depth -- I think of the -- a lot of it comes down to the amount of depth that a façade has -- that this building could be compatible in terms of that.

So that's what we talked about in terms of the lodge. Should we move on to the theater for a minute? Then we can come back and --

Mark Hornberger: Just one quick question.

Michael Boland: Sure.

Mark Hornberger: Your model shows four buildings, but there was another piece of the study that staff had looked at that actually moved part of the program onto the other side of the [hansa] up at the south end.

Michael Boland: Yeah.

Mark Hornberger: How did that play into the whole analysis of views and compatible character and scale and --

Michael Boland: Yeah. The 2A lodge.

Mark Hornberger: Right.

Michael Boland: Yeah. We talked about that. And the feeling was that -- just tell everybody, there was a -- in 2A, there's a notion that we would take 10,000 square feet, I -- roughly, out of this building and slide it over to the other side of the esplanade. And there was a feeling that that is also an appropriate solution. This is a site that -- again, the buildings historically came out to about here, and so moving a piece of the square footage out to that location was thought to be compatible, again, with all the other caveats in terms of its character and feeling and mass and all --

Jim Hanson: Michael, I think that's shown in the photos on this one.

Michael Boland: Yeah.

Jim Hanson: And you felt like it maintained the views?

Michael Boland: It -- again, it depends on how it's built and how tall it is.

Jim Hanson: Underground, or this is above --

Michael Boland: No.

[Laughter]

Michael Boland: I think it's a -- it's more a question of -- yeah, it's shown here. It's actually shown on the bowling-alley site one. You can see the little -- this little guy here. I mean, you know, it -- we were assuming it was a one-story building and that it wasn't a one-story building that had 35-foot ceilings heights or anything, you know, that it was a modestly -- it was a restaurant or food-service something that was fairly modestly scaled. And you were able to preserve the historic views from up above if it's something at that scale.

Elaine Jackson-Retondo: And that's based on the fact that were buildings there historically [unintelligible].

Michael Boland: I mean, the interesting thing about this building ensemble that existed here historically was that it had a fairly consistent feeling on Graham Street and a kind of -- and a very ragged feeling on the main parade side, on the west side. And so, you know, this idea of pulling some of the square footage across the esplanade actually makes that edge a little more ragged. And so there was a feeling that it's -- you know, it's certainly -- it comes -- it actually comes a little closer to reestablishing the historic character. But, you know, that that -- I think the sense of the group was that those are both -- you know, having it there or not having it there are both appropriate responses.

Jim Hanson: And at one point, there was some concern the El Presidio site may extend into the southern end of the lodge. Is that fairly satisfied now that it doesn't?

Eric Blind: No, unfortunately. Let's see. Kind of the northern edge of the El Presidio site -- we have found things that are that far north in the testing we did in, you know, the [Milan] over here, what we call [Canen Milan]. There were Spanish colonial materials that we came up with, ceramics and things. What we're not sure of is the El Presidio site and those portions of it where the lodge would be -- and then the army continues to build as it extrapolates this post -- that kind of integrity those colonial remains may have. That's still unclear, and that's as good as we can give it now. We didn't find anything definitive that said it is there, but there are a couple artifacts that led us to believe that something must be.

Elaine Jackson-Retondo: So does that expand the boundary, or no?

Eric Blind: Does it expand the boundary as far as the --

Elaine Jackson-Retondo: Of F1.

Jim Hanson: As shown on this map.

Eric Blind: That boundary will be expanded, as we're trying to do an update now, and the mapping of it is always a challenge -- to predictably

map boundaries. But yes, it would be further north. We have found portions further north along where building 39 is, the film center. And -- but I do not think -- I have a map here of one of the drafts -- that it would come substantially into the lodge site as proposed. You can see -- this is a very [unintelligible], so don't take it too seriously. But you can see the blue areas are where we're kind of establishing where El Presidio could extend. We're still trying to work out how confident we are with those boundaries.

Michael Boland: It's got the [unintelligible] --

Eric Blind: Yeah. It would extend kind of into the [unintelligible].

Jim Hanson: And those are near the surface in that location.

Eric Blind: Yeah. If you looked at kind of this overall map, the entire El Presidio site has had very little kind of landscape change, whereas the other western areas of the site have had quite a bit. So we expect things to be at or near the surface. And that's what we found [unintelligible].

Michael Boland: All right. So let's talk about the theater. So the big concern that was addressed about the theater project as proposed -- I lost my theater - - is the idea of subdividing the original theater into two smaller halls. And so this reflects the notion that -- the hope that a conforming theater would -- I'm sorry. This is not the right piece, but let's just put it there -- conforming theater would not subdivide

the theater, the original historic Presidio theater, but would in fact retain this as a single screen and add two new theaters, two small theaters in a new construction located on the [unintelligible].

There was a sense that -- in terms of running through these, that the building would -- should maintain -- an addition should maintain an orthogonal orientation, which the current proposal does, and maintain a north-south orientation -- also the current proposal does. Maintains historic roadways. It accomplishes that.

Maintain historic open spaces. We talked a bit about this. This was historically an open space, this area on the west side, but the consensus of the group was that it is not a very significant open space. It's a back side. It's far from the primary -- the three major open spaces. It's on the back side of the building from those major open spaces. And so it was thought to be -- though it was stated an open space, it was thought to be a more secondary open space and therefore could be conformant by being located in that location, as opposed to it -- for example, the proposal was to put an addition on this side. That would be seen as not conforming.

Maintains views. Again, the -- locating the mass of the building on the west side would impact some fairly minor views. As you see here, the views are not character-defining or significant. And so, again, by being located on that side, it would not block any significant views. The view up Montgomery Street was thought to

be significant, and therefore it's good that the mass of the building is located behind it.

Open south end of the parade doesn't really apply. Compatible scale. There was a sense that the mass of the building -- the new construction needs to be compatibly scaled to the existing theater so that it doesn't overwhelm the existing theater. Ways to do that are to break up the mass of the new construction to make sure that it is lower, to make sure that the front façade is pulled back. A number of things that the current proposal is doing -- and we reiterated those ideas.

The idea of seriality doesn't really apply. Avoid creating a false sense of historical development. A couple of things that we talked about and thought were important. It's important that the new construction be differentiated from the old so that it doesn't -- no one makes -- confused -- confusing it -- or is confused -- confuses old and new. There was a strong sense that the treatment of this western edge is really important so that the western edge of the building still reads as a building and this building volume reads, and that this interstitial lobby that is proposed would be fairly translucent so that you could actually see the edge of the historic theater, and that that historic theater would continue to read. Again, something that I think is important -- already a part of the proposal.

In terms of archaeology, there is actually an archaeological site there, F16. Maybe, Eric, you could talk a bit about F16.

Eric Blind: Yeah. This project seems to be the lucky one. The archaeological site that was predicted out there would have existed at approximately 30 feet above today's ground surface. So it's gone.

[Laughter]

Male Voice: Well, it's at least moved.

[Laughter]

Male Voice: It's actually down on the main parade now.

[Laughter]

Male Voice: You know, the -- this -- the map -- this map that Eric has produced that shows the changes in topography is pretty remarkable in terms of the story it tells around things like that.

Michael Boland: So in terms of nine, let's talk a bit about nine. Compatible scale and proportion. We think the addition could be compatibly scaled, so it is slightly larger than the existing theater. The mass of the addition is broken down in such a way, as we discussed -- but also so that it - - you know, by virtue of ceiling heights or, you know, solid and void or whatever, that you break down the apparent scale of the addition. It could be compatible.

Compatible materials, color, and texture. Here we have a historic building that we want to relate to very directly, and so we're using compatible materials. Historic material, color, and texture is really important, you know, that board-finished white concrete and the red tile kind of mission-style exterior. Again, we don't want to make -- create a false sense of historic development, but we want it to be --

Compatible features. We talked a bit about the façade and the way in which the board-finished concrete, for example, is used, and how, though it's a fairly -- it's a windowless building, there actually is the modulation in the façade to create some articulation and break up the mass, and that that kind of articulation of the solid was important. And that's really what we're talking about in terms of compatible architectural features.

But we also talked a bit -- it didn't get in this, but talked a bit about maintaining the primacy of the front and the lobby, the front door and the arches and that character of that as an entry, and that that -- in the architectural treatment of the building, and that that continue to read as the main entrance and continue to have the kind of primacy that comes from that articulation of that particular façade.

In terms of roof type, we thought it would be very easy to develop a roof type that's compatible with the adjacent theater. It's a flat roof with a little tile parapet that wraps all the way around it. And in terms of massing, the recommendation was that the new theaters or theaters in our proposal be treated -- inherently solid and may be

treated as almost a new structure that's on the west side, and that this -- the lobby be treated in a very light way, a sort of interstitial lobby to, again, kind of better define the difference between old and new and to allow these almost to read like two buildings that are neighbors, make this very light, this sort of connection inside. And there was a sense that if that was the case, that then the massing would be conforming -- conform with the secretary standards.

So Elaine and Craig, is there anything else you'd like to add. Or Eric, anything else I left out? You all were involved in creating this, so --

Okay. Well, if not, any questions or thoughts or anything at all?

Mark Hornberger: Just one question. As we've been continuing to study, looking at the standards carefully and studying visually, massing heights, setbacks, transparency, we've created a new series of documents. When would there be -- and I assume the other project sponsors would be interested in this as well -- a chance to review those findings and circulate them through your group so you have the chance to see those prior to turning this document into something which is a foregone conclusion?

Andrea Andersen: Well, I guess what I would say is we view this document as a framework, a framework for you to use yourselves in taking a look at how you can take the project that you have and make that project a conforming project. And we also view this as a means, then, of

eventually working towards a preferred alternative that then will turn into what is, you know, the three main pieces we have right now. The draft supplemental environmental impact statement -- when we go from draft to final, that preferred alternative then will be identified in the final. It will also then be what is outlying in the Main Post update, so the planning document that we're working towards as well, and then will also become the undertaking that's evaluated in the finding of effect. So we see this not as a document that in and of itself will become final. It's more a framework for you to use.

Mark Hornberger: Okay.

Terry Reagan: So [unintelligible] this is not going to be -- this will be referred to in each one of those respective documents, or will it also -- will it be incorporated into either of those documents?

Andrea Andersen: What I see it more being incorporated into is eventually the design guidelines that will come out of the consultation process.

Jim Hanson: But, Mark, is -- is part of the question, Mark, though, that some of these exhibits or illustrations might help frame the outline? I mean, it might change some of that framework, because it either supports or discredits some observations, potentially. I mean, is -- it would be a tool or something that you might want to use before finalizing the framework that we'd then be obligated to work with. Is that -- Mark, is that substantially correct then?

Mark Hornberger: Mm-hmm.

Melanie Blum: Within that, I think, too, part of certainly our concern on the historic theater -- because, you know, this has something I've been battling with a long time -- the existing historic structure is really -- was built at a time when that kind of theater and that capacity of theater was sort of the norm. Today's theater going -- it's not the norm. And secondarily, the equipment is totally different, so actually making that theater with the [Presinium], and given the restrictions of sight lines and so forth -- the largest theater that we have capacity wise has been something we've struggled with.

And so it's not necessarily a preference. It's almost a necessity to divide that theater to make it work and not have to do additional new construction. And then to be able to create the largest house that does have state-of-the-art standards -- I mean, this is a huge investment, and people aren't going to go to a theater if they don't see quality. And I think that's an important consideration in this. It's not just -- and I think, as you see around the city, all the large movie theaters have closed or become gymnasiums. I mean, we're at least keeping it as a movie theater.

And we've looked at -- because of the interior, the balcony and the lower level, the fact that you could still could sort of keep those faces in the historic -- keep their historic integrity and yet still at least have the opportunity to divide it. And I sort of feel like we

haven't had the opportunity, other than to -- a few staff people present that and explain why we're looking at doing it. It's not just a random decision. And I would hope that that would have some weight on design guidelines. Because I think, as you see, in mostly everything else we've done on the addition -- is to comply with what you've already outlined as design guidelines -- and understood what the standards -- how to apply the standards.

Jay Turnbull: Just out of curiosity, how are you visualizing project sponsors to move forward at this time? Some are fairly mature -- where their design process is. Some are not. And yet, something has to happen, and something has to be voted through at some point.

Andrea Andersen: Again, I -- what -- I view this as a process by which the Trust and various project proponents can work towards a preferred alternative, work towards a project. Therefore, that, you know, would be the one that the Trust would eventually want to adopt. So it's sort of a way for us to, you know, again, work toward those design guidelines that will ultimately be imposed upon the projects that are developed.

So it's sort of like -- I think [Tanver] kind of described it when I heard him do this before. It -- I think it was very difficult for the Trust and for anyone to understand what the impact of projects would be at these locations until you saw when that was designed. It's only once you've seen one designed, therefore, that you can get a better grasp of what works or doesn't work on a particular site.

And that's really kind of what this exercise has done, that is taken the projects that were designed and then take a look at them from a different way, that is if you -- instead of designing them for a particular purpose, if you design them so that they would conform, and now try to use this exercise as a means, through the 106 process, to avoid, minimize, or mitigate the various harms.

Jay Turnbull: So you would see an iterated process, and then an answer might come back which didn't necessarily reflect what you show here, but which might be, in terms of practicality or in terms of program that the project sponsor might have -- might move in some direction toward what you have here.

Michael Boland: That's right. Informed by this.

Andrea Andersen: Right.

Jim Hanson: So there's some flexibility in interpretation about what those guidelines --

Michael Boland: Yeah. I mean, again, this is looking at these projects, really, through one lens. And there are many lenses that become part of the deliberation -- you know, program, programmatically. You're really talking about a programmatic consideration. But I think one of the things that I had heard was that -- from folks is that it's difficult to know exactly what your concerns are, you know, what the -- and so what we were trying to do with this is create a bridge between the

secretary standards and design, essentially. You know, these are the considerations. These are the things that we need to move towards as we continue to evolve these designs. And so, really, that's the spirit [unintelligible].

Terry Reagan: Yeah. I would just add that Michael started out by saying one of the things we didn't consider in this exercise was the programming of the building. And so to the extent that, as you mentioned, the program of the building doesn't work with these considerations or probably is at least challenged, that's good for us to bring out in these discussions, because it's not just historic preservation we're looking for. It's the best possible combination that gets us the project and does the most to preserve the Presidio.

Melanie Blum: Yeah. Because it seems -- like I know, certainly, there's been a number of meetings with CAMP on the proposal and the program and so forth. But, certainly -- I don't know how much Larkspur has had an opportunity, but we haven't had that much of an opportunity outside staff to explain what our program goals are and why and what studies we've done in looking at the space, why we've -- this is where we've ended up as far as design purposes. And I think that would be important to be able to have an opportunity to discuss with all the historic folks who are concerned about the secretary standards being implemented as carefully as can be done.

Mark Hornberger: So perhaps -- that suggestion is great. And we certainly would welcome that as well. If there could be a separate project-by-project

review session with the -- I forget what you call them, the big three or the big four or -- who the historic oversight groups were that participated in the creation of this -- where we could actually go through program, function, and compliance with these, individually for each of our projects -- that would be very helpful to us. Talk about archaeology issues, Eric.

Brian Ramos: So I -- one way of -- frame of reference for thinking about this process that is useful, I think, is to look at -- you know, people -- Michael confesses that he got his exacto knife out and carved up these little styrofoam squares in -- with humility, you know, because they're little squares. And so no one's proposing that these are the little squares -- they're used for massing, and they're used to convey principles, guiding principles that come from the secretary standards for rehabilitation. That is saying let's take these concepts, if you read the secretary standards. You can read them, and they all sound the same to me. I mean, you look at them, and they're very abstract, because they're concepts that -- and so what the exercise did was say let's take these concepts and say, okay -- and let's plop it down in the middle of this space and see how it would look here, given what we know that folks would like to do and -- relative to these three main parts of the undertaking.

And so it's a sterile -- as Michael said, it's a sterile look at the application of the standards to this location, considering all those things. So feeling an association -- play themselves out very different at the Main Post than they do in other locations on the

Presidio in general. And so what they tried to do was identify which aspects of the secretary of interior standards are more important here, how they would relate to the buildings that are around there and things that are proposed, and hope that that gets incorporated in -- hope that there's a compatibility between these standards and the program that they didn't look at.

So the conversation continues. And so I think that's how you think about it is that the 106 process is set up to involve applicants, agencies, interested parties and communicate about the sweet spot between a program and the context in which it's proposed.

Melanie Blum: But I would say that most of what I'm sure both of us have done on this project -- I would say maybe even all three of us -- we -- everybody's doing their studies, but nobody's ever had an opportunity to listen to us explain what our program is. You're looking at what we've developed as designs that we put into a proposal that are in very preliminary stages, and commenting on that without understanding the entire project as a whole, without understanding the program or why we did certain things. And I think that has a big impact on how all these studies end up playing out.

And I think it would be great if we had an opportunity to meet with those people that are weighing in on the project so that they understand the project as we see it and then can comment, at least on -- you know, maybe making suggestions of different ways we

could look at it or whatever. But if they don't understand the whole project -- it's hard to comment in a vacuum.

Michael Boland: Elaine, do you want --

Elaine Jackson-Retondo: Well, I was just going to add a little caveat. The more information, the better. But I just wanted to say that the programs -- I think it's not quite accurate to say that the program wasn't considered from the -- we didn't have the details of the program, but the program was part of -- you know, we know this is a lodge, so there's certain types of things you might not want to do, might not suggest. But if it was just a building with no function with so many square footage, there would have been many different ways this could have been -- this place could have been divvied up.

And so while we don't have -- I don't have that information of the limitations or the struggles with the theater, I think it's a little more accurate to say that we didn't have the specifics or they didn't have the specifics of the program, but they were conscious of the fact that yes, it's a theater, yes, it's a lodge. That was just -- I just wanted to --

Michael Boland: Yeah. I probably overplayed the -- it wasn't done in a vacuum.

Andrea Andersen: And I think, in response to your comment, too, this was an exercise to do one thing, I think, primarily. And when you take a look at 106, once you've identified the alternatives, the things you're supposed to do are avoid, minimize, or mitigate. And I think this

Melanie Blum: Well, to be honest with you, it's a compromise using the theater and continuing to use it as a theater, because even divided, it's not how you'd build a theater today. But we're trying to keep as much of the integrity intact, recognizing its significance and its importance, in reusing it as a theater again, not reusing it -- not using it as something new. So we have really looked at that. And as I said, we are compromising the quality of what that theater experience will be in those two houses, and that's why we've proposed building the largest house as the state-of-the-art-today cinema and using those two houses, you know, for -- with our program where we feel we can do the best job we can but still not have the highest standard of film going.

Michael Boland: Any last thoughts, questions? I'll stick around here if you want [unintelligible].

Melanie Blum: So I guess what our next steps, as far as with us -- I'm still not clear that that --

Michael Boland: Craig, you want to talk a bit about the next steps in terms of the conservation process? Again, these folks will --

Craig Kenkel: Yeah. I don't know if I have the [unintelligible], but we -- we're in the process of -- of we meaning Presidio Trust -- is in the process of revising the finding-of-fact document. And the -- as you all know, the finding-of-fact document examines proposals. And so it -- as it

stands right now, it's being revised, but it's not going to be finalized, because the comment period is still open. I don't recall the date, but --

Female Voice: Right now, it's November 17.

Tia Lombardi: And so, you know, the Trust is still getting comments from interested parties regarding the finding-of-fact report. And then that will be finalized. I don't know all the dates of the meetings. But the 106 process is an ongoing process. So there's going to be a part in which the -- Presidio is going to make a decision about -- and seek concurrence of the parties, the big four that are being referred to, as to what the effects of the undertaking as proposed are. And that -- the dialog is going to continue -- talk -- to talk about ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate whatever those impacts will be. So it's -- this is -- they'll be other meetings that involve the larger group, and the dates will be coming out of those --

Well, we're going to have a public meeting with this as the subject next week, November 19 in the evening, general public. And then we have a public board meeting which is to receive comment on the SEIS on December 9 -- comment on the [unintelligible].

Melanie Blum: Okay. I don't know how, but I haven't been notified of any of that.

Tia Lombardi: Well, you should be. And granted, these dates are moving very quickly, because we're trying to accommodate a lot of concerns.

Melanie Blum: I realize that, but there's got to be some consideration, too, for what -- if we're going to come to a meeting, you know, how is it -- or are we going to have an opportunity to present our project --

Tia Lombardi: No. These are still companies -- these are for the Trust board to receive comment from the public. So that -- these re not project meetings or proposal meetings.

Melanie Blum: So --

Male Voice: It will be very similar to today, for the general public.

Brian Ramos: But what happens is the general public is doing the same thing -- is they're commenting on a proposal that they're not fully informed about.

Tia Lombardi: Well, I think your point is well-taken, and there would be an opportunity, I would imagine -- particularly, say, the theater project, as it moves forward -- for that kind of conversation to happen. But the way the theater is being analyzed in the EIS and the way it's addressed in the Main Post update is at a fairly conceptual level. And what we're hoping is with this kind of conversation made available to the general public, that will help them understand better some of the constrains, but also some of the opportunities around these projects.

Melanie Blum: So you're going to do this presentation at the November 19 meeting?

Michael Boland: Something similar. Something not as detailed.

Terry Reagan: Wouldn't the public come in -- period -- actually in some kind of December -- November 17 -- if there's a board meeting on the 9th?

Tia Lombardi: Two comment periods, the --

Brian Ramos: So the point that you touched on that's important is the fact that -- is that -- and you mentioned it as well -- that things are at various stages of development. And so the amount of detail that's available to folks varies. And the environmental document and the 106 process is kind of -- in that -- it's around a planning document. It's around revisions to a planning document. And planning documents are conceptual by nature. And the 106 process is ongoing to be able to continue involvement of parties as those details become available. So the 106 process will conclude with -- likely with an agreement document that outlines protocols for agency comment as -- and review as things progress, as the level of detail increases.

So it's going to have a program. Just like the archaeology -- there's things that are not completely known about the archaeological record, predicted or anticipated, in the Post. And they'll be protocols for how to differentiate high levels of sensitivity versus low levels of sensitivity and what the protocols will be for any anticipated

construction impacts in those areas, differentially based on what's already known. So there will be certain things that are -- they'll be a process that allows an agency to have compliance with the regulations in spite of the fact that you don't have 100-percent plans or you don't have 90-percent plans. I didn't explain that very clearly, but it's ongoing, and it's largely programmatic and conceptual at this stage.

Jean DiMaria: A question about the meeting on the 19th, when -- November 19, when this is presented to the public. Is there a way to assure that the public gets the same message that Brian relayed to us, which is these are not the little boxes, but this is an ongoing iterative process in a framework in which we still have the option to say -- to make changes?

My concern about presenting it to the public would be like, "Oh, that looks great. Let's have that one."

[Laughter]

Jean DiMaria: And then --

Male Voice: Here it is.

Jean DiMaria: Here it is. Right.

[Laughter]

Jean DiMaria: A week later, it's like, "Oh. But we decided what it was going to be. Right?"

Male Voice: Yeah.

Jean DiMaria: So --

Michael Boland: No. That's an important distinction.

Jean DiMaria: Yeah.

Michael Boland: All right. Well, thank you, everybody, for coming. I'll be sitting around here if you have questions [unintelligible] --

Jean DiMaria: Could you repeat the dates of the meetings that [unintelligible] --

Tia Lombardi: Well, these are the dates. November 19 at 6:30 in the Golden Gate Club, there will be a public meeting. Michael will present essentially what he's presented here today, with a little more context for the general public. So we'll talk about the secretary of the interior standards with a little more information, et cetera, try to orient people to exactly what you just said. These are little blocks. These are not designs. And, you know, get folks to step outside the specifics of proposals until -- you know, at a higher level about what the constraints and some of the solutions might be.

December 9 is a board meeting, not unlike the board meeting we had in July. It's to receive comments. So there will be no presentations, except that the Trust is likely to make a presentation about the kinds of comments we've heard from folks at that point.

December 15 is the proposed [unintelligible] comment period for the EIS. November 17 is the closal comment period of the finding of effect, which has been circulating throughout the board for quite awhile.

Male Voice: What time is the board meeting on the 9th, and where?

Tia Lombardi: 6:30 at the Palace of Fine Arts.

Brian Ramos: See, and it occurs to me, since there's been some conversation about a lack of knowledge about things happening -- the Trust has been commenting on these throughout this process, and we'd be happy to share our comments with all three project proponents, just as a courtesy. We don't have the appropriate contacts. You know, to whom should the comments go for each of the three projects?

Tia Lombardi: If you want, we can put your comment letter on the Web site, which we've -- you've commented -- the ACHP in that way -- they've asked us to put their comment letter on our Web site, so everybody can have access to it.

Brian Ramos: Happy to do it.

Tia Lombardi: We'd be happy to do that. I'll put it up.

Female Voice: When you do, can you let us know, so we know to look for it?

Tia Lombardi: Yeah. It should go up today.

Mark Hornberger: So when -- just -- do you have any preliminary thinking about when this more interactive meeting, where we can meet with the big four individually as an individual project, could happen --

Tia Lombardi: My thought -- doesn't that happen during the resolution phase --

Tia Lombardi: It does. In other words, right now we're still at the phase where everyone's agreeing on what the adverse effects are. We haven't gotten to that point yet. We're hoping to do that at the next meeting, which right now we're trying to schedule for the first week in December. And then once we've come to a meeting of the minds on what all the potential adverse effects are, then you move into the phase where you're trying to resolve those. And I think it's at that point where that interaction will happen.

Mark Hornberger: I guess I think that what we're saying is we do have some disagreements about what those -- your analysis of those adverse effects are. And we'd like to share our material in some meaningful way so you could see why we disagree with your analysis of the effects.

Female Voice: Well --

Mark Hornberger: So when could that happen?

Female Voice: Right now. I mean, that's what we're getting the comments on right now. So in other words, if you disagree with those adverse effects, then send us those comments.

Mark Hornberger: Right.

Female Voice: And that will become part of that next meeting that we have in December.

Mark Hornberger: For -- just for your information, we put together a letter where we responded to the finding of effect, and where we took exceptions to evidence, we documented it, forwarded it back in to the Trust.

Mark Hornberger: Right. Well, we've done the same thing as well with one of the findings. But I think the question really is -- it sounds like for your project -- for our project, do we need to accelerate that process and make sure that all of the comments that we have are on the table here, sooner rather than later? And I think in our case, we've been kind of waiting patiently to see this presentation meeting that we would have with the big four to be able to discuss them all together, program, specifics, conformance with the standards, findings of

effect. And it sounds like that would be not in the sequence that would be most helpful to you.

Female Voice: I don't know if you two are exclusive. I mean, you would like all consulting parties, I think -- provide comment on the finding of effect, the draft finding of effect at this point in time. And -- but that conversation doesn't end with the finding of effect.

Mark Hornberger: Right.

Female Voice: That conversation will continue, because the resolution phase, obviously, is a reconsideration of the finding of effect. How do you minimize an adverse effect?

Mark Hornberger: So you said kind of two different things, and one was related to the program. And so I think -- so would the comments about the program be most appropriate at this point? It might not hurt for folks to know your concern about the limitations that adherence with the secretary standard may place on your program, but those wouldn't be comments that would inform finalizing the finding of effect.

The other set of comments that you said that you have in terms of interpreting the assessment of effects and not agreeing with what some of those findings might be -- the sooner those comments -- those are clearly part of the FOE process, and those -- you should introduce those to the record.

Mark Hornberger: Right. Okay.

Female Voice: So the letter we sent to [Rob] -- just -- you know, maybe forgive that it's not the most precisely organized, but I think our thoughts are there in that we say we believe the most -- let's see -- we believe the most relevant and important view should -- is at or from the central areas of the main parade itself or looking north at the intersection of Graham and Moraga, rather than from the EIS view perspective taken from the east of the entry to the officer's club on Moraga. So I think that addresses Michael's comment about the importance of the view from the historic -- from the officer's club -- being one of our comments that we sent to Rob.

And then the other is just in the face of high construction costs, we face serious economic feasibility challenges. If the program or room count is reduced, the lodge will not be viable given the current economic environment.

Mark, if you have other thoughts -- I mean, those are the two that we've introduced to the record so far.

Mark Hornberger: I think the main thing is the visual studies that we sent along with that were quite limited. And there are other visual studies that we've done which somehow need to be entered. There needs to be a process. Because the only thing that people in general have seen are the things that are in the initial environmental assessment, which

were basically taken by the Trust, and the conclusion on the importance of that view created by Trust staff, as opposed to looking at a variety of views and weighting them to their relative importance. So how do we get that visual record in and assessed by members of the big four?

Male Voice: I would say provide that in a comment letter.

Female Voice: Yeah.

Male Voice: And then what the Trust will do is -- we were just talking with the other big four -- I hate that term, but --

[Laughter]

Male Voice: Signatories.

Brian Ramos: What do you all want to be called? And identify the -- you know, the best process for -- because what -- there's a gray line, and that gray line is, you know, how is the project evolving, which is ultimately the project, and what is really resolution of adverse effect. And so you want things to match up. And it's more complex in this case, because this is geared around a planning document, which has concepts and various levels of detail. So it would be appropriate for the Trust to speak with the National Park Service, the advisory council, and the Shippo. Is that a better way to say it? And they identify how -- whether that plays a larger role in the

resolution of adverse-effect process or in the revising of the finding in that document.

Because it -- given the fact that the finding-of-effect document is geared around concept, if we introduce too much detail into the finding-of-effect report at this point, it -- I -- you know, it could -- it has a potential to kind of take a couple steps backwards, when we -- we're still going to have that ongoing discussion about resolution of adverse effect through avoidance, minimization, and mitigation. So in the interest of the process continuing, it would be prudent for the Trust to have conversations with its partners in terms of the most appropriate place to have that conversation. But that doesn't preclude airing that.

Brian Ramos: Exactly.

Mark Hornberger: Well, I mean, it was interesting. We were sitting at the table in the last 106 meeting, and the state historic preservation architect said, "Well, we really can't assess currently the impacts unless we know what the detailed proposal is." So that really kind of flies in the face of -- we want to have -- assess the impacts on something that is very conceptual, but yet we've got stakeholders who are saying, "We really only can assess the effects when we know the real details --

Brian Ramos: Right.

Mark Hornberger: -- of the proposal."

Brian Ramos: And there's -- you know, there's -- the 106 process works very -- it works either way. And it depends. And it's -- and it happens all the time in different ways. And various agencies have the benefit of having projects that are more developed and more designed than others. And so, you know, it -- you always want agencies to have enough detailed information to be able to make decisions regarding the effects. But the other side of that coin is the project applicants, you know, have to incur expense to fully develop their project to the point in which they may not ultimately have agency support for it. So there's -- you understand the balance that is there.

And so the 106 process is -- recognizes that, and it -- and so it allows you to establish a programmatic-agreement document to resolve -- or to conclude the 106 process that allows -- that identifies the specific process for continuing to refine and agencies to continue to comment as those things -- so people are going to agree on things that are clearly conceptual, make findings about those within 106, have that finding within 106 inform the document at a conceptual level, knowing that it's -- that there's agency commitment that's documented in an agreement document that says, "This is how we're going to continue to avoid, minimize, or mitigate." Do you see what I mean?

Mark Hornberger: Yeah. Sure.

Brian Ramos: So you set up a program that meets those aims, knowing that you can't completely design a project, float it out to the public, have them all comment on it, have all the agencies comment on it, because it just -- nothing would ever -- it would be cost-prohibitive. I just said the same thing like four different ways, so --

[Laughter]

Male Voice: It's -- the 106 process is intended to account for that.

Female Voice: I think many people finish that sentence in a different way.

[Laughter]

Michael Boland: All right. Thank you.

Male Voice: Thank you very much.

Male Voice: Very nice presentation.

Male Voice: Well done, Michael.

[Applause]

[End of Recorded Material]