

Presidio Trust 11.12.08 - 2.00 p.m.



Tigerfish[®]
Transcribing·Editing

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

www.tigerfish.com

Presidio Trust 11.12.08 - 2.00 p.m.

[Beginning of Recorded Material]

Michael Boland: Gary, are you expecting anyone else?

Gary Widman: No. We've got our --

Male Voice: [unintelligible]

Gary Widman: -- team here.

Michael Boland: All right. Shall we start?

Male Voice: Let's go.

Michael Boland: Okay. Thank you for coming today. I -- and I want to thank a number -- actually, half of you who I've seen at previous meetings. So I'll try to run through some of this --

Male Voice: Nothing like the Park Service.

Michael Boland: -- quickly, just so it's not redundant. And we are recording the meeting, and we're -- as we've recorded all the meetings, and we're producing transcripts of all the meetings, just so everyone can see what came up at other meetings and such. So those will be -- once we get them, we'll post them on our Web site.

Well, just a little bit about kind of the genesis of this work. And I'm hoping, you know, Elaine, that you and Craig Kenkel will chime in as I talk about this a little bit, if I leave anything out. But this really grew -- this effort -- the material that we're going to walk through today grew out of a collaboration between the Park Service and the Trust. We convened a 2 1/2-day workshop some weeks ago that involved Park Service staff, not only local Park Service staff, local staff.

Craig participated at kind of the beginning and end of the process. Elaine participated at the beginning and the end. Stephanie, too, who many of you probably knew from the regional office, participated as well. The other participants were Randy Biallas from the Washington office of the Park Service, historic architect, Rodger Evans, who's the chief -- or he's not the chief. He's the head designer, head of the design and planning.

Male Voice: Assistant manager, Denver Service Center, designing --

Michael Boland: Design and planning.

Male Voice: Yeah. Contemporary design construction.

Michael Boland: Yeah. And Larry Walling. He's a landscape architect with the Park Service, recently retired. So that's who participated from the Park. On the Trust side, it was Rick Borjes, myself, Chandler McCoy, who many of you know. Rob Thompson participated as well. And

that was the makeup of the group. It was a 2 1/2-day work session in the Main Post.

So we don't have to listen to the traffic out here -- and we set for ourselves a pretty simple task, which was to look at each of the three major proposals that have been submitted and were included as part --

Hey, Jim.

-- that are included as part of the SEIS to look at the new construction components. So we didn't look at, for example, building 42. We didn't look at building 101. We didn't look to rehabilitation of historic buildings. We didn't study those. We only looked at the new construction. And we looked at all the various sites that are included in the SEIS. So, for example, at the Main Post, we looked at site -- what is affectionately known as site 2 and site 2A, site 2 and 3, and site 2A, the commissary site. We did not look at Fort Scott. We simply ran out of time. And we wanted to make sure that we were able to turn our attention to the lodge, the Anza Esplanade site for the lodge, and also to the theater project. So those are the things we looked at. We did not look at the Fort Scott site.

And our goal was to look at each of these sites and to understand what a conforming -- a building -- an infill-construction site [unintelligible] -- excuse me -- that is conforming with the secretary

of the interior standards might look like. And we approached this undertaking thus. We began our 2 1/2-day session with one day of due diligence. The morning we spent actually touring the entire Presidio, because we had some out-of-town guests who weren't very familiar with the Presidio, so we walked them through the entire Presidio to give them a sense of the whole Presidio context. And we also --

Does everyone know Brian, by the way? You must all -- you've all met Brian. Brian, you want to introduce yourself? I mean, you all know the rest of us, but -- that's why I skipped the introductions. But Brian, do you want to introduce yourself and talk a bit about your role before we get started?

Brian Ramos: My name's Brian Ramos, and I work for a company called ICF Jones & Stokes. We're an environmental consulting firm. And I am working with the Presidio Trust on helping them with the section 106 process and finalizing the finding-of-effect document and all of the subsequent 106 activities that -- as we continue this process. My background's in archaeology. I worked for various state agencies previous to being a consultant, so --

Michael Boland: All right. Thank you.

Anyway, so we spent the morning wandering around the Presidio, the whole Presidio, getting into the context for the Main Post and trying to get them better briefed on the evolution of the Presidio.

Then we focused, in the afternoon, on the Main Post itself. Quite a bit of field time, reviewed the proposals that we'd received in the field -- and also trying to introduce the participants to the various layers of Presidio history, help them understand the complexity of the Main Post landscape and how it evolved over time. Brought lots of historic photos, looked at the work that's been done to date around the cultural landscape, reviewed the cultural landscape, and walked the -- with the archaeology -- predicted archaeology map from the 1993 update, NHLE update -- with that in hand so that they could understand the archaeology and the sensitive archaeology sites in the Main Post, and then also undertook an assessment of the character-defining features of the Main Post.

And that's where you see this list that we developed here on this map that is just -- this list of character-defining features was really - - it was a product of that. We tried to tease apart what's character-defining about the Main Post and tried to enumerate them here, because they then become an important input into whether -- judging whether or not a project is or isn't conforming with the secretary standards. So that was how we spent our first day.

Then that evening, we began our [charet]. And the next day, we spent quite a bit of time producing a series of -- using this matrix and a series of sketches, which you have included, but walking through this matrix. And we began thus. We began by looking at all 10 of the secretary of the interior standards, asking -- which we did on a list. We're all well familiar with it. We asked ourselves which

of those standards seemed most relevant to this particular undertaking, being mindful of the fact that not all of the standards are necessarily relevant to each undertaking. So we identified those. And on the matrix, that's this first column. You see there's a list of secretary standards. And we identified five that we thought were most important for us to begin our consideration of these sites.

Then next, armed with those standards, armed with the character-defining features, armed with our walk about the site, armed with the archaeology map, et cetera, we began to develop a series of strategies that, when employed, we believed, would make these new construction projects conform -- bring them into conformance with the secretary standards.

And so, for example, secretary standard one, which I will point out I badly paraphrased in this matrix for the purposes of space. But we've actually given everybody the actual text of them. We had that with us that day. That's to do with minimizing change to the distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships of a property. And so one of the key strategies for conformance with that standard that we identified was being shorter than any new construction would avoid the removal of historic structure or historic feature.

So we went through these standards and developed this series of strategies. And so that's what this second kind of gray column or -- I -- yours are all in color -- kind of tan column represents is a series

of strategies that we could -- that a project could use that, when employed, would bring us closer to having a project that conforms with the secretary standards.

Then we applied these strategies at each of the sites, where they were applicable. There's some of these strategies that are not relevant. You know, maintaining an open south end of the parade is irrelevant at the commissary and things like that. We applied the relevant strategies at each of the sites and used that to define a building envelope that we thought was conforming.

Now, obviously, this is an effort that was undertaken without benefit of an in-depth understanding of program, as Elaine rightly has pointed out. We actually were mindful of the program, that this was to be a lodge, and that was to be a museum. You know, we weren't designing a lodge for this site or a movie theater for this site, things like that. So we clearly were mindful of the proposed building uses, but we were not trying to check these ideas against program -- specifics of the program as proposed. It was just really focusing on the secretary standards.

And secondly, we were using massing models. And, you know, they end up being little blobs like this. And you will see that, clearly, we're not advocating that the buildings end up being little blobs like this. So if you'll bear with me when you see these funny little blocks that we produced. And I think that in the matrix, what we tried to do was get at some of these more fine-grained issues,

massing the scale, roof line, and features, and the other things that are important, but they're not reflected in these little blocks there. These are -- these little blocks were the kind of outside envelope that a building would want to fit within, you know, a roof would want to fit within and the columns, et cetera. So -- and that will be clear as we walk through this.

So we walked through each of the sites. We actually started with the CAMP project as proposed, which is this funny little block model here, and went through, just to understand how it did or did not conform with many of these strategies that we found. As one might imagine, it does not conform with many of the strategies. If you look down -- quick way to scan this is one is looking for a lot of yeses and not looking for a lot of nos. And a yes means it's more conforming, and a no means it's not. So, you know, there are -- in this column, there are a number of nos, as you scan down, simply places where the building as currently proposed does not conform with the secretary standards.

So then we asked ourselves, "Well, what would a conforming building -- if there was a conforming building at the bowling-alley site, what might that look like?" And this is the first undertaking. And we came up with something that looks like this. And so why don't I quickly walk through the qualities of that, and it will give you a sense of how we -- you know, kind of how this rolled out. So

--

Gary Widman: Excuse me. Can I just ask a preliminary question?

Michael Boland: Sure.

Gary Widman: Since you're not the federal preservation officer, who is the federal preservation officer that did this?

Michael Boland: At that time, Rick was involved in this process.

Gary Widman: Okay.

Male Voice: So this is a product of when he was still here.

Male Voice: Yeah.

Male Voice: Okay.

Male Voice: This was completed when --

Andrea Anderson: Have you not told them who all was at the --

Male Voice: I did. But yeah, Rick was here.

Andrea Anderson: Okay.

Gary Widman: Okay. But there's no one now who's a federal preservation officer.

Female Voice: Well --

Male Voice: Not in this room.

Male Voice: Making this presentation. Right.

Brian Ramos: Are you aware of a requirement for that to be so?

Gary Widman: Yes.

Male Voice: That the -- a federal preservation officer is supposed to present the agency's --

Gary Widman: It -- well, it isn't that specific, but the programmatic agreement is pretty specific. It isn't quite that specific. Yes. It's pretty broad, and it's pretty absolute.

Boyd de Larios: As in the timing for that, my understanding is that Rick was severed from this job at the time that you had that consultation. He was no longer the federal preservation officer. That's not correct?

Jennifer Correia: This was in August. His last day of work was at the end of August.

Boyd de Larios: Okay.

Gary Widman: And so this happened when?

Jennifer Correia: In August.

Gary Widman: And I guess just one other question, actually more to Craig. You've apparently come to some conclusions here as to what complies with the secretary standards and what doesn't. And are these -- conclusions represent the Park Service view as well?

Craig Kenkel: We had Park Service participants at this meeting, so yes. But I think -- for CAMP as proposed or for all of them?

Gary Widman: Well, just for all of them.

Craig Kenkel: Because I'll say that on -- there's what we're talking about -- are fairly abstract concepts. We're not reviewing a design per se. So it's -- yeah, I can say that for sure. But --

Gary Widman: You can say more for sure. Sure. What you said for sure.

Craig Kenkel: Well, I'm not sure exactly why you ask your question. I --

Gary Widman: Because I just want to know if this is Park Service opinion --

Craig Kenkel: I would --

Gary Widman: -- or Presidio Trust opinion.

Craig Kenkel: Right. It's a collaborative, mutual opinion of the Presidio Trust and the National Park Service.

Lucia Bogatay: And Shippo.

Craig Kenkel: And the Shippo. So the other thing that -- they also provided input into this in review. The other thing to keep in mind -- we're talking about some strategies that are very specific and detailed. Ultimately, it's a composition of design that gets evaluated, and its totality is part of section 106. So, you know, we can get hung up on the formalities of who participated and how we reached these conclusions, but they're just meant to be suggestions that might help shape or influence successful design on these various sites in the future.

Gary Widman: So you reserve sort of the right to assess reaction --

Craig Kenkel: Absolutely.

Gary Widman: -- to any particular proposal.

Craig Kenkel: Absolutely. [unintelligible] --

Gary Widman: Okay. I just want to clarify.

Elaine Jackson-Retondo: Parameters. These are really parameters of what you would need to -- unless he -- you know, when Michael

held up that little block, he said, basically, you know, we're not saying the building would look like that, but it would fit within that envelope.

Gary Widman: Okay.

Elaine Jackson-Retondo: Obviously --

Gary Widman: Right.

Male Voice: Okay.

Elaine Jackson-Retondo: -- there would be further review in the process
[unintelligible] --

Craig Kenkel: The standards as written are very flexible. They allow for flexibility in reaching a successful design too. So none of these are absolutes.

Gary Widman: Yeah.

Craig Kenkel: They're meant to be guidelines for what might conform on a particular site in response to its context.

Gary Widman: Okay.

Craig Kenkel: So we're also trying to narrow the context down for each site.

Michael Boland: Well, it's safe to say -- and just to speak to your point -- that if we did produce a building that looked like this that fit in this envelope, that that wouldn't ensure the building was conforming by any stretch.

Craig Kenkel: Right.

Michael Boland: There are a whole universe -- and you'll see them articulated -- a whole universe of other considerations that can't be rendered in computer scale in a little [unintelligible] --

Craig Kenkel: Design an ugly building that would fit within that overall volume and [unintelligible].

Elaine Jackson-Retondo: And I think that --

Gary Widman: Okay. Well, that's -- that --

Elaine Jackson-Retondo: I think the other piece to that is that this is a tool, and because it's a tool, you do have to kind of break things apart. But we are aware that -- you know, the projects as a whole -- that when you just take this out and do that --

Gary Widman: Right.

Elaine Jackson-Retondo: -- you have to somehow break it up, disseminate the information so it's [unintelligible].

Gary Widman: Okay. Well, that clarifies it. Thank you.

Boyd de Larios: I have a further question.

Male Voice: Okay.

Boyd de Larios: As a tool -- I'm questioning the value of the tool here -- that's the subtopic or the topic that you want to talk about -- because you said you did exaggerate somewhat. And I do see an exaggeration on some of these things, the points that you have, and the omission of some of the --

Male Voice: Standards.

Boyd de Larios: -- standards, which to me have tremendous effect on the way the whole project is viewed. That's -- I think that was why the question was ended -- asked, and I was pretty interested in the answer -- is, you know, what level of endorsement is there from the National Park Service and Shippo?

I see nothing in the guidelines that I was able to look at that talk about new construction, other than talking about replacing features of buildings which are of historic value. So I understand that you can apply these concepts to new construction. However, I didn't see any portion of them in the 177 pages of this document that I was not able to review very well -- but that actually talked about -- gave a

basis for your proposals and your ability to do new construction. So
I --

[Overlapping Voices]

Craig Kenkel: Standards nine and 10 address additions to buildings or landscapes,
and/or landscapes.

Boyd de Larios: And/or related new construction.

Craig Kenkel: Mm-hmm.

Boyd de Larios: Right. New additions or -- however, the section in rehabilitation,
going beyond that one, really doesn't discuss anything in the context
of a new standalone construction. It talks about it being an added
feature to rehabilitate a feature. It's not talking about a brand-new
building. It's not talking about something like lodging, which is a
new function --

Craig Kenkel: Right.

Boyd de Larios: -- in a building.

Craig Kenkel: So --

Boyd de Larios: So this is a concept you're introducing here --

Craig Kenkel: Right.

Boyd de Larios: -- I think under --

Craig Kenkel: So the secretary of the interior standards for the treatment of this preservation have a number of suites of standards underneath them, and you can look at a suite of standards that deal with the rehabilitation of historic buildings, and then there's another suite of standards that deal with the rehabilitation of cultural landscapes.

Boyd de Larios: Okay.

Craig Kenkel: So within that broader -- and the standards are fairly identical under each. It's just that for the rehabilitation of cultural landscapes, standards nine and 10 will allow you to make new additions within that broader context of a cultural landscape.

Boyd de Larios: And that was my question. Is that contained within this document, or is --

Craig Kenkel: No, because that one's for buildings.

Boyd de Larios: Ah.

Craig Kenkel: So, Whitt, has one that is for --

Whit Hall: You're referencing the cultural landscapes. I think that your point would -- it says when all creations of a cultural landscape are needed to assure its continued use. I think that's an important point that needs to be documented. And the statement of purpose and need do not make a statement of any sort that would show that new construction is needed to assure continued use of the Presidio Historical Landmark District.

Jason Wright: So can I just ask, we were -- when the matrix was put together, we were utilizing the rehabilitation standards for cultural landscapes or --

Craig Kenkel: They were using probably the standards for rehabilitating buildings when you're looking at the theater, and for rehabilitating cultural landscapes for --

Jason Wright: When looking at sites 2 and 2A.

Craig Kenkel: -- new buildings.

Jason Wright: That's right.

Male Voice: Yes.

Male Voice: Okay.

Male Voice: And [Kim] noted effects really comes under the cultural-landscape umbrella. They're virtually talking about the same thing.

Male Voice: Mm-hmm.

Male Voice: Okay.

Boyd de Larios: This -- I very much would like to see, since we do have -- you know, I apparently drew them to the wrong document -- I would very much like to see the standards that you did use, the full copy of it. My understanding is this is what you just passed out, you said. And so apparently, this is misleading.

Michael Boland: As Craig said, this is -- these are the rehabilitation standards for buildings [unintelligible] --

Boyd de Larios: I understand that.

Michael Boland: -- theater. And they're very similar --

Male Voice: Okay.

Male Voice: -- to the standards for landscape. [unintelligible] --

Male Voice: [unintelligible]

Male Voice: And you can speak to that better than I can.

Craig Kenkel: So we can easily --

Male Voice: We can get them.

Craig Kenkel: -- [unintelligible].

Brian Ramos: So I guess, you know, the -- I -- the thing that I think -- one is listen to what Michael's going to say today, because these folks -- experts in the field and some of the best experts in the field from various disciplines, architectural, historians, historic architects, historic preservationists, got together and spent 2 1/2 days together saying, "If we were going to do something like this and have it conform with these guidelines, what would it look like?" And that's what the Trust wants to tell you today is if something was going to be built that experts agreed to -- and we can have disagreement about whether strictly we're using the landscape one or the building one. But think about these as the principles that, you know, inform the thinking of experts that make these kinds of evaluations. And hear what they have to say about how it would look.

And I'm just saying -- is like let's -- I -- the conversation is really getting into, you know -- I don't want to say attack, but it's like -- it's accusatory in saying, "Did you use this or did you use this?" And it's -- the point is that the Trust and the Park Service and the Shippo had a very extensive conversation with experts to say, "How can we do this sensitive to this context? This is a wonderful place.

It's a special place. It's a historic landmark. How could this occur within this context and conform to secretary standards?" You have absolutely the right to say, "I don't agree with that. I don't think that does conform to standards. I think you're wrong. I think the standard says this, and you say this." That input is part of this process. But I -- give the other folks a chance to say we're they're going with this, and just hear them out. That's all I'm saying.

Whit Hall: Now, Eric, I think to calm things down a little bit, if I'm hearing [unintelligible] right and some of the other comments -- is we want to be sure that our participation in the discussion of specific options presented today does not constitute an agreement that a need exists at all to proceed with the project.

And your question was -- and I'm a regulatory geek, I guess. [unintelligible] when you say something, I think of it in terms of the context of the regulations. And so the -- what Craig was talking about is, you know, there was a general consensus about concepts, but that doesn't mean that agencies had concurred and that these are actually now findings that folks have --

Gary Widman: Right. I just wanted to clarify that.

Male Voice: Yeah. So --

Whit Hall: And you preceded your comment with if this is to proceed, what could work. But you left the if question on the table.

Brian Ramos: The if -- no one's taken the if question off the table.

Male Voice: Yeah.

Male Voice: And --

Male Voice: Obviously, there are a lot of ifs.

[Overlapping Voices]

Boyd de Larios: My background is in contracts as a buyer, and so I'm -- I've read a lot of federal standards, and I always refer to these very documents. And in this particular case, I have a difficulty -- is that I couldn't find the document.

Male Voice: Right.

Boyd de Larios: I thought I had found it, and then I find it's not. So, you know, I will be much more comfortable, just because that's my professional experience -- is I like to read the documents for myself.

Brian Ramos: Sure. And I understand. And so what I'd say is if you looked at these 10 things listed here on secretary of interior standards -- and when you read them, you'll see that they're very outstrapped. And some of them even sound the same. One and two -- I don't -- I am not even sure I know -- I ask someone like Craig to explain to me

the difference between one and two, because they're very -- they're flying at a 30,000-foot level. And so what folks just tried to do is say, "Let's take this 30,000-foot view and plop it down here in the middle of this model."

Tia Lombardi: What we're going to do is we'll put a link on our Web site, which should be up there today, that will take you to the full standards, so you'll have them. You'll have an easy place to find them.

Male Voice: And will it be clear what -- these are guidelines to an advisory process.

Michael Boland: All right. Should we go?

So if I could direct your attention to the third column on this page, on this matrix, entitled conforming building and bowling-alley site. Let me run quickly through the characteristics of what we determined might be a conforming building at the bowling-alley site. The conforming building would not require the demolition of contributing structures, either 97 or the tennis court -- that it would maintain an orthogonal orientation, which is true of almost all of the other buildings in the Main Post. There are two notable exceptions, 97 and the jail [unintelligible] -- that it would not intrude into historic roadways. You see it doesn't intrude into any historic roadways here, being Montgomery and Moraga [unintelligible] --

Redmon Kernan: And you're --

Michael Boland: -- Sheridan.

Redmon Kernan: -- taking Sheridan as closed as your assumption in this.

Michael Boland: I'm making no assumption. I'm merely suggesting the building doesn't intrude into any footprint of any former roadways, any historic roadways.

Gary Widman: So this is the bowling alley, this little block?

Michael Boland: The -- no. Well, the bowling alley is -- here's the bowling alley. I'll take it away. There's the bowling alley. And so we're talking about what is -- what -- if we assume for a minute the bowling alley goes away and some new building is built on this site, what would a conforming building look like? And so are these parameters of what that conforming building would look like -- that it would maintain a north-south orientation. We talked a lot about the fact that many buildings have a north-south orientation in the Main Post, in part -- the great measure -- about topography but also about [unintelligible] today -- that this building would maintain historic open spaces. It would maintain an open space in front of building 100.

And it would also maintain the somewhat open character of this block. This bowling-alley block has had a number of various buildings on it, but they've always been fairly small-scale, and they have been various and sundry, we'll call them. And so it's always

had a fairly open character -- that it maintain significant views. We identified a couple that were important for us, the view from building 100 out, the view from the [Oakland] down to Parade and to the Bay beyond. And so you see in this, we've pulled the mass to the south to maintain those open views.

Maintain an open south end of the parade. And there were two ideas that we put on the table that would -- again, would maintain that open feeling. It doesn't mean there are no buildings there. It means it has no [unintelligible]. There have been buildings there. It's just they've been different -- that the mass of the building be moved to the southern end of the site and that the building be no higher than the top of the current bowling alley. At that point, we identified it as approximately 30 feet. And that just, as a point of reference, roughly aligns with the eave -- the top of the current bowling alley aligns with the eave of the theater. So the sense of the group was that the building should be no higher than the top of the roof of the current bowling alley.

Scale. Is the building a compatible scale? The sense of the group was that the building should have a footprint of approximately 20,000 square feet. If you look at the buildings in this location, 20,000-square-foot floor plate fits fairly comfortably within the scale of these buildings. Some of them are smaller. Some of them are close. But 20,000 square feet felt as though it would produce a building that is roughly compatible scale of the surrounding buildings.

Redmond Kernan: And this little bit there is -- represents 20,000.

Michael Boland: That's a 20,000-square-foot floor plate that is 30 feet high. That's the height of the bowling alley. So that's that volume.

Andrea Andersen: And let me answer your question too, because I didn't get this the first time. When he's talking about 20,000-square-foot footprint, he's talking about one dimension.

Male Voice: Footprint.

Andrea Andersen: He's not talking about two dimensions. That doesn't mean it's a 20,000-square-foot building.

Male Voice: [unintelligible]

Andrea Andersen: Okay.

Michael Boland: 20,000 feet by 30 feet high.

Redmond Kernan: Thank you.

Andrea Andersen: Because I didn't understand that at first. It was always hard too me.

[Overlapping Voices]

Craig Kenkel: The total available site, if we were avoiding -- which it is. It's avoiding the two archaeological sites that are -- define two edges of that with -- and the streets that define the other two edges. The buildable site is 37,000, but this also allows for setbacks from streets and so forth. So 20,000's about the -- is the maximum footprint of the building.

Michael Boland: Yeah. So --

Male Voice: Okay.

Michael Boland: And primarily, it was to pull it -- I mean, we'll get to archaeology in a minute -- is to pull it back from being in front of the school.

Whit Hall: A technical question.

Michael Boland: Yeah.

Whit Hall: The word scale is used throughout this. It's used in the guidelines too. Clearly, just a footprint does not establish a scale, nor does height establish a scale. So it's three-dimensional. It's mass.

Michael Boland: It is. And we didn't rearticulate it, because in the previous one, we had already established a height.

Whit Hall: Okay.

Michael Boland: So it's -- these are additive, I guess you could say.

Male Voice: Well, it still doesn't -- flat roof or a peaked roof and all that.

Michael Boland: Yeah. We'll get there. It's additive.

So if you move down, has seriality, repetition of forms. Just to point it out, the second -- the section we just went through -- these -- I think of these as sort of landscape-scale building features. They have to do with the organization of buildings in space in Main Post and maintaining that character, the way the buildings are organized. And so, for example, this last one has seriality, repetition of forms. This particular case -- this is a small enough building that it could be part of a larger ensemble, but it could also be freestanding. And so it -- that's what the NA really means in that location. It's not like we're adding something that's part of an existing building ensemble. And so you would look for seriality, because seriality is one of the things that we identified as character-defining, that there are often repeated building masses that are in ensembles in the Main Post. So that's what that's a reference to.

Redmond Kernan: I don't understand that one, but I'd like to move on.

Michael Boland: Yeah.

Redmond Kernan: I don't know how an individual building has seriality.

Michael Boland: Well, it doesn't, and that's why you say it doesn't apply.

Redmond Kernan: Yeah. Okay.

Michael Boland: This is more whether or not -- you know, there are some other strategies that we'll talk about later where that idea comes into play, especially on the 2A site where there's a kind of bigger footprint.

Standard three, avoid creating a false sense of historical development. And there was a sense that this building is small enough that it would not create a strong [unintelligible] to the main parade that never existed during the period of significance. And I would add to that, Wayne Donaldson described it in an additional way. He said that it would not create focal point where a focal point -- a build focal point where a focal point had not existed, that this building -- much like the bowling alley does today -- is a small enough building that, as you scan from east to west -- that it seems like part of an ensemble of buildings rather than a focal point. And so the sense of the group was that a building of this height and of that width probably could be built and would not create that false sense of historical development.

Archaeology. Just to come back to something that Craig mentioned. We used this map. And I passed it out to everyone. And as you see on the map, the bowling-alley site has two zones that overlap along the east side and also on the north side, F1 and F20. And as Craig mentioned, what -- the area that's left of this site that is outside F1

and F20 is about 37,000 square feet. So it's -- if you do -- there's -- you know, F1 runs down this side. F20 runs on this side. And so this is about 37,000 square feet. And so we located the square footage of the building outside of these two sensitive archaeology zones, and that's why the building is pushed back into this corner, so that we can avoid those sites.

Okay. Then in terms of the building itself and its character, we talked a lot about the site and -- you know, talked a lot about the relative visibility of the various sites that we've looked at and how that does or doesn't come into play in terms of features, things like rooflines and things like that. And so this is something that we'll talk about in -- as we move through each of these. But in this site, there was a sense that, again -- and some of this is redundant -- that a building --

Thanks, Elaine.

Elaine Jackson-Retondo:

You're welcome.

Michael Boland:

-- that a building of this size would be of a compatible scale with the surrounding buildings in the site.

There were two thoughts about the fact -- about this idea of compatible materials and color and texture. One idea was that it should have compatible materials, color, and texture, but it should be compatible with what's around it. Another idea, particularly put

on the table by the Shippo, was the idea that the building should be dark. A building on this site should be dark so that it receded -- tended to recede visually, and maybe receding into the dark backdrop of trees, it would tend to disappear. And so this is an attempt to capture that thought.

Is -- does the building itself have a compatible building height? And there -- again, there was a sense that so long as the height -- maximum height of the building was consistent with the height of the bowling alley and the height of the movie theater, that it would be of a compatible height with the surrounding architecture.

We talked a lot about the kinds of compatible features that we'd be looking for, and because this is not a very large building, it would want to have -- because of its visibility, it would want to have a number of compatible features. We identified several, particularly roofline, the presence of porches, and the kind of windows that you see in a lot of the buildings, these sort of punched windows that are characteristic of most of the surrounding -- except the theater, of course, which has very few windows, except for the front, the arches.

We talked about roof types. And again, there's a -- there was a sense of the group that -- you know, that -- the truth is when you look at the buildings in the Main Post, a preponderance of them have gabled roofs there -- a number of buildings that have flat roofs or kind of quasi flat roofs, and there are different angles and things

like that -- but that because of this building's location, it would be -- and visibility, it would be very important that this building have a compatible kind of roof, that there be some acknowledgement in the eave, that there be some acknowledgement in columns, you know, that it feel -- have that kind of, you know, classical -- I use the word classical loosely, since these buildings are classical, but, you know, the kind of -- that kind of feeling that those buildings have, that, I think, you know, with few exceptions, 34 and Herbst and a couple others -- that most of the buildings in the Main Post have a certain kind of a feeling around their roofline.

And then lastly, that -- though the building is in scale in terms of massing -- sorry -- that -- though the building size is in proportion with the historic context -- so it's -- scale wise, it's in proportion. But the massing still needs to be articulated. So I think this speaks to your point with -- that not only is it a block this size, but that it still needs to be broken down, in a way, so that it is similar to the surrounding structures, so that building mass is articulated and it feels more compatible, that if it was simply an unarticulated rectangle like that, that it wouldn't feel compatible and that it wouldn't be conforming.

So that was our sense of what any building on this side would need to look like in order to conform [unintelligible].

Craig Kenkel: Just, I guess, a general sense amongst all the designers that were at the meeting is that, you know, a smaller building like that -- like

what we're conceptualizing could probably be an opportunity to have more architectural articulation and details and so forth, rather than a larger one. So there is probably a little more creativity for design when it's at that scale --

Whit Hall: Very similar to our proposal in alternative 3. Congratulations, Lucia. I said very similar to your design in alternative 3. Congratulations.

Lucia Bogatay: Thanks.

Michael Boland: All right. So --

Whit Hall: Do you want comments as we go or --

Michael Boland: Sure. If you want --

Whit Hall: This, very briefly, is the whole issue that has to come up again and again, accumulative effects, which is a building even of that size -- once the hotel is built and the Anza Promenade is built, that building then will be centered on the head of the parade ground, so the eye will be attracted to it no matter what. And --

Male Voice: [unintelligible]

Male Voice: -- it therefore becomes more intrusive and monumental in the nature of the landscape.

Michael Boland: Yeah. I think, again, the sense of the group -- because we were mindful of that. We put all of the pieces up in various iterations, actually. And the sense of the group was that a building that is, you know, the width of the bowling alley, no higher than the bowling alley, located at the back end -- that that building, even in light of those other proposals, could be conformant.

Lucia Bogatay: I have a quick question, which is that you have this predicted archaeological features map, but it's different in very significant areas than the one in the P10. Was there new information that demonstrated that there were no archaeological features in this area? Because in the P10 archaeology map, it shows that the archaeological potential lies all the way up through this central area.

[Overlapping Voices]

Eric Blind: This one is the one the National Park Service provided for the landmark documentation. This is the one that'd kind of well-founded. And --

Lucia Bogatay: This one --

Eric Blind: -- this one is the most well-founded, I would say. And --

Lucia Bogatay: The other was just a sort of random prediction, and this one's based on actual information?

Eric Blind: [unintelligible] this one's predictive. And since, we found that this one is very accurate, and it's meeting what we have found since this time.

Lucia Bogatay: But Eric --

Eric Blind: And that --

Lucia Bogatay: -- on your Web site, there are the famous borings in the parking lot of the bowling alley where they did like two bowling-alley parking-lot borings, and they found something in each boring. I mean, that's -- my husband, who's a statistician, said, "Well, that proves there probably isn't a stadium underneath that area." Because you couldn't -- they're too far apart to actually give you any statistical information.

Eric Blind: Let me continue. To the first point, the PTMP one was showing both historic and prehistoric, and we expanded the prehistoric quite substantially, just to say any kind of valley area in the Presidio that could have deposition may have a prehistoric site.

Lucia Bogatay: Okay.

Eric Blind: So that's why the space is much broader in that PTMP map, by and large.

Now, for the -- we were never trying to either prove or disprove sites through those borings. We did 17 over a multiple-acre site. That was never going to be enough information to either say definitively something is there or that something is not there. What we were really trying to do was give some sort of validation or corroboration to our modeling of what the Presidio -- what kind of transformations have happened in the last 150 years. And with those cores, we were able to do that.

Lucia Bogatay: Okay.

Eric Blind: We kind of got lucky in that three of the cores on the eastern side did conform to the predicted map. We found some colonial-period artifacts, and they were in the area that El Presidio was predicted. And in areas that we were showing that the land -- hills had been completely removed, the cores did show that, that there was a -- the layer we would be looking for is well gone. And it also started to show that this ravine is deeply filled in, to once again corroborate our model. So we weren't trying to prove or disprove the presence or absence of archaeological features.

Lucia Bogatay: Okay.

Eric Blind: We were trying to add a little bit of detail on possibilities. So in areas that we're showing in this map are red, we're now pretty certain that there was really no --

Female Voice: [unintelligible]

Eric Blind: -- possibility for an archaeological site --

Lucia Bogatay: Yeah.

Eric Blind: -- there any more.

Lucia Bogatay: But the blue area is the one we're concerned about. Anyway, thank you.

Eric Blind: Yeah.

Lucia Bogatay: Good answers.

Jason Wright: Is there a more recent map or more recent documentation than this one that we could use to help evaluate that?

Eric Blind: We're actually working on it now.

Jason Wright: Okay.

Eric Blind: It's part of the 2008 landmark update.

Jason Wright: Okay.

Eric Blind: And we're kind of going through the process of trying to establish boundaries, which is very difficult to do for predicted sites, especially when they --

Jason Wright: Underground.

Eric Blind: -- have real-time implications.

Brian Ramos: But I think the important thing on the archaeology is -- to keep in mind is that -- I mean, this is very unique, what's been prepared here in terms of the level of modeling for predicting archaeological resources. I'm an archaeologist, and Eric showed me this, and I thought it was pretty cool, because it's a very sophisticated look at previous earth-moving activities and using that to inform thinking relative to potential for archaeological sites.

And the key word is potential. And what the Trust -- the Trust uses that word very cautiously. They identify areas as having potential archaeology the same as having archaeology. They use it to say that it's anticipated that things won't occur here. And the areas that are called out as site boundaries or known sites -- a lot of those are unknown, but the Trust is acknowledging the potential for those being there and trying to avoid places that potentially have archaeology the same that they're trying to avoid areas that are known to have archaeology.

Michael Boland: All right. Should we -- let's talk about the 2A site. We actually expanded our inquiry at the 2A site a little bit over the SEIS because --

Male Voice: We're skipping the CAMP proposal.

Michael Boland: Oh, I didn't -- we can run through that if you want.

Male Voice: No. I -- I mean, if it's off the table, I wouldn't worry about it.

Michael Boland: I -- well, I -- you know, I won't respond to that, but I -- anyway, the 2A site. We came up with three different strategies for massing the square footage. Now, bear in mind, the way -- in the SEIS [unintelligible] 140,000 square feet at the 2A site. That's assuming that, because of the distance, building 101 no longer is part of the proposed contemporary art museum, and all of that square footage would be located up here at the site. And we also --

Jason Wright: How would one -- it's really not a very far distance. And as I understood uses in -- is it 101? -- that they were to educate children about pottery and art making and [unintelligible], and that they wouldn't be going back and forth to the display of whatever display might be put forth, and that this was also an administrative headquarters, much of which is sort of back at the house, and it doesn't seem that -- could walk 100 yards or two --

Male Voice: Yeah.

Tia Lombardi: Well, conceivably, you could, but what we did hear was we wanted to make sure that what we were looking at was consistent with the alternatives that were analyzed in the EIS. So in the EIS, we had alternative 2, which is a program of new construction and building rehab, and alternative 2A, which takes that program and puts it all in new construction. It's just to --

Jason Wright: Okay.

Tia Lombardi: -- keep it consistent.

Michael Boland: And I think the other thing is that we understand that if we were putting 100,000 square feet rather than 140, that would be easier --

Female Voice: Right.

Michael Boland: -- than the 140. Okay. So, you know, our sense is that it fits within -
-

Male Voice: All right.

Michael Boland: -- that envelope.

So we identified three different ways to organize that square footage on the site. And there -- we named them A, B, and C. And you have, in the materials that we gave you, not only the matrix, but

also some quick sketches that explain those three concepts. And I'll try to model them up here.

Concept 1 -- or concept A -- sorry -- is moving the mass of the building to the west side of the site. Square -- it could actually engage into the hillside. So there's this wooded hillside that comes down on this side -- move the mass of the building to the side, so it's not -- the bulk of the building is not sitting in the center of the site. Let's move it to the side. There might be a small portion, the lobby or something, one story projecting into the site. But this was concept A, and we modeled that. I'll just do these, and then --

Gary Widman: And just to clarify here, you're talking 100,000 square feet max --

Michael Boland: 140.

Gary Widman: Oh, 140.

Michael Boland: That's -- yeah. 140.

Okay. And then concept B. We located the square footage at the center of the site and asked ourselves what the implications of that might be. Again, we're -- this is a modeling exercise, so our goal here was just to model these different massing strategies and understand the differences between them in terms of how the -- in terms of the secretary standards. So the mass of the building located

in the center on axis with the parade -- some, you know, appended side that might come up.

Lucia Bogatay: And didn't you have two appended sides --

Michael Boland: Oh, yeah, we did. I seem to have --

Lucia Bogatay: -- [unintelligible] Red Cross building.

Michael Boland: -- misplaced my little appended side here. So it's -- it walked between the last meeting. But you can imagine [unintelligible].

Lucia Bogatay: But it would -- that would require removing the Red Cross building.

Multiple Voices: No. That's the library.

Female Voice: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm on the wrong side of the street.

Michael Boland: And then lastly, we included -- developed something that we nicknamed it takes a village. And the idea of it takes a village is that you might organize this square footage in a collection of smaller structures on the site that might be connected underground, so you break up the mass of the building into a collection of smaller buildings. And we moved part of the building here and -- but had the bulk of the building located up here. And this might be sort of a lobby or something, for example [unintelligible] --

Jason Wright: Just for comparison, what's the square footage of Herbst Hall and this new structure?

Michael Boland: Well, I'll show you. Here's Herbst. So very comparable. You know, that's --

Jason Wright: A little shorter.

Michael Boland: Little shorter. But, you know, the idea was that it would be Herbst-sized, bowling-alley-sized bites.

Male Voice: That's -- what inch -- is about the right size? That much taller.

Michael Boland: So we would break them up into, you know, 40, 35, 30, you know, between 30 and 40,000-square-foot chunks. On that side, you'd get to the 140. So that was the third idea.

And again, we -- what -- you know, the reason we came up with these ideas is that we wanted to understand whether or not different massing strategies -- you know, this site -- the archaeology really defines the corner where the building mass wants to be located. Up here, because there's a -- the sensitive archaeology really runs along this edge into the library site. In this area, there's a lot more flexibility in terms of how you can organize that square footage on the site. So we thought it prudent to look at a number of different strategies. So those were the three that we modeled.

Whit Hall: And just a real quick --

Michael Boland: Yep.

Whit Hall: -- descriptive question. The drawings in that make it appear that the front building is almost on Moraga. It's not set back. Is that correct? Or was it even a matter of discussion --

Michael Boland: You know, we talked about the desirability of it, you know, moving in various ways, but --

Whit Hall: Okay.

Michael Boland: -- you know, it -- I think it will be clear as I talk what the parameters are. Because the comparison was very helpful that way in terms of defining some of the key moves that are important. So --

Jason Wright: So this adds up to 140.

Michael Boland: That's right.

Male Voice: At the footprint?

Michael Boland: No. That's total square footage. I'm sorry. That would be total square footage.

Male Voice: So what's the footprint?

Michael Boland: So -- well, this is the 20,000 square foot, and we assumed that it could be 20,000 square feet, and it would be two stories, I mean approximately 20,000 square feet, two stories. So, you know, that's -- you know, this one's a little less and -- but it --

Male Voice: So it would be 70,000, and these would be two-story buildings.

Michael Boland: Well, these would be -- this would be 20, say two stories. So that would be 40, you know. And if you add these three up, it's the remaining 100, essentially.

Male Voice: And the concept really isn't so defined that it's four buildings in -- total. It could be five, you know.

Male Voice: yeah.

Male Voice: It could include a one story and --

[Overlapping Voices]

Jason Wright: In C, just for consistency, there is a pit --

Male Voice: Yeah.

Jason Wright: -- according to your --

Male Voice: That's right.

Gary Widman: Did you consider putting those buildings back against the cliff, rather than putting them so prominently in front, right on Moraga?

Michael Boland: You mean -- well, we did talk about that in the context of the first option, which --

Gary Widman: But I mean moving them south.

Michael Boland: Moving the whole building back here?

Gary Widman: Yeah.

Michael Boland: We didn't in this, because again, I think we were trying to understand the bigger envelope. It's the reason we used 140,000 square feet. And, you know, this -- our thought was, well, if we can challenge ourselves by wondering how a building like this might work, a building like this would work better. So --

Male Voice: Although I would say that if there is the underground connection, you have the building on the bowling-alley site, and if you push the others further back south, that's just more that's underground. So from a --

Male Voice: Well, push that one back too.

Male Voice: Yeah. That's a possibility.

Male Voice: Yeah.

Male Voice: Mm-hmm. So there's just a lot of flexibility --

Michael Boland: There is.

Male Voice: -- in this concept.

Male Voice: Yeah.

Male Voice: [unintelligible]

Michael Boland: Again, we just wanted to model some distinctly different moves to understand the relationship between them. And what I'll do -- what I'd like to do is walk through this and actually just primarily talk about the differences between them, because there -- you'll see there are a lot of yeses. So it's these three columns that are over here on the side. And there are a lot of ways in which they are similar, but there are a few key ways in which they're different.

Male Voice: It's the last column, C?

Michael Boland: No. It's -- so it's column -- concept A, concept B, and concept C. It's these three -- so this is currently --

Male Voice: It's all three columns.

Male Voice: C.

Michael Boland: This is C. Yes.

Male Voice: Okay. I'm just trying to --

Michael Boland: Yeah. Okay.

Male Voice: -- stick with you.

Michael Boland: But I'll -- but I thought I'd just merely -- I'll compare --

Male Voice: Okay.

Michael Boland: -- them as I move along and move these around a bit to illustrate some of the key points.

So we actually, when we laid these out -- and although, as [Shia] rightly noted, they are missing -- the library is missing. Our intent was that, in fact, you could organize these buildings in such a way that the library could be retained, and also building 97 and the golf course. I -- the golf course --

[Laughter]

Michael Boland: The golf course as well. We're not building the golf course.

[Overlapping Voices]

Male Voice: Do you know it's 7,000?

Tia Lombardi: I was going to say it's under 10.

Male Voice: Yeah.

Male Voice: 7 or 8,000.

Male Voice: I didn't bring my cheat sheet, so --

Male Voice: It just --

Michael Boland: So an organizing strategy -- all three of them that we described, A, B, and C, would all avoid the removal of contributing structures.

In terms of standard two, the sort of district-wide landscape-scale moves, it, of course, could have an orthogonal orientation, and we think that's desirable -- could maintain a north-south orientation, could maintain historic roadways easily. You know, these are the historic roadways in this area. The development up in this area is actually not historic, including the roadways.

Maintain historic open spaces. We had quite a conversation about this, because in fact, the 2A site historically has been open during the period of significance. And there was a sense that, though that is true -- that this is really the more significant open space, and that moving the bulk of the square footage up in this area -- to some extent, the impact of that is mitigated by the fact that it's outside the quad, if you will. And so that's what this tries to speak to. The site is less significant -- is a less significant historic open space than that site, and so the sense was that we could the -- these three proposals a yes on this particular site, on this particular one.

Maintain significant views. Again, the sense was that it maintains the significant views that we identified by moving the site, so long as this building, I'll point out, is consistent with the conforming building that we already talked about in terms of its height and footprint and massing and all of that -- that or smaller.

Whit Hall: When views are considered in the secretary standards, are they considering also the views of persons traveling to or through the site by automobile, as much as Moraga is a very major passageway through the site?

Craig Kenkel: They should be considering all significant historic views, regardless of whether you're on foot or in vehicle.

Michael Boland: But bear in mind, I mean, a view is not just every view.

Male Voice: Right. I understand that.

Michael Boland: It's -- you know --

Male Voice: But a first impression of Main Post by anyone traveling south on Moraga [unintelligible] could be established with CAMP on one side and the new addition to the theater on the other side and would be very disruptive to an initial interpretation or impression of the historic site.

Brian Ramos: I mean, you can explain this much better than me, but there are views that I think folks would agree kind of characterize the place. And they're those orthogonal arrangements of the buildings -- I get myself in trouble with these words -- and how you described, you know, continuity in terms of building size as you pan from one side to another. And so I guess what I'm trying to say is that all views wouldn't be necessarily valued the same.

Whit Hall: That's entirely true. However, that -- I keep repeating, that's 49-Mile Drive and a major entrance to the historic area [unintelligible].

Male Voice: Yeah. And actually, on our cultural-landscape assessment, it would look at whether some of the most important views from different vantage points existing now -- so that's with the bowling alley there and with all the other structures, such as Herbst Exhibition Hall and so forth, and then do some kind of modeling or projection of what the views might be with new architecture in place. I mean, does that

-- those new structures compromise or enhance or have a neutral impact on the views?

Whit Hall: I just didn't want this yes --

Male Voice: Yeah.

Whit Hall: -- to go by without being challenged.

Male Voice: Yeah.

Jason Wright: Does it necessarily have to compare it to what's there now, because theoretically, you could regain more integrity by removing the bowling alley and not putting anything there than --

Craig Kenkel: Well, but that's creating a view that doesn't exist, so --

Male Voice: Now. But did it --

Craig Kenkel: It's a new view.

Male Voice: -- historically?

Craig Kenkel: It's a new view.

Male Voice: Well --

Male Voice: We don't know what really existed historically from the observation point on the way out.

Female Voice: What's one of the questions --

Craig Kenkel: It's existing views under cultural landscape. It's not what may have existed back in time.

Male Voice: As of when --

Craig Kenkel The value of views is what you experience now.

Lucia Bogatay: So what -- that's -- what would really help me to understand is what the baseline is. Because is the baseline a period of significance, or is it what existed when the district was created? And when was the district created? Are we talking originally created, or updated in '93? Is it -- because that thing was built in '88, so it's not a contributor --

Craig Kenkel: But it existed --

Lucia Bogatay: It existed --

Craig Kenkel: -- at the time --

Lucia Bogatay: What is the baseline --

- Craig Kenkel: -- the Presidio -- existed at the time the Presidio was made a national historic landmark. So even though it's noncontributing, it does have an impact on views.
- Lucia Bogatay: But I know it went through a 106 process, so it must have happened after the district was created.
- Male Voice: Most likely. And my guess would be that they didn't do any kind of consideration of prominent view shots, because the whole concept of cultural landscapes and national register of properties and natural historic landmarks is a fairly new idea --
- Lucia Bogatay: Yes.
- Craig Kenkel: -- within cultural properties, culture-resource properties. It's been around since, basically, the early '90s.
- Boyd de Larios: So what do you advise we do, looking backward, to apply these standards for these relatively new concepts?
- Craig Kenkel:: The standards are applied to tangible resources, and then feeling and association also are part of integrity. But the standards are really to guide physical changes to a historic property. So -- and then when we look at the cultural-landscape guidelines, they also will address views and vistas and so forth. And those can be historic ones that might have existed in time.

For example, if you had a battery on a coastal bluff and trees have overgrown the strategic view shot -- but if you have other view shots that were not designed and were a consequence of the evolution of the site, then they may not be character-defining or historic. And it's really -- so it's not an easy answer. It takes some assessment.

Lucia Bogatay: You know, I still don't know what the date of zero is for determining what is a change. Is it '93? Is it '72? Is it '62? I mean -- or is it 1945?

Male Voice: Or today.

Lucia Bogatay: Or today.

Male Voice: Integrity -- when you're going through section 106 compliance, and you're trying to assess the impact of an undertaking, it's the integrity as it exists at that moment. So --

Male Voice: So now.

Male Voice: Yes.

Female Voice: Okay.

Male Voice: Because there are other changes that have happened on the Presidio, and if you're really going to roll those all out, since it was declared

a national historic landmark, you're looking at the cumulative change through time. So -- and it's --

Female Voice: I'm going to learn about this. I know --

Male Voice: It's complex because --

[Overlapping Voices]

Male Voice: -- you know, the good planning wants to be mindful of the historic context as well. You know, so the [unintelligible] process might include thinking about buildings that used to be there. It's very complex. It's not -- it's hard to give you a good answer on that. But -
-

Female Voice: Yes, it is.

Male Voice: Okay.

[Laughter]

Boyd de Larios: Excuse me. I just -- just one more little throw at this. Okay. So we have nothing over there on the opposite side of the -- and yet there's lodging proposed, which would interfere with the current view. And so that seems to me that you just said that that's not correct, that there should be -- that it should be maintained as an open space, because there is --

Craig Kenkel: No.

Boyd de Larios: -- a significant view.

Craig Kenkel: I didn't say that at all.

Boyd de Larios: Oh, okay.

Craig Kenkel: Because what has already --

Male Voice: [unintelligible] logical --

Craig Kenkel: What's already been done --

Male Voice: -- fallout [unintelligible] --

Craig Kenkel: -- in terms of the strategies here -- we've already identified that the views looking down north south are important. That was done by this work group as part of going through this exercise. But [Wit] brought up a concern about other views that you might experience when you're coming in on Moraga. And we didn't get down to that level of detail there. So there might be different smaller views that weren't considered as part of the exercise. But at the point where you have a real project that is designed out at 50 percent or something like that, and you're using the standards to shape the project, you would then seriously look at and try to understand what

are the major views, north, south, east, west, if there are any. You know, evaluate if they're being impacted.

Boyd de Larios: I see.

Female Voice: [unintelligible]

Boyd de Larios: Well, apparently I have a substantial disagreement with the experts, because as far as I'm concerned, that view from Moraga is extremely important and has been for decades. And to put something in there would interfere with that. So again, if your interpretation is that that is not -- like I said --

Craig Kenkel: All right. So --

Boyd de Larios: -- if the experts said there's no interference, I would like to have --

Craig Kenkel: A view from Moraga --

Boyd de Larios: -- participated.

Craig Kenkel: A view from Moraga which way and where?

Boyd de Larios: From south to north.

Craig Kenkel: Okay. So first of all, you shouldn't make the assumption that what this exercise resulted in is the end-all get-all for how the integrity of the Main Post of the national historic landmark is impacted. It's meant to provide a suggestion for process and how the standards may be used to help guide appropriate change on the Main Post in the future. The concerns you're raising are very important, and they should be incorporated in a more comprehensive review at some point in the future, if such projects come to fruition.

So I'm not discrediting what you're saying, but I'm also not going to accept the fact that you think that experts did not approach this in a very professional, objective way. Within the 2 1/2 days of time they had to work on this, they really gave a very concerted effort to it, and they were very thoughtful and very concerned, and they did realize that what they put on paper was probably going to influence a lot of people and generate a lot of comment and probably some criticism. But it's really not the end-all get-all to this process. It's just meant to help you understand that there is a strategic way these projects could be approached. So having said that, I really have to go get my teeth work done.

[Laughter and Overlapping Voices]

Boyd de Larios: -- more open process to put -- because the 2 1/2 days -- obviously, the concentration -- I have difficulty with the result. And so if it was a more open process, that difficulty might have been -- not exist.

Male Voice: Well, the process --

Male Voice: [unintelligible]

Male Voice: -- for public participation in design on Presidio will be directed by these folks. What's important to understand is that the secretary of the interior standards can be used as design tools to help influence what is appropriate design. And then they're also used to review development proposals on historic property as part of section 106 compliance.

Male Voice: Okay.

Male Voice: So --

Male Voice: Yeah. Just seeking to understand --

Male Voice: Sure. So you'd rather have your teeth pulled than sit here --

[Laughter and Multiple Voices]

Craig Kenkel: Believe me, I'll be thinking of you all as they give me the gas.

[Laughter]

Male Voice: Don't drive afterwards.

Male Voice: Take care.

Male Voice: So just, you know, to continue on this thinking, because it -- you raise a good point. And so I just -- the way that --

Male Voice: Can I stop here?

Male Voice: We will come back to that view later.

[Overlapping Voices]

Boyd de Larios: Let me say what I was going to say.

Male Voice: I mean, I just -- we're --

Boyd de Larios: It's not the view.

Male Voice: We're wandering off --

Boyd de Larios: That's not my point -- topic --

Male Voice: But I --

Male Voice: I just want to keep us focused on --

Boyd de Larios: No. That's not my point.

Male Voice: Okay. Good.

Boyd de Larios: It's -- we're talking about tools here. We're talking about concepts and -- I mean, like that. And so I'm worried about this. You know, I do have a fundamental difficulty. I'm somewhat calmed down now, but initially, when I found out that I printed out 177 pages of the wrong darn document and then, you know -- and what I got is I need to go now read some other document to understand what you're talking about, you know, I -- I have other things that I was trying to accomplish.

So anyway -- so the validity of the tools -- where I started out in the meeting -- you know, how do I -- to be having concerns, approach you with a framework that you understand, since I'm not understanding you, apparently -- how do we make this work? You know, I think I've got a valid viewpoint. I'm part of the public, and I want to contribute.

But, you know, I -- we have an archaeological study or predicted [unintelligible] that I don't have access to yet. We have a lot of reports that we -- that we're not -- I don't have access to -- there's -- yet. Excuse me. I'll calm down. There's a lot of information that is missing from this process. So you're talking about concepts here, and I understand that. I participated in the first one, because I was not available last week. I am available this week, just barely. So I have -- I'm familiar with what you're saying. I want to make them work. And I'm sorry. I'm hearing logical problems in that. And if

I'm wrong, I would like them explained to me. And I don't think that's unreasonable.

Brian Ramos: And let me just say a couple of things. Is -- one is that the archaeological information is very sensitive, and it's not something that's generally distributed wholesale to the public. It's --

Male Voice: I understand that.

Brian Ramos: -- something that's protected, because there's looting and things like that. And so you're going to see archaeological information disclosed to the public very different than you're going to see information about building environment resources disclosed to the public. Someone's not going to go steal the building, but they will go dig up archaeological sites. It happens every day. So the -- and a lot of the information, as Eric indicated, is still being developed. I mean, this is ongoing research --

Male Voice: I understand.

Brian Ramos: -- and stuff like that. And so there's availability that limits that.

But back to the -- your original comment -- excuse me -- your original comment about what was and wasn't considered in terms of being a view is a fine comment to make. It's a reasonable comment. And you're saying that there's an additional view shed that you

think should be considered in the finding-of-effect document that you're not seeing expressed in this matrix.

Male Voice: Correct.

Brian Ramos: That's a perfectly appropriate comment to make, and you made it. And so you saw there was a reaction to, perhaps, how it was made. And so the point is that you're involved in the 106 process right now, and you just might not feel like it. But this is the process. People are -- experts are sharing their information, and they're asking your views. And they're taking your views and incorporating it into their thinking. And this is -- the 106 process is, we already know, less fun than the dentist. But this is kind of how it works. And so folks heard what you said, which is there's a view shed that you think is important relative to the construction of the lodge that's not fully articulated in the Main Post [unintelligible], and you would like to see that addressed.

Boyd de Larios: I think you missed it. That's not what I thought.

Male Voice: Okay. Well, I --

Male Voice: Don't do it again.

[Overlapping Voices]

Gary Widman: Well, let me clarify something from your comments. What is the official role of this meeting in the 106 process and the [NIPA] process? I mean, are we to take these things as somehow given or subject to comment? Are we supposed to comment on this? Do we need to comment? If we do, I mean, obviously we need a lot more information than we've got now. I mean, we're just being presented with this, and the comment period runs in a few days. How do we treat this in the NIPA process? What's the role of this meeting in those official processes?

Jennifer Correia: I think this was to communicate what happened in the workshop to everybody and like get everyone up to speed with things that we've worked on and done as collaborative efforts with other agencies.

Brian Ramos: So what's different about this than what's in the finding-of-effect document and what's in the NIPA document is what's in those documents are proposed undertakings. There's applicants and project --

Gary Widman: And should we now assume that number 2, for example, is no longer a proposed undertaking?

Male Voice: No, we shouldn't. We should say -- we're -- the Trust is sharing with you the efforts of experts saying what would it look like if it conformed with secretary standards. And they're sharing with you their thinking on this -- on their decision making.

Gary Widman: So this has no role, then, in either process. We just rely on the basic documents and comment on those, and we don't comment on this. Michael's nodding yes. Is that --

Male Voice: No. I think that what you need to not do is look at the finding-of-effect document as the end of the 106 process.

Gary Widman: All right.

Male Voice: The 106 process is going to continue, and it's going to continue with three main objectives, avoidance, minimization of impacts, and mitigation of --

Gary Widman: Right.

Male Voice: -- the impacts.

Gary Widman: But if we fail to comment now, before the comment period runs on this, are we going to somehow be charged with not commenting on this?

Andrea Andersen: Well, there's really two comment periods that are running right now. One's a comment --

Male Voice: Yes.

Andrea Andersen: -- period on the draft supplemental environmental --

Male Voice: Right.

Andrea Andersen: -- impact statement. And then another is a comment period that's running on the finding of effect.

Male Voice: Exactly.

Andrea Andersen: In a way, I guess, that's what we've been saying here is --

Male Voice: That's my question.

Andrea Andersen: -- is what we're --

Male Voice: And for me, could you just say when that is, what the --

Andrea Andersen: Sure. Right now, we actually have two different closeouts. That might change.

Male Voice: The finding of effect. When --

Andrea Andersen: The finding of effect. Right now, the closeout for the comment period is the 17th of November. Right now, the closeout for the draft supplemental environmental impact statement is the 15th of December. That's the closeout period for the --

Male Voice: Okay.

Andrea Andersen: -- public comments on those.

In a way, if you will, we are -- we have written our draft finding of effect, and that has been circulated. And as you know, Brian already talked about when you go through the 106 process, you know, first you figure out what are your historic resources, and then you figure out what are going to be the impacts on those historic resources, and then you go through a process of either trying to, you know, avoid, minimize, or mitigate those impacts to those historic resources.

And we answered this question earlier today, which is, you know, what was really the thrust of this process. And if you will, the thrust of this process was at avoidance. That was really the thrust of this process was trying to find a way where you could build a theater, you could build a lodge, you could build, you know, a contemporary art museum on the Main Post, and they would avoid adverse effects. And that's really the purpose of this particular process.

Gary Widman: But there's only five days between now and the deadline.

Andrea Andersen: No, there isn't.

Gary Widman: I thought you said November 17.

Andrea Andersen: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes.

Gary Widman: For the --

Andrea Andersen: For the FOE. Yes.

Gary Widman: Yeah. Today's the 12th. Right?

Andrea Andersen: Mm-hmm.

Male Voice: So --

Male Voice: Comments on this are not part of the FOE comments.

Gary Widman: -- you're expecting us, then, to comment on this within five days.

Andrea Andersen: No, not on this.

Gary Widman: Do we --

Andrea Andersen: This isn't for the final --

Gary Widman: -- waive our rights if we do not comment on this?

Andrea Andersen: No.

Female Voice: No. I mean --

Gary Widman: This is -- okay. Well, that's what I'm trying to clarify.

Andrea Andersen: Yeah. No. All we're really giving you, if you want to know, is sort of a preview of what's to come, I mean, in essence. You know, we're continuing to move forward with the process, and we think we're getting close to resolving the universe of what are all the adverse effects. And that's really going to be the thrust of the next consultation meeting is to get everyone to agree that here's the universe of the adverse -- potential adverse effects that could come from these proposals.

Male Voice: But they'll be a new document between now and then. Right?

Female Voice: Yes.

Andrea Andersen: Yes. There will be a revised finding of effect.

Male Voice: Okay. And so that --

Female Voice: So right now, you're --

Male Voice: -- would be the appropriate --

Andrea Andersen: Right. And then at that meeting, you can -- we'll talk about the revised finding of effect, and we might also start talking about avoidance, minimization, and mitigation at the next meeting. And that's kind of what you're getting a preview of right now.

Male Voice: So really, there's no need to comment on this in the FOE process.

Male Voice: That's right.

Male Voice: But now let's clarify in NIPA.

Female Voice: Okay. For the NIPA process, if you will, how we're taking a look at this is we're using this to help formulate what our preferred alternative is going to be. So in other words, right now we have four -- we have a proposed action, and we have alternatives to the proposed action. But we haven't developed a preferred alternative. And so in essence, we are using this process to help us craft what the preferred alternative is going to be, craft what is going to be in the update to the, you know, Presidio Trust management plan. That's what we're using this for as well is to figure out what --

Male Voice: But since --

Female Voice: -- our preferred alternative is going to be.

Male Voice: But since these, A, B, and C, are so different from anything that's in the impact statement, presumably then you're going to start the whole process over again. You're going to have a draft with a, you know, 60-plus-day comment period with this in it. I mean, this is not in the impact statement at all.

Female Voice: Well, it's not -- any one of these particular alternatives or different ways of looking at it is not, but the way that we view it is. Each one of these is within the range of reasonable alternatives that has been analyzed within the EIS.

Male Voice: But you just said that you're developing a whole new preferred alternative. Alternative --

Female Voice: Right.

Male Voice: -- 2 is out.

Female Voice: No. We've never --

Female Voice: This is just an example.

Female Voice: -- identified a preferred alternative within our previous document.

Male Voice: Well, because it's called proposed action.

Female Voice: All we had before is a proposed action.

Male Voice: Which is --

[Overlapping Voices]

Female Voice: Within the final environmental impact statement right now, what we have sort of sketched out that we view will be in the final environmental impact statement will be a preferred alternative, and then you'll see alternative 1, 2, 2A, 3, and 4.

Male Voice: But these -- this is something different.

Female Voice: This is within --

Male Voice: But you couldn't have a preferred alternative which is 2AC. This --

Female Voice: Could be.

[Overlapping Voices]

Female Voice: It'll be called the preferred alternative.

Male Voice: Yeah. Okay.

Male Voice: Well, it seems to me you should have a public-comment period on that, then, if you're developing something new, which you are.

Female Voice: Well, that's the process that we're in right now.

Male Voice: Is the public allowed to prefer -- to propose other alternatives?

Male Voice: Well, the public hasn't seen this.

Female Voice: The public has always been allowed to propose other alternatives --

Male Voice: [unintelligible]

Female Voice: -- and the public will see it next week.

Male Voice: Yes. We proposed alternative 3, not knowing the possibility of site 2A would be available, because we were responding basically to an RFP. I'm wondering if this time you would not entertain an alternative 3A, which would be a positioning of the structure or something similar to it for a history center in the infantry terrace U. And I have [unintelligible] --

Male Voice: But let's stay with this --

Male Voice: No. I had -- I have a total different proposal that I would make.

[Overlapping Voices]

Male Voice: I'm wanting her to respond to my question.

Male Voice: All right.

Female Voice: Well, I mean, in a way, I think you're confusing the RFP process with the NIPA process. Right now, we have identified a set of

proposals that the Trust is analyzing and then is analyzing alternatives to those different proposals.

Male Voice: And one of them is alternative 3.

Female Voice: One of them is alternative 3. That is correct.

Male Voice: So now that CAMP is not to be going -- appears not to be going to site 2 -- [unintelligible] 2A, but you wrote 2A into your plan without inserting a 3A.

Female Voice: Well --

Male Voice: [unintelligible]

Female Voice: -- all of those are alternatives. See, the proposed action is to put something on this particular site. That's the proposed action. All the rest of them are alternatives of that proposed action. In a way, you could say 2A is an alternative to 3. I mean, there's no really no difference between them. You could also put --

Male Voice: Well, it's a different structure [unintelligible] different purpose.

Female Voice: -- a history museum on the 2A site. It --

Male Voice: Function is separate from form.

Female Voice: -- doesn't really matter as far as the NIPA analysis is concerned.

Male Voice: But are you going to change your designation of proposed action?

Female Voice: We are going to change it to just basically say we have a preferred alternative, and then we're going to have alternative 1, 2, 2A, 3, and 4.

Female Voice: [unintelligible]

Male Voice: So the proposed action will be just ignored.

Female Voice: It'll just be called -- it'll be called alternative 2 and alternative 2A. It'll no longer be called proposed action. All we'll have instead -- or what we'll have, you know, that is what the Trust would envision adopting in a record of decision is the preferred alternative.

Male Voice: I think you need to give a comment period to the public when you make a change of that magnitude. Think about it.

Female Voice: Okay.

Male Voice: Okay. I -- back to what I was trying to say. I thought [Clint] was proposing an alternative that needed to be discussed and needed to be in public exposure. I have one that I could produce that would be an alternative to the do nothing, with some modifications. And

when is it appropriate for me to tell you about that and possibly have those considered?

Female Voice: You would have to submit that as part of the comments on the draft SEIS.

Male Voice: Okay. I had wanted to do it prior to now -- to this point, but have not been -- and it sounds like it's still not quite --

[Overlapping Voices]

Female Voice: This is the time. It's the time during the comment period on the SEIS -- is -- you know, have we analyzed a reasonable range of alternatives.

Male Voice: Okay.

Michael Boland: All right?

Female Voice: Okay.

Female Voice: Back to you.

Male Voice: Back to you.

Michael Boland: So back on our matrix here. Let's come down to open -- maintains open south end of parade.

Male Voice: Which column are we in?

Michael Boland: We are in -- still in the concept A, concept B, concept C, those three columns.

Male Voice: Okay.

Michael Boland: And we're working our way down, down near the bottom.

Maintain open south end of parade. Again, assuming that any construction that's envisioned in concept C is within the parameters of the conforming building that we described already, which we'd assumed, by the way, in concept C -- that this would maintain the open character of this site that formerly existed in the open south end of the parade.

Is it compatible scale? Now, this is one of those examples where the feeling of the group was that the position of the mass actually makes a difference, that a scheme like this, where the mass of the building is broken into smaller buildings, helps break up that mass and makes the buildings of compatible scale. Similarly, sliding the bulk of the square footage over to the side, as in concept A, because it pulls it out of the central view, would tend to mitigate for scale as well -- but that the concept B, where the mass of the building is located in the center of the site -- that it would be very difficult for a building of this size located in that location to be [conformic], just

by virtue of the fact that it's so large and it's centered on that open space.

Male Voice: Could you just tell me what one of these standards you're now --

[Overlapping Voices]

Male Voice: Two?

Michael Boland: Yeah. So these all rip up. So this is about, you know, kind of landscape scale, maintaining the landscape-scale character.

Jason Wright: So can I ask a question?

Michael Boland: Sure.

Jason Wright: You keep using the word mitigate when you're saying that the mass there would be different -- or the impact would be different if it's all pushed together, this and that. The process is not talking about mitigation. Right?

Michael Boland: Right.

Jason Wright: I mean, that's [unintelligible] --

Michael Boland: Except it's little m mitigate, not big m mitigate.

Jason Wright: Okay.

Michael Boland: Okay.

Jason Wright: Just making sure.

Michael Boland: You know, the rest of us use mitigate --

Female Voice: Willy-nilly.

Michael Boland: -- [unintelligible] --

[Laughter and Overlapping Voices]

Michael Boland: I don't mitigate like that kind of mitigate.

Male Voice: Okay.

Michael Boland: I mean mitigate.

Male Voice: Okay.

Michael Boland: I'll try to avoid the word mitigate.

Female Voice: Or minimize its use.

Michael Boland: Or minimize. Maybe I'll use -- I can't use avoid either, I know, so I'll avoid all three of those words. Oh, there's avoid. Okay.

So anyway, if we turn -- ask you to turn to the next page. The last -- again, this is where this issue of seriality comes into play. And there was a strong sense that a building of this scale -- that again, breaking this up into a series of small buildings -- that these buildings would want to have some relationship to each other, that it would be advisable. And so you would think about them as an ensemble, and you might want them to have some qualities, whether it's building mass or form, that repeats. So the seriality's important. And whether that is true of it -- that's inherent in this scheme, we think.

I think it's also possible -- we had a lively discussion about the idea of locating the building over in this site and taking that large -- fairly large form and breaking it up into a series of masses that would read almost as an extension of that line, and that you would pull it over -- mass there, and that that would help mitigate for that. So you see that here, because you have this large mass of building. It's broken into small and repeating masses and forms.

So avoid creating a false sense of historical development. The feeling of the group was that, though this has been an open site -- that by moving this square footage up here rather than having the bulk of it down here, that we're, again, not creating that strong southern end to the parade ground, which is really the most

important thing that we thought was important to avoid in this area.
So moving the building up here --

Male Voice: To avoid creating --

Michael Boland: To avoid creating that strong -- a strong southern edge to the parade ground, and that by moving the building up here, we avoid that. So we are -- the sense of the group was that all three of these schemes are consistent with that thinking. They avoid creating a false sense of historical development.

Protect archaeology. As I mentioned, we laid these out so that they would avoid the zone -- I forget the number, Eric -- of this site, the archaeology zone that extends out under --

Eric Blind: That's --

Michael Boland: -- the library.

Eric Blind: -- [unintelligible].

Michael Boland: Yeah. Oh, that's F1. Right. So it would avoid F1. The idea was to slide the development over to the west side of the site to avoid that.

And then in terms of some of the features, just a little bit about that. There was a lot of discussion about the interaction of scale and the interaction of this location, and how the location, to some extent,

mitigates for some of these -- but to the idea, for example -- the extent to which parts of the building, whether it's this or whether it's this, are located in the view shed and can be seen in direct relationship to these buildings here -- these compatibility features become important, that they become more important if the building had a compatible scale. Did it have compatible materials and color and texture, compatible building height, et cetera? And we tried to walk through each of these and talk about the differences.

But I would say, generally, the largest concern that was expressed by the group had to do with the way you would treat a large mass that was located in the center of the site -- a real feeling that because of the visibility of that, that it would have to be more compatible, that it would be important that the building -- a building located in this site would have a compatible roof type, compatible architectural features, be built in compatible materials, because it would be so --

Male Voice: But they all have to be compatible, so now you have a relative ranking of compatibility?

Michael Boland: Well --

Male Voice: This needs to be super compatible?

Michael Boland: Well, no. There's -- I think -- you know, Craig talked about it earlier, that there's this relationship between scale and the extent to

which the building needs to more accurately reflect the historic character of the surrounding architecture. So it's a larger building. It means that it needs to be more compatible in terms of its porch and --

Male Voice: Super compatible.

Michael Boland: -- things like that. Yeah. So there is a hierarchy. Whereas if it's a smaller building, because it's a smaller building, there's a sense that it needn't incorporate as many of those compatible features.

Male Voice: Quick question. The larger building, Mike -- was it anticipated that the bowling alley would stay in that site, or another -- on the -- this side of Moraga?

Michael Boland: That it would stay here --

Male Voice: Yeah.

Michael Boland: -- under this scenario? No. We removed the bowling alley in this scenario.

Male Voice: So then the new structure does have a monumental presence over the --

Michael Boland: If it is here. That's right. And so that was the concern that was expressed in that discussion, and where the idea of breaking the

building the apart and where the idea of moving the mass to the side came from.

Male Voice: But you minus some square footage too. Right?

Michael Boland: Well, now I am in this diagram. Yeah. I'm mixing up by blocks.

Male Voice: I mean, it just -- shrinking and -- but, you know, it seems like there was a piece missing.

Michael Boland: I'll put it back here.

Male Voice: No. It's all right.

[Laughter]

Male Voice: It's just -- I'm just trying to watch the [unintelligible] --

Michael Boland: You want it to be 100,000 square feet. I --

Male Voice: We want it to be 40,000 square --

Female Voice: Could you put a larger structure underground and have it be more compatible, such that it looked less like a building and more like a landform?

Michael Boland: To the extent that it avoided archaeology, that it would be --

Female Voice: Yeah. That's the problem.

Michael Boland: Yeah. But no. Indeed. And in fact, that's --

Male Voice: But that might be more of an issue --

Michael Boland: In this area.

Male Voice: Back --

Female Voice: Yeah. Further back.

Michael Boland: Well, in fact --

Female Voice: That's what I kept thinking when we -- when I was thinking about [unintelligible] --

Michael Boland: Yeah.

Female Voice: Very discrete.

Michael Boland: Yeah. And I -- you know, Eric's analysis has given us really good information about fill and, you know, how far down you could go to reach sensitive -- potential sensitive -- prehistoric archaeology that would be in the bottom of the site and suggest places where putting the building underground is more feasible --

Female Voice: It's probably still a bit of a risk. Sorry. Go back to --

Male Voice: Quickly, while you're --

Michael Boland: Yep.

Male Voice: -- moving through your -- like the entire form would have to fit into this -- to the ridge of the roof?

Michael Boland: That was --

Male Voice: We're not talking center of roofline --

Michael Boland: No. This is the --

Male Voice: -- height any more.

Michael Boland: Yeah. No. This is -- the entire structure would fit in that little block. Yeah. And that, by the way, is the intention with all these, that --

Male Voice: Yeah.

Michael Boland: -- the building mass fits in these --

Male Voice: Because before when we were talking, we were saying like mid height of the roof is --

Michael Boland: Yeah.

Female Voice: Average --

Michael Boland: Yeah. No. We're shifting to, in some cases, absolute heights at the highest point, and to elevations, just so it's, you know, x -- 145 feet above sea level, so it's easier to relate these disparate things, because the topography's so confusing.

Male Voice: Well, on top of that, some of the earlier plans were to raise the earth on which the building was built, which -- you know, you can have 30 feet of earth and 30 feet of building, and you've got 60 feet.

Male Voice: Yeah.

Male Voice: And so you're saying you're sticking with existing -- your 30-foot limit is based on existing landscape.

Michael Boland: That's right. And that's --

Male Voice: Okay.

Michael Boland: -- the height to the top of --

Male Voice: The top of the ridge.

Michael Boland: Yeah. The top of the ridge of the bowling alley.

Male Voice: Okay. Thank you.

Michael Boland: Which aligns with the eave of the theater, just to put those in context. Again, we -- we're trying to use elevations. They're a much more concrete way of -- elevations above sea level are a much more concrete way --

Male Voice: Well, that's good.

Michael Boland: Yeah. Concrete way of talking about heights.

Male Voice: Talking about concrete.

Michael Boland: We haven't considered sea-level rise in this document.

[Laughter]

Michael Boland: There's a disclaimer. You know, the time frame of those NIPA documents are not quite that long, so --

If I could ask everyone to actually turn to the last page. Why don't we stick on CAMP while we're talking about CAMP, and then we'll come back to the lodge. If I could ask everyone to turn -- there's a -- you have a page that looks like this that has only three white

columns. If you sort through the document, it's the next page. There you go.

Male Voice: It says lodge. Is that --

Michael Boland: Last -- yes. It says lodge. But the last one is conforming-structure commissary site.

Male Voice: Yeah.

Michael Boland: So why don't we talk about the commissary for -- I'm sorry that the commissary does not appear on this model, but we actually went down to the site, and we did this analysis onsite looking at the existing commissary, and we walked through Crissy Field as well.

Male Voice: We can visualize it.

Michael Boland: I know you know it well. You can refer to the map up there, the area.

Did you not get it? I'm sorry. Which --

Female Voice: It's this page here. It's --

Michael Boland: This page.

[Overlapping Voices]

Michael Boland: Yeah. It's the last column. I'm sorry. That -- they don't all fit on one
--

Male Voice: That's all right.

Michael Boland: Okay. Conforming structure of commissary. I'll just quickly run through this. Yes -- and we looked at this two ways in our discussion. We looked at it -- either, you know, reuse of the existing building or the reconstruction of something at the current building site. So we looked at it both ways in our thinking about this.

Male Voice: Okay. Because -- even though the EIS does not look at it both ways.

Michael Boland: We thought it was important to ask ourselves the question, you know, what are the implications of -- you know, because the --

Male Voice: Good.

Michael Boland: -- distance between rehabilitation and complete reconstruction -- there are a lot of things that are between -- you save the foundation with three walls -- you know, I mean, there are a lot of different ways to [unintelligible] --

Male Voice: I think you need to make that clearer in your [unintelligible] --

Male Voice: Sort of narrowing the NIPA document to define it as a reuse of the building only [unintelligible] --

[Overlapping Voices]

Female Voice: That's the PTMP alternative.

Michael Boland: Yeah. So that's what PTMP said.

Female Voice: PTMP said that, that it was reuse --

Michael Boland: Reuse the building --

Female Voice: Are we stuck with it?

Male Voice: We wouldn't object to tearing it down --

Male Voice: I'm glad you're opening it up --

Michael Boland: Again, this -- for this -- the purposes of this undertaking, we looked at it in both ways.

Male Voice: Okay.

Male Voice: Good.

Michael Boland: Okay. So the reuse of that site or the reuse of that building avoids the need to remove historic structures. Yes. It maintain -- would maintain an orthogonal relationship to Mason Street. Bear in mind that buildings down there have a different relationship. They tend to run east-west rather than north-south, so for example, this north-south orientation doesn't really apply to Crissy Field.

Male Voice: By orthogonal, we mean basically right angles?

Michael Boland: Yeah. Which is -- has historically been true of almost, again, all the building -- in fact, all the buildings, because even the ones at the far end have an orthogonal relationship to the portion of Mason Street and the airfield that they're immediately adjacent to -- that it would maintain historic roadways and historic open spaces. The commissary site is a site that historically had another series of sets of buildings on it, and they were demolished by the army that built the commissary.

Redmond Kernan: I mean, you're doing -- peculiar thing of saying maintain north-south orientation. It doesn't apply, but it is north-south. Right?

Michael Boland: Yeah, it is, actually, as a matter of fact.

Redmond Kernan: So --

Michael Boland: It's a square. Yeah. So it's a good point.

Redmond Kernan: If it was important to you, I'd say yeah.

Michael Boland: Yeah. Well, I think probably the word that's the problem there is no.
I mean --

Redmond Kernan: Yeah.

Michael Boland: -- you know, it really is -- you know, this one --

Redmond Kernan: Well, it seems to --

Michael Boland: -- sort of like doesn't apply.

Redmond Kernan: It seems to -- okay.

Michael Boland: Yeah. I mean, our attempt is not [unintelligible]. It was actually --

Redmond Kernan: So it's really an n/a.

Michael Boland: It's really an n/a.

Redmond Kernan: Okay. I mean, one day they're going to be added up, and they'll get
a report card, so --

[Laughter]

Michael Boland: Well, and then we'll have to get into a whole discussion about waiting and the relative --

Male Voice: Yeah.

Male Voice: Then we'll have to --

Michael Boland: Look forward to that.

Male Voice: -- get our teeth done.

Michael Boland: I'll look forward to that. Then we'll have to all go get our teeth done. That's right.

Maintain historic roadways, open spaces, maintain significant views. We noted that it was important -- in our discussion that it's important that it not -- that if the building is rebuilt there, say, and we don't use the commissary, that it not be so tall that it obscure views from the Main Post block out to Crissy Field. And you'll see that comes up a little later in our discussion --

Male Voice: But that's a pretty big building that would do that.

Michael Boland: Yeah. It would be large.

Male Voice: 70 feet tall or something?

Male Voice: Yeah. The bad thing about the commissary itself is the high end of it was put along Mason Street for truck delivery, so it's got the extra high bays, none of which is necessary. And you probably want to do something --

Male Voice: It's got that funny little hat [unintelligible].

Male Voice: Yeah.

Michael Boland: Historic open spaces, maintain views. We talked about that. South end of parade. Here's an n/a.

Is it compatible scale? Maintain a compatible scale with the Crissy Field context. There's quite a variety in terms of the scale of buildings. Obviously, there's -- a building of this size is there already. So the sense was that, because of this variety -- that this site -- this location offers greater flexibility. Again, whether we reuse existing building or we build a new building --

Male Voice: I probably wouldn't word it that way. It's not a -- it's not compatible with anything else down there. It's much bigger. But it is existing, and therefore, I think I would value it on that element rather than it being compatible with the surroundings.

Michael Boland: Yeah. I think the sense was that it is part of the context. The existing building is part of the context. And so therefore, you know, the building is --

Male Voice: The building's compatible with itself.

Michael Boland: Well, the building is part of its context. And therefore --

Male Voice: Okay. I would word it differently --

Michael Boland: So yeah. Okay. That's --

Seriality, repetition of forms. Again, you know, the sense was that if you were starting over and rebuilding something on that site, that you might want to break the mass of the building down, because it's still a larger building -- break it down in such a way that there was a repetition of form and seriality, so that it read as an ensemble of buildings rather than one building on that site.

Male Voice: And I don't know if I'd agree with that. I think it can be read as one building, but having stronger elements. You could have an entrance statement. You could have a reroof. You could have -- but -- anyway, I think it could be done in a way that makes it work on that location.

Michael Boland: Without it being -- the mass being broken up into a series of --

Male Voice: Rather than to pretend that it's a series of small structures, because -

-

Michael Boland: No. I think you're right.

Male Voice: -- I think you're straining too hard to do that.

Michael Boland: Avoid creating -- on the next page, avoid creating a false sense of historical development.

Male Voice: No problem. I mean, you couldn't --

Michael Boland: Yeah. I think we could probably do that.

Protect archaeological resources. We had quite a bit of discussion about P1, which is this, you know, [AKAS of harsecks] -- we all know on the back side of the --

Male Voice: I'm sorry. What is it?

Michael Boland: P1 is the -- a burial site that's on the back side --

Male Voice: Oh, I see.

Michael Boland: It's on the map.

Male Voice: Yeah. Okay. I'm with you.

Michael Boland: P1. It's shown as P1. And you can see -- there are actually two sites. There's P1 and P2. P1 is AKAS of Harsecks, and then P1 is -- the

margin of the marsh is sort of how I think of it, the edge of the former marsh, which -- there's always a risk of encountering a prehistoric site, like we did when we were building the marsh at Crissy along the margin of the -- of a former marsh. So that's what P2 is.

Male Voice: P2 is built over today. Right?

Michael Boland: Oh, yeah. Both of these sites are built over today. I mean --

Male Voice: Both of them. Okay.

Michael Boland: Well, I mean, you know, P1 has a parking lot and three little structures and --

Male Voice: Oh, yeah. But, I mean --

Michael Boland: It doesn't have a concept.

Male Voice: I wouldn't call it built over.

Michael Boland: But -- you know, but the point is that, you know, we felt it important to acknowledge that there are some limitations on ground penetration there that could or could not occur in the commissary, because we're a little fuzzy about the margins of P1 and --

Male Voice: Okay.

Michael Boland: -- how close it comes to the building. So we thought it important to acknowledge that.

Nine, compatible scale and proportion. Again, there's a sense the building's already there and that those buildings have a fairly industrial scale. And so the reuse of the building or building in that location could be compatibly scaled.

Compatible materials, color, and texture. We talked a lot about the kind of building types and the character in buildings. And there's the sense that you have added to your kit parts, if you will, down in Crissy Field -- the added opportunity to evoke a more industrial kind of building character, because they're industrial buildings down there as well, warehouses and such -- maybe warehouses, I should talk about. But -- as opposed to the Main Post, where there -- you know, there's a -- that's not really prevalent in the Main Post. And so the idea is that you have this other aesthetic that one could reference in your work.

Again, building height. We talked about building height. We'd want it to be restricted to lower than the height of the bluff, maintain that view down to Crissy. We thought it was very easy for the building to have compatible features with the Crissy Field context. We thought it important to note that it should, but also acknowledge that the location has greater flexibility in terms of compatibility.

You know, there isn't a consistent series of features that you find on all the buildings at Crissy Field.

Gary Widman: The only feature at Crissy Field is grass, so if you put on the grass on the roof --

Michael Boland: Well, you know, looking at all the building -- you know, some have --

Gary Widman: I know. I'm just being --

Michael Boland: -- [unintelligible]. Some have black roofs. Some have -- you know, different --

Male Voice: You're not talking about Crissy Field itself. You're talking about all of them.

Michael Boland: Yeah.

Male Voice: You're going to build a contemporary-art facility. I don't think it has to have -- mimic or care about the industrial element of Crissy. It can just say, "We're somebody different."

Michael Boland: Well, I -- again, I --

Male Voice: As it does today.

Michael Boland: Yeah. I think, again, that we were trying to acknowledge that there's this other kind of kit of parts, if you will, set of tools you can use having to do with the kind of industrial aesthetic that's down there.

Male Voice: Well --

Michael Boland: But yeah. I mean, that doesn't mean that one couldn't --

Male Voice: At Mission Rock, they made the new developer there use a wrinkled-tin building in his construction, and now they're busy tearing down --

Male Voice: The old wrinkled --

Male Voice: -- buildings that are around there.

Michael Boland: You get a big stack of that asbestos siding and reuse that over again.

Male Voice: Yeah.

Michael Boland: And then compatible roof type. Again, greater flexibility in terms of the variety of roof types to choose. So that was our thinking about the commissary.

Male Voice: Well, I don't think we have much [unintelligible] commissary discussion, but let's go to the lodge --

Jason Wright: Can I just -- can I add something --

Michael Boland: Sure.

Jason Wright: -- that -- I think that might be useful to think of when continuing to review this in the review is that, in the same way kind of that you proposed the angles for the view sheds from up above down, especially when thinking about these sites and the lodge, that maybe it would do this when you're looking over the bluff and maybe the building has to fit into that view shed --

Male Voice: Kind of the cone, two-dimensional cone.

Michael Boland: Yeah. That's a good idea.

Male Voice: [unintelligible]

Michael Boland: All right. So let's turn our attention to the lodge. Do a brief construction project, demolish building 34, and build a lodge. So we began our discussion -- here we go -- with a lodge and attempted to ask ourselves how one might modify the current proposal to bring it into greater conformance with the secretary standards. And let me run through that.

Male Voice: And what would sort of be the room production and square footage of it?

Michael Boland: You know, I can't speak to the room production, actually, or -- I mean, and square footage is a little bit difficult, because it depends on how many stories you fit into the available --

Male Voice: Okay. I just --

Michael Boland: -- space and all that stuff. But --

Male Voice: Compare the changes with what was proposed --

Michael Boland: Yeah. Well, I'll walk through those, actually, just kind of issue by issue.

Male Voice: Okay.

Michael Boland: Why don't we talk [unintelligible], because there are a bunch of different modifications. So -- okay. So we turn to conforming lodge.

Number one, does it avoid the removal of historic structures? Yes, it does. Have and maintain an orthogonal orientation to the Main Post. Yes, it would. Maintain -- and some of these things are true -- and some of these early things are pretty much true of the current proposal as well. Maintain a north-south orientation. Yes. Maintains historic roadways. Yes. It avoids Anza, and it avoids Graham Street, the historic roadways in this [unintelligible].

Maintain historic open spaces. We had quite a bit of discussion about this. It does avoid putting construction in areas that were open spaces, the main parade, the El Presidio, the old parade. And we talked quite a bit about the east-west circulation. And this was an important thing. And that's something that you see -- you see this isn't drawn as one building. It's drawn as a series of masses --

Gary Widman: I must say, I don't see how you can possibly come to the conclusion you have there with structures like that. I mean, it does not maintain the situation as it existed at the time of the landmark, which is what we were talking about on everything else. You've got four enormous buildings that do define a boundary between the main parade and the old parade. How can you say that it maintains the circulation?

Michael Boland: That --

Gary Widman: It blocks it almost completely.

Male Voice: Where's the circulation?

Gary Widman: Well, Gary, the --

Male Voice: Right here.

Male Voice: Oh.

Michael Boland: I can merely communicate what the consensus of the group was, but let me try to take it apart. First of all, the point you're raising is addressed in a number of different places in the matrix, and I'll try to elevate those. This is simply asking the question of are we putting buildings in a place that, during the period of significance, was an open space. And this was not an open space. This site was full of buildings. And so --

Male Voice: No. I'm sorry. We were just, earlier, discussing the fact that we use zero as a -- as Lucia mentioned, as of the time the landmark was established.

Michael Boland: That was in discussion of views.

Male Voice: There is only one building in there now. It's the building that we're sitting in.

Michael Boland: That was in the context of view discussion.

Male Voice: Pardon?

Michael Boland: The point that -- that was -- we were talking about views.

Female Voice: Oh. Actually, it wasn't the way I was meaning to ask it, so --

Michael Boland: Okay. Well, I understand that to be --

Female Voice: [unintelligible]

Male Voice: -- and I think Craig did too -- a discussion about views. We were talking about views.

Male Voice: Yeah. That's what I was thinking about.

Female Voice: Sorry.

Male Voice: Okay. Well, you cut off the views too, so --

Michael Boland: Well, we'll come back to views.

Male Voice: Okay.

Michael Boland: This is -- this item is maintain historic open spaces. It's --

Male Voice: Okay.

Michael Boland: -- one aspect of --

Male Voice: Okay. Well, you know, put me on record --

Male Voice: [unintelligible]

Male Voice: -- as saying that this is not -- I don't feel like that's an accurate statement.

Male Voice: So do --

Male Voice: [unintelligible] -- significance and time that the nomination was updated are different -- two different things.

Michael Boland: And again, the important caveat to that was the group felt that it was important that, as historically there's -- there was an ensemble of buildings and that it was possible to move through those buildings from east to west -- that this building would want to maintain that ability to move from east to west. And so you see it's broken apart here in a series of volumes.

Male Voice: Okay. This was --

Boyd de Larios: It -- you have -- you're replacing supposedly historic buildings with a different form of building. It is not going to resemble those buildings. And -- but your only justification is that there's something that existed there previously. Am I correct?

Michael Boland: That is -- first of all, I'm not talking about justifications. I'm merely explaining the rationale for why we located new architecture in that location as opposed to in the middle of the old parade, which has historically been an open space, the main parade, which has historically been an open space. This is a site that [unintelligible] it still is not an open space. It's a site where there has been architecture.

So I think the important thing to bear in mind is that in section two, we're not talking about buildings so much as we're talking about the landscape and the role the buildings play in defining the open spaces of the Main Post --

[Overlapping Voices]

Boyd de Larios: That was what my -- was trying to do earlier is try and understand what you guys were thinking. Now, I applaud the fact that you are looking at the guidelines, and you seem to have adopted the language. But in this one, it doesn't -- it's bouncing. It's not making sense. Because you -- what you have -- you're appealing to a period of historical significance which is 231 years. Now, you say that there was something there during the period of -- but not for 231 years.

Michael Boland: [unintelligible]

Boyd de Larios: Okay. So what part of this -- of the --

Michael Boland: There was nothing --

Boyd de Larios: -- period of historical significance are we talking about? And that's what -- the question was raised earlier. And I -- it needs to be settled at some point. It's like what is your rationale for determining where something will be? Is it the cutoff of the National Historic

Landmark District? What -- the creation -- at that point, there was nothing there. So how do you justify -- or what is your thinking that says because there was a building here once, I can put something else here?

Michael Boland: That is not the justification --

Boyd de Larios: Okay.

Michael Boland: The only justification that I've articulated -- this -- again, this is a landscape-scale section, section 2, standard two. And so what we have done in section 2 is we've gone through, we've looked at the cultural landscape, we've looked at the evolution of the Post, we've defined what historically significant open spaces are, we've defined locations where there were formerly development.

For example, we've talked quite a bit about this section. There's been a lot to talk about. You know, this is a site that has had, historically, an open character, but it's had buildings on it, for example. This is a site that was built and that those -- that built edge, if you will, defined and framed the old parade and the main parade.

Male Voice: But --

Michael Boland: And so, you know, it -- we are not reconstructing the ensemble of buildings that lived here historically, which again, I think is

contrary -- clearly contrary to the secretary standards. But there -- you know, this idea that you put new construction in a location where buildings formerly existed -- so, you know -- and use that new construction to reestablishing missing historic character in the landscape is a valid use of the secretary standards, a valid application.

Male Voice: Let me tell you --

Female Voice: [unintelligible]

Michael Boland: I think we just disagree. I mean, I --

Male Voice: Right.

Michael Boland: We talked about this before. So I'm happy to move on, and we can -
-

[Overlapping Voices]

Redmond Kernan: Well, I would just like to make a couple of points with it, because we do over and over -- at one time, there was a smaller set of scattered buildings, which were much lesser footprints and dominance. And when they were there, mostly, these building -- 38, 39, and so on, weren't there. And so these now have a powerful presence in terms of an east-west view. And to then say, "Well, and that was the old parade" -- and so to then say, "Well, okay, that got

done" -- but they never put this back, because, you know, they -- these were powerful. And so I think then to say, "Okay, now we're going to go back to an earlier time and put in a size that wasn't there" -- and it -- I -- what bothers me is that, as you look at any angle, it looks like a continuity of structure, and you call it a structure. And yet, you want to turn it into multiple structures, so it isn't a structure. And yet, it unfortunately reads like one. So that bothers me.

And you have maintain historic open space, and then below that, maintain significant view. No, it didn't. And I think one of the view discussions for the north-south -- but there wasn't much of the east-west. And it's a -- not a view of east-west, but it's a permeable feeling that the Main Post has east and west. So rather than say there's this powerful corridor, which the main parade is, it's keeping the permeability. And it's a subjective judgment about how much. And in the background, behind these, are those powerful 38, 39. So I hear your words, but it ends up looking like it just went on for too long, you know.

Michael Boland: And I agree, Rhett. And, in fact, this whole issue of permeability and the idea that, you know, if one was going to break the mass apart, that you would break it apart into four structures rather than one, and you would make this -- maintain this permeability, visibility that goes through the buildings -- I think you're right. That's important. And we tried to reflect that idea.

Redmon Kernan: And it probably -- I think it's too much in that location, and maybe guidance is to go back and look what used to be there. But if I were to put in that much, I wouldn't have it be a repetitious -- because it then seems to create a statement that's subservient to this, perhaps, but also dealing with the powerful expression there and here and sort of competing with that when there's nothing there. So anyway, that's my little speech on it. And I haven't found, in my head, a solution that works, except to -- you know, pick up a mountain and it works fine --

[Laughter]

Redmon Kernan: -- or put the lodging over here where you have some empty buildings. So -- but it's a very difficult, you know, effort to try to do that.

I would almost, as I think I told you once, add something to the back side of this and get rid of some of this up here, because this has a blank wall essentially looking at the main parade and the main parade looking at that. So you could have sort of a presence along its side, since it's already causing a blocking. So --

Male Voice: Turn that into the hotel --

Redmon Kernan: With all that said, I don't know how it fits in the boxes, but it -- I don't think it's there yet.

Male Voice: We haven't heard at all. What's your reaction to the one-down one-up case? I mean, why is any of this legal at all, if you've -- particularly this, in view of the one-down one-up? Tell me. I can see you're about to tell me. I'd like to hear it.

Female Voice: I would just let you know that this exercise is an NHPA exercise, obviously, and it was done in that particular context. And we didn't ask anybody to interpret the Trust act when they did this particular exercise, so -- but our answer to that, I think, is in the draft SEIS, you know --

Male Voice: What do you mean?

Female Voice: The answer to the question of whether or not we think it is a one-up one-down equation -- and our answer is no, we don't think it is.

Male Voice: Can you tell me why?

Female Voice: Of course. We think it isn't because of how, you know, this act has been interpreted in the past, and we're interpreting it in a similar way.

Male Voice: But the way it's been interpreted in the past is directly contrary to -- I mean, the one court interpretation says you've got to live with the rule, so --

Female Voice: Well, I mean, I think --

Female Voice: I honestly don't think this is the place --

[Overlapping Voices]

Gary Widman: I mean, I know this is all hypothetical, but it seems to me -- you know, people are -- you're spending money and time on this. And if none of this is legal in the first place, why?

Andrea Andersen: Well, obviously we think it is.

Gary Widman: Well, I know, but I'd like to know why. If there is such a reason, I'd love to know what it is.

Andrea Andersen: We have a response to the comment in the draft EIS that's out. There --

Gary Widman: There is no comment in the draft EIS that says --

Female Voice: [unintelligible]

Gary Widman: -- why --

Andrea Andersen: Yes, there is. There is a response to this comment in the EIS that's circulating.

Gary Widman: Okay. Would you give me the page of that?

Andrea Andersen: [unintelligible]. Sure.

Gary Widman: I'd be happy to read it.

Male Voice: Okay.

Male Voice: Is there --

Female Voice: Is he done yet?

Male Voice: No. I -- if it's a question about this, keep firing them at me. Okay?

Male Voice: The archaeology of El Presidio -- is it known how far it extends to the north?

Eric Blind: Me?

Male Voice: Eric --

Male Voice: Talk to us.

Male Voice: -- you're the expert. Talk to us about the schmear.

Eric Blind: We're -- we did a limited testing in the lodge site, on the southern end of it --

Female Voice: [unintelligible]

Male Voice: This side?

Female Voice: Mm-hmm.

Eric Blind: -- just up here, [unintelligible]. And in that testing, we came up with a couple of colonial-period artifacts. It's not clear whether any of those artifacts have any integrity, in so far as integrity for archaeology is are they in somewhat of a state that they were left in by the people we're studying, or are they in a state that they were left in by the bulldozer that put them there. So because the -- this was a site that was built on by the buildings the lodge is meant to mimic, the Civil War-era barracks -- those seem to have integrity. We have a couple artifacts from El Presidio.

Male Voice: So --

Eric Blind: My guess right now is that El Presidio will probably -- its integrity as far as like bounded site probably ends around where the powder magazine is and the southern end of building 39.

Male Voice: So it would extend a little bit further north than is shown on the character-define -- on the predicted archaeological features map that we have.

Eric Blind: Yeah. So for that -- this one -- once again, very -- this is predictive. For those areas that we're talking about, it's fairly accurate. You know, Presidio -- don't know -- the El Presidio F1 site that we'll be drawing for the 2008 update will extend considerably to the east [unintelligible]. That was not known at the time, in 1993. And it'll move a little bit to the north, but like I said, probably about to the extent of the powder magazine and not much further north than that.

Female Voice: The very first archaeological dig that was done in the parking lot discovered footings that align with the powder magazine, a pair of them exactly aligning with the entrance to building 39.

Eric Blind: Correct.

Female Voice: And if that was a structure -- and it's apparently an adobe structure - - then you'd think there would be schmear to the north of it too.

Eric Blind: That's true. The architecture kind of forms a nice, neat, bounded site for El Presidio, the fortification. But what happens outside the walls is really hard to define within a boundary. It's not like the colonists stayed within the walls and they didn't make a mess outside or had some impact on the landscape.

Male Voice: Or lived outside.

Eric Blind: Or lived outside.

Male Voice: It's pretty standard Presidio practice to have buildings -- to have people living outside. And so --

Eric Blind: Like [unintelligible] spring.

Male Voice: Correct.

[Overlapping Voices]

Male Voice: So anyway -- so you talked about boundaries here. But, you know, that's the Presidio internal. Though there was a life outside of the boundaries --

Eric Blind: [unintelligible]

Male Voice: I understand. You're being somewhat cautious, and I'm being less cautious. I think there's -- is there any expectation that that would not be a very rich site there? Why would it not be very rich in archaeology?

Eric Blind: The site for the lodge?

Male Voice: Right.

Eric Blind: Because we haven't found much evidence that would indicate it's rich. We put in, you know, limited -- but backhoe trenches in this little [Canyon Lawn] area.

Male Voice: Okay.

Eric Blind: Like I said, we came up with, I think, two colonial-period ceramics out of, you know, a decent value of dirt that we went through. We found much more American-period stuff related to the Civil War barracks. So that's the only reason I would say that we're not expecting a lot is because we haven't found a lot yet.

Male Voice: Okay.

Eric Blind: There could still be some if we dig a little deeper, or we could have just plain missed it.

Male Voice: Okay. So you said there was a larger volume of [unintelligible] artifacts. Is that still a small volume of material, or is -- I mean, we have multiple periods of historic significance here --

Eric Blind: Right.

Male Voice: -- we're looking at. Right? So, you know, is that still not a rich archaeological site?

Eric Blind: No. That's the difference. What we're saying is F9, this kind of Civil War-era barracks -- we found intact features, things that have integrity. We have architectural features as well as kind of trash-pit features that are very rich archaeologically that are in more or less

their original state, as the people who we'd be studying put them there. What we're not quite sure of is the very few ceramics that we have from the colonial period that are in and amongst these American-period features, whether they have any sort of meaning or that's just --

Male Voice: Okay.

Eric Blind: You know, I found colonial ceramics out on the bluff of a bigger beach, but I'm not going to draw El Presidio to incorporate that --

Male Voice: I understand that.

Eric Blind: -- just because the army just moves so much soil around here that you wind up with things well out of place. What we're trying to figure out is how can we bound El Presidio that is still in place -- that we could still say something about the past based on its kind of --

Male Voice: But there is a site under the lodging that has some --

Eric Blind: Yeah.

Male Voice: -- archaeology integrity.

Eric Blind: Yes. Civil War site.

Male Voice: Okay. So it is not [unintelligible].

Eric Blind: No.

Male Voice: We'll get to that.

Eric Blind: We're getting at that.

Michael Boland: We say that on the next page. Where are we?

Male Voice: We're at compatible scale and then seriality.

Michael Boland: Seriality.

Male Voice: And it's -- seriality seems such an invented idea. And it sort of drives, then, well, one, two, three, four --

Female Voice: [unintelligible]

Male Voice: I understand it -- but you want new seriality.

Female Voice: Oh, yeah. Is it creating a false impression of [originalness] to --

Male Voice: I mean, I understand the [Flinston] buildings, the brick barracks, and Infantry Terrace. But I don't know that -- it seems to me defining seriality of a new structure as a good thing sort of drives it into a long design --

Female Voice: Your suggestion is that because -- the seriality is making that too big.

Male Voice: I think it's too big anyway.

Female Voice: And I think the way Michael explained it was that when you have more than one -- let's just assume it's the size that it is -- seriality then becomes an important feature. If it's one structure, then it's not.

Michael Boland: Yeah. I mean, I --

Female Voice: But this is a -- this is being proposed as a, you know, multiple-pavilion structure. So then seriality -- so you don't want all three or four to look completely different.

Michael Boland: Yeah. And I think that the sense -- just to put a little flesh on that, the sense of the group was that seriality is actually one of the most distinctive features of army bases all over the country, that buildings are -- building forms are repeated, and that they exist in ensembles, and that was important, that that's actually as important as having a gable roof. Having a series of repeated forms in the landscape is important. So --

Male Voice: Well, it seems to say four is better than two, and I guess I'd rather have less, so --

Female Voice: I don't think it's saying that.

[Overlapping Voices]

Michael Boland: That's not the implication of it.

Female Voice: Yeah.

Michael Boland: I think the idea is that -- you know, there's a -- you know, the Presidio generally, I mean not just the Main Post -- it really is full of vernacular architecture. I mean, it's an incredible collection of vernacular buildings. And they tend to have repeating forms. They tend to have gable roofs, unless they're post-Second World War. There are certain things that they all have -- you know, Presidio wide, not just the Main Post.

Male Voice: [unintelligible]

Michael Boland: And so that's really where that came from and why it's culled out so distinctively here as an aspect of this place, because I think it's -- it's unique to army bases and not unique to many other landscapes.

Male Voice: Well, but it isn't unique to it now, and therefore, it's introducing seriality in a new construction --

Male Voice: Well, it is, but just not at that location.

Male Voice: It -- no. But this is -- these are --

Male Voice: They're saying that like this has seriality, and those have seriality.

Male Voice: I got -- yeah. I got that.

Michael Boland: Yeah. I think, again, these are -- it's under section 2. They're about the cultural landscape. They're -- you know, they're district-level ideas. They're not buildings -- they're not as building specific. So it's about --

Male Voice: Okay. That said it all.

Michael Boland: -- organizing buildings --

Male Voice: I just --

Michael Boland: But I hear you. I just want to make sure.

Avoid creating a false sense of historical development. Clearly, it would not be old. It would be differentiated from the old. Protect archaeological resources in place. I think Eric talked about that. But F9 -- it clearly impacts F9. There was some discussion about the relative importance of F9 versus F1 and the fact that we have other Civil War-era sites, whereas -- which is what this is trying to get at, that -- relative to F1, that F9 is maybe of lower value because we

have other Civil War sites where we can gather this information.
But nonetheless, it clearly impacts site F1 -- I mean, F9. Sorry. F9.

Then in terms of the building, we talked a bit about some of the compatible features that the building itself should have, that it was important that the lodge width be modulated to exist -- relate to the existing 86 and 87. And that is both in terms of this front piece -- making the distinction between the front and the back so that these read like -- not only do these read like separate buildings, but these read like separate buildings. There used to be a double row of buildings between Anza Street and Graham Street -- and that this building be of a length that's similar to this, so that again, it feels like it's of a compatible scale, consistent scale, that we would want these structures to have the materials, colors, and texture -- Presidio white and red, that the building should not exceed the height of the adjacent Graham Street Barracks, that --

Male Voice: That's 86 and 7 --

Michael Boland: 86 and 87. Yes. Sorry. That the building should have a porch -- we'll call it a porch-like element, also known as a porch -- along the eastern elevation, and relate -- you know, relate to that street in a kind of urban way. The -- it's interesting. The parade grounds had --

Male Voice: Excuse me.

Michael Boland: Okay.

Male Voice: I'll be --

Michael Boland: Half an hour or more.

That these parade grounds had different kinds of characters on their east side and west side, and that this building ensemble had different kinds of feeling on each side. And so this side had a porch. It was the front. And the thought was that it was important that these buildings have a front and that they have a porch-like element on that side, that they have compatible treatment in windows and compatible small-scale architectural details. And that lastly -- it be important that the roof had to be a gabled roof, that gabled roofs are characteristic of most of the architecture in this area and that, ideally, that gable should run north-south.

Male Voice: Except you didn't want too much gable.

Michael Boland: Yeah. On this representation, it's -- there's a gable in the front, and then this is treated more like a kind of large version of this -- of the porch. You know, a lot of these buildings -- I looked it up, but it's attached. You know, that there are -- often, the army would build a building with a gable, and then they'd build an addition, a kind of slightly sloped-roof addition on the front that became an -- architecture. The thought was that one could treat either this as a separate building or treat it as a kind of large porch that's appended

to the back of the building. Again, I'm trying to break up the mass so that it's --

Male Voice: But you were talking about having porches on Graham Street.

Michael Boland: Graham Street. That was about Graham. Well, this is literally a porch, you know, a kind of colonnade with an upper floor.

Male Voice: Okay. But then you would do the same on Anza?

Michael Boland: The idea in this model is that this building mass -- you know, the army [unintelligible]. They would build a portion, and they'd glaze the porch in. And so this is -- the idea here is that this would be open porch on the ground floor and glazed on the upper floor, which is consistent with what's next door. Over here, the idea is that you would treat this -- you would read like a glazed porch. You know, we would read like an addition to this building.

Male Voice: Okay. I mean --

Michael Boland: But again, it's a bubble diagram. Call it a bubble diagram in foam. So -- okay.

We're in the home stretch here, guys. Theater. Now let's talk about the theater.

Male Voice: What about the sprinkling of buildings and the restaurant --

Michael Boland: Yes. We talked about that. Thank you for asking about that.

One of the other thoughts was this idea that -- is it item 2A -- the idea that pulled some of the square footage out across the esplanade so that you could reduce the size of this building. And the group felt favorably disposed to that idea, since historically buildings came out to about here, redefining that edge of the parade ground -- this is the original width of the parade ground -- reducing the scale of this and creating a more ragged ensemble, kind of speaking to your point, Rhett, about the -- kind of breaking down the regularity of these.

The second idea they talked about -- there was some discussion about that people felt good about was the idea that these building lengths might change, speaking again to the point you made -- and pull this back, you know, make this long and slide it back and pull some of this square footage up there, break it apart. So we talked about all of those ideas. And there was a sense that -- important thing is that anything out here be no more than one story, so that --

Male Voice: And it would be hotel use? Is that --

Michael Boland: Yeah. That you could -- there might be pieces of the hotel that you could pull out. Like, for example, part of the program is a restaurant that would serve visitors who are on the esplanade. And so you

could pull that out and actually put it along the esplanade in a one-story building --

Male Voice: I think you got too many potatoes in a 10-pound sack. But there's just too much square footage, I think. But to imagine this as then later a walk-through time -- I'm like, "Hey, 2010, you know." But I don't get back to 1870.

Michael Boland: Well, again, that's a different consideration. But, you know --

Male Voice: Well, it seems antithetical. It -- anyway. I mean, it just may be too much for me, and I --

Male Voice: No. I think that will come up in discussion, cumulative effects. It has to.

Male Voice: [unintelligible] one-story restaurant up there and then three one-story kiosks the size of small cottages, and the pedestrians who will be walking between them in kind of a tunnel-like situation -- it just doesn't make sense.

[Overlapping Voices]

Male Voice: We have no dimensions or anything on that except a couple of drawings in the main parade which show the kiosks the size of relatively small cottages, maybe 16 feet high, on platforms that are raised four or five, six feet above the main parade, in this very

heavily-built situation. So they're going to have the new construction of the line of hotels fronting on 40- to 60-foot-wide construction of the Anza Promenade with this row of structures. So the kiosks on the Anza Esplanade and that restaurant really will be the defining edge, not your hotel, of this thing.

Redmon Kernan: And just as you tried to solve our 140,000 square feet, you don't know what square footage you're trying to solve for in putting this forth. And so it --

Michael Boland: Yeah. Again, Rhett, I think that, you know, what we were trying to do is understand, define an envelope -- and, you know, kind of what are the factors, you know, what are -- in terms of height, in terms of width, in terms of massing and such. You know, now one could go back [unintelligible] square footage --

Male Voice: Well --

Michael Boland: -- based on that. It's certainly --

Male Voice: Or maybe you defined too big a number. So -- okay.

Male Voice: I guess I can see why the walkthrough time and what's gotten through the EA before is not here, because you don't want people commenting on that. You want people commenting on the mass and what this was really developed for. But I think it's important to go

back and put that in once this discussion has taken place, because that is going to change the way that we look at this.

Michael Boland: Okay. All right. So --

Female Voice: And I think that will be done in the Main Post update.

Michael Boland: Yeah.

Male Voice: But then we may lose -- or we, you, others may lose the option of saying, "Oh, it really is too many potatoes in the bag. We ought to have less."

Female Voice: I think it's already in the Main Post update.

Female Voice: It is.

Female Voice: The idea of having this here and this --

Male Voice: Yeah. I know --

Female Voice: -- building here is all in the Main Post update.

Male Voice: No. I know. And it's --

Male Voice: He's talking about the idea of having less.

Female Voice: Oh, well, you can comment on less.

Male Voice: No. It's not assessed in anything [unintelligible] a few pictures saying this is the way it'll be. There's no analytical --

Male Voice: And it's reflected differently in the different alternatives, so there's -
- personally, I don't have a good sense of what -- why it's not consistent in each alternative if it's already supposedly approved.

Female Voice: The main parade is consistent.

[Overlapping Voices]

Male Voice: There are no dimension drawings --

Male Voice: I'm talking about the SEIS.

Male Voice: -- [unintelligible]

Female Voice: Right.

Male Voice: Well, I guess --

Michael Boland: Go ahead --

Male Voice: [unintelligible]

Michael Boland: -- [unintelligible] the theater.

Male Voice: Before we do, there's the same issue. But we're solving a problem for a given, and the given is what should be challenged. What are givens, and why is x square footage a given? And then you say, "Here's how you can make it work." But why is it a given to begin with? And --

Female Voice: Well, I think that's --

Male Voice: -- that, I guess, is the underlying --

Female Voice: The exercise here was -- I mean, there are obviously many different ways of looking at it. The exercise here was to work within the given, to work within what we were analyzing.

Male Voice: Well, where did they -- there's some stolen --

Male Voice: [unintelligible]

Male Voice: -- tablets someplace that has the givens on it. And so that is -- if you accept the givens, then you go, "Okay. Well, this came down, and this will be." But it's --

Male Voice: His point is there's no analysis of [unintelligible].

Female Voice: There is in the SEIS.

Male Voice: Well, and I think, also -- I hear what you're saying, because -- the exercise was -- is related to context, and so it's proportional, and I -- that's why it doesn't have a number yet. It is because it's in relation to the buildings that it's adjacent to. So --

Male Voice: I don't think so. There's a number that's being solved for. And then there's architectural criteria being applied with the outcome being x rooms, square footage, whatever. And so, you know, enough said on that. That's what you're doing. And I guess I wouldn't do a Main Post update that way. I would say we should update the Main Post as saying, "What do we need to make it work for people? What do we need to make the place have the right kind of feel and usage and, you know, livability and things?"

Male Voice: As a park.

Male Voice: And then say, "Okay. How do we translate that into square footages and possibilities and convention rooms" -- or whatever it might be. But I -- but this is an architectural exercise under the 106. But it has assumptions at the beginning or givens which ought to be stated and that's -- required to solve for these and to determine that. So I'm just -- so I got it. Let's go forward. But it isn't what I would think one would do in a planning exercise.

Female Voice: Well, I guess, to respond to that, in a way I hear what you're saying. But also, take a look at what they did for the conforming museum. I

mean, for the conforming museum, that's not 100,000 square feet there. So I mean, obviously what they did was try to -- take a look at what the proposed projects were and then try to see a way to make them conform. And if you had to make them smaller to conform, then that's what's on the matrix. But it -- at the end of the exercise, you didn't have to make them smaller to conform than what was already proposed. Then you'll see something that's comparable in size to what was proposed.

Male Voice: If I was at the table, I would have said, " [bait]. Take some away, and we'll get it down to conforming."

Female Voice: So your point for conforming is just different, really, for this project here than the point that they come up with on the matrix, is what you're saying.

Male Voice: Yeah.

Female Voice: Yeah.

Male Voice: Okay.

Female Voice: Got it.

Female Voice: The thing that I'm wondering is were all of the -- in terms of determining that these all complied with the secretary of interior's -- to the extent that they do, they were looked at in isolation. Each one

was looked at by itself. Because if you add them all up, you've still got 265,000 square feet. Right?

Michael Boland: We also looked at it this way.

Female Voice: Did you look at them cumulatively?

Michael Boland: Yes. We looked at them this way.

Female Voice: [unintelligible].

Michael Boland: We just [unintelligible] --

Female Voice: Because it's hard for me to see how this volume of new construction couldn't be an adverse effect, no matter how you parsed it, especially since my understanding of the secretary of the interior standard is that you only add new construction after you have conserved what you have, you've evaluated it, you've enumerated it, you've repaired it, you've found a use for it, presumably, so that it isn't sitting there with the heat turned on, before you added new construction.

And that's why the description of how you add something new is -- has a shade on it. It's shaded in, because an -- the top of the shading is defined by saying, "The following work is highlighted to indicate that it represents the particularly complex technical or design aspects of rehabilitation projects and should only be considered

after the preservation concerns listed above have been addressed. And those include identifying, retaining, preserving, protecting, maintaining, repairing, and replacing if missing."

And it's not clear to me that that's been entirely done. I mean, you're probably working on parallel tracks to make sure that happens. But from our standpoint, it's -- it would make a lot more sense if you -- you know, you're following the guidelines to do the homework before you get the candy.

Female Voice: Well, I think what you're recognizing is the fact that these are rehabilitation standards. And to be honest, rehabilitation standards don't work very well for new construction, you know, in a historic landscape. I mean, that's what's hard about them. These were really written, if you will, for the project that Michael's about ready to talk about. Those fit perfectly for the theater, those standards.

Female Voice: Yeah. I think that's because --

Female Voice: See what I'm saying? It's harder to apply that sort of standard to new construction than it is to construction that's associated with an existing historic building.

Male Voice: That's because they don't contemplate new construction.

Female Voice: I think that's the truth is that they didn't expect --

Female Voice: Right.

Female Voice: -- you to be adding new buildings in a historic district. And so they didn't go -- do a good job of describing it, because they basically don't recommend it.

Male Voice: [unintelligible] landscape standards.

Female Voice: Right.

Female Voice: Does it --

Male Voice: It's not in the building standards. That's the difference.

Female Voice: Okay. Maybe you better show me the chapter.

[Overlapping Voices]

Male Voice: Let's finish. Please.

Male Voice: It's getting to be a long day.

Female Voice: I'll find it.

Michael Boland: I'm 45 minutes late for my next meeting. Sorry.

Let's see if we can talk about the theater. And I have built -- I have created a dummy here, a little blob. And let's run through that quickly. It's in the center of the stage [unintelligible]. First, minimize change to distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships. You know the current proposal calls for subdividing the original theater into -- at the mezzanine level and do a lower and upper theater. Obviously, the project -- if the project did not subdivide the original theater, that would be beneficial, and so we suggested that and instead suggested that the two smaller theaters should be built in a smaller addition located on the west side.

Male Voice: Is it not just beneficial in the sense that -- or is it kind of a higher level of requirement? I mean, you can say, "Oh, it would be nice. It would be beneficial if we didn't. But if we do, it'll look the same outside." But is -- what is it -- is the building rehabilitation standards -- that says maintain this space so you understand --

Male Voice: Yeah.

Male Voice: So I don't think it's just -- to say it's beneficial -- I -- anyway, I think that in your rating system, that misses something, so --

Michael Boland: Well, I -- and maybe I misspoke. I mean, for it to be conforming, we couldn't divide the theater.

Male Voice: Okay.

Michael Boland: That's really what this said, or that's what it tries to say.

Male Voice: Okay.

Male Voice: Conforming it to the building standard --

Michael Boland: Right.

Female Voice: The rehab standard.

Male Voice: But conforming -- yeah, for buildings. But conforming to rehab standard for cultural landscapes -- kind of like flipping from one to the other when you put an addition on the side rather than subdivide the interior.

[Overlapping Voices]

Michael Boland: The standards for the rehabilitation of buildings also speak to the idea of building an addition to an historic structure.

We thought it would be important that any addition be orthogonal to the Main Post's -- to the orientation to the Main Post orthogonal [unintelligible] Main Post, that the mass of the building be oriented to the north-south, oriented to -- south, just like the theater is, that the addition avoid protruding into existing historic roadways, Infantry Terrace, Moraga, Montgomery, and Bliss, that -- we talked

quite a bit about this -- the open space on the west side of the theater and concluded as a group that, though the addition would sit in a site that has historically been an open space, it's a less significant open space than, say, if the building addition was being proposed for the front side of Montgomery Street -- or the front side of the building on Montgomery Street rather than the west side -- or I should say east side, rather than --

Maintain significant views. You can see, although an addition on the west side of the existing theater would impact views that are not character-defining or significant -- that's not written correctly. I'm sorry.

Male Voice: I would like, again, to put on record a strong objection to -- it does impact views of anyone driving in past the cemetery. They're immediately getting a historic sense of this place, curving around the [unintelligible] from the side. To the left, they see the -- what's the word he used? -- the repetition of architectural forms in the row behind the barracks. And it is a major portal to the entire historic site. To have a modern structure sticking out like that sticks out and just meeting up on your right and to have CAMP, to me, is entirely inappropriate and destructive for the integrity of the historic site.

Michael Boland: Okay. We'll agree to disagree on that.

Maintain the open south end of the parade. Not applicable.
Compatible scale. If the new construction -- if -- it will be of

compatible scale if the new construction is scaled to relate to the existing theater. And, you know, that the -- that -- you know that an addition to a theater has -- is inherently a kind of solid piece. And then there is perhaps some interstitial space.

[Phone ringing]

Michael Boland: I'm sorry. I've got to turn that off.

Some interstitial space that would be treated differently. And so the idea is to use the design of the building to break up the mass and ensure that it reads as compatibly scaled.

Male Voice: And does that represent how many thousand square feet -- the proposal was for 18 addition, I think.

Michael Boland: Yes, this does.

Male Voice: So that's --

Michael Boland: It does. Yeah.

Male Voice: Well, so how many thousand? I missed that.

Michael Boland: 18.

Male Voice: The addition is 18,000?

Michael Boland: Yes. [unintelligible]

Male Voice: On an earlier presentation, you talked about having 200-square-foot theaters.

Michael Boland: Actually, the proposal is a 100-seat theater and a 200-seat-theater.

Male Voice: I see.

Michael Boland: And they would be massed together in the new -- you know, rather than subdividing the historic theater, we'd leave this as it is, and then we would build two smaller theaters in the addition that are 100 seat and 200 seat.

Male Voice: Okay.

Male Voice: I thought you had a model where they were actually separate buildings, and they were both 100 foot -- 100 seats. This is -- that was two weeks ago, so --

Female Voice: No. It was always one.

Male Voice: But the proposal made was for subdivision and two new theaters.

Michael Boland: No. A subdivision and one new theater.

Female Voice: One new theater.

Female Voice: One new theater.

Michael Boland: So we're swapping it. It was subdivision of this, 100, 200, then a new theater over here. And so the -- you know, we're swapping it. This would be the one theater, and this would be the two theater. It's a total of three.

Male Voice: And they end up with the same number of seats.

[Overlapping Voices]

Male Voice: Probably it's less.

Michael Boland: Okay. So avoid creating a false sense of historical development or adding conjectural features. Two points. [unintelligible] new construction would be differentiated but compatible, but there's a greater risk of creating a false sense of historical development when you're adding on to a historic building.

We talked a lot about the desirability of designing the building in such a way that this western wall of the theater read so that this building would remain legible as a solid. And there are actually a -- two historic doors that exist on this side that could be used to connect to the sort of interstitial space that could function as an extension of the lobby and allow for circulation. And so there was a

lot of talk about the desirability of making -- treating this edge in a way that that -- the edge of that reads -- pulling this back, dropping this down, making it transparent so that that connection remains, that building still reads --

Male Voice: I think it -- again, it's just that you begin solving it for a number of seats that you've been given. And I think this building should be subservient to this building, and its size makes it almost impossible, because it is actually a tad bigger. And therefore, rather than do a planning effort and say, "We want to provide an economic opportunity to reuse the main theater. What's the minimum addition that needs to be added," we're going through a process of justifying, again, a given of a certain number of seats. And so that said, I guess you can develop any matrix you want that kind of says, "Okay. Provided you do it right, it'll be okay." But I think doing it right -- you know, provided it's the right scale. Well, I think the right scale is smaller. So it's kind of dangerous wording to say, "Provided it's the right scale," without having a sense of -- I think it should be two-thirds or less the size that is proposed.

Female Voice: Maybe you could push it to [unintelligible].

Michael Boland: Yep. That's very possible.

Female Voice: If you've got to have that number of --

Michael Boland: Yeah. And, I mean, again, bear in mind -- I mean, I -- you know, I'm not nearly as talented as the model makers are. So, I mean, I think that some of these issues are actually in here. So if --

Male Voice: Well, but it does leave it out there as adding to a theater but making the addition bigger and dominant.

Michael Boland: Well, I think that's exactly not what we want. And so I think we probably -- our hopes are maybe closer to what you're suggesting than the model suggests. So let me continue to walk through this. Because that was, in fact, our intent, that this block -- you know, if I had my exacto, I'd trim it down some more -- but, you know, this block being --

Male Voice: I'm going to bring one next time.

Michael Boland: -- be lower and be smaller than the historic theater. You see under compatible height, if the height does not exceed the ridge of the movie theater. So we want it to be lower.

We want it to have compatible features, a compatible roof type. And again, I think the goal was to let this read as smaller than this. And again, I'm not doing a very good job of convincing you, given this little foam block, but -- and then to make the connection a very light connection. This is something Wayne Donaldson in particular talked quite a bit about, that you want any connection between the sort of new theaters and the old theater to be very transparent and be

smaller scale, be lower, be pushed back, you know, so that it reads -
- and maintain the main entrance of the theater as the main entrance.

Male Voice: But there's also going to be function space apart from the theater --
right -- a mixing --

Michael Boland: Well, that's the idea of the lobby, that it would be a fairly generous
kind of lobby --

Male Voice: What I'm getting to is this is a sort of necessity, a box. And there's
very few openings. This is the opportunity to have some opening.
And -- but I can go down to a detail, but I think it's important how
that reads on -- [Wood] is a fairly precious corner, depending upon
what the cumulative effect of other things are, because if you add a
-- new buildings up here and new here and new here and so on,
you're -- Wood's going to wonder what they -- what happened to his
Presidio, you know. It didn't look like this.

Female Voice: Actually, the way it's worded [unintelligible] no bigger than what's
there. And maybe we could just tweak the wording so that it says it
will be smaller.

Male Voice: I would even go so far as to say forget the height of the roof,
ridgeline on this one, and go down to the [sofen] or eave to reduce
the massing -- and its appearance in comparison to the existing --

Male Voice: I had the same thought, but it was definitional. If height is the traditional one-half between the eave and the peak of the roof, then we have a real problem. If height means the maximum elevation of the structure, that's a different issue.

Michael Boland: That's what we're hoping height means from now on, the maximum elevation of the structure, so no more of these funny, complicated ways of defining height, so --

So that's what we've done.

Male Voice: And what do you do --

[Laughter]

Female Voice: Michael's right out of time.

Female Voice: He's going to go get his teeth done now.

[Laughter and Overlapping Voices]

Male Voice: What do you do with this --

Michael Boland: Yeah. Let me tell you.

Male Voice: -- now that you've gotten -- and are we the last group that you talk to, or --

Female Voice: Yes.

Michael Boland: You are. And [unintelligible]. I've been trying to take careful notes of everything I've heard. And we're -- you know, I see this as a living, breathing thing. And so what I'm trying to do is incorporate the thoughts that I've heard in this and technical language, you know, like the thing you mentioned [unintelligible] and how else we can tighten up the language around a conforming movie theater.

You know, I think there are two kinds of things. There are places where we may all not agree [unintelligible] the lodge. We said we just have a disagreement. There are other places where our -- this has been really helpful for me, because I've been able to see ways in which -- you know, it's quite funny when you're working on something and you're a kind of insider, you know. It's -- you know, the Park Service and the Trust -- we've been working on this, and we kind of understand what's implied by the words or the meanings of the words. And it's been helpful to present this, because now I can understand places where we need to tighten the language up and make it much more concrete. You know, the height of the building shall not exceed x. The square footage shall not exceed y. And so my goal is to take this, to tighten up the language.

And again, I think, you know, as [Andrea] mentioned earlier, it becomes -- it's sort of a preview of what we'll begin to get really into as we talk about the next -- moving to the next phase of the 106

process. We'll be talking about strategies for avoiding and minimizing and mitigating.

Male Voice: The information that you guys are gaining from these discussions and presentations -- is that going to be incorporated into a new version of design guidelines, and therefore the Main Post update?

Female Voice: Yes.

Male Voice: Before or after the next FOE?

Female Voice: Well, after. I was -- it will be after. Because really, the design guidelines are something that we envision coming out of the, you know, avoid, minimize, and mitigate portion of 106.

Male Voice: So that's this portion.

Female Voice: Mm-hmm.

Male Voice: But that should be -- that should then guide the design of any new buildings --

Female Voice: This is where it gets a little bit fuzzy, because, you know -- and I'm sure that Gary understands this. Under NIPA, you know, there's a way to design a project where you design the mitigations into the project, or there's a way to have a project and then later, you know,

mitigate it. And so in a way, we're kind of hoping this is going to do both. You know, they don't --

Male Voice: [unintelligible] HPA. Right?

Female Voice: Well, yes, of course you can. You could always redesign the project and -- so that it is more conforming.

Male Voice: Yeah. And under the National Historic Preservation Act, you -- I mean, you have to have something that's an undertaking to assess the effects of. And that's what the applicants presented. And --

Male Voice: Sorry.

Male Voice: So what I'm saying--

Male Voice: Who are the applicants? The Trust is doing a Main Post update.

Male Voice: I know. And the Main Post update incorporates particular elements that are a reflection of a project that people have conceived. These are concepts. And they're -- so you can't do a 106 process on a concept. There -- someone would have to say, "This is what I'm going to build, and this is the project," and then you do 106 on them --

Male Voice: I thought the undertaking, though, is the Main Post update. And you could do that absent applicants to build buildings.

Male Voice: You could.

Male Voice: You could.

Male Voice: Sure. You could.

Male Voice: Quite an idea.

Male Voice: It's --

Male Voice: And so this is not done that way. This is done in response to a process that got underway with RFPs and applicants coming in, the terms you use. And this is how better planning might make it more tolerable, if I may. I mean, I think that's where we are.

Female Voice: I think we were actually using the word more conforming.

[Laughter]

Male Voice: Tolerable, conforming.

Male Voice: That too.

Male Voice: You were mentioning that yes, they could always go back and redesign. But then don't we have to go back into a review process and public presentation?

Female Voice: It depends --

Male Voice: Because what you're getting after a redesign might be completely different than --

Female Voice: What everybody reviewed.

Male Voice: -- what everybody reviewed and expected before.

Male Voice: It's a question of how significant the changes are. And I would suggest they're probably significant enough that you should start it over.

Female Voice: Well --

Male Voice: You may not agree with that.

Female Voice: If somebody would tell me where in these guidelines it says you can add a new building in a historic district. Because I don't find it in there, and I find --

Male Voice: It's something in there you can't --

Female Voice: We'll take down your question, and we'll get back to you.

Female Voice: Yeah. Just get back to me.

Female Voice: Definitely.

Male Voice: If it's necessary to use a resource or something.

Female Voice: It does say --

Male Voice: You have to show a need.

Female Voice: It does say you have to show a need and that is has to be --

Male Voice: Go for it.

[Laughter and Overlapping Voices]

Female Voice: You know, definitely -- I just took that down and we'll --

Male Voice: I think you want to do that, probably.

Female Voice: One other question was -- is if the trees in Infantry Terrace are coming off, the view down that way is -- of this theater addition is going to be much better or worse, depending on how you look at it.

Male Voice: Well, except that this whole slope, this ridge -- it's just these trees --

Female Voice: It's just those trees that are coming up?

Male Voice: Yes. Because the historic -- there was more here historically. This was --

[Overlapping Voices]

Male Voice: Thank you.

Female Voice: Well, thank you for filling us in.

Male Voice: Thank you.

Male Voice: One last note. Do something to sketch in the dimensions of the Anza Esplanade next time.

Male Voice: Yeah.

Male Voice: We will.

Male Voice: Nobody in the public has any idea.

Male Voice: I will

Female Voice: It's in these. It's in the document.

Male Voice: Well, thank you for planning this out.

Female Voice: Sure.

Male Voice: I will say this is very creative legal interpretation, which I think will give a judge a chuckle. But thank you. And now I know what your position is.

Male Voice: Anyway, I found the process helpful, talking this through and -- understand it. I do think it would have been better to do it before RFPs.

Male Voice: This -- and the cumulative effect is not discussed.

Michael Boland: No, it's not. It's not --

Female Voice: It's in the FOE, but it's not in that.

[Overlapping Voices]

[Off Topic Conversation]

[End of Recorded Material]